

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 11, 1971

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Foreign Judgments,
Road Traffic Act Amendment (Seat Belts),
Statutes Amendment (Administration of
Acts and Acts Interpretation).

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH-
EASTERN DRAINAGE**

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I ask leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My statement concerns the South-Eastern Drainage Act Amendment Bill, the second reading explanation of which I gave on Tuesday. Apparently, the explanation which I gave honourable members does not truly reflect the intentions of the Bill or of the Government with regard to clause 12.

Mr. Millhouse: That's an extraordinary admission.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is being rude and discourteous. Unanimously the House gave leave to the Minister to make a statement; he should be heard in silence. Any further interjections will be dealt with.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was about to say that some people are not big enough to admit that an error may have been made and to correct it before people are confused by it. Clause 12 repeals and re-enacts section 48 of the principal Act and provides a maximum rate which may be declared of three-tenths of 1c for every \$1 of the total value of all ratable land included in the assessment. The amount which will be raised by the rate will be directly proportionate to the value of the ratable land which is still included in the assessment when appeals are determined. It is not possible to make an estimate of the amount which is likely to be raised by this rate, but the amount to be raised cannot

exceed the cost of cleansing and repairing the drains and drainage works and maintaining them in a proper state of efficiency and the other expenses connected with the care, control and management of the drains and drainage works.

As the rate is limited by the Bill to three-tenths of 1c in \$1 it will be apparent that, if costs exceed this sum, the rate cannot be increased to recover the full cost. Earlier it was estimated that the cost could approximate \$100,000, but action to recover a fixed sum has been abandoned as it is realized that, in the event of a significant number of rate-payers successfully appealing, the total assessment would be reduced and hence those rate-payers who were included in the assessment would have to pay a much higher rate for the maintenance of the drains. I make this explanation, which is in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, so that the intentions of the Government may be clearly understood.

QUESTIONS**WATER PUMPING**

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister of Works give me some information about licences for pumping from the Murray River in South Australia? I recall that, when I was Minister of Works, I discussed with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Beaney) the desirability, when the Dartmouth agreement was ratified, of conducting a survey of the Murray River in South Australia in order to make proper and better use of the increased allocation of water that will eventually become available to South Australia, especially with regard to divertees and holders of licences. I ask this question in the interests of those who are requiring new licences (of course, it is not possible to issue them at present) or those who wish to have their licence areas extended. My question does not relate in any way to the survey regarding salinity: it relates only to availability of water. I ask the Minister whether, if such a survey has been carried out, what progress has been made, and, if it has not been carried out, I ask him what he intends in this regard.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No survey is being made at present regarding the matter that the honourable member has raised. I think the honourable member would know that, when the decision was made to meter the supply of private irrigators along the river, part of the reason for that decision was to find out more accurately what water was

being used. In fact, it is believed that the metering will lead to a more beneficial use of water; that is to say, possibly not as much water as is being used at present need be used. I do not think it is practicable to undertake any survey of this kind until the metering is completed and we have had time to assess its effect. The honourable member would be fully aware that we are well and truly over-committed regarding diversions on the Murray River. That is, of course, having regard to the worst possible conditions. In many years, water is surplus but, when we allow water to be diverted, we must have regard to the worst possible conditions that could obtain and base the diversion on that position. I understand that at present we are still diverting the maximum amount of water that we should divert, even taking the Dartmouth dam into consideration. However, I will discuss the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief, in the light of the honourable member's question, to find out whether he has any thoughts about whether there would be any value in the type of survey that the honourable member has mentioned being undertaken at present.

BUSINESS SAMPLERS CLUB

Mr. HARRISON: Will the Attorney-General have investigations made into the genuineness of the Business Samplers Club presented by the Port Adelaide Junior Chamber of Commerce (commonly known as Jaycees), which is currently advertising over radio and television and in the press, offering "over \$250 worth of goods, services, values and entertainment for an unbelievable \$12.95 total cost". Many constituents in the Albert Park area have told me that they have been telephoned by courteous operators who have said that these people should become members of the club, as only a limited number of memberships can be issued. The Port Adelaide Junior Chamber of Commerce claims that it will retain all money and will retain all profits made from the metropolitan Business Samplers Club after all expenses such as advertising, printing, promotion, and staff salaries are paid. If the Attorney-General has this matter investigated in the interests of all concerned, it will clear the air for my constituents.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter having been brought to my attention, I am having inquiries made and hope to be able to give the honourable member some information next Tuesday.

DEPARTMENTAL HEAD

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say why an advertisement appears in the Public Service Notice of November 10 inviting applications for the position of Director in the Department of the Premier and of Development? The Director will be permanent head of that department? This is one of the senior positions in South Australia in the administration of Government affairs and, as the Premier well knows, until now the position has been held by a person with tremendously high qualifications who has been eminently suited to this job. When one learns of the necessity now to fill that position, one is confronted with certain questions, and the question I put to the Premier is based on the fact that this position is widely sought after in the department. I imagine that normally a vacancy would occur only through death or illness, or by Government instruction. I therefore ask the Premier why this vacancy has occurred.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier's Department is of fairly new construction; in fact, until 1965 there was no Premier's Department in South Australia, the department of the Minister (the Treasurer) who was given the courtesy title of Premier consisting of his personal secretary and two typists. Since that time there has been a marked change in the policy relating to the departments that come under the control of the Minister who is now the Premier, with that portfolio. The Premier's Department now controls a much wider area of the Public Service than was previously the case, and the development portfolios have all been centred in this department. After consultation with the Public Service Board, it was considered that there should be a senior officer in this department who was responsible for the overall development of policy administration within the department, and that that had to be a senior Government officer.

The honourable Leader will know that the Secretary of the Premier's Department has had a much lower classification and salary in the Public Service than have other senior Government officers. For instance, he has a much lower classification and salary than has the Under Treasurer, the Engineer-in-Chief, the Director of Public Buildings, the Railways Commissioner, or other officers of this kind, whereas the permanent head of the Premier's Department now must be an officer with an extremely wide range of administrative responsibility; he must not merely be the personal secretary to the Minister, who is

the Premier, but must cover all the areas of development within the State. In these circumstances the Public Service Board recommended alterations in the structure of departments: for instance, it recommended that the Tourist Bureau become part of the Premier's Department rather than be a separate department, and that the senior officer of the department should have a classification commensurate with the responsibilities necessary for the overall control of the activities of Government coming under the Department of the Premier and of Development. In the circumstances, a new position has been created, and it will be necessary for applications to be called for that position in terms of the Public Service Act. However, this is not in any way denigrating the present Secretary of the department, who may, of course, apply for the position.

EVICCTIONS

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, have investigated the imminent eviction of two young couples living with a Housing Trust tenant in my district, without permission of the Housing Trust? One young couple is the son and daughter-in-law of the tenant (the son is 21 years old) and they have two young children. The other couple is the daughter and son-in-law of the tenant (the son-in-law is 20 years old) and they have an infant child. The tenant has a three-bedroom house, and these two young couples have been told that they must leave the premises in two weeks. The son of my constituent (who is the tenant) has had an application lodged with the Housing Trust for two years, but I understand that it will not be considered because he has not been in constant touch with the Housing Trust, he having considered that by doing so he would be making a nuisance of himself. The other couple applied only this morning, because previously they were too frightened to apply as they did not want to disclose that they were living without permission in the house. I believe that these two young couples have no chance of getting any other accommodation than a Housing Trust house. I ask the Premier whether he will personally intervene so that the Housing Trust is not responsible for evicting these two young couples into the street, because that is what would happen.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern for his constituents, but he will appreciate that it is

the responsibility of the Housing Trust to maintain standards of tenancy that will not lead to a deterioration of housing in the area he represents. That is a very real responsibility. I appreciate the problem facing the constituents, and I shall certainly have this subject taken up with the Housing Trust to see whether some assistance can be given or whether some alternative accommodation can be found elsewhere. The honourable member knows that there are provisions in each Housing Trust tenancy agreement about the number of people who can be accommodated in a trust house and, if these are not enforced, the resultant deterioration of housing standards is quite real. This is not something that the trust can suffer. However, if there is any way in which these people can be helped, this will be done.

INDUSTRIAL STATEMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the Government is satisfied with the state of industry and employment in South Australia? I saw in this morning's newspaper (and obviously members opposite must also have seen this because of their reaction to my question) a report attributed to the State Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union (Mr. J. L. Scott) in which, amongst other things, the following appears:

"Unemployment among tradesmen in the engineering trade in South Australia was fast approaching a chronic state," the State Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union (Mr. J. L. Scott) said yesterday. Recent statements by the Premier expressing confidence in the state of industry and employment in South Australia were "not in accordance with the facts as we know them".

Mr. Scott said that the union was having extreme difficulty in placing many of its dismissed members in work. As this expression of opinion is at such variance with the expressions we have heard repeatedly and recently from the Premier and other Government members, I ask my question in the hope that the Premier can clear up the apparent contradiction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has obviously not spoken to Mr. Scott: I have.

Mr. Millhouse: I bet you have: early this morning, too!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As Mr. Scott happens to be a member of the Labor movement and a valued member of the State Executive of the Australian Labor Party, naturally I consult with him.

Mr. Millhouse: Has he been misrepresented?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I have a letter from Mr. Scott in which he attacks the *Advertiser* over the report. If the honourable member had ascertained the truth or otherwise of this report, he would not have asked his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Mathwin: You just happened to have it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not expect the Deputy Leader to ask a Dorothy Dixier, but I suppose I could rely on the Deputy Leader's taking the opportunity to knock South Australia, if he could.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask the Premier to withdraw that statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When an honourable member is on his feet, he is entitled to be heard in silence. What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I absolutely reject the Premier's allegation that I take every opportunity to knock South Australia, and I ask the Premier to withdraw that statement.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. If the honourable member wishes to make a personal explanation, Standing Orders provide for that. As the Premier's remark was not unparliamentary, I am not going to ask him to withdraw. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This morning, Mr. Scott expressed dismay because he could not place some people in the engineering trade. At present, it is difficult to find work for numbers of the union's members, particularly patternmakers. Following the action of the vehicle manufacturing companies in South Australia, such as Chrysler Australia Limited and General Motors-Holden's in altering their structure of production and in reducing their patternmaking activities because of the alteration in the times of new models and the like, it has been difficult to find work in the short term for people previously employed at those plants. The Government has done as much as possible to find employment for these people who face difficulty because of a change in the structure of industry in South Australia. What happened as a result of Mr. Scott's protest that it was difficult to find work in the engineering trade was that a reporter said, "How does this tie in with the Premier's statements about

expansion of industrial employment?" Mr. Scott replied that, although there were numbers of instances of expansion in employment in South Australia, they did not affect the engineering industry, except for the A.N.I. drop forge, which would not provide employment in the short term. Mr. Scott then attacked the Commonwealth Government for its failure to give special assistance to South Australia to expand employment in the engineering industry because, after all, the Commonwealth Government gives such assistance in other areas of employment in South Australia, but not in this area.

Mr. Millhouse: Did he refer to you at all?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to a reporter's question, he said that the expansion in employment in South Australia, which he acknowledged, was not showing up in the engineering trade, and that is perfectly true.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Only one question is allowed at a time and I will not allow an honourable member to ask a question and then continually interject and so prevent his colleagues from getting their business before the House during Question Time. The honourable Premier is replying and he must be heard in silence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Scott pointed to some South Australian plants which are expanding but which do not provide employment in the trades covered by his union. In addition, there are other plants such as Fletcher Jones which will not provide for patternmakers (not of the iron variety anyhow). South Australia is expanding its industrial capacity at a heartening rate. I assure the honourable member, although doubtless from the nature of his question today he will be disappointed about this—

Mr. Millhouse: I reject that implication entirely.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that I will shortly announce a considerable employment facility for South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: Did this all happen in your term?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, entirely, and I hope the honourable member will get up and cheer. It will provide employment for over 450 people.

Mr. Venning: What are you doing for the rural community?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member always wants to change the subject when it is unpleasant for him. What I am doing for the rural community is to try to help industry in rural areas. For instance, under our Government the industry at Mannum has got far greater assistance from this Government than from any other Government in the history of the State. Further, at Mount Gambier we have just brought in a new plant. The Director of that firm (Mr. Fletcher Jones) said that it was coming to South Australia rather than going to the Liberal-governed State of Victoria because it could get a better deal from us. If the honourable member for Rocky River wants to know what we are doing about employment in the country, I can tell him we are helping wherever we possibly can. Indeed, under the conditions we have produced, this Government has given more assistance to rural industry than has ever been given before in the history of the State.

In South Australia we have a rate of expansion of industrial undertakings which is heartening, but two problems face us. The first is caused by the restructuring of the engineering industry following decisions made by G.M.H. and Chrysler in relation to the structure of their industry. The second problem stems from the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to take action to stimulate the economy at a time when it knows from forecasts made by all the economists in this country that by January we will have 124,000 unemployed in Australia.

Mr. Venning: Would this involve the Commonwealth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier of New South Wales (a Liberal Premier) has asked for a special Premiers' Conference on this score, and I have supported him because I think he is right. I wish the honourable member would give a bit of support, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I reject utterly the imputation of the Premier that I take every opportunity to knock this State. I think those were his precise words: if not, they were certainly the essence of what he said when he answered my question on the state of industry and employment. Quite to the contrary of what the Premier has said, I am delighted when a new

industry establishes in South Australia or when there is expansion of any existing industry, irrespective of whichever political Party is in office. My great fear is that the industrial expansion so evident here during the terms of the Liberal and Country League Governments is obviously not being maintained under Labor.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is trying to raise debate in a personal explanation. That is not allowed. I call on the next business.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I have given a ruling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I disagree to your ruling in that case, Sir. I was giving a personal explanation and there was nothing whatsoever exceptionable about that personal explanation, which was on a matter of very great importance on which the Premier had offered me a deliberate insult, and you failed to protect me when he did so.

The SPEAKER: Order! Do you disagree to my ruling?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disagreeing to your ruling if you do not allow me to continue, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, I am not permitting the honourable member to continue. Does the honourable member wish to move disagreement?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has handed me the following motion:

I move to disagree to your ruling that I not be allowed to continue my personal explanation as, you said, I was raising matters of political argument.

Is the motion seconded?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, Sir.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Earlier in Question Time the Premier made an imputation against me that I took every opportunity to knock this State, and he based this imputation on the question I had asked him about the state of the economy in South Australia. Sir, I objected to the Premier having said that, and you did not uphold my objection. I therefore took the only way that I knew to protect myself by making a personal explanation and, in the course of that personal explanation, it was necessary for me to give the reasons why I had asked the question. I was giving those reasons when, because of the

jeering from members opposite, particularly those on the front bench, you interrupted my explanation and ruled (after you had heard the jeering, no doubt) that I was raising matters of political argument and that I should not continue.

It is impossible for me to give a proper personal explanation on this matter without canvassing the matters I was canvassing at the time. If members of this House are to have any rights to protect themselves when they are attacked by other members, it is necessary to do this. This is a most serious matter, because not only was I attacked by the Premier in that way but he also attacked the *Advertiser* and suggested that a report in this morning's paper was the exact contrary of what Mr. Scott had said. That, too, is a serious matter, which I wished to canvass in my personal explanation. Because of this, and because you, Mr. Speaker, should be the arbiter of the rights of members, irrespective of Party, I move to disagree to your ruling, because I believe it is a thoroughly unfair one.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): I support the motion, but I prefer to ignore the asinine interjection that I heard made by the Minister of Labour and Industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. COUNBE: My reason for supporting my colleague is that he sought and received the permission of honourable members to make a personal explanation, and no objection was raised. Having received that permission, the honourable member proceeded to make an explanation in his own way, as he is entitled to do. In the middle of his explanation you, Mr. Speaker, saw fit to interrupt him, so he was deprived of the right that had been given by the House to give the full reasons for his seeking leave to make a personal explanation. With due respect, I think it might have been better and wiser, Mr. Speaker, to permit the member for Mitcham to conclude the remarks he was about to make (whatever they might have been), because it has been a long-standing custom of the House that a member who seeks leave to make a personal explanation receives the unanimous permission of the House, no matter what side he belongs to, and that the Speaker hears him out.

It is a fundamental right that we have this opportunity to seek leave and make a personal explanation, and the member for Mitcham was simply exercising that fundamental right. I suggest that what the honourable member

was saying is not the matter before the Chamber: what is before the Chair is that he was making a personal explanation and that you chose to cut him short. If, however, he was debating a matter to which you took exception, I suggest that it was part of the personal explanation he was entitled to make and that it would have been far wiser for you to have heard him out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion, and draw the attention of members opposite to Standing Orders. It is necessary for members in their activity in this House to act in accordance with Standing Orders. Standing Order 137 provides:

By leave of the House, a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House; but such matters may not be debated.

Erskine May, in his explanation of the practice of the House of Commons, which we follow on these matters, says that general arguments or observations beyond the fair bounds of explanation are out of order.

Mr. Millhouse: I wasn't beyond the fair bounds of explanation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, the honourable member (and you Mr. Speaker, drew his attention to this) was going quite beyond the bounds of a personal explanation and embarking on a general debate on the nature of policy under Liberal and Labor Governments, and that is not a matter of personal explanation. Your ruling, Mr. Speaker, was entirely in accordance with the traditions of this House and with Standing Orders.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): This goes beyond what is written in Standing Orders. Honourable members are supposed to abide by Standing Orders, but laws of the land develop through common law and precedent, and one adopts what goes on in a certain place according to that. This session, Ministers, in replying to questions (they are not supposed to debate the replies), have debated the matter and used political innuendo against Opposition members. A practice and precedent, in which Government members are not limited, has been created. You, Mr. Speaker, have chided us on our behaviour but, if you adopted and enforced Standing Orders as you are now doing, there would not be the problem we are having this session. The Minister of Roads and Transport rarely gets up without going into politics.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the motion before the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: I am trying to make a strong point that, if you are going to carry out the letter of Standing Orders, you will get obedience from honourable members if you do that with justice to every honourable member. This is the protest we are making: the House is getting out of order and losing its reputation among the people because of the unfair attitude you adopt on these matters.

Mr. Langley: What about your Deputy Leader?

Mr. McANANEY: If you, Mr. Speaker, apply Standing Orders to members opposite and do the same regarding the Deputy Leader, if I am asked to support the Deputy Leader I will not do so. This will be my attitude when you are treating both sides the same.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to reflect on the Chair. He must speak to the motion. If the honourable member wants to reflect on the Chair, he must move a separate motion. Under Standing Orders, the honourable member must confine his remarks to the motion before the House.

Mr. McANANEY: I think I have made my point and have made you, Mr. Speaker, uncomfortable at the same time by speaking the truth. What is necessary to straighten up honourable members' behaviour is to enforce Standing Orders on fair and equal terms.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Works, by way of an aside, said that some people were big enough to admit that they were wrong at times. I submit that this is one such time. You, Mr. Speaker, stopped the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in mid-sentence, as you have tended to do on many other occasions. You are wont to request members to behave in a courteous manner, and I believe that members should expect the right to courtesy from the Chair. On more than one occasion you have sat down honourable members (and the honourable member for Florey would be well aware of such an occasion) without any warning. I believe that it would have been courteous, even if you are not required to do so, to give some warning. It is your normal practice, and it is the normal practice of Speakers in the few other Parliaments that I have attended, if an honourable member is trans-

gressing Standing Orders in some way, to inform him, call him to order, and let him change his approach, as you have just done with the member for Heysen. I believe this is the crux of the matter.

In the past you have tended to dismiss points of order without listening to them fully. That is not for me to criticize, but I believe some courtesy is due and that there should be some give and take. I support the Deputy Leader in this motion because I suggest you did not give him an opportunity to reconsider his remarks. Perhaps if he was out of order he might have reconsidered it and you might have been able to lead him into the right form, but you gave him no opportunity to do this. I support the motion with great regret. However, I do so because I believe your ruling is wrong.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I get no pleasure from speaking to this motion, but I support the Deputy Leader. The Deputy Leader was called a "knocker" of South Australia, and he very rightly protested about this. He was then told by you, Sir, that he could not take a point of order on that issue or ask that the remark be withdrawn. Therefore, he had to make a personal explanation, and in so doing apparently, in your judgment, he went somewhat wider of the mark than he should have done. When being ordered to resume his seat he took the only course open to him: he moved disagreement to your ruling. I believe there have been some spectacles in this Chamber that have not been edifying to people outside of this Chamber, and there are faults on both sides.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And you are trying to justify them.

Mr. RODDA: I appreciate the difficulties you have in presiding over this House, but the difficulties are not all on this side. It is because of this that there is such strong support for the motion. You, Sir, are the custodian of the rights and privileges of the minority in this House. The South Australian Parliament has a high reputation in the legislative chambers not only of this great Commonwealth but also of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and we want to see this maintained.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I oppose the motion. Since I have been a member I do not think I have witnessed such a spectacle as members of the Opposition rising one after the other to support a motion to disagree to a ruling of the Chair which was so obviously correct and, indeed, the only ruling you could have made in

the circumstances. I refer again to Standing Order 137, under which the ruling was given and which provides:

By leave of the House, a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House; but such matters may not be debated.

Erskine May, in the passage referred to by the Premier, points out that this is not to be used as a cloak for the advancing of general argument beyond the bounds of personal explanation. It is of great importance to the proper conduct of the business of this House that you insist that a personal explanation be confined to matters that are personal. The importance of it is this: as has been pointed out by honourable members earlier in this debate, it has been the practice to grant leave to members to make personal explanations and to hear them without interruption while they make these explanations. Standing Orders provide that there shall be no debate so, if you were to permit the sort of observation that was made by the member for Mitcham under the cloak of making a personal explanation, it would work a great injustice to other members, because no-one could disagree with him.

Under Standing Orders no-one is entitled to debate what he says and so, when a member imposes on the House by asking for leave to make a personal explanation and then uses the leave granted to him to vindicate himself personally, and to make political observation as the honourable member did when seeking to compare the performances of Liberal and Labor Governments in regard to industry in this State, no-one can reply to him because of the Standing Orders regarding personal explanations. So I say he is abusing the processes of this House and that it is your duty to prevent him from so doing, as you did creditably and honourably.

The member for Bragg has suggested that some warning should have been given to the member for Mitcham. When you intervened, Sir, the member for Mitcham reacted angrily, not to say impertinently, and it was no surprise to me when you directed him to resume his seat. I think the ruling you have made is essential for the protection of the rights of members, because, if the practice grows of members abusing leave given to make personal explanations to canvass controversial political matters, knowing that no reply can be made, it is inevitable that members will be moved to refuse leave from time to time, knowing that the personal explanation will be abused in that way. For that reason I say that not only

was your ruling right but also that it was absolutely essential to the preservation of the rights and privileges of members.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. I believe the Deputy Leader ought to have been allowed to make his personal explanation because of the charge that was made in a 10-minute reply given by the Premier. I think he had every right to make some explanation, and I believe that you refused him this right by cutting him off in the middle of a sentence. It is hard to understand how you can protect people, particularly the people on the front bench opposite, but you do not hear when I am called a rat, a liar and a pommy. I have never been afforded protection by the Chair, yet you give this protection today. I believe the member for Mitcham had every right to explain the position. When you cut him off in the middle of a sentence he rose on a point of order, and without hearing his point of order you immediately said there was no point of order. I should have liked to hear the point of order.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I oppose the motion. As a relative newcomer to the House, I am shocked and amazed that such a motion should come before the Chamber under such a flimsy pretext. The member for Heysen attacked you, Mr. Speaker, and castigated you, saying that you were not impartial: that you favoured one side compared to the other. Then the member for Bragg referred to me, saying that I had been sat down abruptly by you because I had transgressed Standing Orders. It is true that that happened. I put it to the House that that fact is concrete proof of your impartiality. As a Government member, I was treated in precisely the same way as an Opposition member would have been treated. I was sat down as I deserved to be sat down, and as members opposite deserve to be sat down when they contravene Standing Orders. I repeat that this is concrete proof that you, Sir, are entirely impartial in your judgment, for you sat down a Government member as rapidly as, if not more rapidly than, you sit down Opposition members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have the right of reply, I think, Sir.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member speaks, he closes the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not repeat what I said in putting the case for this motion except to rebut what was said by the Attorney-General, because his comments, in the light of what I had said (which he entirely and utterly

ignored), were beside the point. I took the only course open to me to rebut a very serious slur cast on me by the Premier. Indeed, he cast that slur in the course of a 10-minute reply (as one member pointed out); if he did not bring politics into the matter and try to denigrate me, I do not know who did. I was simply trying to protect myself; I could not do that without canvassing the performance of one Government against that of another. That is the crux of the matter. In summing up, I refer to the point made by the member for Bragg: you, Mr. Speaker, gave me no opportunity to desist from what you regarded as improper. You simply sat me down and would not let me continue. Even if you were right (which I dispute) in interrupting my personal explanation on the grounds that you gave, you could at least have warned me, telling me to desist from that line of explanation. I believe that you would have done that in the case of any other member who was in the position in which I found myself. That is another point I bring against you in moving this motion. You gave me no opportunity whatever to go on to another point, and to complete my personal explanation, having left the other point. Although I have made that point, I do not believe that you were entitled, in any case, to stop me. Of course, you will be vindicated in this vote because numbers count, and might is right in this place. However, with the failure of this motion I believe (and I think I speak for all members on this side) that we see one more blow to the rights of private members in this House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Carnie, Coumbe, Evans, Ferguson, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Eastick and Goldsworthy. Noes—Messrs. Clark and McRae.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

TOYS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is likely that provisions with regard to the safety of toys will be considered? At about this time of the year people spend much money on toys for their children. I understand that many toys are dangerous for small children as they contain small objects that can be swallowed easily while others have sharp edges which can cause cuts and other injuries. Some toys are painted and finished with lead paint or other dangerous substances, while still other toys are in the shape of fine projectiles which are dangerous to the eyes. I understand that the Commonwealth customs regulations that deal with the safety of imported toys ban those toys that are obviously dangerous. Therefore, many toys exist that are dangerous in the less obvious ways, as I have outlined. I ask the Attorney whether the matter can be considered with a view to warning the public about these dangers.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will discuss the matter with the Chief Secretary and let the honourable member have a reply.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say whether landholders whose properties adjoin the ponded area of Bool Lagoon can be notified when the South-Eastern Drainage Board opens the water gates on drain M at the Moy Hall Road junction? During the ponding, some inundation of adjoining properties occurs, the boundary fences in the area becoming submerged. When the water recedes with the opening of the flood gates, it is found that the salinity and resultant chemical action on the wires on these fences during this submersion has caused a complete collapse of certain parts of the fences. Stock has been known to stray with the result that there is boxing of the stock of neighbours. All that the landholders ask is that they be notified when the flood gates are to be opened so that they will be able to supervise stocking and repair any fence the wires of which have eroded. This is not a grizzle by the landholders: they merely seek the co-operation of the local authorities. I understand that an officer of the department opens the flood gates. I will supply to the department the names of the people concerned. If this co-operation can be arranged, the scheme will be able to work more smoothly.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague.

No doubt it would help if the honourable member could supply the names to which he has referred.

COPPER SHIPMENTS

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Marine any information about shipments of copper concentrates from the newly established mine at Kanmantoo? I understand that this mine is now operating and that the concentrate is being prepared for export. I believe that these initial shipments will be made from Port Adelaide within the next few weeks.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Marine and Harbors Department has leased one acre of land for storage purposes. I think that it is expected that the first shipment of copper concentrates from Kanmantoo will take place in about one month. It is expected that about 60,000 tons a year from the mine at Kanmantoo will eventually be shipped from Osborne.

Mr. Evans: Where will it go?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not concerned with where it will go; I am more concerned with the fact that work will be done at Osborne, thus providing welcome activity at that plant. As I think members will be aware, there has been a marked run-down in activity at Osborne in the last few years as a result of the conversion to oil and natural gas for power, and I am indeed pleased to know that 60,000 tons of cargo a year will be shipped from there.

PRISONERS AID ASSOCIATION

Mr. EVANS: On October 5, I asked the Premier whether he would discuss with the Housing Trust the possibility of making a house available to the Prisoners Aid Association. As I have received no reply to that question, will the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Premier, follow up the matter and find out whether or not the Housing Trust is prepared to make a house available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that.

COURT SENTENCE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General say whether he is aware that a Bill has been introduced in the Tasmanian House of Assembly, providing for weekend work to be ordered, in lieu of imprisonment, as punishment for certain classes of offence, and whether he has considered introducing a similar reform in this State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have read the press report of the introduction of this measure in Tasmania and it is undoubtedly one of the matters that will be considered by the committee the Government is about to appoint to consider the penal system and the revision of the criminal law in South Australia.

FARE EVASION

Mr. McANANEY: Having read in a Victorian newspaper recently that tramway fares evaded in that State amount to about \$1,000,000 a year, I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether, now that he is taking over control of transport, and so on, he will ask the Municipal Tramways Trust Board whether the situation in South Australia is similar, and whether he will obtain a report on the collection of road maintenance tax. I think the Commissioner of Highways claimed a year or two ago that a large sum was being lost through non-payment of this tax.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to refer the question of the tram fares to the M.T.T., but I do not think the trust could help the honourable member on the problem of the evasion of road tax. The latter matter must be referred to the Commissioner of Highways, and I shall be pleased to refer it to him. I assure the honourable member that it is not necessary to have Ministerial control over the trust for us to get information. Information is always available readily, as I am sure it will be in this case.

SALISBURY NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. GROTH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question regarding the Salisbury North Technical High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Difficulty has been experienced in developing the area concerned, owing to excessive weed growth. Adverse weather conditions have prevented the Public Buildings Department from effecting the number of cuttings and other treatments necessary for weed control. The area has been cut and watered recently and is expected to be ready for use in late autumn, 1972.

CADETSHIP DEFERMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education take up with his colleagues, as a matter of policy, the possibility of granting a deferment of cadetships or scholarships to any student who, having gained a Government cadetship or scholarship, is subsequently offered a travelling scholarship or exchange scholarship, such as that offered by the Rotary Club

movement? I raise this matter because I understand that there was an instance this year of a student having been granted a cadetship and, believing that he would have the opportunity to re-apply for a similar cadetship this year if he accepted a Rotary exchange scholarship, he accepted the scholarship. Of course, as I think is apparent to most honourable members from reading the newspaper, extremely few cadetships or scholarships have been offered this year; certainly, none has been offered in civil engineering, which is the area of interest to this student. The matter has been raised with me as one of policy. I understand that anyone who qualifies for one of these scholarships must have matriculated and that it will be difficult to get boys to take Rotary scholarships, or any other scholarship, if by so doing they find that their future tertiary education will be jeopardized. This is an important area and I should like the Minister to consider whether students who are granted cadetships or scholarships might be allowed a deferment in the circumstances that I have outlined.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the honourable member certainly has a point in the example that he has quoted and I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleagues and the Public Service Board to find out whether we can place in operation a system to cover this sort of case.

WHYALLA WORKERS CLUB

Mr. BROWN: Will the Minister of Works have examined the position regarding the easement that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has over private property that is set aside for car-parking facilities by the Whyalla Workers Club? I understand that the department uses this easement to gain entrance to a water storage tank in that area. The club desires to fence this area, and this would deprive the department of its right of way, but the club, which has its own easement into the area from another direction, desires to make a suitable arrangement with the department so that neither party will be unduly affected by any alteration.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to ask the department to examine the matter for the honourable member and I hope that, because of his representations, a satisfactory arrangement can be made that will inconvenience neither party.

CITRUS JUICE

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to

my question about the importation of citrus juice?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that inquiries were made of the Bureau of Census and Statistics, which has advised that it is unable to supply the specific information requested but provides the following data, which may be of assistance. During the financial year 1969-70, 155,435 gall. of citrus juice or concentrate, with a free on board value of \$127,606, was imported into South Australia from overseas. In the financial year 1970-71, the corresponding figures were 10,001 gall. with a free on board value of \$13,442. The bureau records indicate that of these imports, 2gall. of orange juice or concentrate was imported during 1969-70 and 165gall., valued at \$476, was imported in 1970-71. No data is available to determine what quantities of the direct imports to Adelaide were subsequently marketed in other States, and what quantities imported through other States were subsequently marketed in South Australia. It is assumed that the bulk of the imports was grapefruit juice or concentrate, imported to fill a shortfall in local requirement caused by seasonal fluctuations in the grapefruit crop.

BENADRYL PRICE

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Premier ask the Prices Commissioner to investigate the increases in the price of Parke Davis Benadryl in the 228 ml bottle sold by chemists? I understand that this proprietary line of anti-allergic decongestant is often prescribed by doctors for children who are asthmatic or suffer bronchial congestion, but it is not on the Commonwealth so-called free list. In 1970, a bottle of this preparation cost 92c; in January, 1971, the price rose to \$1.08; in September it rose to \$1.23; and now in November it costs \$1.41.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from the Prices Commissioner.

ARMAGH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ascertain the position regarding the application by landholders and householders in the settlement of Armagh for a reticulated water supply, which they have been seeking for some time? In the past, I understand from the department that there have been some difficulties regarding this scheme. However, because of the development of Clare, including the development of Housing Trust areas, and because a new main has recently been laid in the area, it is considered that the time may be

more opportune for the department to provide this water service at Armagh. It may be of interest to the House to know that Armagh is north of and abuts Clare.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to have an investigation made and in due course to inform the honourable member of the outcome.

MODBURY ROUNDABOUT

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain when it is expected that plans will be completed for the roundabout to be situated at the corner of Wright and Kelly Roads, Modbury? These plans are at present being prepared for the approval of the Road Traffic Board.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will inquire.

ABORIGINAL MISSION

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether the Government intends to establish an Aboriginal mission at Marree, or does he know of any organization that is about to establish such a mission? Local residents have told me that reports are circulating in the area that a mission is to be established there. It is stated that this is possible, as adequate schooling arrangements exist at Marree, the new Samcon school having been completed.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I know of no plans by any organization to establish a mission at Marree. Certainly, I have no plans to establish an Aboriginal reserve in that town.

DRINKING OFFENCES

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Attorney-General say whether, since it became legal for 18-year-olds to buy alcoholic liquor in this State, there has been an increase in offences committed by people in the 18-21 age group and, if there has been an increase, what type of offence has increased the most?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask the police whether there has been any change in the incidence of crime among people between the ages of 18 and 21 years. However, certainly from information I have received and from my own observations, I think it is extremely unlikely that there is any causal connection between the right of people between the ages of 18 and 21 years to drink liquor in licensed places and the crime rate in that age group.

COOBER PEDY COURTHOUSE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Attorney-General take urgent action to rectify the unsatisfactory

position at Coober Pedy regarding courthouse facilities? I have received a letter from Coober Pedy justices of the peace stating:

Recently Mr. Cramond, S.M., whilst attending to a hearing at Coober Pedy was forced, because of the heat, dust and noise, to adjourn to his bedroom in the local hotel so that he might satisfactorily complete the hearing. I have been directed on behalf of the under-mentioned justices of the peace—

four justices are named—

to advise you that a motion has now been moved and passed that we will refuse to hear and determine any further matters after December 31, 1971, unless greatly improved facilities are available by that date. (Signed) G. R. Aylett, J.P.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am surprised that I have had no communication from the gentlemen concerned. They apparently have not thought the matter sufficiently serious to communicate with me or with the Attorney-General's Department. However, I will examine the matter and let the honourable member have all the information possible.

NURSES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to make a statement to clarify the position of nurses finishing their final examinations and training? As members know, new regulations under the Act are now operating, and the effect of these regulations is to reduce the period of training from a minimum of three years and four months to three years, but the requisite time for lectures and practical work has been raised to a minimum of 1,000 hours. There is doubt in the minds of several people who have contacted me concerning what are the requirements of a nurse who is finishing her final examinations and who may have to make up the time of training. In the past, under the old system nurses were allowed 96 hours a year sick leave, and it was not necessary for them to make up this working time. On the other hand, although nurses are still allowed sick leave at the same rate from (shall we say) the industrial point of view, from an academic point of view if they have not completed the necessary time they are being asked to return after their finals, or after their expected date of finishing, to make up the days they have lost.

There is much indecision in the nursing community about this matter. Are nurses, in fact, entitled to sick leave, or are they not? It seems that industrially they are entitled to sick leave and get it, but academically they are not entitled to it and must therefore

make up the difference to the minimum 1,000 hours. The case is slightly more complicated in the changeover period, because some nurses who are now completing their finals under the new scheme, although they are finishing after a period of three years and four months, are being required, since the regulations came into operation on September 23, to work perhaps one, two or three days to make up the academic time they have lost in that period. Therefore, I think everyone in the nursing community would welcome a positive statement setting out the exact situation so that they need have no further doubt about it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

BRIGHTON ROAD FENCE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Works try to expedite the rebuilding and re-alignment of a fence in front of the property at 53 Brighton Road, Glenelg? This property, I understand, was acquired some time ago, and the units are of a good type, although the stone and wrought iron fence is dilapidated and in a state of disrepair. As I understand that in this area it will be a long time before road widening takes place, I ask the Minister to examine the position and, as the fence in front of this property is unsightly, to see whether it can be rebuilt as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it that the honourable member refers to a property of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, or it may well be a matter for the Highways Department. I will check the matter and have it considered by the appropriate Minister.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. COUMBE: In view of several provisions in the Industrial Code regarding safety requirements in factories, more especially those provisions dealing with providing adequate guards on machinery when operators are working at it, can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether there are sufficient industrial inspectors in his department to police these provisions?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: To my knowledge, there are sufficient officers to carry out the work required of them regarding inspections of this type of machinery. I have not had any complaints that people have not had their premises inspected on request or after an accident has occurred. However, I will get a report for the honourable member on whether there are sufficient inspectors in the department.

ASSESSMENT CENTRE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Social Welfare now say when the assessment centre planned as part of the new system of treating juvenile offenders will come into operation, and can he also say what staff establishment is intended and when it is expected that the centre will be fully staffed?

The Hon. L. I. KING: The matter is being considered, and I expect decisions to be made next week. I hope to be able to give the honourable member a reply then.

WATER QUALITY

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has had difficulties about the quality of water supplied to householders whose houses are located on dead-end mains? Constituents have complained to me about this matter, and I think the department has experienced difficulty regarding the quality of water supplied at certain times to householders whose houses are located on dead-end mains. I understand that, when the pressure is low, a silt build-up occurs at the end of the main and that, consequently, the householder finds that the water quality is poor for consumption purposes. I ask the Minister whether experiments have been made to solve the problem.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member has pointed out, there are difficulties with dead-end mains. Whilst no special experiment has been carried out, I think it is recognized that, in this situation, flushing and cleaning must take place more often. Of course, one of the problems is that those engaged on this work must get to the end of the pipe. If there are problems in any part of the honourable member's district, I shall be pleased to examine the matter to find out whether more frequent cleaning cannot take place in the system.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say what stage has been reached in preparing plans and specifications for the Port Lincoln High School, construction of which was approved earlier this year, and can he say when it is expected that tenders will be called for construction to start?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As far as I know, the position regarding the Port Lincoln High School is exactly the same as I have told the honourable member previously. The school's position on the design list was the same when I saw the latest list a few days

ago and, as far as I am aware, tenders will be called towards the middle of next year, as I have told the honourable member. However, if the honourable member wishes me to check the matter, I shall be pleased to do so.

AFRICAN DAISY

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture when he intends to introduce regulations to remove the reference to African daisy from one schedule and place it in another? Further, if this regulation is introduced, what action will the Minister take to ensure that the spread of African daisy on open spaces in those areas to other council areas is prevented? The Government is one of the worst offenders regarding the spread of the weed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

LAW REFORM COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General ensure that copies of the reports of the Law Reform Committee are readily available? Of course, I understand that the Attorney-General is not the Minister responsible for the Government Printing Office. I think the Chief Secretary is the Minister responsible for that department and, as it may be necessary for the Attorney to discuss the matter with his colleague, I have framed the question advisedly. I understand that the Law Reform Committee has now given more than 20 separate reports to the Attorney-General and that arrangements were made, I think when we were still in office, for the Government Printer to print these reports. Yesterday, after the Misrepresentation Bill was introduced, I caused inquiries to be made of the Government Printer to get the report that I presumed, from the Attorney's second reading explanation, had been given on the topic by the Law Reform Committee. I found then that only two of the reports were available from the Government Printer, namely, the sixteenth report (on the law relating to the sealing of documents) and the seventeenth report (concerning the law relating to mortgages and the rights of mortgagees). I then inquired of the Parliamentary Library and found that the library did not have any of the committee's reports. Today, after I discussed the matter with the Parliamentary Librarian and Mr. Host, the library obtained, I think direct from the Chairman of the com-

mittee, several of the reports but not a full set of them. I can only take it that the number of copies of each report printed is too few to satisfy the demand for them. Therefore, I ask the question of the Attorney-General and, particularly, if I may add this, I should be pleased if he would give me a copy of the report relevant to the Misrepresentation Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not been aware that there has been any difficulty in obtaining copies of reports of the Law Reform Committee, but I shall now look into the matter and discuss it with the Chief Secretary. I will give the honourable member a copy of the report relating to misrepresentation.

ROAD TAX

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when the report on the investigation into road tax, or at least those parts of the report that the Government has decided the public should be allowed to know about, will be made available to this House? I understand that a group has been examining road tax and other aspects of road transport. In particular, I understand that the Minister has been given a report on road tax, and this matter is of interest to some sections of the community who are concerned about the injustices of road tax as it now applies. As there has been some investigation into this tax (and I refer particularly to this investigation, although other matters were also dealt with), I consider it important that the House should know as much of the report as the Government is willing to let it know, and I ask the Minister whether, if the whole report cannot be made available, parts of it can be provided.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The committee that was established was a Government committee, and it has submitted a report for consideration by the Government. It is not intended that the report be made a public document.

METROPOLITAN INTERSECTIONS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport supply information on the proportion of road accidents and road fatalities that occur at metropolitan intersections? Recent reports have indicated the acceptance of the scheme to convert dangerous intersections into a *cul-de-sac* system, and this applies especially in the boundary area, which I share with the honourable member for Unley, at Dutty Street. It has been said, in spite of the undoubted saving of life that will result, that this system will

inconvenience local residents. I do not believe for one minute that local residents will begrudge any slight inconvenience that may be caused but, if the Minister could release such figures to show the need for the *cul-de-sac* system, it would help.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think I can provide the statistics for 1970, but I am not sure whether statistics are available for the current year. Figures are prepared on a calendar-year basis and I hope I can provide the figures which, I am sure, will show the need for these modifications. Also, the committee's report on road safety, on which the Government has already acted to some extent, strongly recommends the use of the *cul-de-sac* as a means of reducing the road toll.

HEATHFIELD WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works further investigate the application for a supply of reticulated water to be made available to Mr. T. Riches, Lot 2, Oakdale Drive, Heathfield? I received a reply today from the Minister stating that it is not departmental policy to extend reticulated water services beyond defined township areas in the water catchment area, but I now point out to the Minister that this allotment is in a *cul-de-sac* and there can be no further extension of services in that area, other than within that *cul-de-sac*. I have agreed in the past with decisions that have been made and the Minister knows that I accept the principle that water extensions are not desirable within the catchment area. However, this person is now building a home on an allotment that has no reticulated water, and he may have to have the old bucket-type toilet system, which is unhygienic and detrimental to our catchment area because of the pollution problem. I believe that this is one case where an extension can be provided without the department setting a precedent because there can be no further extensions in this area as the area involved comprises a *cul-de-sac* with only two or three blocks. The main runs within 150ft. of the block. Will the Minister investigate this request because it is a just request?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Premier intend to discuss with the Public Service Board the general standing in the Public Service of social workers, with a view to raising such standing? I notice in the November issue of the *Public Service Review* a couple of letters trenchantly

criticizing the attitude of the Public Service Board on this matter. One of the letters, which is said to have 24 signatories, is apparently from mental health visitors and social workers in the Mental Health Services, and the other is from an individual social worker. From my own experience when in office, I know of the difficulties in recruiting and training social workers and of the fact that we were short of these people at that time. I hope that the position is now somewhat better as a result of the programmes that we initiated. The suggestion in the letters is that social workers, having been trained here, are leaving this State because they can do better elsewhere, and this is a serious matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has already taken up the matter with the Public Service Board.

STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Education, say whether student health services are now available at all teachers colleges? This is a time of extreme tension in the pre-examination period; in fact, for some students it is a time of more than extreme tension, and this shows itself in various ways. The student health services are of special importance at this time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (INSURANCE)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to remedy a deficiency in section 25 of the Public Service Act which has recently been detected. Subsection (3) of that section provides that, subject to subsection (6) of that

section, the Governor may by proclamation—*(a)* declare an additional department and create an additional office of permanent head in respect of that department; *(b)* discontinue an existing department and abolish the office of permanent head of that department; or *(c)* change the name of an existing department or the title of the office of permanent head of that department. Subsection (6) of that section provides that in a proclamation under subsection (3) . . . the Governor may provide for—*(a)* the reading of a reference in any Act to a department affected by a proclamation under that subsection as a reference to *(i)* a department declared or renamed under that proclamation; or *(ii)* a department assuming the functions of a department abolished by that proclamation; or *(b)* the reading of a reference in an Act to an office of permanent head affected by a proclamation under that subsection as a reference to *(i)* an office of permanent head created or the title of which is changed by that proclamation; or *(ii)* a reference to a permanent head assuming the functions of the office abolished by that proclamation.

It will be seen that subsection (6) enables the Governor by proclamation to provide for the reading of a reference to an office of permanent head as a reference to some other permanent head but that subsection does not provide that the Governor may by proclamation provide for the reading of a reference in an Act to any officer of the Public Service as a reference to some other officer of the Public Service; nor does that subsection expressly enable an earlier proclamation to be amended or cancelled. A situation could occur where the title of an officer who is the head of a department is changed and a proclamation is made declaring that a reference in any Act to the original title should be read as a reference to his new title. This situation does not present any difficulty but, where that officer is separated from the department of which he was permanent head and transferred to another department otherwise than as permanent head of that department, it would appear that subsection (6) of section 25 of the principal Act as it now stands cannot be invoked because he would then be no longer a permanent head of a department. However, proclamations purporting to have been made under that section were made in the years 1969 and 1970, since the original Act was passed, and some of these could be of doubtful validity.

The Bill seeks to widen the power contained in subsection (6) to meet the kind of situation I have referred to and to provide for the

amendment or cancellation of any earlier proclamation as from a specified date. The Bill also would have the effect of validating any action taken under any past proclamations that might be of doubtful validity. The need for this Bill has arisen from the deficiency detected in section 25 of the principal Act to which I have referred and clause 2 of the Bill is designed to remedy that deficiency. I commend the Bill to members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, 1936-1969. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the third in a series of Bills designed to bring all parts of the transport service in the State under the control and direction of the Minister of Roads and Transport, following the recommendation of the Transport Policy Implementation Committee. I commend this Bill to members for the same reasons previously given with respect to the Bills relating to the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board. Given the power of overall control sought by this Bill, the Government believes that it will be better equipped to put into effect its policies for the improvement of the whole transport service in this State. The Bill also contains various statute law revision amendments.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a new section 3, the wording of which now conforms to the intention that this Act and the Land Acquisition Act be read as one. Clause 3 inserts a new definition of "Minister" which conforms to the recent amendment to the Acts Interpretation Act. Clause 4 inserts the section which places the Commissioner and his officers and employees under the control and direction of the Minister. Officers and employees are included, as the Act places some statutory duties, mainly with respect to certain disciplinary matters, upon some senior officers. Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive effect statute law revision amendments to sections 56, 57, 83, 91, 92 and 93 of the Act respectively. These amendments are self-explanatory. Clause 11 repeals section 95a of the Act, which provided a cumbersome procedure for the giving

of Ministerial directions to the Commissioner. This section will be redundant if the Commissioner is placed under the general control of the Minister by virtue of this Bill. Clauses 12 to 17 inclusive effect self-explanatory statute law revision amendments to sections 101, 102, 103, 104, 110 and 111 of the Act respectively.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: TOWN OF OODNADATTA

Consideration of Legislative Council's resolution:

That an area of 110½ acres of the reserve for teamsters and travelling stock adjacent to the town of Oodnadatta, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on February 23, 1971, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1970, for the purpose of expanding the town.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That the resolution of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

The Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs, Education and Public Health Departments require sites at Oodnadatta. The reserve was originally dedicated as a teamsters and travelling stock reserve in 1897. In order to provide for the requirements of the three departments mentioned and for future expansion of the town, it is intended to resume 110½ acres of the reserve, which would then contain approximately 36 square miles. The existing water facilities for travelling stock and normal commonage would still be preserved.

The immediate requirements are that the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department requires sites for a hostel and an ablution block. The Education Department requires sites for a school and a residence, and the Public Health Department requires a site for a residence for a district inspector. In view of the purposes for which this land is required, I ask members to support the motion.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the motion. As the Minister pointed out, the motion enables the Government to resume about 110 acres of land from the teamsters and travelling stock reserve. The reserve, which is adjacent to Oodnadatta, comprises, as the Minister said, 36 square miles (about 23,000 acres), so I imagine that the severance of that area from this huge stock reserve will not be noticed by people in the district, particularly as, when the reserve was first established, it was called the teamsters and travelling stock reserve. Today, there is no

need for a reserve for teamsters because teamsters have disappeared from the area and road transport has taken over. Most people are aware that the narrow gauge line from Marree to Alice Springs via Oodnadatta will close in a few years. There will still be a need for a travelling stock reserve, because this locality will continue to be the centre for the transport of cattle from the area.

The Minister also said that the land was needed for a Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department hostel. The hostel has been built, and I had the pleasure of visiting it a few months ago. Housing 24 Aboriginal children of school age, it is a beautiful building and well worth inspecting. The children attend the Oodnadatta Primary School. I believe there is need for the hostel to be extended. The hostel cost about \$140,000, and the children are full-time residents. Parents are permitted to visit their children at the hostel, but the children are not permitted to leave the hostel at any time.

A new Samcon school is soon to be erected at Oodnadatta on the resumed land. Members may recall that I asked a question some time ago about this new school. The Minister's reply was to the effect that the closing of the narrow gauge line to Oodnadatta would not affect the number of schoolchildren to any great degree. Indeed, a survey has shown that only eight children attending the school will be affected. While the Aboriginal hostel remains open at Oodnadatta, I believe that there will always be a need for a school in this area. I further believe that, even after the narrow gauge line has been removed, Oodnadatta will still be a viable town. At present, there is the hostel; there will be a new school; there are officers of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department and the Bush Nursing Society; and Oodnadatta is the centre of a road transport network that serves the cattle industry in the Far North.

Resolution agreed to.

SNOWY MOUNTAINS ENGINEERING CORPORATION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 2644.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This short Bill deserves a speedy passage through the House. However, it is an important Bill because in essence it validates, as far as South Australia is concerned, Commonwealth Government legislation enacted in 1970 whereby the Commonwealth Parliament established a body to be known as the Snowy Mountains Engineering

Authority, which stemmed from the old Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority. I think that most members of the House have at one time or another inspected the Snowy Mountains scheme and seen the standard of work carried out by that organization. I recall, when in office, having preliminary talks about the establishment of the corporation with which we are now dealing; that was before the Bill was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Dann (Commissioner of the Snowy Mountains Authority) is well known to me personally. What we must realize is that by the passing of the Bill a corporation which has certain skills and expertise available to it will now be available to the State, for a start on a consultancy basis. I expect, for instance, that the Engineering and Water Supply Department, in the design, perhaps, of some of its larger dams, could call in the corporation's officers to advise it on the civil engineering aspects that must be investigated, and on the design work entailed in constructing such large dams. It might also be desirable to call in the corporation's officers for consultancy work on the design of highways across large bridges.

Many overseas companies are called into Australia on a consultancy basis for the design of bridges and, in this regard, an overseas consultant was engaged on work connected with the Morphet Street bridge. We have seen the unfortunate results of the collapse of bridges in Melbourne. Overseas companies were used as consultants in the construction of those bridges, although I am not reflecting on those companies when I say that.

This new corporation cannot carry out physical work: it can be engaged only on consultancy work to help the States on investigation and design. It can give technical assistance and advice and it can work with private consulting engineering firms. There are many outstanding private consulting engineering firms in South Australia and, in reply to questions, I have said that this corporation would be called in only for really big jobs. I do not think that the local private consultants will have anything to worry about in this regard. I realize that some of the local consultants have a working arrangement with overseas consultants to whom they refer questions, but those local firms will now be able to use our own Australian authority instead of having to call on the overseas firm.

I am aware that this corporation has had some spectacular successes in gaining contracts

and carrying out civil engineering work successfully in many overseas countries to the credit of Australia and to the credit of Australian engineers and workmen. This Bill will enable the corporation to function in South Australia. Similar legislation is being passed in the other States so that this corporation will be able to assist all State Governments in a consultative capacity. This will apply to Government departments and to semi-government authorities or authorities working in conjunction with the Government. As one who has an engineering background, I have a working knowledge of the old Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority under its first Commissioner and later under Commissioner Dann. I support the Bill.

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

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 4. Page 2775.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill at the moment because the Minister has not told us anything that substantiates his move to bring the Transport Control Board directly under his control, that is, to bring under his day-to-day direction a board which works on a policy that has been evolved over a longer period than that which generally applies to the evolution of normal Government policy. Because the Government refuses to show any leadership in relation to metropolitan transport and in the face of confusion that has been deliberately created by it concerning metropolitan transport, we on this side have urged the Government to appoint a Director-General of Transport to see that the future development of metropolitan transport is properly co-ordinated. We believe that this Government is allowing the State to lapse into a dangerous and critical situation because of its lack of planning and foresight.

In this Bill, however, we are dealing with a different section of South Australian transport. In fact, we are going back to what was considered in 1965 and, if the Minister cares to read again (because I am sure he has read it many times) the second reading explanation of the Hon. Frank Walsh, he will find that it was the Walsh Government's intention to put country transport in South Australia into the tightest strait jacket possible. We do not know what the present Government intends to do about transport control because the Minister

has given the House no clear statement on metropolitan transport. I invite the Minister to say, in Committee, what Government action is contemplated in relation to the control of transport, particularly country transport. I believe the Minister has indicated that he does not favour stringent control at present, but he has also indicated that other forces may have a bearing on his attitude.

I know that South Australia is now an applicant to the Grants Commission, and it could well be that the Minister and the Treasurer will come back to this place and say, "We are sorry: we do not want to have transport control, but the Grants Commission says we must have it." We want to be sure that the Minister does not contemplate that type of action by his Government. I am not willing to give him direct control of the Transport Control Board until he states his position categorically and clearly to this House and to the public.

As usual, in the second reading explanation no real explanation is forthcoming; therefore I must oppose the Bill, even though I have supported other Government measures on transport. It is an insult to this House for the Minister to treat this matter as a plaything and to think he can keep the transport policies within his own office. I only hope for the sake of us all that he has some plans, for the public could so far be excused for thinking that he puts them all at the back of a drawer, because at no time does he tell us his plans except for an occasional press statement that means nothing.

What can we say about the Bill except that we suspect the Government may have plans sharply to control transport in country areas? We know that the story has been well ventilated in the House before that South Australian primary and secondary industries have developed to their present stage of production for only one reason—the freedom to choose the type of transport that suits their operation. Under the direction of the Labor machine outside the House, the previous Labor Government set out to redistribute transport revenue in this State, taking it from road transport and putting it into the hands of the Railways Department. Those days were fraught with difficulty for all South Australians. At one time it looked as though the Labor Government of the day would press on and adversely affect the costs of this tremendous industry, practically destroying road transport.

I remember attending meetings throughout the country, listening to protests, and stating clearly

what our Party stood for in regard to transport operations. This was a clear difference of opinion. It was one of those automatic things that happen when an Opposition is able to show the distinction between its policies and those of the Government. That Government had got into office under the slogan "Live Better with Labor", a slogan about which we do not hear much today as prices sky-rocket as a result of impositions made by the Government and as other imperfections of Government policy become known to us. The Labor Party put away that slogan as it set out to regulate and discipline South Australia. The Opposition will not forget the way in which that Party set out to do this, ignoring the protests of industry. The Legislative Council stood against its wishes.

Before the 1968 election, Mr. Dunstan suddenly found that he was in favour of free road transport: his Party was glad that the Legislative Council had saved it. I wonder whether this subject has been reawakened in the councils of the Labor Party. Will it again try to impose this restriction? I do not know. I suggest that before the Government once again sets out to attack road transport it should look within its own organization. What is this Government doing about the efficiency of the railways? What is it doing in relation to that arm of activity which is protected by the operation of road transport control? In yesterday's *Australian* there appears an advertisement measuring 8½ in. by 15 in. which states:

In the 12 months to June, 30, 1971, the South Australian Railways transported 2,046,377 head of livestock from as far away as Broken Hill in the north to Millicent in the South-East. For your State railway system that represents earnings worth \$1,016,001.

That represents just a little over 5 per cent of the deficit of the Railways Department. What is this department doing wasting money advertising itself in the *Australian*, which every member knows has a very restricted circulation in South Australia? Does it intend to transport the livestock of New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia? How much does it lose every time it puts one sheep on the rails? The Minister will not answer that question. He has already said how much the Railways Department loses when it carries a passenger. We know that it loses when it puts a head of cattle on the rails. The Railways Department loses \$20,000,000 a year, yet there is no attempt by the Minister or by the Government to bring efficiency to that service. In fact, the Labor Government vigorously criticized us when we introduced

efficiency in one direction. We curtailed an extremely uneconomic rail service, and the present Minister said it should be restored. Now this advertisement is put into the newspaper as if revenue of \$1,000,000 from all the livestock carried in South Australia in one year is significant when it amounts to only 5 per cent of the Railways deficit. We need a better attitude by the department than it is showing. As no explanation worth even 2c has been given, I am suspicious that the Minister has a vindictive plan that he will execute against road transport to the detriment of the State. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): As members know, I have previously supported a Bill dealing with the Municipal Tramways Trust. I said that Bills relating to the M.T.T., the Railways Department and this Bill were a triumvirate of Bills dealing with transport, but I believe that a different principle is involved in this Bill. In relation to the M.T.T. Bill, we heard—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow debate on that topic. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill under discussion; he must not refer to a Bill already considered in the current session.

Mr. COUMBE: This Bill, unlike another Bill, does not indicate its objectives. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

I have previously stated to members the reasons for having overall Ministerial control of all bodies which form part of the transport service in this State.

That is the reason given, but it does not touch on this Bill. In respect of other measures we might consider, the Opposition has indicated that matters dealing with metropolitan transport that would come under the Director-General of Transport have our support, because we have said that we urge the appointment of such an officer. This Bill, however, does not refer to that. There is a bad principle of legislation contained in the Bill. I go so far as to say it is effrontery and an insult to the intelligence of members. In his second reading explanation the Minister also said:

Secondly, proposals are under consideration for the reorganization of the functions of the Transport Control Board. Investigations and discussions are still being held on all aspects of this proposal and it is unlikely that a decision will be made one way or the other for quite some time.

Therefore, the Minister is putting before members a Bill, although he does not know what will be the result of discussions on this matter.

Despite that, he asks the House to agree to the Bill. He is asking us to sign a blank cheque by giving him this authority. If the Minister had said that the Bill did certain things in relation to the Transport Control Board, obviously members would have known what was in his mind, and they could have taken a different attitude. I maintain that it is an extremely bad legislative principle to put before the House a measure that is contingent on discussions, deliberations, and investigations that are still being carried out, because who knows what the result will be? Probably the Minister does not know the results yet. In an effort to justify this move, he said that the terms of office of members of the Transport Control Board who were appointed for three years will expire on December 10. If the Minister wanted the board to continue he could have introduced a simple legislative measure, if it was necessary, although I imagine it could have been done administratively. The Minister continued:

... if a decision is made to discontinue the Transport Control Board at a future date, terms of office will not be unnecessarily interrupted.

That is a very weak argument. We can read into it what the Minister has in mind: that the Transport Control Board will be discontinued in the future, because he says that, if a decision is made to discontinue it, the term of office and the tenure of office will not be unnecessarily interrupted. We can read into that that the Transport Control Board is to go. The board deals mainly with country operations. In regard to the other matters on which I have spoken, we have been talking about the metropolitan situation, for which we have indicated our support. However, we have a Bill, yet even the Minister does not know what will be the result of the discussions (even if he has a good idea). Not only is it a bad principle, but it is absolute cheek and effrontery for the Minister to ask the House to give him a blank cheque.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can do a lot better than that.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister is trying his best to put over this House something about which he does not even know the result, unless, of course. I cannot even take the Minister's word as it is printed in *Hansard*. I am paying the Minister the courtesy of believing him. Had the Minister said that after investigation the Government had made certain decisions about the board, another

attitude may have been taken. However, I cannot in conscience vote in favour of a Bill in which these nebulous facts are put before us. I am speaking as a legislator who has certain principles, and I believe this is bad legislation. It is a weak effort by the Minister to put up such a puerile Bill, because he is talking about terms of office, which could be handled administratively (as the Minister knows) or by a small amendment. My views about bringing everything under the control of the Minister are known (I indicated them last night), as are the views of the Opposition on this matter in relation to metropolitan transport. Because of these views, and on principle, I object to the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I will put the mind of the member for Torrens at rest at the outset. If the honourable member had read the Bill (which he obviously has not) and checked it with the Act, he would have realized new section 6 provides that the term of office of members of the board shall be three years. He knows better than to say in this House that, if the Minister wanted to provide for a shorter term, he could have done it administratively. Administratively, I cannot alter (and I should not be able to alter) the term laid down by Parliament.

Mr. Coumbe: You could have introduced a small amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have introduced a small amendment to provide that, instead of having a three-year term of office, the members of the board will hold office for such term not exceeding three years as the Governor may fix when appointing the members. That is a small amendment, and it is the only way that the matter could be dealt with, as the member for Torrens knows. He had his tongue in his cheek all the time he was speaking.

Mr. Coumbe: I object to the wording in your second reading explanation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This House is not being asked to adopt the second reading explanation and, if the member for Torrens does not like the explanation, that is just too bad. That will never become a Statute of this State. What is in the Bill is what counts, and I did not hear any adverse comment on what is in the Bill.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you suggesting that your word does not count?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did not say that, and I do not want the honourable member to try to twist things or to put words

into my mouth, because it does not do him credit and he knows that he cannot get away with it. I shall deal now with some of the rubbish that the Leader has spoken. For instance, he made great play of the fact that the South Australian Railways was wasting money by putting advertisements in a newspaper. He asked what good this would do and whether we would gain capital from New South Wales (I think that was the term he used) because the advertisement was in a national newspaper. I should hope that the press people who feed the Leader would have told him that the advertisement was in the South Australian edition of the newspaper, not in the edition circulating in any other State in the Commonwealth. Should a business undertaking advertise its products? Is the Leader willing to say that John Martin and Company Limited or Myer S.A. Stores Limited, or any other business undertaking, should not advertise?

Mr. McAnaney: Do they advertise in the *Australian*? No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot dictate, and I would not want to dictate, whether Myers, John Martin's, or anyone else, advertises in the *Australian*, the *Sunday Mail*, the *Advertiser*, or the *News*, or over radio or television. That is the business of the firm concerned. We have had the Leader blowing in Big Bob Francis's ear today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about Big Bob Francis.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and respect the rulings that you give from the Chair. I ignore the rulings given by the honourable member opposite who is trying to deputize for you.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think Big Bob dropped a bomb?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot reply to that, because it would be against your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: It is out of order, and nothing further is to be heard about Big Bob Francis in this debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader made great play of the fact that last week he moved a motion in this House urging the Government to proceed with the appointment of a Director-General of Transport. I complimented him in my reply to his speech, when I said that I was pleased that at long last the Opposition had acknowledged the need for a Director-General of Transport, something that this Government had been talking about and

working towards for the past 18 months. Even if it did take the Leader 12 to 18 months to acknowledge that I am right, I commend him for it; but I draw the attention of the House to his insincerity when he instructed his Whip to move the adjournment of the debate instead of allowing a vote to be taken, knowing it was the last day of private members' business. Much was said by the Leader about public transport and the need for it. I should like to reply, but out of respect for the Chair I think I should not, because it has nothing whatever to do with this Bill. The Transport Control Board does not control transport in the metropolitan area, and the Leader should know that.

Mr. Hall: I do know that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Then why is the Leader talking about metropolitan transport when it has nothing whatever to do with the Bill? The Leader made some play about the state of railway finances. In view of the attitude he has taken today, and previously, in this House, one would be pardoned for believing that he is attempting to convey the impression that railway finances have suddenly gone from good to bad since this Government has been in office. No-one knows better than the Leader does that that is not so. Let me remind him and the House that in 1961-62, a year of Liberal Government, there was an \$8,000,000 deficit. We did not then hear any squeals from the present Leader of the Opposition about doing something about railway finances—and he was a member of the Government Party. In 1962-63, there still being a Liberal Government in office and the Leader still being a member of the Government Party, there was a deficit of \$8,200,000. In the next year, still with a Liberal Government, the deficit was \$6,300,000; in 1964-65 it was \$7,100,000. So the total deficit for those years, prior to the advent of a Labor Government, was about \$30,000,000. During those years a Liberal Government was in office, yet no-one seemed to worry. Everyone seemed to accept the position. Why the sudden panic by members opposite? In 1965-66, the first year of the Labor Government, there was a \$9,000,000 deficit.

Mr. McAnaney: It was getting out of hand.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the honourable member said that, because in the next year there was a \$9,500,000 deficit, and in 1967-68—

Mr. Venning: What about now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —there was a deficit of \$12,700,000.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not keep interjecting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course the deficit has risen (no-one is suggesting it has not) but the point I hope I am driving home to members is that this is not something that has happened over the past 12 months: it is getting progressively worse and will continue to do so.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you do something about it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that because, if he ever rouses himself from that slumbry little place called Crystal Brook, looks at the State of South Australia, sees what the Government is doing and listens to what is said, he will realize that action is being taken. I have said it is expected that there will be a deficit of about \$20,000,000 this year in regard to railway transport and, although this is a surprise to the member for Rocky River, it is no surprise to any other member, because I have said it six times in the House previously, but he has never heard it. One would think members opposite thought that South Australia was the only State in the Commonwealth or the only place in the world where losses were being made in the public transport sector. I invite them to examine what is happening in the public transport sector in other States and in other countries of the world, and they will find that in most cases losses are incurred in respect of railway operations and, in fact, the whole of the public transport sector, if they merely compare the cash received in fares and freight charges with the cost of operation and establishment.

However, none of these critics ever takes into account the social benefits that accrue from a public transport system: they want to forget this. Rocky River would still be an undeveloped outback area if the railways had not provided a service there to make the member for Rocky River a wealthy farmer. He knows better than I that the railways have provided the service necessary to open up the country, and that the people of the State have provided the finance to open up the areas concerned. The Leader said that he would vote against the Bill, and he has a right to do that. He voted against your ruling this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, so he is going to do two things wrong, and this will be yet another nail in his coffin. He said that he was voting against the measure because members opposite did not

know what the Minister would do regarding transport controls, and apparently the member for Bragg does not know, either.

I suggest that they might care to walk to the Clerk's table and read last Tuesday's *Hansard* pull, because a question on this matter was asked on Tuesday by the member for Eyre, and the reply was that the Government did not intend to introduce transport controls. To make a great issue of it 48 hours later surely shows the incompetence and insincerity of the Leader. This Bill, which in terms of the wishes of the member for Torrens is a small Bill, is designed merely to do two things: first, to place the Transport Control Board under Ministerial control (and there has been no valid opposition to that); and, secondly, to alter the term of office of the members of the board. We will find out just how genuine is this Parliament in believing that the elected representatives of the people should control the destiny of the State. I commend the Bill to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmonds, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Messrs. Allen, Carnie, Coumbe, Evans, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Tonkin and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Clark and McRae.

Noes—Messrs. Eastick and Goldsworthy.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Board is subject to control of Minister."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Minister to enlighten the Committee on this matter. So far we have received nothing but abuse from him, but we can give abuse as well as he can.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: A certain feeling exists among those who are aware of the operations of the Transport Control Board and the implications of the change being made to place the board under the day-to-day control of the Minister. A feeling is abroad that the Government might curtail more rail passenger services and replace them with bus services. This could be one of the moves it makes to grapple with the

huge railways deficit. In previous decisions to make economies in railway operations, train services were replaced by efficient and satisfactory private bus services. However, because of the Government's attitude of drawing everything it possibly can under Government operation, if there is to be any curtailment of rail passenger services the railways might run the buses. However, the railways would have much less chance of running buses economically than would a private company, and I would not approve of the replacement of rail passenger services with departmentally operated buses. Will the Minister assure me that this will not take place?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Although it is a hypothetical question, I certainly will not assure the Leader along those lines. I agree completely with his earlier interjection that he can hurl abuse as well as we can.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The debate will not proceed along abusive lines.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: True, as I have stated publicly and in this Chamber, the affairs of the Railways Department are being carefully examined. The Government is concerned with the financial position of the railways. However, a fine distinction exists between the Government's attitude and that of the Leader. I do not think that many of his colleagues would subscribe to the scathing criticism he has made of the ability of our railway officers. In my experience, they are most efficient.

Mr. Millhouse: You didn't seem to think so a few months ago.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To chip in like a little pipsqueak is typical of the member for Mitcham. I have vivid recollections of the previous Government's policy when it decided to close down some rail passenger services. I can recall the directions that the previous Government issued to the Transport Control Board which resulted in the railways losing an estimated \$17,000 a year. Is that the policy that the Leader wants? Is he willing to sacrifice a State-owned project in the interests of his friends in private enterprise? Is that the policy that he wants me to support? If it is, I have no hesitation in saying that under no conditions would I acknowledge that that was the correct policy. I will always speak strongly against that policy for as long as I can.

The South Australian Railways belong to the people of this State, and any Government has a responsibility to protect the assets and

interests of the State. With those thoughts in mind, the Government believes that the policy of the Transport Control Board should be determined by the Government, not by three people who have been appointed to do a job but are not directly responsible to the Government. It is unbelievable that last night this place, including members on the other side, agreed to Ministerial control over other areas of transport, yet the Opposition has adopted a different attitude to this Bill. It is quite plain where we stand in this regard.

Mr. HALL: The Minister should not say that when the previous Government was in office I sought to help my friends in private industry. Of course, I do have friends in private industry, but the Minister does not have any. We all know the effect of the Minister's administration on private industry: it is totally destructive. Some people closely associated with the Government are reported today as saying that all is not well with this Government's administration.

The CHAIRMAN: That matter is not dealt with in this Bill. The debate must be linked to the clause.

Mr. HALL: This Bill deals with the Government's transport policy. If the Minister curtails rail passenger services he may seek to use the roads. The next thing we hear is that he is cancelling existing country passenger services operated by private companies and transferring them to the control of the Railways Department. Perhaps that is why he has introduced this Bill. Because he will not tell us why, we must surmise these things. I now feel entirely justified in my first opposition to this Bill. Opposition members are not arguing a matter of no confidence in the administration of officers of the Railways Department. However, we are placing the responsibility on the Minister. The Minister continually shelters behind individuals and will not take responsibility if he can avoid it. We fear that the Government intends to eliminate private bus operators in the country and introduce road services run by the Railways Department. We do not know what will happen to road transport freight. The Minister says that he does not intend to institute transport control, but what will happen when he comes up against a recommendation of the Grants Commission? He should tell this Chamber what he will do then, but I do not expect that he will.

It seems that we are handing the control of road transport and passenger services to

the Minister to do what he will. He is adept at changing his mind and, obviously, we cannot rely on his statements. It may be not the present Minister but another Minister within the same Government who may introduce road transport controls, and it seems that we are making it easier for the Government to institute this control. We should not allow this unless we have an assurance from the Government that this will not be Government policy and that the Government will not, under pressure from the Grants Commission, institute road transport controls. Unless the Minister gives that assurance, we can only assume that he will introduce them.

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: I should restate three matters for the benefit of the Leader, who seems intent on stirring up mischief: if he cannot find some he manufactures some, either by half-truths or by deliberate untruths. He has suggested that, somehow or other, I will get at the private bus operators. About six months ago I provided the Adelaide City Council with a letter stating that this Government had no intention of doing anything with the private bus operators serving country areas, except for the Angaston, the Kapunda and the Wallaroo-Moonta services. All of this had been handed over as a result of the closure of the railway lines by the former Government. These were being examined. For the remainder, the Government had no proposals whatever. That assurance has been given to the City Council, which has accepted it. I do not know whether the Leader would be as magnanimous as has been the City Council; if he wants to stir up trouble he will not be but, if he wants to be fair for once, he will be so magnanimous. He asks whether the Minister will take over the day-to-day operations of the Transport Control Board. The Bill clearly states that the board will comply with the directions, if any, given by the Minister. Obviously the Government intends that the board should be subject to the policy of the Government. Day-to-day operations will continue; otherwise, why should we have a board? It is merely a matter of ensuring that the board complies with the policy of the Government which has been elected by the people, a fact which members opposite seem conveniently to forget.

It has been suggested that somehow or other I will introduce transport control on freight. Again the Leader is not prepared to accept what I have said in this place. I do not know what more I can say. I gave an assurance on Tuesday, and I have given assurances on other occasions, including today.

The Leader has brought forward a hypothetical case based on something that the Grants Commission might recommend. Cabinet would have to make a decision on any suggestion of the Grants Commission. However, I do not expect the commission to come up with anything of that type; I do not think that it is its function to tell the Government how to run the State. I repeat that the Government has no intention whatever of reintroducing (we had controls years ago under the Liberal Government) road controls. That has been said publicly and accepted publicly as a statement of fact.

Mr. HALL: From the Minister's long-winded statement the position is becoming a little clearer. He has said that he has no proposal to institute road transport control.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I said "the Government".

Mr. HALL: I accept that. He says that the Government has no proposals for road transport control, but he does not know what he will do if the Grants Commission says that there should be control. He has said that it will be up to Cabinet. There we see the worth of the Minister's argument. The Minister can say that he did not intend to do it, but that Cabinet decided to do it. We have a situation that there may be transport control and there may not be, depending on when the decision is made. When I put the matter to the Minister about the Grants Commission, he said the decision would be one for the Cabinet, not for him.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You realize it would need legislation by this Parliament, don't you?

Mr. HALL: I am interested in knowing Government policy. The Minister cannot give an unconditional guarantee that there will not be transport control. After saying I was wrong in my statement about taking licences away from country bus lines, he referred to his letter to the City Council. He will not give

an assurance that he will not attack, through the Transport Control Board, those who service the Angaston and Moonta areas. The Minister said that he wrote to the City Council, indicating that he would not displace existing licence holders of country bus services, with exceptions. I ask him what he will do about the exceptions.

People have spent much money in equipment to provide a better, quicker and cheaper service than the railways gave. The Minister leaves a question mark over these people. What will happen to their livelihood? I want an answer from the Minister. Hundreds of my constituents are interested in knowing what the outcome will be. Will the present bus proprietors be able to continue or will their licences not be renewed when they expire?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader has made a perfectly proper request to the Minister for information, but the Minister sits pat. He says nothing, hoping that the clause will be passed. One of the criticisms often made of the Minister is that he will not give a straight answer to a question. People do not know any more after he has spoken than they knew previously—which was mighty little. All that the Leader has asked for is information. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he will get up and reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DOOR TO DOOR SALES BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 16, at 2 p.m.