

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 21, 1972

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment (Parole),
Stock Foods Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS**GAS**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether, in negotiations for the sale of natural gas to New South Wales, any restriction has been placed on the purpose for which the gas can be used? I believe that any refining or secondary petro-chemical industry that may use gas from our fields should be established so that the benefit is available to the people of this State. As, potentially, the New South Wales market can use a greater percentage of the gas than can the South Australian market, the economics of the matter could cause any petro-chemical or other industry to be developed on the New South Wales seaboard or at some other convenient place rather than at a place where it would be of financial benefit to this State. Therefore, if there is no actual protection with regard to the use that can be made of the natural gas (other than with regard to the energy it supplies), have the negotiations concerning price resulted in South Australia receiving the maximum benefit, for the gas originates in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The producers have been informed that South Australia would not consent to liquids or wet gas being supplied to New South Wales. The provision through the pipeline will be solely for dry gas, which will have to be stripped. This will mean that a by-product of the sale to New South Wales of dry gas will be sufficient wet gas which, together with the wet wells in South Australia, would economically justify a further pipeline in South Australia and provide the basis for the development of a petro-chemical industry here. This has been clearly stated to the producers.

Dr. Eastick: Has it been written in yet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, not as yet, because, before the pipeline is established, provision will have to be made for its traversing South Australian territory, which is Crown

land, and special provisions will then be enacted in South Australia when arrangements are made with the producers to supply, and the pipeline is to proceed. The people in New South Wales have been told clearly that our supply to them will be limited to dry gas and that, provided that it is dry gas (and basically that is methane), they will have no problems about the provision of the gas pipeline through our territory. That pipeline, unlike our pipeline in South Australia, will be privately owned (it will not be owned by the State of New South Wales) by the Australian Gas Light Company, which will be providing the pipeline. That has been made clear. South Australia will insist on the retention of ethane, wet gas and liquids, for South Australia. In all the negotiations with the producers, it has been made perfectly clear to them that this is the case.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say what action, if any, the Government intends to take with regard to the construction of the pipeline from Moomba to Sydney? Both this morning's *Advertiser* and the early edition of the *News* this afternoon report that the pipeline planned to carry gas from Moomba in South Australia to Sydney is in jeopardy, the reason given being the ban which has been placed on the construction of the line by the Federated Ironworkers Association, because of the report that the contract for the pipes has gone to Japan and has not been let in Australia. I think I need not refer any more to the information in the newspaper. The Premier will undoubtedly be well aware of the ban and of its serious consequences for an industry in this State that we all want to do whatever we can to foster. I also understand that it is not possible to fabricate in Australia the pipes required for the pipeline. Therefore, I wonder whether the Premier is willing to use his influence with the unions involved to see that the ban is lifted if it has been imposed already or, if it has not been imposed, to see that it is not imposed, so that this work may continue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, this is not the business of the South Australian Government at all. I consider that the position that the honourable member put in his last statement of fact before posing his final question, namely, that the steel pipes involved cannot be fabricated in Australia, is not correct.

Mr. Millhouse: Not at all?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that the pipes can be fabricated here. However,

the opposition to the decision of the Australian Gas Light Company is not confined to trade unions in South Australia but is widely held in the industry. It is a matter between those particularly involved and the company. At the general level, so far as any Governments are involved, it is a matter for the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments, the competitors of the successful tenderers, and the unions concerned. It is not a matter in which the South Australian Government can achieve anything: the decisions are made elsewhere than in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: You have no influence with Mr. Husdell?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of Mr. Husdell's being involved. I think I have a considerable influence with Mr. Husdell, but he is not the only person involved in this, by a long way. I find it strange that the honourable member, when he is in Government and has any union trouble, always asks the Opposition to use its influence, but when we are in Government he asks us to use our influence with trade unions. Concerning the employment of Australians on fabricating major works in this country, no, it is not a matter for the South Australian Government. I have told the Leader of the criteria for our decisions in this matter, and that stands. As to industrial matters, or matters of how we should use Australian bases for employment in this country on major construction works, in this specific matter those lie with Governments and companies other than those in South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE: My question involves something that is a matter for the South Australian Government. In view of the contract that has been let between the Australian Gas Light Company, of Sydney, and producers on the field at Moomba—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It has not been let.

Mr. COUMBE: I am sorry; negotiations are proceeding, and we all hope a contract will be signed soon. Can the Premier say what will be the basis of the royalties that will accrue to South Australia from the product produced in South Australia? With his knowledge of negotiations regarding the volumes likely to be extracted from South Australia, can he give me any information about the financial return to South Australia in royalties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have been reported to me, but I think the best thing I can do is get a full and accurate report for the honourable member rather than speak

from memory of the reports that have been made. I will bring down that information next week.

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Premier say whether any negotiations have taken place regarding the laying of a second pipeline from the gas field to Adelaide? A report in yesterday's *News* states:

Meanwhile, the securing of the natural gas contract with A.G.L. also means the establishment of an oil, condensate and natural gas liquids project for the supplying consortium. . . . The partners would supply liquid hydrocarbon products to markets both within Australia and for export to South-East Asia, Japan, and the United States. This would involve a major development drilling programme and would entail the design and construction of a liquids pipeline from the field to Adelaide.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nothing that I could say comes close to any sort of conclusive negotiation. It is certainly not true to say that the provision of the contract to Sydney will mean the export of any by-products from hydrocarbons, but the conditions we have laid down for development in South Australia are that the maximum benefits should accrue to South Australia, not only in monetary terms but also in the provision of employment within this State, from the resource that we have. Several sites have been viewed and several propositions are being considered by the Government, but it is by no means certain that we will have a second pipeline to Adelaide, although the provision of an additional pipeline does seem probable. However, it could well go elsewhere than to Adelaide and, naturally enough, the Government is looking not only at the provision of additional employment for South Australia but also, if it is at all possible, additional employment in a decentralized area.

LABELLING

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry have investigated the labelling of garments offered for sale in this State? I ask this question as the result of statements made by Cynthia Smart in an interview with John Evans (Rural Officer of the Australian Broadcasting Commission) in the country breakfast session transmitted from radio stations 5CK, 5LN and 5SY, on Monday, August 28. The topic under discussion was wool promotion and the labelling of woollen garments offered for sale. I refer to the transcript of that programme, as follows:

John Evans: Well, let's take this labelling example a little further, What do you mean

by labelling, is the wool symbol perhaps being misused or what?

Cynthia Smart: Oh no, not the wool symbol, because this is very wellknown. However, there is labelling. For instance, I saw a garment the other day, it looked like wool, there was a tag on it which said all wool, but you lifted up the little tag and underneath to find another little tag which said 100 per cent acrylic fibre. And yet, it had all wool written on the top, on the tag where you could see it. People buying this type of thing may not lift up that tag for a long long time. They might be completely satisfied with the garment, but, there again, they might be completely dissatisfied with it and blame it on wool, so perhaps some of the problems that we have had with wool may not have even been wool at all, and this is what worries me.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will have the honourable member's question examined.

THEBARTON POLLUTION

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation undertake to have investigated a polluting substance that is released daily by the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories at its plant at Osman Place, Thebarton? I am informed by a constituent living nearby that a steam-like substance is discharged regularly from that plant and that it penetrates many houses in the area, thus causing extreme irritation to those people affected.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined and to provide the honourable member with a report.

JUVENILE ASSESSMENT CENTRE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what stage has been reached in the provision of an assessment centre for juvenile offenders? I believe that this is a matter of great urgency. Certainly, there is great evidence of community concern, especially regarding the increasing number of absconders. There is no doubt that, although many young people require supportive treatment to help them return to the community and to get them back into society, others (they can be called larrikins or otherwise) are in the initial stages more in need of restraint and some form of discipline for the protection of the community, and the community has a right to be protected. As such an assessment centre seems to be a project of the highest priority (it was agreed by experts to be virtually the keystone of the new system of treating juvenile offenders), I think it is of great interest to the community to know

to what stage this assessment centre has been developed.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Assessment work is at present being carried out at Windana and, to some extent, at Vaughan House. Structural alterations are planned and, indeed, are in hand to provide additional facilities for this purpose. I will obtain an up-to-date report for the honourable member concerning the present stage of the matter.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier use his good offices and the good offices of his Government to have set up a rural bank for the specific purpose of assisting rural producers? (Although this is a Commonwealth matter, I relate my question specifically to people in this State.) Other members representing rural areas and I are being approached more and more frequently by constituents who, having applied for rural reconstruction assistance, have been told that, because of the nature of their mortgages or the time when they were negotiated, they do not qualify. These people are left in need of a long-term loan, which is not available to them from the current financial sources. There is a clear case for establishing a rural bank in this country, and both major Parties have referred to this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly support the provision by the Commonwealth Government of long-term rural credits. That is quite another matter from the State's setting up a rural bank.

Mr. Rodda: I was referring to long-term finance on a Commonwealth-wide basis.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, in relation to the Commonwealth, I will support the provision of long-term credits to try to assist in the difficult situation facing most of the rural industries in Australia at present. The provision of finance by the State Bank is overwhelmingly for people engaged in primary industries. The State Bank has most of the business in the soldier settlement areas of South Australia, particularly in the Riverland and on the West Coast. At present it is fully extended in helping rural industries in South Australia. In that respect it has gone far beyond any other banking institution, and that policy will continue to the limit of the resources of the State. I certainly support the proposition the honourable member has put forward regarding Commonwealth banking institutions.

STRATHALBYN ROAD

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Strathalbyn-Wistow-Mount Barker road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Strathalbyn-Wistow-Mount Barker road will connect to the South Eastern Freeway at the Mount Barker Interchange, thus providing the Strathalbyn area with a very much improved route to Adelaide. Originally, it was hoped to complete the Strathalbyn-Wistow length at about the same time as the next section of the freeway to Mount Barker is opened in about two years time. However, problems associated with design, land acquisition, and particularly with present inability to allocate financial priority as against other important rural projects indicate a longer period which cannot be avoided. A revision of the advance programme is not yet completed. At the present time, it appears that the work may have to be spread over three to four years.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about the resealing of the yard at Morphetville Park Primary School? When I asked the Minister the question I explained to him the shocking condition of the yard, which has pools of stagnant water lying about in it with consequent problems for the students, the teaching staff and the school cleaners.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I cannot reply to the question as yet, I will check the position and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

RIDGEHAVEN SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say what stage has been reached with the projected building of an infants school at the Ridgehaven Primary School? In the Loan Estimates, \$250,000 has been allocated for a major addition to the school, in this case an infants school of brick construction, the work to commence during the 1972-73 financial year. Correspondence has passed between the Minister and me, and he has received a deputation on the matter from members of the school committee. The Minister is therefore aware that this is a necessary and urgent project.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because of the many contracts we let last year, there has been an unusually high carry-over in expenditure into this financial year. However, enrolment problems at Ridgehaven are such that this

is a project that is continuing on schedule as far as I know. I will check the matter and try to bring down the latest information on the availability of the new accommodation as soon as possible.

PORT LINCOLN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the construction of the six-teacher open unit at the Port Lincoln Primary School is on schedule, and when it will be able to operate? I had understood that this unit was to operate at the beginning of this school term but, on a recent visit to the construction site, I noticed that several weeks work seemed to be needed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been informed that all brickwork has been completed for this unit, and that materials for roofing are available and will be erected soon. As work is proceeding smoothly, it is expected to complete the project in early November. I think that that would result in a delay of about six weeks in the original schedule set out for this unit.

PARKSIDE SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the projected purchase by the department of properties in Kenilworth Road, Parkside, adjacent to the Parkside Primary School? As these houses are in a poor condition, several have been condemned by the council. I am sure that this land will be a welcome addition to the playing area of an old school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This school is one of those older primary schools, like Goodwood Primary School, situated on a restricted site, and, ultimately, we will have to rebuild the school away from the road. If the properties referred to are not required at present, they will be required when rebuilding takes place. I will obtain details of the negotiations as soon as possible.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my recent question about fencing national parks on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Since the National Parks Commission adopted the policy of assisting adjoining landowners in providing fencing along boundaries between national parks land and adjoining properties eight years ago, about 150 miles of fencing has been erected, and reimbursements of about \$70,000

have been made to landowners throughout the State. In general no difficulties have been experienced in implementing this policy, but there have been problems in relation to some individual properties where a surveyed and gazetted but unmade roadway exists between the park and the privately held land. In these circumstances no common boundary exists, although the natural vegetation extends to the boundary of the private land, and it is therefore necessary to seek the co-operation of the local district council in having the road closed and added to the park.

When this has been achieved, a fence can be erected under the normal policy. However, not all district councils are willing to co-operate in this way. The policy has been actively pursued at both Hincks and Hambidge Conservation Parks, and to date more than 50 miles of fencing has been erected on the boundary of Hincks Conservation Park and more than 30 miles at Hambidge. These mileages represent almost 70 per cent of the total length of the boundary of Hincks and more than 60 per cent of the total length of the boundary at Hambidge. Other applications for assistance have been received from landowners adjoining these two parks, and these applications will be considered soon.

MAIN NORTH ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport give details of the programme of constructing a section of the dual highway at Gepps Cross? Such a highway is being constructed, but over the Gepps Cross section, particularly at the Cavan railway crossing opposite the entrance to the abattoir, much congestion has been caused to traffic on several days a week and some congestion is caused all the time. Will this section of the highway be completed soon in order to bring it into line with other sections of the highway farther north?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have details of the date on which this section will be completed but I understand that work has already commenced on the extension of the dual highway from south of Cavan railway crossing to the vicinity of Cross Keys Road. As far as I can remember, the work is scheduled to be completed some time next year.

SCHOOL THEFTS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education say what action is being taken to reduce the number of thefts of property from our schools? Referring to the Education Depart-

ment, under the heading "Loss of Government property" the Auditor-General's Reports state that for the year ended June 30, 1972, the value of equipment stolen was \$22,883; for the year ended June 30, 1969, it was \$4,327; for the year ended June 30, 1970, it was \$4,861; and for the year ended June 30, 1971, it was \$7,088. What action has been taken to prevent loss of property, and why has there been such a large increase over the past four years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the second part of the question, there were more burglaries over the last four years. We suspect, in some instances, that a gang (possibly from the Eastern States) committed a series of thefts from schools in this State. The figures quoted by the honourable member indicate the kind of problem that concerns us. At present we are investigating the possibility of employing a security service, or of establishing our own security service, to prevent thefts and fires. I remind the honourable member that to provide our own security service with three teams, each of two officers, visiting schools each evening of the week would probably cost about \$40,000 a year. The employment of an outside security service would cost more than that in order to obtain an effective coverage. Another aspect we are investigating is the installation of special alarm systems, and shortly we hope to install (on a trial basis) several of these systems in a few selected schools. For obvious reasons, I shall not say at which schools they are to be installed. I assure members and the public generally that we are very disturbed about the situation. It is a difficult problem because there are many schools and because almost any effective method of protection against burglary or fire is expensive.

Mr. Mathwin: You want resident caretakers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Each resident caretaker would cost about \$3,000 a year as well as \$14,000 for each house, and up to \$1,500,000 a year could be spent in order to avoid an annual burglary rate of, say, \$20,000 and a fire loss of up to \$200,000 a year.

Mr. Evans: What about the part-time use of pensioners?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is all very well, but if we put a person in this position, I do not think we can legitimately expect a pensioner to be able to do this kind of job within a school. We will have to have someone who can look after himself should there be a confrontation with a person who is trying to commit theft or arson. A person who

would do that sort of thing could be expected to resort to some kind of violence. Initially, there is an element of violence associated with these acts. If we are to employ people to counter this type of act, we will have to contemplate employing people who are capable of looking after themselves. If we employed our own security people, we would plan to send them out in pairs. This would afford an extra margin of protection for the individuals engaged in providing the security, and their interests are involved as well.

Mr. Mathwin: There could be—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is Question Time and not a debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All the possible actions we might take in relation to this matter are being considered. When we have reached a final decision in the matter, I will make a public announcement about what we intend to do. I will try to give that announcement the widest publicity possible so that the stupid people in our community who want to indulge in burglary or arson will know that they run the risk of being apprehended.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Education say what demands were contained in the letter reportedly delivered to him yesterday by a group of schoolchildren, and does he intend to make any changes of policy as a result? This morning's paper reports that a demonstration (I think that is the word used) of 120 schoolchildren took place yesterday, when the schoolchildren went to the Education Building, apparently hurled abuse at the Minister in his absence, and handed in a letter. Before this I had seen in the paper that the organization behind this action was the Student Action Group, supported by the Communist Party and, apparently, by the Australian Labor Party, through the Young Labor Association, which had contributed \$10 to the expenses. Therefore, no doubt the Minister will find the demands made upon him persuasive. A number of points raised are matters of policy, such as the statements about no corporal punishment, no segregation, freedom of dress at school, and so on. I should like to know whether the press report contains the full list of demands served on the Minister and whether any or all of the demands will be agreed to.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In his usual style, the honourable member has managed to throw certain insinuations at the Labor Party. The honourable member's assumption

is completely and utterly incorrect: there is no support for the Student Action Group from the A.L.P.

Mr. Millhouse: It was in the newspaper.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No doubt that makes it true! There is no support from the A.L.P. for the Student Action Group.

Mr. Millhouse: This is the first time it has been denied.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This morning's newspaper also had an editorial stating that a certain colleague of the member for Mitcham—

Mr. Millhouse: I think you're getting off the subject.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —was guilty of certain things. I suppose that, if the honourable member's standard of acceptance of material in the newspaper is as he has just enunciated, he will support that editorial fully.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He'd be right in that case.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He might be, but the fact that something is in the newspaper does not prove anything, as the honourable member knows.

Mr. Millhouse: The Young Labor Association made a contribution.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not aware of what the Young Labor Association may or may not have done. The only point I make for the honourable member is, I repeat, that there is no support from the Australian Labor Party for the Student Action Group. However, there is support for the group from the media. As a result of the publicity by the media, the press and television, 120 students went on strike in Adelaide yesterday. Big, big deal!

Mr. Evans: Some of them—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Some of those at the demonstration went only to see what was going on. If the media had fulfilled its function with a greater degree of responsibility, what happened yesterday would have been a complete non-event. Yesterday afternoon I saw representatives of the students and told them what the departmental policy was on matters such as uniforms and corporal punishment. When they raised other matters, relating to the administration of certain schools, I told them that the Government and the department expected the schools to be able to resolve their problems for themselves and that the Government or the department should not be involved in issuing directives to the schools. I told them that, if we as a community wished to encourage the exercise of initiative in the

schools, we were not helping to do that by telling schools, consequent on an approach from certain students or other persons in the community, that the schools must do this or that and telling them that a complete plan of what they must or must not do would be laid down for them. That is not an appropriate way to approach this kind of problem, in my judgment and in the judgment of the Government. Consequently, beyond telling the students that our regulations provided that the wearing of school uniforms was not compulsory and that the regulations did provide for corporal punishment in certain circumstances, I made no reply to the deputation that saw me later yesterday afternoon.

I should like to say one thing more. Several of the students involved yesterday were, in my judgment, sensible and rational people and those who came to see me in my office were not members of the Student Action Group, because the group had banned having anything to do with the deputation to the Minister. Those who saw me in my office seemed to me to be sensible and rational people. I did not agree with everything they said, but we had a reasonable discussion of the various problems. I should like, on behalf of some people who work in the Education Department and who happened to be looking from one of the balcony windows of the Education Building while the students were outside yesterday, to object publicly to some of the abuse thrown at them by some ratbags among the students. These employees were described as bludgers and were told to get on and do some work about education, and other such expressions were used. On behalf of all employees of the Education Department, I lodge a public protest at that, because invariably in my experience those associated with the administration of education in South Australia are conscientious, hard-working people who are devoted to the cause that they serve. That applies not only to the Director-General and the top stream of officers but to all the people who work in the Education Department, down to those who clean the building. The abuse that was slung at employees of the Education Department yesterday was completely unjustified. There was no call for it whatsoever.

SUPERANNUATION REFUNDS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what action he or the Government has taken about a request by the Australian Bank Officials Association that contribution by members of the association to superannuation and provident

funds be returned following dismissal or resignation of members from employment? The Premier would know that a copy of a letter forwarded to him was sent to me, and in that letter the association asked the Government to consider ways and means to provide the facility that I have mentioned. Part of the letter states:

Many of the trust deeds of bank superannuation funds (and one may safely assume this circumstance applies to other employer's funds) contain provisions that the administration shall withhold all funds, including members' own contributions, in the event of their dismissal from their employment for any reason. The A.B.O.A. has on many occasions had brought to its attention situations where an officer has been responsible for misappropriation or stealing of bank funds and as such has been dismissed, charged in a court, been convicted and required to make full restitution to the bank. The association does not condone any such action by an officer, and indeed believes that the action of the bank thus far is appropriate. It does not agree however that the bank has the right to invoke further punitive action by withholding all of that officer's own contributions to his superannuation fund.

In effect, at present a person is required to pay a penalty twice. I appreciate that this is not necessarily a field in which the Government can act immediately, but I should be pleased to obtain from the Premier information on any action taken or consideration given by the Government regarding this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain for the Leader a report from the Chairmen of the boards of the two Government banks.

LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain details for me of land in my district that his department has acquired for freeway purposes? To assist the Minister, I refer particularly to the amount set out in the Auditor-General's Report under the headings "Adelaide to Modbury Freeway" and "North Adelaide Connector". I should appreciate the Minister's obtaining details of this expenditure and information about the properties being acquired.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information.

MODBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 14 regarding the six-teacher open unit being constructed at the Modbury Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Delays have occurred in the building of the six-teacher

open unit at the Modbury Primary School because of wet weather during the early stages. It is expected that, if there are no further interruptions, the unit will be completed in December of this year.

BRUCELLOSIS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier (who is the Leader of the Government) take the necessary action to assist his colleague in another place regarding the difficulty that that Minister got into yesterday about the lack of finance to eradicate brucellosis? Yesterday, in another place, a censure motion was moved because the Minister had stated that, because of lack of Government finance, primary producers would have to pay the cost of vaccination to eradicate brucellosis and, probably, tuberculosis in cattle. In reply to the censure motion, the Minister said:

I am aware of the problems and have taken this matter to certain quarters. I can say no more at this stage, but I hope something—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entirely out of order in referring to a debate in another Chamber.

Later:

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier say whether the Government will reconsider its decision that farmers will in future be required to pay for brucellosis and tuberculosis vaccinations for their cattle? I am sure it is not necessary for me to remind the Premier how important the beef industry is, not only to South Australia but also to Australia as a whole. As the producers are at present contributing to a fund (a certain tax being deducted from the returns on their cattle), they are doing something to protect their industry. It may be of interest—

The SPEAKER: It would be of interest to the House if the honourable member would explain his question.

Mr. VENNING: At present, the beef industry is the greatest export earner for the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. VENNING: I ask the Government to reconsider its decision regarding the costs of vaccinating cattle.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Given the condition of the fund, which would be well known to the honourable member, it has been necessary for the Government, in the interests of meeting the expenditure involved, recently to impose this charge. It is not true that the fund can bear all of the charges. As a con-

sequence, I cannot hold out any hope to the honourable member that the matter will be reconsidered.

GURKHA APPEAL

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier consider supporting an appeal launched in Australia to aid the resettlement in India of Gurkha ex-servicemen, and will he appeal to the South Australian public for its support? Gurkhas are well known throughout the world as loyal and excellent soldiers. They have a great military record and have often fought side by side with Australian forces. The aim of this appeal is to obtain money to service a welfare plan to assist retired Gurkha servicemen in their native country of Nepal, a country with few resources which is subject to frequent natural disasters. As a result, retired Gurkhas and their families are in dire need of help.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The overseas aid given by the South Australian Government is limited basically to three areas: first, to Austcare; secondly, to the Freedom from Hunger campaign; and, thirdly, to the seconding of South Australian public servants to help in countries such as New Guinea where they undertake public service on behalf of the Government concerned. It is certainly not possible for us to extend our assistance to charitable groups outside the ambit of these organizations overseas. Matters concerning foreign affairs, assistance, and overseas trade are normally handled by the Commonwealth Government, and the South Australian Government does not intend to go beyond the areas in which it has already undertaken to help.

RAIL FREIGHTS

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether any approaches have been made by the Government to Minerals Mining and Metallurgy Limited regarding transport of concentrates from Broken Hill? The following report appears in yesterday's *News*:

Minerals Mining and Metallurgy Limited may use roads rather than rail transport facilities to ship concentrates from Broken Hill. Mr. V. A. Kater, a director and secretary of the company, indicated this today.

This company has taken over the Broken Hill South mine and, if it does decide to transport its concentrates by road, this will have a detrimental effect on the town of Peterborough, which is a railway town, and the surrounding council area, although I realize that this company must cut costs in order to operate the mine.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Approaches have been made by the firm to the Government on the matter of carrying concentrates by rail. The company requested the Government to arrange a special concession for the transport of ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie. This request was fully considered by the Government and, bearing in mind that this freight rate could not be applied generally to the mining companies in Broken Hill (whose rates are now under periodical review), the Railways Commissioner had discussions with the mining companies to ascertain whether they would accept the fact that the new company taking over the Broken Hill South mine was engaged in a salvage and closing-down operation, and whether they would object to a special freight rate being applied to Minerals Mining and Metallurgy Limited, without that rate not being used by the other companies as a lever in the current negotiations; but the other companies would not agree. They regard the Broken Hill South operation as a normal mining operation and we are therefore virtually prevented from doing anything at all for the new owners of the Broken Hill South mine, and the normal freight rates will apply.

It must be borne in mind (and I do not know whether the honourable member knows this) that the freight rate applying to the transport of ore from Broken Hill is subject to a rebate based on tonnages carried, but these are tonnages carried across the board. The rebate is not related to the tonnage carried by each individual company: it is related to the total tonnage carried by all the companies. In this way the operations of one company can automatically affect all the other companies.

We have taken this matter as far as we can. I do not know, nor has it been suggested to me, that the company will transport its ore by road. Of course, if the company chooses to do that, it has that right. I remind the honourable member that last time when the freight rates were being negotiated (and I think that was during the period at the end of the previous Government's term and the commencement of this Government's term) the suggestion was put by the mining companies, in an endeavour to depress the rail freight rate, that they might transport the ore themselves by road or even develop a pipeline. That did not eventuate, and I do not believe it would be economic to transport the ore by road trans-

port in view of the favourable rates offered by the railways. However, this decision is one for the company itself. The Government will certainly not prejudice its relationships with the other companies only for this one company. We desired to do something but, regrettably, the area to help was not available.

CUMMINS SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Education see that the District Council of Port Lincoln receives a reply from the Education Department concerning the connection of the Cummins Area School to the Cummins modified system of sewage disposal? On July 22, 1971, the District Council of Port Lincoln wrote to the Director-General of Education, stating that this system of sewage disposal was to be installed in Cummins and requesting that the school be connected to the system. I believe that no reply was received by the council to this letter and that on May 8 the council again wrote to the Director-General stating that this system was now operating and asking the department for its decision. The council wrote to me on the same day, asking me to look into the matter. On June 16, 1972, I wrote to the Director-General of Education, as follows:

For schemes such as this to operate at the lowest possible cost to the ratepayers, it is essential that every organization and individual be connected, and the council is concerned that you are one of the very few who have not signified their intention to do so.

I did not receive a reply to this letter, and I assumed that the reply would go directly to the Port Lincoln council. I received a letter a week or so ago from the Clerk of the council stating that the council had still not received any communication from the Director-General on this matter. As it is essential that as many properties of ratepayers as possible be connected to such a scheme so that the costs are distributed equitably, I ask the Minister to investigate the position and to try to bring this long drawn-out matter to a close as soon as possible.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to look into this earth-shattering matter and to bring down a reply as soon as possible.

OUTLAW

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Education undertake to do everything in his power to prohibit the distribution of the booklet *Outlaw* which was distributed by a student

of the Flinders University to children who took part in the strike march yesterday?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I can say that a certain thing is prohibited and produce an absolutely zero result. The only thing I can tell the honourable member at this stage is that the student concerned was apprehended by the police, and full details of the incident that occurred were noted by the police who were on duty and by the members of the Vice Squad who were called in as a consequence. I have no doubt that a report on this matter will be made available to the Attorney-General in due course, and a decision will then have to be made whether or not the student should be prosecuted. I am not sure of the age of the student or, indeed, whether it was a student from Flinders University; it could well have been, but I do not know. Until I can give more details on the matter, or until the Attorney-General has had a report, I think it is probably wise to make no further comment.

DOGS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on August 22 about destroying dogs in Belair National Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Regulation 18 of the National Parks and Wild Life Act regulations, 1972, provides:

No person shall bring into, or permit, a dog to be in a reserve, other than a game reserve or other than a recreation park, when the dog shall be kept on a lead.

This position is similar to that provided under by-law 21 of the by-laws made under the repealed National Parks Act, 1966, and is consistent with the agreement reached by Ministers at the fifth Ministerial Conference on National Parks, in Perth, that "steps be taken to ensure that all States . . . exclude cats, dogs and other household pets . . . from national park areas". Regulations 29 (1) and 30 give wardens appointed under the Act the power to impound or destroy domestic animals or feral animals found at large in a reserve. Since the commencement of the Act and regulations on July 3, 1972, four large and savage dogs have been destroyed by the Ranger-in-Charge, Belair Recreation Park (a warden under the Act). These dogs were obviously wild and uncared for and were, no doubt, at least partly responsible for stock damage and losses in the nearby farming areas. The dogs were a danger to wild life in the park.

We know of no occasion where the Ranger-in-Charge has destroyed dogs in the vicinity of visitors to the park, although it may have been possible for someone to witness the actions of the ranger unbeknown to him. In all cases, a low-powered rifle has been used by this officer, who has an intimate knowledge of park usage by visitors to the park. At no stage is there any danger to visitors or nearby residents. A number of animals have also been impounded (at the pound) over the past two months, some animals on more than one occasion. There are large routed timber signs at each of the main entrances to the park which clearly indicate that dogs must be kept on a lead. However, action will be taken immediately to construct and erect a further sign at the pedestrian entrance near the golf course.

WHYALLA MAIN

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether microbiological readings and other analyses are still being taken regularly in respect of water in the Morgan-Whyalla main and, if they are, when was the last investigation made and what were the findings at the time?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer that matter to the Minister of Health.

NORTH FLINDERS MINES

Dr. EASTICK: I ask the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, whether he can say what procedure is adopted by the Mines Department when considering an application from a mining organization for Government assistance for the purpose of undertaking additional prospecting or investigations. I refer to page 35 of today's *News*, which contains a report, part of which states:

North Flinders Mines Limited is seeking assistance from the South Australian Government in its exploration of the Parabarana Hill copper prospect, north-east of Leigh Creek in South Australia's Far North. This is revealed in the annual report, issued today.

Although other statements are made, I refer specifically to the point that a person reading that the South Australian Government is involved in or associated with investigations being undertaken by this company could conceivably be led to believe that he ought to purchase shares in the company or become involved in it, on the understanding that it is in some way sponsored by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has had an application from North Flinders Mines Limited that we might undertake for it some part of its drilling programme

for the proving of a prospect at Parabarana Hill, a prospect which on all indications looks fairly favourable. The Government is considering this, and ways in which it can help by carrying out a drilling programme are certainly being examined. We should be willing in other cases, if mining companies sought this type of assistance from us, to consider the matter, where it appears that there is a reasonable prospect from drilling results. That does not mean that the South Australian Government is guaranteeing the company or putting it forward as a better investment risk than any other mining company, but it is in line with the Government's view that work of Government and private investment can, in fact, from time to time be effectively married in order to obtain a beneficial public result.

Dr. Eastick: Will the Government benefit in the event of satisfactory results being obtained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Consideration is being given to the Government's having some share of equity in the company in return for the work the Government carries out, and this is in accordance with the policy adopted by Governments elsewhere in the world. We see no reason why the Government here should not adopt such a course if it is recommended to us by our officers as being a reasonable undertaking in the course of our drilling programmes.

PARA HILLS PADDOCKS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether there is no chance of the Government's purchasing the whole of the Para Hills paddocks as open space? I saw in the paper, I think on Tuesday, the report of an announcement by the Premier that land in this area was being purchased by the Government, and that half of it would be used as open space. The report states that the offer was well received by those at the meeting, but afterwards the Chairman of the Para Hills Save the Paddocks Committee said he was not happy with anything less than 320 acres of open space being provided.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He's hard to get on with.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister says that I am hard to get on with and that Mr. Giles is hard to get on with. I am glad that the representations I have made in this House on this matter have at last borne fruit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No other member has raised a voice in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham is getting a little wide of the explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I have said on previous occasions, I am particularly thin-skinned and easily put off.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: However thin-skinned you are, you are adept at sitting on the fence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am easily put off by remarks such as those the Minister just made. If members opposite have finished, I will say that I am delighted that the support I gave to Mr. Duncan in this matter has forced the Government's hand, but only to a limited extent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and I must stop him on that note. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is being more of a comedian than he usually is. He is being looked at with considerable interest by his heir apparent right now. There is no chance of the Government's buying the whole 320 acres of paddocks at Para Hills for open space.

Dr. Eastick: You don't fear a complete close-down of building operations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The proposal for the remainder of the Para Hills paddocks, which I put to the meeting at Para Hills on Monday evening, will be carried out by the Housing Trust, which intends to purchase the whole of the leased trust land (that zoned residential and industrial alike) and put it together with the remainder of the Para Hills paddocks already owned by the trust, which will enable us to provide a open-space area of about 113 acres. Regarding the total open-space requirements in that area (given the fact that the Government has already purchased open-space areas, in accordance with the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, close to that area), we have made a provision for open space which is beyond that of most of the metropolitan area.

Dr. Eastick: You don't think you will have houses without plumbing, do you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not, and I am certain that the views I expressed at Para Hills on Monday evening gained the overwhelming support of the members of the Save the Paddocks Committee. I thought

the honourable member's advocacy in this matter strange.

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because his history when in Government of acquiring areas for open space, even within the limitations of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, was disastrous.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nothing was done for two years by the Hall Government to purchase open-space areas under the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan: not a single cent was provided. It was only when this Government came to office and provided the special metropolitan Adelaide land tax surcharge to service the loan moneys we made available to the development fund that we started to purchase open-space areas. The honourable member's Government paid not one cent to the development fund. The only contribution made in relation to open space was under the \$300,000 a year subsidy plan from local government. The honourable member well knows that most councils within the metropolitan Adelaide development area submitted to his Government that they could not possibly afford to purchase the open spaces specified in the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan under that scheme. None of the major open spaces within the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan was purchased, and the honourable member knows that.

Mr. Millhouse: You're now putting a qualification.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Which one was?

Mr. Millhouse: You had to put in "major", didn't you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member cannot point to any significant area under the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, specified in the 1962 plan, that was purchased by his Government. Not one purchase was made through the State Planning Authority or the development fund.

Mr. Millhouse: Purchases were made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I challenge the honourable member to say which one of the open-space areas specified under the 1962 plan was bought, pursuant to local government joint operation, under his Government.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course not! I do not know why the honourable member now raises this additional area, which is beyond the provisions of the 1962 plan, because he did not provide anything under

the 1962 plan. The only reason he raises this matter, which is beyond that provision, is that he thinks he will do a little political stirring.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether Mr. Giles (Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union) has agreed not to impede any building operation to be undertaken at The Levels and at Pooraka, in areas which are the subject of the save the paddocks campaign, and elsewhere in the State? It was stated earlier that Mr. Giles would withdraw all plumbing unionists if any attempt was made to put a building on any of these areas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should have thought the honourable Leader could make that inquiry of Mr. Giles if he was interested. I have not had any communication with Mr. Giles, but I am certain that I would have the support of members of the plumbers union in carrying out the policy of the Government.

Dr. Eastick: What about Mr. Giles?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants to make inquiries of Mr. Giles I am sure he will be able to do so.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Why should I make inquiries on the honourable member's behalf? Apparently he has developed aphasia and palsy. If he is interested in finding out things of this kind he is perfectly capable of making an inquiry. Why does the honourable member think he can constitute me his agent?

Mr. Millhouse: Oh now, come on! You are just frightened to do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must not continually interject. Ministers are not responsible for what the press states, and trade union affairs should not be the subject of questions in this House unless it is really an issue. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have answered the question. I am quite satisfied, and that is the extent of Government responsibility in this matter. I am satisfied that the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union will carry out work in accordance with Government policy.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY EXHIBITION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry give me some information about the industrial safety exhibition? The exhibition, which played a significant part in promoting industrial safety in this State, was

supported by employer and employee organizations. I recall the pleasure it gave me to open the exhibition, which was held in Hindmarsh Building. Since the exhibition was held, other matters have come to pass. Can the Minister say whether his department has any plans to organize another industrial safety exhibition, either of the type just held or based on the large exhibition held in the United Kingdom? I am not suggesting an exhibition as large as the one held in the United Kingdom, because that would be beyond our scope, but has the Minister any plans for a permanent exhibition, possibly supported by employer and employee organizations? I believe that this would be an important aspect of safety in this State.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not know whether the honourable member is aware that the safety exhibition has been shifted from Hindmarsh Square to the Port Road, where facilities are being tidied up so that the display can remain there permanently. We are also considering a safety exhibition on a much larger scale than we have had in the past.

DERNANCOURT INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the possibility of making the intersection of the Lower North-East Road and Balmoral Road, Dernancourt, safer? The Minister is no doubt aware that I have previously written to him and asked him questions, and that recently I presented a petition concerning the reconstruction and widening of the Lower North-East Road between the Torrens River at Dernancourt and Anstey Hill. On July 13 the Minister wrote to me and informed me that, because of difficulties that had been experienced, there would be a delay in the commencement of this work and that it was not expected that construction would commence before 1974. People who live in this area have informed me that this is a dangerous intersection and that, with the volume of traffic now using the Lower North-East Road, a serious accident is feared. They have therefore requested that, instead of having to wait until 1974 for this work to be done, something be done now to make this intersection safe.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter examined.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BECKER: Will the Treasurer say what proportion of the \$2,000,000 to be provided by the Government to reduce unemployment

will be made available to councils to carry out high labour-intensity work and, if such allocations are made to councils, whether a time limit will be set on the spending of the money?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The final proportion will not be decided until applications have been received from councils, so that the Government can judge the priority of works to be undertaken. Applications have been invited from councils. At the outset, I should think that between 70 per cent and 80 per cent of the money would be allocated to councils. However, it is too early to fix a specific figure until applications have been examined and priorities given to the work in relation to which applications are made.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say whether a time limit will be set on spending the money allocated to councils?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A time limit has not been set but, if we want work done in the short term, that will be done.

AMOEBIC MENINGITIS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether the Government intends before next summer to make available to scientists at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science additional funds for further investigation into the source of the organism responsible for cases of amoebic meningitis?

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

SITONA WEEVIL

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Premier, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, say what progress has been made on the control of sitona weevil in this State, how seriously the Government and the Agriculture Department view the weevil problem and, if they view it seriously enough, whether the Government will allocate extra funds to help control it? I understand that this weevil is again prevalent in pastures in this State and that concern is being expressed regarding the reduction of fertility in pastures. I believe that the sitona weevil lives on the nodules of the roots of legumes, and that this, in turn, destroys the build-up of nitrogen in the soil. This matter is of vital concern to landowners, as many pastures of lucerne and medics have had to be re-sown.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Attorney-General willing to set up a small committee to investigate the establishment in one of the established hospitals of a centre for the treatment of teenage offenders who are in need of psychiatric treatment? This suggestion was made in the first annual report of the Juvenile Court Judge on the administration of the new Juvenile Courts Act, which report was tabled in the House this week. The report suggests that in certain cases children who have been committed to institutions because of offences they have committed are in need of this sort of treatment, but that no facilities are at present available for treating such children.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Juvenile Court Judge suggested in his report that the possibility of establishing a section of a psychiatric hospital that could be reserved for juveniles who might need psychiatric treatment should be investigated. If a juvenile offender is in need of such treatment, he is, of course, treated in the ordinary psychiatric hospitals, and that applies whether or not he has offended against the law. Whether there is any point in establishing a specific part of a psychiatric hospital to be devoted to the treatment of disturbed juveniles who have come into conflict with the law, I do not know. At present treatment is available in the ordinary psychiatric hospitals, and I should have thought that that would meet the situation. As the matter has been raised by the Judge of the Juvenile Court, I shall discuss it with the Chief Secretary and officers of my department to ascertain, first, whether any good purpose would be served by reserving some part of a psychiatric hospital for this purpose and, secondly, whether it would be practicable.

GLENELG TRAMS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the complete fleet of Glenelg trams is to be painted in the same drab, uninspiring colours, or will the rejuvenation be carried out in something which is at least brighter, more attractive, and more modern, and which would attract tourists? The red and deep cream colours in which they are being painted now was the height of fashion 45 to 50 years ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that question has been asked previously.

Mr. Mathwin: No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the member for Glenelg previously asked a general

question about the colour of the trams, but I do not think it is the same question. The Municipal Tramways Trust decided to restore the original colours of the exterior of the trams. I am sorry if the member for Bragg is finding things difficult but, apparently, he is suffering from, wind, if one can judge by the strange look on his face. I understand that the interior of the trams consisted of polished blackwood, but as this was painted some years ago, it is now virtually impossible (certainly economically impossible) to restore them to their original form. I understand that it is intended to restore the trams to the same condition as was shown at the inspection of the first car this morning. I do not know whether the member for Glenelg has seen the car.

Mr. Mathwin: Yes, I was there this morning.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is strange that I did not see the honourable gentleman: he must have been hiding somewhere, because I was also present and did not see him. I am pleased that he has shown enough interest to look at the tram, and I wish he had made his presence known, because if he had I would have given him a pressing invitation to join me and travel to Adelaide in what I believe to be one of the finest forms of transport in South Australia, and in Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: It's all right except for the colours.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure that the M.T.T. would be pleased to receive suggestions from anyone.

Mr. Becker: Be careful!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not wish to be as rude as the member for Hanson has been concerning his experiences on the train, when he was extremely rude to employees of the South Australian Railways. I have noticed that he was much kinder to M.T.T. employees, probably because some of them might live in his district and have something to say about him. Perhaps the member for Glenelg could suggest a colour scheme, as long as it is not the colour of the Liberal Movement.

Mr. Mathwin: That's not a bad colour.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The M.T.T. has had an approach from an anonymous source, but I think the member for Becker knows what I am about to say.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this week you called members to order for not referring to other members by their correct titles, and the Minister is out of order.

The SPEAKER: That was, I am sure, a slip of the tongue. Members are not to refer

to other members by their surname, but must address them by the name of the district they represent. I am sure that the* Minister of Roads and Transport will co-operate with me in my efforts to maintain Standing Orders in this honourable Chamber.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It was purely a slip of the tongue, and I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the member for Hanson. I think the honourable member knows the point I am trying to make for the benefit of the member for Glenelg. An approach has already been made from an anonymous person to place an advertisement on the new tram and, obviously, this person thinks that the colours are desirable, as he wishes to place an advertisement on each side of the new tram.

Mr. Mathwin: That would just brighten it up.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think that the political candidate for whom the member for Hanson made the application would brighten anything up. However, the application was rejected.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport details of the discussions that have taken place between his department and the Commonwealth Department of Supply about rerouting the Stuart Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have written to the Minister for Supply (I think it is) making suggestions about the proposed route because of the restrictive nature of the country but, at this stage, I am not aware of any reply having been received.

DEPARTMENTAL CO-OPERATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is possible for closer co-operation to exist between the Education Department and the Community Welfare Department concerning problems associated with some delinquent children? In his first annual report on the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, the Juvenile Court Judge refers to this matter, which apparently was raised in 1960, and his report states:

I regret the necessity to report that the need for a closer liaison between the Education Department and the Community Welfare Department still exists. I have discussed this matter with the Director-General of Community Welfare, who has assured me that the resources of his department are available to assist a child (and, if necessary, his or her parents) referred to that department by the Education Department.

The inference seems to be that the Education Department is not making the maximum use of the resources of the Community Welfare Department. From the comment it seems that this problem has existed for some time, although previously the department was not called the Community Welfare Department. Is it possible for closer co-operation to exist between these departments?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consult my officers regarding the report of the Juvenile Court Judge, and then, in line with our own thinking on the matter, I will consult the Minister of Community Welfare to see what can be done to improve liaison between the two departments. Should any further action be necessary, I will take it.

FILM CLASSIFICATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Attorney-General propose to take any action regarding the advertisement, recently inserted in the paper over the name of E. J. Goldsworthy, concerning the enforcement of the Film Classification Act? I have today received a letter from a constituent well known to me and, I think, known to the Attorney. I shall be happy to show him the letter later if he wishes. The constituent expressed concern about an advertisement which he saw, he says, a few days ago in the paper and which is as follows:

Australian Theatrical and Amusement
Employees Association, S.A. Branch
Notice to Members
R Film Rights

Members are advised that they are not to accept any responsibility, nor are they to become involved in questioning or querying the right of any person to gain admission to R certificate films. This responsibility rests exclusively on the proprietor or manager. The association will take appropriate action to protect members who are disadvantaged as a result of this advice.

E. J. Goldsworthy, Secretary

I realize the difficulties which the authorities must have in enforcing the rule that those between two years and 18 years of age should not be admitted to films of this kind. Indeed, I asked the Minister a question about an instance of this some time ago. However, this advertisement must, if it is observed by the members of that association or union, magnify these difficulties out of all proportion. Does the Attorney propose to take any action in the light of Mr. Goldsworthy's advertisement?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, I do not. The Film Classification Act imposes certain responsibilities on the managements of theatres and

makes them liable to penalties if they admit persons between the ages of two years and 18 years to films classified with a restricted Classification. The observance of that obligation placed on the management by the law is a matter for the management to work out with its own employees. If there is some question or dispute between theatre employees and management about how the obligation should be observed, that is a matter to be resolved between those parties. Certainly it is not a matter which could be dealt with by legislation. The Act is clear regarding the obligation. It is clear that an offence is committed if a person within the prohibited age group is admitted to the theatre. I was not previously aware of the advertisement to which the honourable member refers, but how the obligation is to be observed is obviously a question between the theatre management and its employees.

FILTRATION PLANT

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Works, say what was the cost of installation, as opposed to the total cost, of the filtration plant displayed at the showgrounds and to what use, if any, it is proposed to put this filtration display when it has served its present educational purpose? The display is obviously dear to the heart of the Minister of Works, because workmen incurred a considerable amount of overtime, I am informed, to prepare the exhibit in time. It is of interest to members of the community, but it has been put to me that it would do much more for the peace of mind of the community if as much time and effort could have been put to an earlier start on filtration of the water supply generally, particularly of the water entering the Morgan-Whyalla main.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Works explained last night (very lucidly, I thought) that the cost of the permanent building construction at the showgrounds in relation to this exhibit was \$35,000.

Mr. Coumbe: That was the total.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, the total cost of the exhibit was \$43,500. This is shown in the Estimates.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister did not separate them last night.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The cost of the permanent building was, I believe, \$35,000. That is not related to the question the honourable member asked. The annual cost is about \$8,500, so I presume the filtration exhibit cost

is part of the annual cost. I imagine that sum of money is completely insignificant in relation to filtration of any substantial provision of water by any main, particularly the Morgan-Whyalla main. Without there being a detailed investigation, I think the honourable member would be capable of assuming that filtration of the Morgan-Whyalla main would cost millions of dollars. The honourable member is arguing about sums of a completely different magnitude.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LISTENING DEVICES BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate the use of listening devices, and for other purposes.

Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the first of a series of measures which will be introduced into this House and which are intended to protect the "right of privacy" of the individual. The particular invasion of that right that is dealt with in this measure is that which results from the use of listening devices or, as they are more popularly known, "bugging devices". In substance, this Bill proposes that the use of such devices will be largely prohibited. It also imposes a total prohibition on the communication or publication of information obtained by the unlawful use of the devices. The substantial prohibition proposed is, however, subject to two exceptions. The first exception relates to the use of listening devices by members of the Police Force in the course of their duty. The second exception relates to the use of devices by persons to record conversations to which they are a party.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 provides, amongst other things, for a definition of "listening device" and a definition of "private conversation". While it is felt that the definition of "listening device" is reasonably self explanatory, I would point out to honourable members that a "private conversation", as defined, includes any conversation carried on in circumstances that may reasonably be taken to indicate that any (and I emphasize the word "any") party to the conversation desires it to be confined to the parties thereto.

Clause 4 prohibits, subject to the exceptions proposed later in the measure, the use of a listening device to overhear, record, monitor, or listen to any private conversation. The provision, of course, does not preclude the use of a listening device where the parties to a conversation consent to its use. Subclause (2) of this clause places the burden of proving that the parties to the conversation consented to the use of a listening device on the person charged with the unlawful use of the device. This burden of proof serves to emphasize the proper responsibility that is placed on a person who desires to use a listening device to overhear a conversation, that responsibility being to secure the consent of all the parties thereto.

Clause 5 provides a substantial penalty for a person who disseminates information obtained from the misuse of a listening device. There are some who would consider that this dissemination of the information is even more reprehensible than the recording of it. Clause 6 provides for the lawful use of a listening device by a member of the Police Force in the course of his duty. Subclauses (1) and (2) of this clause together require the approval of a judge of the Local Court to be obtained for the use, and provide that the listening device must be used in accordance with the terms of the approval.

Subclause (3) provides for the use of a listening device by a member of the Police Force acting in the course of his duty, where the delay in seeking the approval would frustrate the purpose for which it is intended to use the device. In addition, the member of the Police Force must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that if there had been time to make an application for approval it would have been granted. Subclause (4) provides that the responsible Minister be formally advised of each use of a listening device under this section. Subclauses (5) and (6) are intended to prohibit any improper disclosure of information obtained by members of the Police Force and others under this section.

Clause 7 permits a person (including a member of the Police Force) who is a party to a private conversation to make a record of that conversation in the course of his duty, in the public interest, or for the protection of his lawful interests, and also gives that person a limited right to publish or communicate that information derived from the use of that listening device. Clause 8 is intended to control the possession of listening devices which are of their nature clearly suitable for use as clandestine "bugging devices".

Subclause (1) of this clause gives the Minister power to "declare" these devices by notice in the *Gazette*, and upon such declaration the provisions of the clause will apply. In passing, I would say that, although on the face of it the power to "declare" the devices is extensive, the plain common sense of the matter dictates that this power should be used most sparingly, since otherwise the Minister or his delegate will be deluged with applications for consents under the succeeding provisions of this clause. Subclause (2) provides that a person shall not have in his possession, custody or control any declared listening device unless he has the consent of the Minister. A substantial penalty is provided for a breach of this provision.

Subclause (3) provides reasonable flexibility in the granting of consents under this section, and also permits the consent to be granted subject to conditions, restrictions, or limitations. Subclause (4) provides for the revocation of a consent. Subclause (5) is intended to ensure that any condition, limitation, or restriction to which the consent is subject shall be adhered to. Subclause (6) provides for the Minister to delegate his powers in relation to the granting of consents under this section.

Clause 9 provides that the Minister having the administration of this measure shall cause a report to be prepared specifying the use made by the police of listening devices under clause 6 of the Bill. The report must distinguish between uses authorized by a judge and the uses not authorized by a judge. A general statement of the purposes for which the device is used must also be provided. Subclause (2) of this clause provides for such a report to be laid on the table of this House.

Clause 10 permits a person charged with an offence against this Act to elect to be tried by jury as if the offence with which he was charged was an indictable offence. If the defendant does not so elect he may be proceeded against in a summary manner. Subclause (4) of this clause somewhat extends the time within which a prosecution for an offence against this Act may be brought, to a maximum of two years. It is suggested that this extension is reasonable since, of their nature, offences against this Act are committed in a clandestine manner.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

**DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Daylight Saving Act, 1971, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

The effect of this short Bill is to provide, with one minor exception, for the observance of daylight saving in this State on the same basis as it was observed during last summer. Before consideration was given to the question whether or not to provide daylight saving in the forthcoming and ensuing summers, representations were invited from organizations and persons most likely to be affected by the reintroduction of daylight saving. The Government, having given these representations the careful consideration they merit, has come to the view that on balance a reintroduction of the previous arrangements is justified to the extent that it will be of benefit to a considerable majority of people in the State.

The Government was represented at a Ministerial meeting in Sydney dealing with the reintroduction of daylight saving on an Australia-wide basis. Discussions at this meeting showed that views supporting or opposing the continuation of daylight saving were similar in each State. It was clear that the community at large supported daylight saving and therefore a decision was made by all States, except Queensland, that it should be reintroduced next summer. This decision was made with the realization that some people and organizations would be disadvantaged.

Discussions centred around how best such people and organizations could be assisted in overcoming their difficulties during this period. To this end the South Australian Government subsequently got in touch with a number of organizations and held discussions on possible ways of overcoming the difficulties. For instance, country dwellers relying on a limited news service believe that, during the daylight saving period, the news services are too early. All participating States agreed to contact the media in their respective States recommending that they consider altering the times of their television and radio news services when daylight saving is in operation. As occurred last year, the Minister of Education has again stated that headmasters, with the agreement of the majority of parents and staff, may vary school hours to suit local requirements during periods when daylight saving is in operation.

Complaints were made by farmers last year that daylight saving affected the hours of receipt of grain at silo stations during the harvest period. We discussed this matter with representatives of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, who informed us that although it has been the policy of the State Bulk Grain Handling Authority to approve receipts of grain in bulk during normal working hours (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays) receipt hours are extended before 8 a.m. and after 5 p.m. on weekdays and overtime approved at penalty rates for work by silo staff on Saturdays when the volume of deliveries warrants such action. The representatives of the co-operative expressed the view that grain growers in this State should have no more difficulty with deliveries to silos during the harvest period with daylight saving than previously, as the co-operative's policy is to facilitate receipts from growers and, provided there is a sufficient volume of deliveries, silo staff are directed to work extended hours for receipts.

Ministers considered the period of operation of daylight saving and decided that, since the last Sunday in February can be as early as the 22nd of that month, when the benefits of daylight saving are at their peak, the period of daylight saving should be from the last Sunday in October to the first Sunday in March, thus extending by one week the period during which daylight saving will be observed. This alteration means that the period of daylight saving is uniform between the States involved.

The Bill now before the House was prepared after taking all the foregoing matters into consideration and bearing in mind that, if the proposed action was not taken, the time difference between South Australia and the major Eastern States during the daylight saving period would be 1½ hours. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act, this being the section that provides for a period of daylight saving to be observed in the summer. The amendment proposed is to substitute for the last Sunday in February the first Sunday in March because the last Sunday in February can be as early as the 22nd, that time being when the benefits of daylight saving are at their peak. The effect of this amendment will be to extend by one week the period during which daylight saving will be observed. The period now proposed is from the last Sunday in October to the first Sunday in March. This amendment ensures that the period of daylight saving is

uniform as between the States involved. Clause 3 repeals section 6 of the principal Act, which provided that the Act should expire on October 15, 1972. The effect of this amendment is that a period of daylight saving as set out in the principal Act, as amended, will occur each summer in this State until Parliament determines otherwise.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Continued from September 20. Page 1494.)

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That further consideration of the Bill in Committee be now resumed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): There is a matter I desire to raise before we go into Committee. I regret that the Minister of Community Welfare is not here because it concerns him in particular. It is, in my view, a serious matter which I should air in the House at this first opportunity. Yesterday, I asked the Minister a question about an article written by Mr. Stewart Cockburn which appeared in the *Advertiser* of last Saturday. In the course of my explanation of the question, I contrasted the apparent facility which had been given to Mr. Cockburn to go to the McNally Training Centre last week, talk to the staff and the boys, form his own conclusions and write an article, with the difficulty I had had in getting the Minister's permission to visit the Windana Remand Home and Vaughan House, even though I am a former Minister and, therefore, the present Minister must know I was already familiar with the places.

I made the requests I did in the light of much unfavourable publicity which was given at the time to those institutions. I asked the Minister of Community Welfare how Mr. Cockburn had come to go there and, in the course of his reply, the Minister said:

Mr. Cockburn sought permission to go to McNally and be present at a sitting of the Treatment Review Board, which handles the management of the children at McNally, decides the period for which they will remain there, their programmes, and so on.

He said that Mr. Cockburn had sought permission to go there in the same way, he would have us believe, as I had sought permission in this House to go to the other institutions. I have spoken to Mr. Cockburn today to check this and I find that that is not accurate, that in fact what happened was that one of the Government press officers

asked Mr. Cockburn whether, in view of all the publicity over abscondings, he would like to spend a day at the McNally Training Centre and sit in on the board's proceedings—the precise opposite of what the Minister said in answer to my question in the House. I have, of course, Mr. Cockburn's permission to raise this matter publicly, and I do. I protest most vigorously at the fact that the Minister said yesterday that Mr. Cockburn had approached him or his officers about going there, whereas Mr. Cockburn tells me that the reverse was the case.

I protest at the fact that members of this House, who have the responsibility for voting the money for these institutions and for the work of the Government in this as in every other field and who have the responsibility for making the laws of this State on the matter, should be treated less favourably than a journalist, even one so respected and well known as Mr. Cockburn. This, in my view, is scandalous. I do not know why the Minister was not prepared immediately and openly to allow me or any other member of this House to go to any of the institutions under his control and to talk to the staff and to those in the institutions about conditions there.

Mr. Mathwin: Perhaps he had something to hide.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether he was frightened of what we might find there but why do people in his name allow an outsider, someone who does not have the responsibility that we have, the opportunity to do these things? Undoubtedly, the Minister thought that, having been there, Mr. Cockburn would write an article entirely sympathetic to the policies and the actions of his department. The member for Ross Smith yesterday, in an interjection when I was asking my question, gave that away when he said, "And why he writes such rubbish about it?"

Undoubtedly, the Minister and his supporters on the other side were not very pleased with the article which Mr. Cockburn wrote and which appeared in the *Advertiser* last Saturday, because it was in several respects critical of what was going on at McNally. Since then, a further article in the name of Mr. Cockburn has appeared in the *Advertiser* (I think yesterday morning) where, on the front page, there was a report of the mother of a boy at McNally criticizing the department, and there was a statement by the Minister deploring such publicity, saying it should not be given. If I may suggest it to the Minister, now that he is back in the Chamber, that is not the way to

engender public confidence in the administration of his department and the institutions under his control. When it is allied to misinformation in reply to a question, it is, as I say, a very serious matter indeed. I have spoken to give the Minister an opportunity to correct what he said yesterday about Mr. Cockburn's visit to McNally or to deny that what Mr. Cockburn has said is accurate. I ask him to do that and to explain why a journalist should be given so much more favourable an opportunity than members of this House to visit and write about an institution.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): I understand that the honourable member, while I was out of the Chamber (I did not hear what he said, but I have been told), said that Mr. Cockburn had told him that he was contacted by a Government press officer about a visit to McNally. Is that the gist of it?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As to that, I can only say that, so far as I was involved in the matter, it was a request for permission to visit McNally Training Centre for the purposes I have mentioned. What, if anything, took place between a Government press officer and Mr. Cockburn, I do not know. I assumed, when I was asked whether Mr. Cockburn could go to McNally Training Centre, that the initiative had come from Mr. Cockburn. If it was as a result of some other means to which I was not a party, I just do not know that. If Mr. Cockburn says that that is so, no doubt it is. I do not for a moment doubt his veracity. If I can rely on the honourable member's account of his conversation with Mr. Cockburn, then I accept that Mr. Cockburn must have had a conversation with a Government press officer antecedent to my involvement in the matter.

However, the reply I gave in the House was accurate to the best of my knowledge. It is still accurate. So far as I was involved in the matter, there was a request for permission, to which I acceded. As to the facilities accorded to Mr. Cockburn, it seems to me that, when the Minister is asked by someone for permission to visit an institution, he must make a judgment as to the person concerned in order to decide what facilities can be accorded to him, and it seemed to me that Mr. Cockburn was an experienced journalist, he was interested in the topic of treatment of juvenile offenders, and he desired to have some facilities at McNally Training

Centre so as to make observations that might be of interest to the public (which also has an interest in these matters). Therefore, these facilities were accorded to him. I repeat that, as to each request and each application for permission of this kind, it is necessary to make a judgment of the use that will be made of the visit, the reliability and sense of responsibility of the person concerned, and the motive for which the application is made. All those matters were taken into account.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Earlier this afternoon, following a question by my colleague, by way of interjection and in other ways the Treasurer saw fit to indicate that this Government had undertaken a large number of purchases in respect of land in the metropolitan area. This point is not denied, but the Treasurer saw fit on that occasion to indicate that nothing (and he subsequently used the words "major extent") had been undertaken by the previous Government, a Government whose actions and activities were hampered by having to undertake extreme financial stringencies to clean up the mess that had been left with it by the previous regime.

It is interesting to note that the present Administration (although we on this side do not accept it as a suitable Administration) did learn from the folly of the 1965 to 1968 period. The Government that followed the Administration that had been in office from 1965 to 1968 had to face a financial stringency that did not permit it to undertake many projects that would show up—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the total deficit in that three-year period?

Dr. EASTICK: The Government that came to office in 1968 instituted several projects and also planned and made provision for additional projects. I refer to pages 112 and 113 of *Hansard*, July 21, 1970. A former Minister, referring to the State Planning Authority, said:

The authority has been carrying on the work regarding acquisition of open spaces in metropolitan Adelaide for the future use of the ever-increasing population of the metropolitan area. In about two years, the Government has made available to the State Planning Authority a figure in excess of \$500,000, and the authority purchased about 560 acres of land in locations such as Athelstone South, O'Halloran Hill, Happy Valley, Cherry Gardens, Aldinga, and in the Onkaparinga estuary at Port Noarlunga for public reserve purposes.

The State Planning Authority is currently negotiating for the purchase of other land totalling, I understand, an area in excess of 1,250 acres. Incidentally, although a local government matter, the Government made

available in the last two years a sum totalling about \$467,000 to local councils, and when it is remembered that the councils themselves contribute, this means that almost \$1,000,000 has been spent in purchasing such areas for recreational purposes within particular local government areas. One of the larger purchases recently agreed to by the authority was 352 acres of land for the Black Hill Regional Park reserve above Athelstone, and eventually this reserve in the eastern foothills will cover about 1,200 acres. The previous Government also financially assisted the Mitcham council's purchase of about 150 acres of land in the vicinity of Windy Point, and this particular subject has received some publicity in the last week or two.

This is the Hall Government, the Government that the Premier has said this afternoon did nothing. The Minister also said:

That purchase will provide an almost unbroken chain of open spaces in the hills face zone linking the national pleasure resort at Shepherds Hill with the Windy Point area. In addition, we allocated part of the area known as the Islington sewage farm (83 acres) to the State Planning Authority for open space purposes. The total value of that 83 acres was estimated at \$581,000, or \$7,000 an acre. I noticed from His Excellency's Speech that the Government has intimated that it intends, in effect, to increase land tax on some owners of land in metropolitan Adelaide to finance further purchases of this kind.

That, as the Premier said this afternoon, subsequently was brought into being. The Minister also said:

I point out that there was never any need to use revenue for this particular purpose.

That was the purpose decided, for which the arrangements were entered into during the previous two years. The Minister also said:

The last Government continued to secure finance for the authority by way of debentures, and since the implementation of the Act three loans secured by debentures have been arranged.

The Opposition believes that, if an announcement is made condemning a former Administration, that announcement should be one that can be substantiated. It can be seen from the portion of the speech that I have quoted that the previous Administration had a very definite programme for developing open spaces for the benefit of the people of this State.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1494.)
Schedule.

Labour and Industry, \$1,204,161—passed.

Minister of Labour and Industry, Miscellaneous, \$26,000.

Mr. GUNN: I condemn the Government for its action in bowing to pressure from the trade

union movement when it paid the fines of a union secretary.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell the truth! The Government paid the costs of Mr. Woolley, a Kangaroo Island farmer.

Mr. GUNN: They were not Woolley's costs. They were paid on behalf of the trade union.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They were Woolley's costs.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn all members that the debate will continue in accordance with Standing Orders. The honourable member for Eyre is addressing the Committee, and I repeat my warning to all members.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I was so rudely interrupted by the Minister of Education, I was about to say that the Minister of Labour and Industry and his Government took the irresponsible step of paying the costs awarded against Mr. Dunford, the Secretary of the Australian Workers Union. I am protesting on behalf of my constituents, who are 100 per cent behind the action of the people on Kangaroo Island. Those people for the first time really stood up against the blackmail of the trade union movement. The trade unions attempted to hold Kangaroo Island farmers to ransom. The unions selected an isolated community because they thought they could dictate to it. It was one of the most despicable courses of action in the history of the trade union movement. For the South Australian Government to spend the taxpayers' money for such a purpose is nothing but a case of misappropriation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support what the honourable member has said. I would not have spoken if it had not been for the interjections.

The CHAIRMAN: The interjections were out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And they were ill-advised, too. The Minister of Education knows perfectly well that what the Government did was to relieve Mr. Dunford of the obligation he had at law to pay Mr. Woolley's costs.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The member for Eyre talked about a fine that the Government paid. You know that that was not true, and you are now trying to support his misrepresentation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This must not be a second reading debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister wants to support his claim, which is at best a half-truth, he should get up, and do so. What happened was that costs were awarded against Mr. Dunford, and that means Mr. Dunford was responsible for paying Mr. Woolley's

taxed costs. That liability could be discharged only by payment. What the Government did was to make that payment and, therefore, to discharge Mr. Dunford's liability to Mr. Woolley.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And the money went to Woolley's lawyers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. Mr. Woolley was entitled to get the money from Mr. Dunford, and it was paid by the Government on behalf of Mr. Dunford to Mr. Woolley. Who was relieved of an obligation? Will the Minister say that in some way Mr. Woolley was relieved of an obligation? The only person who was relieved of an obligation by the Government was Mr. Dunford, because that was an obligation imposed on him by the court. He lost the case. The Minister knows as well as I do that that is the position. I do not know why he should try to mislead this Committee by interjection.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish! The member for Eyre was not telling the truth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is very poor conduct indeed on the part of the Minister. We know that the Minister, who does not have the same trade union background as many Government members have, is embarrassed by what happened; I have used a relatively neutral word.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is an untruth, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This debate is in Committee, and we are dealing with a specific vote, which is going to be the only subject matter to be discussed. If anyone deviates from it, I shall sit him down. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister intends to defend this vote, which is \$10,000, let him at least do it honestly, without trying to mislead the Committee when other members are speaking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Get your colleague to tell the truth for once.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There was nothing inaccurate or untruthful in what the member for Eyre said, and the Minister knows that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come off it! Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This was one of the most serious and reprehensible actions the Government has taken; it intervened on behalf of one of its political friends, a trade union secretary, and relieved him of an obligation imposed by the law of this State. If there is an excuse for it (and I have not heard any

that I am willing to accept) let the Minister get up and give it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you accusing me of being dishonest?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am once again warning members in Committee about interjections, and I am going to take the necessary action in accordance with Standing Orders if I am disobeyed.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): As usual, the member for Eyre was entirely wrong. He thought he would try and stir up a little amusement. He was entirely wrong and, as the Minister of Education pointed out, he was not telling the truth. As far as the member for Mitcham is concerned I am surprised (although after having thought it over I am not surprised), because he is becoming irresponsible, too. He well knows that it was a Cabinet decision to pay the costs of Mr. Woolley and that it was done in the best interests of the State and of the public of this State. I remind the honourable member that this was not the first time that this has been done, although it was the first time that it was done by a Labor Government. It would not be the first time for a Liberal Government, either State or Commonwealth. I do not want to go through those occasions to remind and embarrass the honourable member any further by naming those instances.

Mr. Clark: It was done by a Government of which the member for Mitcham was a member.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Let us not go too far into that question because, as I have said, the payment was made to Mr. Woolley in the interests of the public.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The member for Mitcham has made certain insinuations typical of the man, I am afraid. He insinuates that I am embarrassed by the decision that was made. I tell him and other members that I fully support that decision in the interests of the South Australian community.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you like to enlarge on that last phrase?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Most definitely. The consequence of not paying Mr. Woolley's costs to Mr. Woolley's lawyer would have been a refusal by Mr. Dunford to pay. No doubt a prosecution or action on behalf of Mr. Woolley to get payment would have followed.

Mr. Venning: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Rocky River does not care about the South Australian community. He would be happy to see Mr. Dunford go to gaol and for industrial upheaval to follow throughout the State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: And the member for Heysen would miss out on the opportunity to make his contribution—

Mr. Venning: Where does all this start and finish?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is that there are situations with which any Government is faced or can be faced which, in the interests of the conciliation and settlement of industrial disputes, require action. This was one of those situations. This dispute had been initially settled in conference about two weeks or more before it was finally settled except, as a result of the operations of certain outside influences, who apparently had an interest in continuing the dispute, because of political advantage—

Mr. Millhouse: Who were these outside influences?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Why was it that a certain gentleman left a conference where agreement was reached and consulted with Mr. Lynch, and then another Commonwealth Minister (I think Dr. Forbes), and came back again so that by the Monday the dispute was unsettled again.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that people went back on their word on the settlement?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was agreed at one of the meetings that settlement was reached.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister is wandering away from the line now under discussion.

Mr. Venning: He is always doing that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is only one Chairman in this Chamber. I warn the honourable member for Rocky River that Standing Orders prevail in this Chamber and that, if he does not comply with them, I will name him. The honourable Minister is dealing with the line "Law costs associated with Kangaroo Island Industrial Dispute, \$10,000". This is the only matter that is going to be discussed by this Committee. I will not allow a second reading debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The law costs were paid to avoid industrial unrest, and I was trying to explain that people connected with the Liberal and Country League had an

interest in preventing the settlement of this dispute.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: I rise on a point of order. I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the statement?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The statement I made was that there were people connected with the L.C.L. who had an interest in the continuation of the dispute on Kangaroo Island.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has asked for the withdrawal of that statement. Is the honourable Minister going to comply with that request?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I have asked the honourable Minister to withdraw that statement but, as it is not an offensive remark in the opinion of the Chair, I can go no further than that. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not the first time that costs have been paid, as the Minister of Labour and Industry has pointed out. Indeed, it is not the first time that costs in relation to a matter in which Mr. Dunford has been involved have been paid, because Mr. Dunford's own costs on an occasion have been paid by the Commonwealth Liberal Government under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which provides for the payment of costs in certain instances.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have pointed out previously that the honourable Minister is creating an open debate on something that is not connected with the payment of the law costs of \$10,000 under consideration by this Committee. The honourable Minister should know that in Committee he is permitted to speak only to the actual vote under discussion. He is not allowed to deviate into a second reading debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was just explaining the background of the Government's decision.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is. There is an explanation necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have given a ruling on how this debate is going to proceed, and it is going to proceed along those lines.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have given the explanation of why I think this expenditure was justified, and I want to conclude by saying that, unlike certain members on

the other side of the Chamber who are interested in provoking industrial unrest in the community, purely for their own political advantage—

Members interjecting:

Mr. McAnaney: You're a liar.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has accused members on this side of the House of provoking industrial unrest for their own political advantage. I find that offensive and I ask that you, Mr. Chairman, direct the Minister to withdraw that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitcham is not going to direct the Chair in what it should do in accordance with Standing Orders. The honourable member has asked for the withdrawal of a certain statement, and I ask the honourable Minister whether he intends to withdraw the statement he has made.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the interests of peace in the Chamber I withdraw it, but I demand a withdrawal from the member for Rocky River and the member for Heysen for saying that I am a liar. I demand that on the ground that it is unparliamentary language.

Mr. VENNING: I rise on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Rocky River cannot take a point of order. I have warned him continually, and the next time he offends I will name him. The honourable Minister of Education has asked for the withdrawal of an offensive word, and he referred to the honourable member for Rocky River. Does the honourable member for Rocky River withdraw the remark?

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I never made that remark.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I may have misheard, but certainly the member for Heysen used the term.

Mr. Venning: Get your facts right in the first place!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister has asked for the withdrawal of an offensive word used by the honourable member for Heysen. Does the honourable member for Heysen withdraw?

Mr. McANANEY: I withdraw the word "liar"; he is merely evading the truth.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I conclude my remarks by saying that forces are at work in this community that have an interest in provoking industrial unrest in the community.

If the cap fits, any member opposite may wear it. I leave it to all members to work out what are those forces.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the debate to continue along those lines. The debate must be absolutely relevant to the vote being considered—the payment of law costs involving \$10,000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The law costs involved were paid in order to avoid a most serious industrial upheaval, which other interests were intent on provoking.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It would have been much better if the Minister had not bought into this matter at all but had allowed the Minister responsible—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As far as I am aware, the Chair is in command of this debate, and it is going to stay that way. I draw the honourable member for Mitcham's attention to the same remark I have made many times in the last few minutes: we are in Committee, dealing with law costs involving the payment of \$10,000. The debate will continue along those lines; there is nothing in the line about the honourable Minister of Education. The debate will continue on the payment of the law costs concerned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to answer the point made by the Minister of Education on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitcham will not be answering remarks that I have ruled out of order. Many remarks have been made during the debate on this line and I have ruled those remarks out of order. I will not allow a debate on those remarks that I have ruled out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out, if that is your ruling—

The CHAIRMAN: That is my ruling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that the Minister is able to say these things, out of order or not, and no answer can be given to them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has been a member of this Chamber long enough to know that any remark ruled out of order by the Chairman should not be referred to in further discussion. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What distinguishes this payment of \$10,000 by the Government from payments to which the Minister of Labour and Industry referred, and, I think, incidentally, to which the Minister of Education may have referred, is this: no undertaking was given by the Government, prior to the incurring of the liability for this sum, that it would be paid.

It was only after the liability had been incurred that an undertaking was given or any action taken. I think that members will find that, in every other case to which the Ministers have alluded vaguely, either the payment was made pursuant to Statute (and there is none here) or the payment was made pursuant to an undertaking given either in the early stages of proceedings or before proceedings were commenced, and not at the conclusion of those proceedings after the liability had already been incurred and could be discharged only by payment.

That is the difference, and Ministers know that, but they do everything they can to avoid acknowledging that distinction. That is the position, and I challenge any member opposite, including the Attorney-General who is now in the Chamber again and who knows better than anyone else, and I challenge any other Ministers, to deny what I have said. On the explanations given this afternoon by both Ministers, it is perfectly obvious, as it was obvious previously, of course, that what the Government did here was to give in to threats of defiance by Mr. Dunford.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a lie.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister now says that that is a lie. He is calling me a liar, I presume, and I therefore ask him to withdraw.

The Hon. L. J. King: And you have made a most serious reflection on every Minister in the Cabinet.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will withdraw the word "lie" and substitute "untruth".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The meaning of that word is the same, and I ask the Minister to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not going to give interpretations of the meaning of words. I will not let the honourable member think that he can take advantage of the Chair. He asked for a withdrawal by the honourable Minister. The word "untruth" is now complained of and I will not allow a debate on the interpretation and the meaning of certain words.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has substituted for the word he withdrew a word that is equally offensive. He said that what I was saying was an untruth, and I ask for a withdrawal of that word, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If it makes the honourable member any happier, I will withdraw the word "untruth" and substitute "terminological inexactitude".

Mr. Becker: Don't be childish.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hanson is right: the Minister of Education is being childish, and does this to get out of his embarrassment.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm not embarrassed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What I have said is what happened, whether the Minister calls it a "lie", "untruth", or "terminological inexactitude". The Government gave in to the threats and bluff of Mr. Dunford when he defied any order which it was sought to enforce against him for the payment of this money. The Government was frightened, in other words, of what would happen, because it knew, as a Government, that it was not sufficiently strong to enforce the law of this land.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It knew that the sanction for the enforcement of the payment of this money was the imprisonment finally of Mr. Dunford for contempt of court, and it knew that members of the Australian Workers Union (of which I think he is the Secretary or some other officer) at the gaol said that they would not imprison Mr. Dunford. That is why the Government had to pay the costs in these circumstances. It was a surrender to those forces in the community that would break down law and order, because eventually—

The Hon. L. J. King: Who are they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —there must be—

The Hon. L. J. King: Who are they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In this case it was members of the Australian Workers Union, without a doubt, as it had been, and as the court found, right throughout this dispute.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes it is. Eventually, as the Attorney-General knows, and as every member in this Chamber knows, there must be a sanction for the law. We imprison people for contempt of court and for offences—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections by honourable members who are out of their places are definitely out of order, and any honourable member who so interjects will be dealt with. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When this Government saw that there was a threat to that sanction, it gave in and paid the money on behalf of Dunford in order to discharge his liability,

that is, the money which was agreed as Woolley's costs. That, in itself, was a serious breach of the spirit of the law. Why the Government will not acknowledge the weakness of its position and of what it did, instead of hiding behind this vague picture of industrial chaos which it says would have occurred, I do not know, but I point out finally—

The Hon. L. J. King: You ask the farmers concerned how vague it was!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out finally to the Government that, by giving in on this occasion, it will be harder for it ever in future to stand up against pressure to do the same thing again. We will find that, if there is another experience of this kind (and I hope there will not be), it will be a further encouragement because of the Government's weakness and partiality to one of its own on this occasion and there will be a weakening of the forces of law and order that keep the community together.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I point out to the member for Mitcham and those of his colleagues who support him (and I understand they are few) that the forces referred to by the honourable member were trying to extend the dispute on the island.

Mr. Millhouse: Extend it in what way?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I point out that the subjects being raised and the matters now being debated by the Minister are the same as those that you, Mr. Chairman, ruled out of order earlier.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled many times in the last quarter of an hour or so that we are dealing with a vote of \$10,000 for the payment of law costs. As that is the only subject matter under discussion by the Committee, I shall not allow a debate of this kind to continue. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I realize that, Mr. Chairman. This matter has been argued on a number of occasions and Opposition members are disappointed and angry that the Government took a responsible attitude to avoid widespread industrial unrest. It was in the best interests of the State and the people that the Government acted so responsibly.

Mr. McANANEY: The history of this matter was not that of an industrial dispute or anything to do with the Industrial Commission. I entered the dispute only because

certain people were being victimized against the law, and that is the whole basis of the case that was before the court.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has ruled (and it will repeat the ruling, and honourable members must take notice of the authority of the Chair) that we are dealing with the vote of \$10,000 for the payment of legal costs: we are not dealing with an industrial dispute.

Mr. McANANEY: It was not an industrial dispute.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: With due respect, Mr. Chairman, I said it was not an industrial dispute. It was the victimization of certain people in a civil action and, when the case was lost by the person who was victimizing other people, he was not willing to pay the costs, so the Government came in and aided and abetted the victimization of an individual on the island. There has not been produced one instance of a similar happening anywhere in Australia. The Attorney-General has been asked to cite a similar case but, although he is an honest man, he has not been able to do so. That indicates that this payment should never have been made. This matter has nothing to do with an industrial dispute: it related to a man who had broken the law. How can we have law and order in this country, and what will become of the country, if we do not stand by law and order? The Government has allowed the breaking of the law; it has aided and abetted and this, to me, is damning in the eyes of decent people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I point out that the line we are debating is "Law costs associated with Kangaroo Island Industrial Dispute". The line itself refers to the dispute that has occurred.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member challenging the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am not challenging the ruling of the Chair: I am merely pointing out to you, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest deference, that this line involves the Kangaroo Island industrial dispute. The Government said that it acted in the best interests of the State in doing what it did. I ask the Minister whether the Government intends, if there is a further action of this nature, to pay the costs of the action?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot ask a hypothetical question with regard to a line dealing with legal costs. If the honourable member reads the line under

consideration he will see that it refers to law costs associated with something. Will the honourable member continue along those lines?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If neither the Minister nor any other Government member is willing to give a reply—

The CHAIRMAN: I will not allow a question along those lines. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We shall have to wait to see whether the Government repeats its foolish and reprehensible action.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the line "Workmen's Compensation Act—Certifying Medical Practitioners, Medical Referees and Boards—Fees and expenses", which shows that the actual payment last year was \$435 out of an approved allocation of \$2,000 and that \$2,000 is provided this year. That is a startling variation, and there must be a reason for it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It is because of the fees payable under the Act to medical referees and members of medical boards. Having been the Minister of Labour and Industry, the honourable member will realize what is involved.

Mr. Coumbe: But why the big variation?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I understand there has been an extension in this area. However, I will obtain a detailed report.

Line passed.

Minister of Agriculture, \$55,597—passed.

Agriculture, \$4,247,421.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the provision made for the salaries of the Superintendent of Research Centres, officers in charge, managers, research, technical and general staff. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture say whether the proposed rationalization of these research centres has been proceeded with and, if it has, what stage has been reached in that rationalization and whether the purposes of such rationalization are likely to be achieved soon? It has been suggested from time to time that projects should be conducted in relation to certain agricultural areas. Although the additional \$45,000 is not sufficiently large to indicate that an increase in the number of centres is contemplated, can the Minister say whether there has been any forward planning in this respect?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As my information does not answer the question raised by the honourable member, I will take it up with the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a reply for him.

Mr. VENNING: Regarding the provision for research centres, I have tried to ascertain whether the rural youth organization comes under the aegis of the Agriculture Department, and I understand that it comes under this heading. Will the Minister of Education therefore ask his colleague what is this year's allocation to the rural youth organization, which, the Minister will remember, wanted to come under the aegis of his department, but which, I understand, still comes under the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consult my colleague on the matter.

Dr. EASTICK: The \$9,500 provided for the testing of cattle for tuberculosis is the same as the sum voted and spent in 1971-72. Following the announcement by the Minister of Agriculture recently that the brucellosis control programme is to be phased out and that the tuberculosis campaign is to be stepped up, I ask the Minister whether he can provide the Committee with more information on this line.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Agriculture Department enters into contracts with private veterinary surgeons to carry out tuberculosis testing and this allocation covers the cost of those contracts. The exact provision was spent last year because the sum voted related to an actual contract that had been entered into.

Mr. EVANS: Last year the sum of \$400,553 was voted for fruit fly eradication and actual payments amounted to \$395,005. It is intended to provide only \$246,573 for this purpose this year. Also, although \$68,990 was voted last year, under "Plant Industry", for fruit fly eradication (including road blocks), actual payments amounted to \$82,308. Despite this, it is intended to provide only \$45,000 this year, which is a further decrease. Is it expected that there will be fewer fruit fly outbreaks this year, or has this decrease occurred because we have acquired sufficient plant to combat any infestation that is discovered in the metropolitan area? Will the Minister also ascertain whether my suggestion, that sterile males be introduced to attack infestations, thereby decreasing the breeding of fruit fly, is being considered? This most effective method of attack against insects has been used in other countries.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will pass on the honourable member's suggestion to the Minister of Agriculture. Regarding fruit fly, the only provision that has been made is for the finalization of payments covering the 1971-72 outbreaks, and no provision is made for

outbreaks that could occur this financial year. However, this does not mean that if further outbreaks occur they will not be dealt with, because they will. Clearly, an excess warrant would be required to finance any expenditure required under this heading. The department is being relatively optimistic, thinking as it does that, there having been outbreaks in the last year or two, none will occur this year.

Mr. Evans: Has there been a decrease in the number of road blocks?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. The contingency item to which the honourable member refers relates to road blocks. Plant industry is not a wages and salaries item: it is a contingency associated with the running of road blocks and with the fruit fly eradication campaign. Therefore, if fewer people are employed in eradicating fruit fly, the Government will be paying less for materials and so on; hence there is the reduction in the contingencies line and in the salaries and wages line.

Line passed.

Agricultural College, \$601,986.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line "Vice-Principal, Senior Lecturers, Lecturers, Instructors, Scientific and Technical Staff". The Minister of Education will be aware, even though it is not his portfolio, that, following the Sweeney report, the salary structure for senior lecturers and other people at that higher level was improved. When the increased salaries were introduced, consideration was given to the salary commitments for the more junior appointments of lecturers and instructors. Although the position of the senior staff has improved, no worthwhile movements, other than cost of living adjustments, have occurred in relation to the salaries of instructors, particularly in the manual sector of engineering, farm workshop, sheep husbandry, and so on. The figures provided do not clearly indicate the position of these people, who are an integral part of the college system and who are extremely important in the overall situation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They were not covered by the Sweeney report.

Dr. EASTICK: I know, but, following the Sweeney report on senior lecturers, they have been paid at a much higher level than they enjoyed before and they have gone ahead of others not covered by the report, in order to maintain a high quality of instruction and to ensure that these people will work harmoniously in a relatively isolated area such as Roseworthy Agricultural College. Do these addi-

tional funds represent a tangible improvement in the position of the instructor and the demonstrator?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: These conditions apply to a lecturer in a college of advanced education who has a degree, who is teaching the equivalent of university standard courses, and who has had at least five years experience. Clearly, instructors would not fulfil these conditions. I know of no case (nor is there likely to be one) where, as a consequence of a salary adjustment being made following the Sweeney report, people could claim salary adjustments when they were not covered by the report. Any argument for payment to instructors would have to be on a basis different from that covered by the Sweeney report, so that no case for instructors could be substantiated as a result of senior lecturers who, by qualifying under the report, received an increase in pay. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to obtain information about any adjustments of pay for instructors.

Mr. COUNBE: Is the Roseworthy Agricultural College to become a college of advanced education?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: From the point of view of Commonwealth financial support, it has been a college of advanced education from the inception of the work of the Wark Committee. For provisions of the current triennium, submissions made by this college were made through the newly established Board of Education to the Australian Commission of Advanced Education, with the State Treasurer and officers of the Education Department being involved in the discussions. It has been agreed that the college will become an autonomous college of advanced education under the Board of Advanced Education, and in future it will cease to be a department of the Government.

Mr. Coumbe: Any date?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Legislation will have to be introduced but, as further consultations will have to take place, I doubt whether any legislation will be ready before the end of this year. If it is not, it will be introduced next year. That will alter the status of Roseworthy, as a college that is also a Government department, so that it becomes a college that is not a Government department but under the control of the Board of Advanced Education. Concerning the financing of Roseworthy, it is now treated as a college of advanced education.

Line passed.

Produce, \$1,110,900.

Mr. CARNIE: The sum allocated for salaries at the Port Lincoln freezing works is comparable with the sum allocated last year, after taking into account normal increases, but the history of the works does not present an attractive picture. The Auditor-General's Report, at page 127, shows that in 1967-68, the loss was \$186,858; in 1968-69, it was \$291,629; in 1969-70, it was \$236,735; in 1970-71, it was \$317,393; and in 1971-72, although reduced, it was \$147,251. Since I have been a member I have asked that a committee be set up to investigate the operations of the Port Lincoln works, and I contemplated management consultants making a complete investigation.

The Government set up an able committee, and those interested were grateful, but it was not what I considered to be the most satisfactory arrangement. The committee took evidence for some months in Port Lincoln and Adelaide, and delivered a report to the Minister in February of this year. Since then, I and many others have tried to ascertain what is in that report, but without success. We have been told that the Minister is studying the report, and that, when he has completed his study, he will present his findings to Cabinet, after which a decision will be made. This is not a satisfactory situation, because these works are important to Eyre Peninsula. It has been suggested that the works should be upgraded to American beef export standards, because this would ensure a greater continuity of through-put and enable financial losses to be reduced. The time has come to phase out the Gepps Cross abattoir and to upgrade country meatworks at Port Lincoln and other places. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that everyone interested in these works is waiting for this report.

Line passed.

Fisheries, \$360,912; Chemistry, \$357,948—passed.

Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous, \$253,650.

Mr. VENNING: The sum of \$500 was voted last year for abattoirs investigation, but no payment was made. It is proposed to allocate \$11,000 this year. I should like information on this line.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is the final expense of the consultant (Mr. Ian Gray) in relation to the report on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the House receive the report of this consultant? The Minister claimed in another place that the report was

just a verbal one. In the nine years since I became a member many reports have been made and Parliament has paid for them, but we see only the triennial report. Facilities at the Gepps Cross abattoir have been improved over the past seven or eight years and it seems to be functioning very well. However, compared to similar organizations in other States, it is not a great success, yet we are asked to vote \$11,000 for a verbal report and we are not seeing results for the money. The Government should explain what was involved in the Gray report and what action has been taken as a result of that report. The operation of the abattoir will not be successful while the board represents such a variety of interests. It is completely impractical. We must have a smaller board representing one school of thought, and it must engage the services of experts, as do other boards controlling the marketing of primary production. We are entitled to have a report. It might make the Minister of Agriculture better advised, although possibly no wiser.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I can assure the honourable member that the Minister is wiser than he on these matters. The Government's policy decision on this matter will be announced soon.

Mr. EVANS: I understand that, because of a re-organization, the Country Fire Services will not need an allocation this year. For the reimbursement to district councils in connection with the eradication or control of noxious insects, \$3,000 was voted last year, but actual payments amounted to \$11,041. This year we are asked to allocate \$8,000. Can the Minister explain these two lines?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The working party reporting on the Country Fire Services has completed its investigation and there are therefore no further costs in relation to that matter. I am not really able to comment directly with regard to noxious weeds. Apparently there were many more around last financial year than was expected, and this explains the expenditure of \$11,041 compared to the sum of \$3,000 actually voted. The provision is for the purchase of insecticides and plant to assist councils in controlling potential grasshopper and locust hatchings. Additional funds were sought for the employment of two casuals for spraying and survey work in view of increased grasshopper activity in the Hawker, Peterborough and Eyre Peninsula districts. As we are not sure how much work will be involved, we have

provided a round sum of \$8,000 as a rough estimate.

Mr. McANANEY: For rural group buying co-operatives, \$154 was spent last year, and \$500 is provided this year. The Government promised in its election campaign that it would set up co-operatives to help primary producers. As Chairman of a co-operative for many years, I know that farmers were saved hundreds of thousands of dollars in discounts they received. Will the Government carry out its election promise to establish co-operatives to assist primary producers?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The sum of \$500 provided here is for the fees and expenses of the committee of four, comprising the Assistant Director of Agriculture (Mr. P. M. Barrow); Mr. G. E. Andrews, representing the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated; Mr. G. P. Kenny of the Lands Department; and Mr. R. G. Fenwick of the Stockowners Association. This provision also covers the sum required to complete investigation for the printing of the report.

Mr. NANKIVELL: When will the Government decide its future policy on the Citrus Organization Committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot make any statement on that matter for the coming year; nor can the Government. I have no doubt that action will be necessary, but no decision has been made.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister get me a full report?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know that I can bring down a full report, because Government policy is involved. It is not possible to bring down a full report until that policy has been determined, but I shall ask the Minister of Agriculture whether that is the position.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 26, at 2 p.m.