

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 14, 1966.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The **SPEAKER**: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the motion and other members to accompany me to Government House for that purpose.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.21 p.m.

The **SPEAKER**: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech, together with other members I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on July 13, to which His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for the Address in Reply to the Speech with which the Lieutenant-Governor opened the second session of the Thirty-eighth Parliament. I also thank you for your message of welcome to me on my return to South Australia. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

QUESTIONS

RESEARCH LABORATORIES.

Mr. **HALL**: This morning I heard a report on the radio news that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited had purchased 35 acres in Melbourne to establish research laboratories. I understand that the B.H.P. Company is closely associated with the South Australian branch of the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, which has been responsible for major developments in ore extraction in South Australia, two instances being scree ore extraction at Iron Knob and uranium extraction at Port Pirie. As these laboratories have developed new techniques with the result that new industries have been attracted to South Australia, will the Premier say whether he had discussions with the company about its intention to establish these laboratories in Melbourne?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I have not been consulted in any way on the matters referred to by the Leader. However, I will ascertain from my colleague, the Minister of Mines, whether he has been consulted or whether he can provide any information on the subject.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: I was disturbed by the implication of the Premier's reply to the Leader, which was that the Government knew nothing of the B.H.P. Company's plans to establish mineral laboratories on a site in Victoria. This, of course, may have serious repercussions on the mineral laboratories at Parkside, and I ask the Premier whether he will go further than he undertook to do in answer to the Leader, and make representations to the B.H.P. Company to see whether this decision is irreversible and, if it is, what effect it is likely to have on the support which has been given in the past (as the Leader pointed out) by the company to the mineral laboratories in South Australia.

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I have no doubt in my mind (nor has the Government, for that matter) in relation to the continuance of the laboratories on the land at Parkside originally owned by the mental hospital. In fact, the Government agreed to more land being made available for the extension of these laboratories and, to the best of my knowledge, that extension will continue. Whilst I do not wish in any way to reflect upon the management of the company, if its head office in Melbourne is more concerned with its activities in Victoria than with its interests in South Australia, through South Australia's not being directly represented at head office, it will mean that South Australia will not be as well off in that direction as it has been in the past. That point can be considered. I am prepared to make further inquiries provided I do not damage South Australia's interests in this matter.

HOLDEN HILL SEWERAGE.

Mrs. **BYRNE**: The major portion of the area at Holden Hill bordered by Valiant, Lyons and Grand Junction Roads and the Hope Valley reservoir has a sewerage scheme which has been approved and which is programmed for construction in August or September, 1966. Can the Minister of Works say when this scheme is expected to be completed?

The Hon. **C. D. HUTCHENS**: It is expected that the area involved will be sewered by November or December next. The area between Lyons Road and Southern Terrace is owned by

the Housing Trust, and a tentative subdivision of it has been submitted to the department, but the subject has been complicated by the strong possibility of a route for a freeway being required through this area and along the eastern boundary of Malcolm Avenue and on to Grand Junction Road. The proposed route of the necessary sewer mains to provide a sewerage service to Malcolm Avenue and Cornish Avenue is to be drained through the Housing Trust property to Lyons Road. However, the Engineer for Sewerage states that no firm proposals can be made at this time until details of the proposed freeway are known and the action to be taken by the Highways and Local Government Department to obtain ownership of the properties that would be affected is known.

There is a small area at the northern side of the area in question, and it is indicated that the sewage from there will eventually be discharged into the 15in. trunk sewer which has been approved as a portion of the major Hope Valley sewerage scheme. However, this area is also in doubt because of the proposals to construct the freeway referred to above.

LOCK RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: It has been brought to my notice that several minor accidents have occurred on the Eyre Peninsula railway line, particularly near Lock. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Minister of Railways to see whether this line can be inspected so that it will be in reasonably good order before the coming harvest? It is not only a delay and hindrance to the operation of the railways: it is a hazard to train crews.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

SUBSIDIZED HOSPITALS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, an answer to a question I asked last week about the basis to be used for compiling compulsory contributions by councils to subsidize hospitals?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Part IV, section 38, of the Hospitals Act, 1934-62, gives power to the Director-General of Medical Services, with the consent of the Minister, to require a local government body by notice in the *Government Gazette* to contribute any sum to any hospital declared under Part IV of the Act which, in the opinion of the Director-General, serves an area or portion of an area of that local government body. The basis of assessment used in calculating the amount to be contributed by the local government body is as follows:

Metropolitan (for Royal Adelaide Hospital): A contribution equivalent to .914d. in the pound of assessment as shown in the latest water-works assessment for the local government area.

Country (for all country hospitals to which Part IV of the Hospitals Act is declared to apply): The criterion in this case is the financial need of the hospital and the financial ability of the local government body to pay. Each case is considered yearly on its individual merits. The generally accepted average for the State of the amount expected to be contributed by local government bodies served by hospitals under Part IV of the Act is 6 per cent of the council's rate revenue or 2d. in the pound of its assessment.

TEACHERS' SALARIES.

Mr. CLARK: Last Tuesday I addressed a question to the Minister of Education regarding salaries paid to certain teachers in their first year after leaving the teachers college. Has the Minister a reply to that question?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member mentioned cases of students entering the teaching service from teachers college and getting less credit for certain qualifications under the new Teachers Salaries Award than they would have got under the old award. In the old award, for instance, a student who had a course of training of at least four years at a teachers college with passes in six degree subjects or equivalents was credited with three years of service as a teacher for the purpose of determining his initial salary as a junior assistant. The A.U.A. in Arts and Education would have met the requirements. In the new award, the credit is given in terms of the following clause:

Where he has attended a four-year course and obtained a Diploma of Teaching, two years' credit.

Under the new award, if this student also held a degree, an additional \$200 would be added to his initial teaching salary. There is nothing anomalous about these conditions. The Teachers Salaries Board, after hearing evidence from the advocate of the Minister of Education and from the Institute of Teachers, decided on this change in the award which was duly agreed to by the Government.

The honourable member suggests that the Associateship of the University of Adelaide in Arts and Education is a superior qualification to the Diploma of Teaching, but in the eyes of the Teachers Classification Board this is not so. The A.U.A. in Arts and Education (requiring at least two years of full-time study) is rated as six classification units, and the Diploma of Teaching (requiring at least three years of full-time study) is rated as nine classification

units. A first degree is rated as 10 classification units. It is most unlikely that a student who is advised to complete an A.U.A. in preference to the Diploma of Teaching in her final year in teachers college would have been in a position to complete the Diploma of Teaching before leaving teachers college; as the former represents success in six units of study, none necessarily at second year level, and the latter represents success in nine units of study of which, in the case of secondary students, two units are needed at second year level. The Institute of Teachers in its submissions pressed for recognition of higher qualifications held by teachers, although not exactly in the terms which the Teachers Salaries Board saw fit to provide. Students who were very successful in their courses in teachers colleges gained substantial salary rewards in terms of the new award. The less successful students naturally get smaller rewards. This surely cannot be considered as an anomaly, and there is nothing to be rectified.

SCANTLING TIMBER.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to the question I asked on July 7 regarding scantling timber?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have the following reply from the Conservator of Forests:

During the first quarter of this year approximately 170,000 super feet of scantling timber was supplied in South Australia by South Australian producers, in addition to which some supply was sent to other States. Currently the rate of supply from the same sources would be between 400,000 and 500,000 super feet on a quarterly basis. The production of high-quality scantling needs careful selection of timber and particular care in handling and the volumes already produced have been received particularly well by the industry. It is believed that, subject to continued and unqualified acceptance by building authorities, the rate of production will increase materially in the next 12 months.

BASIC WAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding whether the \$2 basic wage increase recently granted by the court was to be paid to members of the Public Service, including temporary officers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Approval has been given to extend the increased basic wage payment to all public servants, including temporary officers.

GAS.

Mr. HUGHES: Since the present session began, some questions have been asked of the Premier by the former Leader of the Opposition whether the Premier will make available to the House the Bechtel Pacific Corporation report in regard to natural gas resources in South Australia so that the report can be printed and then debated by Parliament. The insistence by the former Leader in asking these questions indicated that he would like the House to believe that, if he were Premier, information on any action to ensure the construction of the pipeline would be made available to the House. Will the Premier say whether, 18 months ago, the then Premier made available to him any information regarding talks he had had with the Governor of the Reserve Bank, Dr. Coombs, regarding money to be made available to build a pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide as was reported in the *Sunday Mail* of last weekend when it was claimed by a member of another place that Sir Thomas had given him permission to use information that had not been published previously?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know of any discussions that either I or the member for Gumeracha had when he was Treasurer of the State on matters associated with the financial aspect of Gidgealpa or the gas pipeline. I am not in a position to know whether the member for Gumeracha gave to a member of another place permission to disclose certain information in the Council: that is a matter for the member for Gumeracha. I say definitely that the honourable member and I did not have any discussion concerning the financial proposals associated with Gidgealpa or the suggested pipeline during that period.

BRIGHTON SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question, concerning the progress of building at the new Brighton Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director, Public Buildings Department, reports that the contract for the erection of the Brighton Boys Technical High School was let on October 22, 1965, and, in accordance with the time quoted by the contractor, is due for completion in the latter half of February, 1967. Work is at present proceeding on schedule, although the contractor is endeavouring to have the school completed and ready for occupation at the beginning of February, 1967.

GOVERNMENT COSTS.

Mrs. STEELE: Yesterday the report of the Trotting Inquiry Committee was tabled, the Chairman of that committee being Mr. Andrew Wells, Q.C. I understand that that report has created some interest in the community. Can the Premier say whether the fees paid to the Chairman and members of the committee were recommended by the Public Service Commissioner, as were the fees in regard to other inquiries currently being conducted, or were they fixed by negotiation with the people concerned?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the honourable member had paid attention to what I said last Tuesday, she would have heard me say that the fees paid to the Chairman of the Trotting Inquiry Committee had not been settled and were entirely in the hands of the Public Service Commissioner.

INSURANCE.

Mr. McKEE: A constituent of mine has asked me to make inquiries on behalf of his son, who is under the age of 21, regarding age excess applicable to comprehensive insurance. The constituent concerned handed me a letter written by the Motor Vehicles Superintendent of the Transport and General Insurance Company, which states:

We acknowledge your letter dated June 27, 1966, and advise that the excess applicable to Mr. A's policy is \$70 or £35. We notice that the letter was forwarded to you on August 26, 1964, when the policy was originally effected, explaining our reasons for the higher excess. However, following the renewal of the policy in January this year the additional age excess of \$50 would also apply making an excess of \$120.

I understood that persons under the age of 25 paid an excess of \$50 or \$60 if they had not taken out an extra coverage for the first \$20. I believe that if insurance companies can apply these excess charges at will it should be made known to the client when he is taking out his policy. Will the Attorney-General ascertain what anomaly has occurred with regard to this policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member but I point out that in South Australia comprehensive insurance has no specific legislation governing it, though the Commonwealth Government has power in relation to life assurance policies and has legislated in respect of these. Other insurances in South Australia are effected under contract, and at the moment we have no specific provision limiting the way in which these contracts may be made. We have

had many complaints about certain aspects of comprehensive motor car insurance, personal accident insurance, fire insurance and the like, and it is because of this that the Government has seen fit to announce that in this session a Government insurance office covering all insurable risks will be created in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: All insurable risks?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: In conformity with your Party's platform?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I will certainly examine the matter raised by the honourable member, but at the moment it is simply governed by common law in relation to ordinary contract, and I do not think there is much we can do for his constituent at this stage. In other States the existence of a Government insurance office has, by competition, forced private insurance companies into a different attitude towards their clients from that of many insurance offices in South Australia.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question is supplementary to that asked by my friend, the member for Port Pirie, about the State insurance office.

Mr. Rodda: Is he your friend?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: He is a close friend of mine.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have appealed to the House this afternoon for co-operation, and I again ask members not to indulge in debate.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question, to the Attorney-General, is supplementary to the one asked by the member for Port Pirie regarding the State insurance office. I do not think the Attorney in his reply was clear on whether "all insurable risks" included life assurance. Can the Attorney amplify that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Personal life assurance is included in "all insurable risks". This is governed by Commonwealth legislation. The explanation on this aspect of the matter will be given, I have no doubt, in the second reading explanation of the Bill when it is given to the House.

WATER RATES.

Mr. BURDON: The Government has intimated that it will introduce a system providing for the quarterly payment of water and sewer rates. Does the Government intend to make it possible for such payments to be made to a bank, as is the case with Electricity Trust accounts, which are also payable quarterly?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In anticipation of the possibility of quarterly payments

of water and sewer rates, certain arrangements have been made, and I think I am correct in saying that it will be possible from early August of this year to pay water and sewer rates at any branch of the Savings Bank, but not at agencies of that bank.

PARA HILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question concerning the completion date of the new Para Hills Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that the contract for the erection of the new Para Hills Primary School was let on June 3, 1966, and the time quoted for completion of the work by the contractor would make the school available early in February, 1967. However, the contractor's estimate of the time required to construct the school was dependent upon his being able to proceed with the work without delays due to inclement weather. Present conditions of deep soft ground on the site do not permit foundation work to be undertaken by normal contracting methods, and the contractor has notified the department to this effect. Inquiries are being conducted into the means of overcoming the present difficult site conditions in an attempt to ensure completion in readiness for the commencement of the first school term in 1967.

MISCELLANEOUS LICENCES.

Mr. HUGHES: Last weekend a constituent of mine told me that some people in Wallaroo Mines who had miscellaneous licences were being charged different fees by the Lands Department for those licences. He said that he was paying \$12 while his neighbours (who were not pensioners) were paying only \$2. Can the Minister of Lands say how this differential rating is applied?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This situation comes about because one form of tenure is in the form of an annual licence issued by the Lands Department, the normal fee for which is \$12 for up to one acre in this locality. On the other hand, occupational licences are issued by the Mines Department. The conditions under which those licences are issued, and the fees that are to be charged on them, are set out in section 67 of the Mining Act, and if the honourable member looks at that Act he will see the position set out. I might add that the fee in this case is a statutory requirement. That is the reason for the difference in the two charges for those two types of tenure.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Mr. RODDA: Some concern has been expressed in my district that daylight saving is likely to be introduced. Can the Premier say whether this matter has been looked at on a Commonwealth-wide basis?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not made any representations to the Commonwealth Government concerning daylight saving, nor have I been informed by that Government whether it is likely to be introduced.

FIREWORKS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the celebration of Guy Fawkes' day and the use of fireworks. I understand that during the interval between the two sessions a proclamation was made under the Explosives Act prohibiting the sale of explosives or fireworks in this State after 1966 except between certain dates, which would channel the celebration by the use of fireworks away from Guy Fawkes' day to the old Empire Day on May 24.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Commonwealth Day.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, if the Attorney wishes to be a purist. No sooner had this proclamation been made than the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister announced that Commonwealth Day would no longer be celebrated but that the celebration would be on the Queen's official birthday on June 9. I notice that Commonwealth Day in fact was not celebrated, in the schools anyway, on May 24. I was therefore surprised to read in the *Advertiser* of May 4 an announcement by the Minister of Agriculture (I presume acting as a spokesman for the Government)—

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—that despite the change from the celebration on May 24 to June 9 the proclamation that the Government had issued would nevertheless stand. I ask the Premier whether this is a fact, and whether the Government intends that despite the change, which has been agreed Commonwealth-wide, from May 24 to June 9 it is still intended to try to have our celebration by fireworks—the only celebration—on May 24, or whether there is to be a further change?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I did not like to interrupt the honourable member, but the Minister of Agriculture is the Minister responsible for these matters and I suggest that the question be directed to him.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had taken notice of the proclamation he would have known that it contained no mention of the celebration being

on Commonwealth Day. This Government was well aware of the intention of the Commonwealth Government to change the celebration day from May 24 to the Queen's Birthday, and because of this we settled for May 24 in the proclamation. The position is that Guy Fawkes' day or fireworks day (as we will probably refer to it now) has been transferred from November 5 to May 24.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, who, apparently, looks after explosives. I apologize if I picked the wrong Minister to ask about fireworks previously, but I asked my question of the Premier because I thought he liked to answer questions involving policy. However, I am happy to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are glad you're happy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I'm glad that you're glad that I'm glad.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to honourable members that an honourable member seeking permission to explain a question does so by seeking the permission of the Speaker and the concurrence of the House. The concurrence of the House is given in silence. If honourable members are silent, that is taken as consent for an explanatory statement to be made. If there is interruption, that leave is withdrawn. I know that interruption was not intended on this occasion, but it is difficult for anybody in the Chair to determine the mind of the House. It is entirely the business of the House whether or not leave is granted. I ask honourable members to co-operate with me in administering Standing Orders. The honourable member for Mitcham is in order in asking his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize if I did the wrong thing. As I could not understand the answer the Minister of Agriculture gave previously, will he say why, as the Government knew there was to be, as he says, a change in the celebration of Commonwealth Day from May 24 to the Queen's Birthday in June, the Government has provided that in the years after 1966 fireworks in class 7 may be sold by retail only from May 11 to May 24? In other words, what now is the significance of allowing fireworks to be sold up to May 24?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am sorry I did not make myself clear to the honourable member previously. The Government desired to get away from the dangerous time of November 5. I regret that this happened to

coincide with a special occasion as far as the former Leader of the Opposition was concerned. I say this with no disrespect to him. The people of South Australia and, particularly, the Emergency Fire Service, the Fire Brigade, and the Police Force are concerned about fire dangers on November 5. That is why May 24 was chosen, a time of the year when there would not be the same danger. This move has no connection with Commonwealth Day, the Queen's Birthday, or anything else. Guy Fawkes' day was celebrated because of a certain action many years ago.

Mr. Millhouse: On November 5!

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This is not Guy Fawkes' day; it is fireworks day, on May 24. People may buy fireworks a fortnight before that day, and during that time only.

VISTA SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: There is an area known as Vista in the Tea Tree Gully district where considerable housebuilding is taking place. In my opinion, provision must be made eventually for a new primary school in this area because of the distance between the primary school at Tea Tree Gully and that at Hope Valley, which are overcrowded. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department is aware of this position and whether steps have been taken to acquire land for educational purposes in this area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The position is being closely watched by the Education Department, and the need for a new school site in the Vista area and in the general area section 833, hundred of Yatala, is currently being explored.

CROWN LEASES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Lands give the reasons for now refusing to transfer Crown leases to proprietary companies? Can he say when this decision was made and whether it is to be retrospective? I ask this because of several applications that have been made, including one that has been lodged for two months and has been declined.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The applications current when the decision was taken by Cabinet on the recommendation of the Land Board have been dealt with as a matter of policy at this stage. It was not considered that they should be treated any differently merely because they had been lodged at that time. The reason for this decision was mainly that the limitation imposed by the Crown Lands Act was being evaded. The honourable member will be fully aware that perpetual lease

land was granted to private companies originally to help develop this State; but this is generally no longer the case. However, where it is the case, consideration could be given to the matter. But we find that, of late, there has been a considerable increase in traffic in this regard. It is the difficulty that we have in preventing the evasion of the limitation under the Crown Lands Act, and of revenue-producing legislation such as the Stamp Duties Act, that has caused the Government to take this decision on this matter. Regarding afforestation, we shall consider these applications on their merits so as not to prevent activity in that field. Alternatives have been offered in most cases to people who have been refused the right to form a company. They will be granted occupation of this land as tenants in common.

WHARFAGE CHARGES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the comparatively high South Australian wharfage charges that are driving our exports to Victorian ports?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Export wharfage charges are generally a very small fraction of the value of the goods upon which they are imposed. Some examples are as follows:

	Wharfage Rates.	
	New.	Old.
Wool	20c a bale	15c
Cheese	60c a ton	50c
Goods, general	60c a ton	55c

The old wharfage rates operated prior to November 15, 1965. The interstate haulage rate from Adelaide to Melbourne for the above-mentioned commodities in lots of over five tons is \$15.80 a ton and it is not easy to understand how anyone would pay such a freight charge to avoid paying wharfage charges, let alone be influenced to take such action by an increase of 5c or 10c in the wharfage rate.

SHOPPING HOURS.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that the Premier has a reply to my recent question about the Shopping Hours Committee.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The report of the committee appointed to inquire into certain aspects of shop trading hours has been made to the Minister of Labour and Industry, who is attending a Ministerial conference in Canberra and will not return to Adelaide until Saturday. I understand that he intends to release the report next Monday.

EGGS.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Agriculture, when speaking in the Address in Reply debate, referred to the plan of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia, and said he was pleased that this scheme was successful and that most of the egg producers were happy with it. Because of this comment, can the Minister say whether he will give egg producers in this State the opportunity to endorse the scheme by holding a poll?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No.

PIKE AND MUNDIC CREEKS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: On June 30, when I asked the Minister of Works a question about Pike and Mundic Creeks, he said that the report was almost completed and would be submitted to him soon. Has the Minister received that report, and if he has, has he further information on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that my expectations were not realized. I have not received the report but I shall inquire, and when I have it I shall inform the honourable member.

STURT DAM.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about using water impounded by the Sturt dam to water the lawns and ovals at Flinders university?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the question I consulted the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who has supplied the following report:

I think the situation may be best summarized as follows: The dam has been designed and built as a single purpose dam to automatically impound and release floodwaters. There is no control on the outlet. Up to a certain flow in the creek the water can pass through the outlet without restriction, but when heavy flows occur the level in the reservoir will build up and when the peak of the flood passes the flow through the outlet will gradually lower the level until conditions return to normal. Utilization of the dam to impound water for subsequent use in the distribution system would defeat the purpose for which it was constructed. Much of the 23 square mile catchment area is being rapidly developed for residential and commercial purposes. None of the area is sewered and many years will elapse before all towns in this catchment have a sewerage service. In these circumstances the waters of the Sturt are heavily polluted.

The capacity of the storage is 450,000,000 gallons and even in years when the reservoir filled, the amount of water available for feeding into the distribution system would not exceed 350,000,000 gallons after allowing for evaporation losses and some unusable residual

quantity. This is equivalent to about 1% of the present annual consumption in the metropolitan area. If the dam had been designed as a dual purpose dam it would have been necessary to build it much higher in order to assure that sufficient storage space was available at all times to take care of a flash flood. Construction of a costly main and chlorination plant would also have been necessary. The economic aspects were closely examined before it was decided that the dam should be a single-purpose flood control structure. The grounds at Flinders university are watered from the reticulation system in common with the numerous recreation areas, sports grounds and school grounds aggregating hundreds of acres. While this does not pose any immediate problem concerning the actual supply of water, this will not be the case at some future time when all potential sources of supply have been fully exploited.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The last part of the answer is to the effect that at some time in the future it will not be possible to continue watering from the reticulation system. Can the Minister say what his department plans to do to water ovals, and so on, when that day comes?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am no more capable of looking into a crystal ball than is the honourable member. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has been planning for many years (for which I claim no credit) to meet the future situation. This circumstance has not yet arisen, and I cannot anticipate the future in any way.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

Mr. HEASLIP: A report in this morning's *Advertiser*, headed "\$670,000 Plan for Roseworthy", states:

The Government would spend \$670,000 on new buildings at Roseworthy Agricultural College, the Premier (Mr. Walsh) announced last night. On AD87, he said the new buildings would comprise an agricultural engineering centre, a science block, and a plant-breeding centre. The present facilities and equipment at Roseworthy were outmoded and inadequate. The report of the Public Works Committee on Roseworthy Agricultural College (Science Block and Farm Engineering Centre) states:

An amount of \$3,733,000 was available from the Commonwealth Government as a grant to South Australia for technical education provided that this amount was committed on approved projects prior to June 30, 1968.

The same report, under the heading "Finding of the Committee", states:

There are other minor buildings and equipment which are estimated to cost \$257,000, which is in addition to the estimate of \$670,000 submitted to the committee, but it is expected that this expenditure also will attract a full Commonwealth grant if commitments are made prior to June, 1968.

The article in the *Advertiser* implies that the South Australian Government is spending \$670,000 at Roseworthy Agricultural College. Will the Premier make it clear to the House and to the public whether it is the South Australian Government or the Commonwealth Government that is providing money for these works?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This money cannot be spent until the Government approves of the expenditure, and it is not a question of who is supplying it. I referred to the expenditure at the Roseworthy Agricultural College, and I shall supply further information at the appropriate time next week.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I was surprised that the Premier, who made the telecast, was unable to give to this House detailed information about the substance of that telecast. Before he brings down a reply to the question asked by the member for Rocky River, will he also ascertain whether additional students will be trained at Roseworthy college, and whether serious consideration is being given, as a consequence of the building programme, to raising the status of the college from that of one conducting a practical course to one conducting a technological course? Having made some inquiries concerning this matter earlier in the year, I was told to bide my time, as something was in the wind that I might be interfering with. I assume the reference was to the provision of finance for the building programme?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not wish to become tangled up in the administration of somebody else's department, the Roseworthy college not being under the administration of the Premier's Department. If any complication has arisen as a result of what I said on the telecast last night, I point out that what I said was completely within my rights. Indeed, I have always made it my business at least to be as explicit and truthful as possible.

Mr. Millhouse: It was entirely truthful.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall try to ascertain what information I can get in regard to the next move to be made at Roseworthy college.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am afraid I did not fully understand what the Premier said, but I gathered that he was in some doubt about whether or not this was expenditure that would be entirely at the cost of the South Australian Treasury or whether it would be recouped to the South Australian Government by a Commonwealth Government grant. I understood the Premier to suggest that he

would get some information on this and report further. I find it incomprehensible that the Premier of this State should have committed his Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow comments in questions, and particularly references to answers given to questions by honourable members. Such comments are definitely a breach of the practice of the House and I ask the honourable member not to pursue that course.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Will the Premier give a definite assurance to the House about whether or not the expenditure is to be borne wholly or in part by the South Australian Government or whether it is to be borne wholly or in part by Commonwealth Government subsidy? Also, will he say to what extent, in either case, each particular Government will be involved in the expenditure of \$670,000 on this project?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Having already given the House certain information on this matter and an assurance that a report would be brought down next week, I have nothing further to add.

Mr. SHANNON: When the Public Works Committee inquired into this matter Mr. Herriot made it clear that this was a high priority job. He said, in effect, that if contracts were let by the end of July there was every prospect of a full Commonwealth grant. He went on to make a further comment, which is just as important and may be of some information to the member for Albert, who apparently had not read the report.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment in asking a question. I am afraid that this practice has developed to a stage where I must insist that comments shall not be made in asking questions.

Mr. SHANNON: I was only making it abundantly clear to the Minister of Works that this is an added attraction to the State Government to obtain more Commonwealth money. Mr. Herriot also said, in effect, that it was the aim of the administration to have the college classed as a tertiary establishment soon in order to qualify for a subsidy for recurring costs. Can the Minister say whether the Government is treating this matter as urgent?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Public Buildings Department has declared this to be a matter of urgency for many reasons.

STRATHALBYN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding pumping in the Strathalbyn water district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Milang temporary pumping unit for the Strathalbyn water supply operated for a total of 2,356 hours during the period November 18, 1965, to May 4, 1966, and pumped nearly 65,000,000gall. of water. The reservoir storage on November 18, 1965, was 19,000,000gall. and on May 4, 1966, it was 8,000,000gall. It is expected that the permanent pumping units, which are at present being installed, will be operative next summer. Further, it is advised that, in view of the fact that the permanent plant has not yet been installed in the main station at Milang and also because the probable maximum demand of consumers has not yet been experienced, the surplus capacity of the scheme cannot be determined until after next summer at the earliest.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Northfield High School,
Oaklands High School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Standing Order No. 85 be so far suspended for the remainder of the session as to enable the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant to be accommodated with seats in the Chamber on the right-hand side of the Speaker.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a Joint Committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report; that, in the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee; that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions;

and that the Attorney-General (The Hon. D. A. Dunstan) and Messrs. Hudson and Millhouse be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Dried Fruits Act, 1934-1941.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes two minor amendments to the Dried Fruits Act. First, clause 3 (a) amends section 18 of the principal Act in consequence of the change to decimal currency. The maximum rate of contribution to the funds of the Dried Fruits Board is changed from one-sixteenth penny a pound to \$1.20 a ton, which represents a very slight increase. In the past the actual rate of contribution has always been less than the maximum rate.

In the second place, clause (b) inserts a new subsection in section 18 empowering the board to fix differential rates in respect of dried tree fruits and dried vine fruits. The board is of opinion that the present uniform rate does not represent a just contribution to administration costs by producers of dried tree fruits. Clause 4 is a formal provision providing for all monetary references in the principal Act to be expressed in decimal currency.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to prohibit discrimination against persons by reason of their race or colour, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition for not having a copy of the explanation available for him at present, but I shall have one prepared and sent to him immediately. The purpose of this Bill is to give effect to the

Government's intimation to the Commonwealth Government that the Government of South Australia believes that the whole of the United Nations Draft Convention on Racial Discrimination should be ratified by the Commonwealth of Australia. One of the provisions of that convention, as I shall explain shortly, is that legislative provision should be made to prohibit practices of racial discrimination within the subject State. In South Australia, fortunately, we do not have very many practices of racial discrimination. Some occur but, when compared with what happens elsewhere, they are not very serious. However, they could develop into unpleasant incidents if they were allowed to continue.

I have been grateful for the co-operation of bodies concerned with the rights of racial minorities in this State in that they have not taken public and direct action of the kind that has happened elsewhere in Australia because it was indicated to them clearly that the Government intended to take this important step and that, rather than that direct action should be taken by groups of citizens, it was better that the community as a whole should express its disapproval of practices of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, or country of origin. If this measure had not been proposed we might have seen in South Australia some of the direct action that has been taken in other States because those States did not see fit to enact legislation of this kind. In South Australia, happily, we have a community that clearly disapproves of discrimination against persons by reason of their race, colour of skin, or country of origin. That disapproval stems from the general attitude of this community that all citizens should be given equal rights before the law, and should be treated as human beings and not differentiated against because of minority discernible characteristics.

I believe that here in South Australia, in this matter again, we can give a lead within the Commonwealth, and that we can enact here in the circumstances existing in South Australia a measure that was proposed similarly by the Government of the United Kingdom but, unhappily, not passed by the House of Commons during the previous Parliament. The Bill is a simple one; it prohibits certain practices in South Australia of discrimination by reason only of the race, country of origin, or colour of skin of the person discriminated against, and it penalizes, and in some cases makes void or inoperative, measures taken in furtherance of that particular discrimination. The definition clauses of the Bill are modelled

on definition sections contained in legislation already existing in South Australia. Clause 2 defines various terms generally along the lines of existing legislation. For example, "place of public entertainment" and "shop" are based upon the definitions in the relevant Statutes.

Clauses 3 to 8 inclusive prohibit discrimination in various respects on the grounds of a person's race, country of origin, or the colour of his skin, under a maximum penalty of \$200, while clause 9 provides for summary procedure. Clause 3 prohibits refusal of admission to licensed premises, places of public entertainment, shops and public places; clause 4 prohibits refusal or failure to supply services; clause 5 prohibits the refusal of food, drink or accommodation; and clause 6 prohibits the refusal of the letting of premises. Clause 7 prohibits the dismissal of an employee, and clause 8 prohibits the making of agreements or instruments containing restrictive covenants in connection with the disposal of or dealing with land. This last clause provides, in addition to a penalty, that any restrictive covenant is to be void or inoperative.

When the Government originally prepared the Bill it did not include the provision contained in clause 8, but the Bill was subsequently discussed with several academics in Australia who had had experience of investigating discriminatory practices in other parts of the world, particularly in the United States of America. They strongly represented to us that, whereas at the moment there were no known discriminatory practices in South Australia of the kind prohibited in clause 8, nevertheless this was the most objected to and the most regularly used discriminatory practice in the United States, and it had become increasingly used in the United Kingdom (that is, the provision of restrictive covenants upon disposal of or dealings with land to exclude these people of certain different racial characteristics from certain areas in the community). Therefore, the Government thought that it should include this particular clause.

Such are briefly the provisions of the Bill. It is, I think, unnecessary for me to say much in justification of its provisions. Honourable members are well aware of the need for social legislation of this kind. Indeed, the need for such legislation has received recognition by the United Nations, which recently adopted a convention on the elimination of racial discrimination. The preamble to the convention refers to one of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations as the promotion and encouragement of universal respect for, and observance

of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction; to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaiming that everyone is entitled to rights and freedoms without distinction, in particular as to race, colour or national origin; and to the necessity of eliminating racial discrimination throughout the world with a view to the establishment of peaceful relations among nations and the harmony of persons living side by side in the same State. The principal operative clauses of the convention provide that racial discrimination shall not be practised, defended or supported and that, to this end, legislation where necessary shall be enacted; that States shall guarantee equality in the enjoyment of civil rights, including the right to freedom of residence, right to work under just and favourable conditions, the right to housing, and the right of access to any place or service intended for use by the public, such as transport, hotels, restaurants, cafes, theatres and parks.

Fortunately, we do not have what may be called a racial or colour problem in Australia, but I think it will be agreed that, apart from the convention to which I have referred, everything possible should be done to ensure that such a problem does not occur. As is known, the Government's policy is to protect and advance the interests and wellbeing of the Aboriginal population. It is in relation to this particular section of the population that certain minor but known discriminatory practices exist in South Australia, and it is our intention to see that these cannot continue. You, Mr. Speaker, will be aware of certain practices that exist in some northern parts of the State. While it is against the Aboriginal population of this State that known discriminatory practices exist, the Bill does not differentiate between Aboriginal people and other minorities that have discernibly different characteristics of country of origin, colour of skin, or race. We believe this should refer not merely to the Aboriginal population in South Australia but to all people who may have discernibly different characteristics of this kind. It is particularly important for Australia that this should be so, in view of the close relations which exist and which should be developed between us and our near Asian neighbours. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. FREEBAIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 19, at 2 p.m.