

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 8, 1967.

The House met at 2 p.m.

The CLERK: I have to announce that, because of illness, the Speaker will be unable to attend the House this day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn) took the Chair and read prayers.

QUESTIONS**DISCOTHEQUES.**

Mr. HALL: I wish to ask a question of the Premier who, I understand, is the Minister responsible for entertainment in this House. It concerns the operations of what are popularly described nowadays as discotheques, a French word meaning "a library of records", but used today to describe a place of entertainment operating in cabaret style. Discotheques have become popular in South Australia in the last 12 months, but there is a great difference in their methods of operation on Sundays. Some discotheques function under an entertainment licence whilst others function under a cabaret licence. A proprietor of a wellknown discotheque in the city has informed me that he can obtain only an entertainment licence and is not permitted to open at all on a Sunday, whereas some of his competitors who hold a cabaret licence are able to open their premises on that day.

I am told, however, that, although a cabaret licence does not permit the proprietor concerned to make a cover charge on a Sunday, some of these proprietors do. Therefore, such proprietors have a distinct advantage over their competitors who do not hold a cabaret licence. I am told, too, that the law governing this type of entertainment does not permit a satisfactory solution of the problem. As the proprietor in this case seems to be a reputable citizen and working at a disadvantage in relation to his competitors, will the Premier take up this matter with the Chief Secretary and bring the great consideration which I believe the Government has already given to this matter to a satisfactory conclusion?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I am not the Minister responsible for any entertainment that may take place in this House. If the Leader will let me have the information in his possession, I am willing to forward it on to the Chief Secretary. Further, from what the Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation of the Licensing Bill, I under-

stood that he intended that a comprehensive review should be made of all matters concerning Sunday entertainment, which I assume would include the matter to which the Leader has referred. I shall endeavour to obtain and make available a report on the matter referred to by the Leader as soon as possible.

ELECTRICITY TRUST LOAN.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier any information about the current Electricity Trust cash loan?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am pleased to report to the House that, after a circular about the loan had been sent out last weekend, the loan opened on Monday morning and was over-subscribed within 48 hours of its opening. The problem now is to decide which applications for subscription will have to be rejected. I consider it a tribute to the trust that the loan was over-subscribed in such a short time, especially having regard to statements made about the buoyant conditions of the economies of other States, where similar undertakings are fortunate to have 40 per cent of their loans subscribed in a much longer period than 48 hours.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Over the last 12 or 18 months there have been reports of discontent on the part of school organizations and voluntary workers regarding the payment of subsidies by the Education Department. Yesterday, in reply to questions I asked on notice, the Minister of Education was kind enough to supply figures for the current financial year showing that the estimate of payments for subsidies was \$499,000 of which, until February 28 (a period of eight months), substantially less than half (\$226,946) had been paid out, together with another \$100,000 to come from the Public Buildings Department Loan funds of which only \$10,000 had been paid out. Therefore, substantially less than half of the estimated sum has been paid out in eight months. Can the Minister say whether the reason for such a disproportionately low pay out of school subsidies is partly because schools have not taken up their allocation, and whether there is any other reason why payments under this head seem to be lagging so significantly?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member's experience of complaints about subsidy payments must have been a singular experience because, as Minister, although I have received many complaints on all kinds

of subjects, I have received no complaint whatever about the payment of subsidies. Obviously, the honourable member does not appreciate the procedure adopted in the allocation of subsidies. He referred to eight months having passed but, of course, that is the position only in terms of the calendar. In fact, the allocations to the various schools are not known until some time during the first part of that eight-month period. I am sure that the honourable member will find that by the end of the year the estimated sum will have been paid out. Heavier payments will be made towards the end of the year. I should like to draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that in the previous year the Government paid out slightly more in subsidies than the sum estimated, so it is highly probable that the same thing will be repeated in this financial year.

MARINO QUARRY.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding the use of road metal from the Marino quarry?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the Marino quarry is the only present source in the metropolitan area of clean, hard and durable screenings suitable for use in bituminous works. No other source can consistently supply material to specification requirements in the large quantities required annually. The use of any other source outside the metropolitan area would involve heavy additional cartage and operating costs, and would increase the price of crushed products by at least 50 per cent.

WEST BEACH SCHOOL.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last year, I asked the Minister of Education questions regarding the proposed West Beach Primary School, and he said that land had been purchased for this school. In answer to a later question, the Minister said that the construction of the school depended on the growth of population in the area. Can the Minister say when the construction of this school is likely to commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall try to obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

EASTWOOD INTERSECTION.

Mrs. STEELE: As the Minister of Works is probably aware, on Greenhill Road, at the intersection of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads, much work, including the recementing of pipes in situ, is being carried out. For a consider-

able distance back from the intersection many men are working, and there are many vehicles and some machines operating. When I came into town this morning, a big grab was working at the intersection, and traffic was held up for a considerable distance. No-one was directing traffic and there was a dangerous situation as motorists could not see to their right because machines were working and obstructing their view. Will the Minister give instructions that a member of the Engineering and Water Supply Department direct the traffic, as I have seen on many occasions, or could this matter be referred to the Police Department, so that a police constable could be on duty directing the traffic?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not know whether this is one of the works being carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, or whether it is a project on contract. I shall take up the matter with my department in order to ensure the greatest safety and the smooth flow of traffic.

HOLDEN HILL HOUSING.

Mrs. BYRNE: As the Housing Trust has commenced to subdivide a tract of land fronting Lyons Road and Valiant Road at Holden Hill and house-building has begun, can the Premier, as Minister of Housing, say how many houses are to be built on this land and whether the houses are to be for sale or for rental?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain a report and bring it down for the honourable member, I hope on Tuesday next.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report of a statement made by the Chairman of Directors of the Silverton Tramway Company about the company's right to compensation in the event of its section of railway being taken over and standardized by the Government. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, say what progress has been made towards getting a determination of policy between the respective Governments regarding whether that section of railway is to be acquired from the Silverton Tramway Company to be converted to standard gauge? Can he say whether there will be next year, when the whole of the work is completed, a break of gauge because there has been a delay in reaching agreement on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: To my knowledge, some attempts have been made to reach agreement. The Minister of Transport in this State has visited other States, as has, I believe, the Commissioner. We believe that this matter is of such great importance to the success or otherwise of the standardization plan that, unless greater consideration is given (I presume by the Commonwealth Government), the delay the honourable member refers to could occur. In an effort to further safeguard the matter, certain discussions will take place in New South Wales either this week or next week between the respective Ministers (and also, I believe, the Commissioners) with a view to asking the Commonwealth Government to seriously consider this matter. I have read with interest the terms associated with the Silverton Tramways Company, which has very good protection from its own point of view. These terms could be of great financial consequence to the Commonwealth Government. It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government's view is that it will proceed by another route. However, I believe that such action would upset almost everything in connection with this important matter. My personal opinion is that discussions should be held with a view to assisting in the most amicable way possible so that all parties would get a reasonable return for their effort in this matter. I believe that the Silverton Tramway Company is entitled to be considered: I hope that no force will be used to determine another route, that the normal procedure will be adopted, and that the harmony that has existed between the railway systems in all States and the Silverton Tramway Company will continue. I know that further conferences will be held.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: I understood that definite arrangements were made and a contract was let to proceed with the replanting of the grounds of the Port Pirie Primary School during the 1966 holidays, but for some reason the work did not proceed. Can the Minister of Education say when the work will commence and, if he cannot, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that some difficulty has arisen as a result of the procedure of supplying new books under the free book system. First, if books are not available the

adjoining schools must be canvassed, and that practice is fair and reasonable. The difficulty arises when books are not available from adjoining schools, as the headmaster must then apply for a form to apply for the books. I bring this procedural matter to the notice of the Minister of Education: will he ascertain whether something can be done about it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention. I shall consider it to see whether delays can be avoided and, if they can, I shall take the necessary steps.

GLENCOE ROADS.

Mr. RODDA: I understand that the Tantanoola council has applied for the Kirip and the Old School Roads to be bituminized. I need not tell the Minister of Lands (he would know from his own knowledge) how important these roads are, and for how long they have not been surfaced. Will he ask the Minister of Roads to consider favourably the bituminizing of these roads?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do this. From memory, one of these roads is the boundary between my district and that of the member for Victoria.

HOUSING TRUST.

Mr. CURREN: In past months I have been requested continually by my constituents to assist them to obtain a rental house in towns in the Upper Murray area, which district I represent. Will the Premier ascertain the waiting time for applicants for Housing Trust rental houses in Renmark, Berri and Barmora? Also, will the Housing Trust building programme in these towns provide for the building of double-unit houses for rental?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member soon.

TORRENS RIVER.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that the work of improving the banks of the Torrens River just below the Hackney bridge being carried out by the Lands Department in conjunction with the Adelaide City Council is now being done after the scheduled date of completion. Because of the delay, users of the river have complained about the continued low level of the pool. Can the Minister of Lands say when the work is likely to be completed and whether, at that time, the pool level is to be raised?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

ELIZABETH BUS SERVICE.

Mr. HALL: A few months ago I was approached by a Para Hills resident employed at General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth, who told me of the difficulty experienced in obtaining permission from the Transport Control Board for a bus to be licensed to take him and his fellow employees to work at Elizabeth from the suburbs east and north-east of the city. A petition was signed by 118 people who desired this bus service, and a bus proprietor was willing to institute the service to ascertain whether it was warranted, but the Transport Control Board has refused to license the service. This matter, incidentally, is not tied up with the whole question of transport from Elizabeth to the city whereby many local residents believe permission should be given by the Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board for a bus to run from Elizabeth to the city. This matter involves getting G.M.H. employees to work, and if this application for a bus service, which cuts across existing routes, is not granted, employees have to use their own cars, as they are using them today. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport to take this matter up with the Transport Control Board, so that the convenience of the people may be met by allowing the bus service to operate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

BEAUMONT CHILDREN.

Mr. HUDSON: It has been reported in the press that digging at the Paringa Park warehouse has ceased without the Beaumont children having been found. No doubt all of us are pleased in one sense that the parents' hopes of finding their children alive have not been completely disappointed. It has also been reported in the press that, while the digging was being carried out, policemen were on duty for the whole period, and that the press reporters concerned were not allowed access to any of the areas immediately adjacent to the digging. In view of this report, will the Premier ascertain from the Police Commissioner whether further information can be made available regarding the events of the last few days?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although I doubt the wisdom in acceding to the honourable member's request, I am prepared to discuss some aspects of his question with the Police Commissioner. I hasten to assure the House that I had complete knowledge of the Police Department's activities concerning the digging, and I previously said that the department was looking after the Government's

interests in this respect. I believe that in the interests of the public concerning this matter the Police Department has performed an outstanding task. Although I may not have much sympathy for some of the reports that I have read on this matter, I have read with some interest a confidential report that I would not be prepared to make public at this stage, in case anybody were subsequently harmed. If, after I have spoken with the Police Commissioner about the latest developments, there is anything further to report to the House, I shall inform the honourable member. Suffice to say at this stage that every precaution had to be taken in the interests not only of the owners of the property concerned but also in the interests of the public generally. I commend the Police Department for its work in that regard.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that as yet no alternative arrangements have been made for the cleaning of windows in school buildings and that, in fact, no arrangement exists for their cleaning. As it has been reported to me that some parent organizations assume that this work is now to be left to them, will the Minister of Education say whether that assumption is correct; and, if it is, will he say what provisions exist to cover an injury that may be sustained by any voluntary worker undertaking such duties?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It has never been suggested that this work should be undertaken by the parents. Indeed, I have received no reports of parents undertaking the work. However, I believe that when parents undertake voluntary work at schools there is some cover although, from memory, I am not sure of the details. No arrangements have been made officially for parents to clean school windows, and I have never suggested that they should. I hope that we shall be able to see from experience what is the result of not cleaning windows—

Mr. Millhouse: It's pretty obvious, isn't it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: —so that we can see whether it is really necessary to clean them, or not. The point is that school windows are not cleaned in at least one other State except by occasionally washing them with a hose. I have heard no complaints that the schools suffer, or that education suffers, as a result of that policy. In fact, if it can be shown that we do not need to clean the windows any more than by taking that action, it will be seen that if this matter had been examined

(as it should have been) many years ago by the previous Government a considerable sum could have been saved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has said that at least one other State cleans its school windows by hosing them down. Can he say which State that is; who is responsible in that State for the hosing down of the windows; and is it intended in this State to make some person or body of persons responsible for this task?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: From memory (and I am subject to correction) I think the State is New South Wales. I am not aware of who does the hosing down and, therefore, I cannot answer the rest of the honourable member's question. If necessary, I have no doubt that this matter will be examined in due course.

WATER METERS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: During recent weeks, when visiting some of the new sections of my district, I have found that both in private developments and Housing Trust areas it is now the policy to build houses without any front fences. Residents in these areas plant their lawns to the gutter at the roadside. In most cases, however, the lawns are broken by water meters that protrude above the surface. Indeed, many people have told me that they have sought permission from the department to sink their meters below ground level. I understand that the department, in acceding to such requests, undertakes the work at some cost to the householder. As it seems to me that the department might consider setting all water meters below the surface in future, will the Minister of Works consider this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the difficulties of the people living in new suburbs. Having noted the difficulty to which the honourable member has referred, I shall take up this matter with the department and ascertain whether something can be done to solve the problem.

OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL.

Mrs. STEELE: A recent visit to Outer Harbour convinced me that the facilities there for handling overseas passenger liners must surely be among the most outdated of any port in Australia. When a ship is about to leave the wharf a mobile crane thrusts its way through farewelling crowds standing on the wharf, lifts the gangway from the vessel, and swings it around in mid-air to deposit it on the wharf.

Mr. Casey: It happens in Sydney too, you know.

Mrs. STEELE: But Sydney has an overseas passenger terminal. Although the skill of the crane operator is commendable, the hazards to life and limb of the public on the wharf cannot be over-estimated. Plans for a modern overseas passenger terminal having been approved and recommended by the Public Works Committee in, I think, August, 1964, the previous Government intended to press on with the project. However, the present Government, no doubt because of financial stringencies, seems to have abandoned the project, confining plans for providing better amenities for overseas passengers to a restaurant, snack bar and shop. As South Australia will continue to be by-passed if overseas shipping lines have to contend with the facilities at Outer Harbour which are slow, inefficient and dangerous, will the Minister of Marine say when the overseas passenger terminal will be proceeded with, so that South Australia will participate in the benefits that overseas shipping lines bring to the more progressive ports in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I point out that the position has improved during the life-time of the present Government inasmuch as a restaurant now exists at Outer Harbour.

Mr. Hurst: A nice one, too.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Indeed. The need for a proper overseas terminal is not new. I point out, however, that many members (particularly members of the Opposition) are making demands on the Harbours Board for facilities in their own districts which are important to the primary and secondary industries in their respective areas.

Mrs. Steele: They don't handle overseas shipping, though.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: They handle overseas shipping as it relates to precious cargo that is very important to the districts concerned. The member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg), who has been talking to me about Thevenard, is only one member who has approached me. No Government can do everything at once; indeed, the previous Government was not able to, nor are we. We have to consider priorities and determine their order in the best interests of the economy of the State.

Mr. HURST: Because of the apparent urgent need for a proper overseas terminal at Outer Harbour, will the Minister confer with his Cabinet colleagues with a view to deferring the installation of a deep sea port at Giles Point so that work can proceed soon on the overseas terminal?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I have said, we will determine priorities in the interests of the economy of the State. I can say no more than that and I am sure no member would expect me to do so at this stage.

MAIN ROAD No. 99.

Mrs. BYRNE: On July 6, 1965, with the member for Gawler, I was a member of a deputation which waited on the Minister of Roads regarding the reconstruction and sealing of the Smithfield-Modbury Main Road No. 99. As the main traffic to the Para Wirra national park will naturally favour the use of this road (from the Main North Road, through One Tree Hill) when it is sealed, will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Roads a report as to the sections of roads (including main and district roads) that have been reconstructed and the extent of the work already carried out on survey, design and land acquisition?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

GOOLWA FERRY.

Mr. McANANEY: Recently it was announced that a new ferry would be provided at Goolwa. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads when it will operate?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

POWER BOATS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Marine the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the registration of power boats?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This morning I saw a copy of the report and talked to the Chairman of the committee; I expect that the final report will be in my hands tomorrow. On Monday I will submit it to Cabinet, following the meeting of which I shall be happy to make the report available to members of the press who have shown much interest in it, so that its contents can be made known to the public.

FRUIT FLY.

Mr. CUMBE: In reply to my question of last week, the Minister of Agriculture said that legislation was being prepared and was likely to be introduced shortly to provide for compensation for people affected by the recent outbreak of fruit fly. As many people in my district are concerned in this matter, can the Minister say when the legislation is likely to be presented to the House and, particularly, whether it is likely to be presented this session?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The legislation is unlikely to be introduced this session, but it will be introduced early next session. A beneficial aspect of this is that it will allow a better understanding of what sum will be involved as compensation. By that time the fruit will have been removed and we will have had more time to assess the sum involved. I understand that, in the event of compensation being payable, the usual procedure is to introduce legislation towards the end of the year in which an outbreak has occurred.

CONTAINERIZATION.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Regarding the adequacy of our ports, I wish to refer to the policy of the previous Government which was to ensure that Port Adelaide was capable—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member desires to make an explanatory statement, he must seek leave of the House.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. With your permission and with the concurrence of the House I wish to outline the policy of the previous Government—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member wish to ask a question or does he wish to ask leave to deal with some other matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question deals with policy. With your permission and the concurrence of the House, I ask the Minister of Marine whether he intends to continue the policy of the previous Government to ensure that Port Adelaide will be up to world standards, particularly in respect of the new system of containerization on which the previous Government had done much work to ensure that, when that important innovation took place, this port was not by-passed.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I never cease to be amazed. For the first time in my life I have heard that the previous Government made provision for containerization. I assure the House that the Government is well aware of the facts of this matter and is working with all those concerned to provide facilities at Port Adelaide that will embody all possible services relating to containerization. If honourable members read the report submitted by the Harbors Board, they will find a section dealing with the work done in preparation for containerization.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say whether, as Port Adelaide is a relatively shallow port, which prohibits the servicing of large oversea

vessels, the containerization facilities that are being established will serve only interstate containerized ships, or does he expect that the facilities will also be made available to over-sea containerized ships?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Arrangements have been made for the handling of interstate ships, and I think that berths 15 and 16 are being prepared for the handling of oversea vessels.

POTATOES.

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, a poll was conducted of potato-growers in this State and they wisely voted to keep their orderly marketing scheme. When this matter was last discussed here, the Minister of Agriculture extended an invitation to me to inspect the potato-marketing arrangements. Some of my colleagues would also like to be present when this inspection is made. Can the Minister say when it can be arranged?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Only yesterday, the member for Mitcham suggested a date for this inspection but, unfortunately, the date suggested by him was inconvenient. I shall be happy to arrange a suitable time for as many members as possible to inspect the Potato Board, and I am most anxious for them to do this. If any member suggests a date, I shall arrange for this inspection.

SAMCON SCHOOL.

Mr. RODDA: My question refers to the new Samcon school at Kalangadoo, which I was privileged to inspect last Monday. This school is a boon to Kalangadoo but, of course, there are a few teething problems. The school seems to be frequented by flies, brought about by gaps left in the main entrance doors at each porchway. I understand the gaps are left there by design and that they are necessary in connection with the cooling system. The gaps are most attractive to flies, and these are causing concern to the staff and the students. Although there are a few other matters I shall make known to the Minister of Education in time, can the Minister now say whether he intends to consider this phase of the design?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer this question to the Public Buildings Department to ascertain whether anything can be done about the design. I realize that flies and other insects can be a nuisance at times, both in schools and in other places.

STUDENT ALLOWANCES.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Can the Minister of Education give me the information, for which I asked him privately, regarding allowances for students at the Institute of Technology?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Full-time students at the Institute of Technology, whose fees are not met by scholarships, cadetships or similar awards, or by employers, may be considered for benefits under the fees concession scheme. Under this scheme, no money is paid to the student but assistance is given towards the payment of fees. The concession is determined on a means test basis, and is in the form of a loan only or combination of loan and grant, depending on the course being taken. The concession is on a more liberal basis for those students whose home is in the country. Courses approved under this scheme are those leading to the Associate Diploma or the Diploma in Technology. I have a form of application for assistance under the fees concession scheme of 1967, which sets out the matter in greater detail, and I shall be pleased to make this available to the honourable member.

There could be students at the institute holding leaving technical bursaries. Those country students who were doing full-time courses would receive a boarding allowance of \$150 a year. No means test is applied to these allowances. Holders of Commonwealth Advanced Education Scholarships attending Diploma of Technology courses at the institute on a full-time basis would be eligible for the benefits of that scheme, which include payment of fees and a living allowance based on a means test.

MAIN NORTH-EAST ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Highways and Local Government Department intends to continue the widening and reconstruction of the Main North-East Road between Grand Junction Road and Smart Road, Modbury, and this work is proceeding. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, ascertain when this section is expected to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

CAFETERIA.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question is directed to the Minister of Works, although I am not sure whether he is the person to whom I should direct it. I believe that South Australian Government employees in the new Reserve Bank building are not able to use

the cafeteria on the thirteenth floor of that building which is reserved solely for the use of Commonwealth Government employees. There are no facilities for State Government employees to obtain refreshments in the building. This has caused some inconvenience and a little heartburn to State Government employees. Can the Minister of Works say whether there are any plans to provide for the use of the existing cafeteria by State Government employees, or whether an alternative arrangement is to be provided for them?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter does not come within my jurisdiction. I think it would come under the Chief Secretary, as the Minister in charge of the Public Service Commissioner's Department and, as the honourable member has raised it, I shall refer it to my colleague.

EDUCATION STANDARDS.

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, there were press reports that, when a child left one State to go to another State, that child lost up to a year because of the different gradings and standards. Can the Minister of Education say whether there has been discussion or co-ordination between the States on this matter, or whether annual meetings are held with a view to seeing whether such disadvantages can be eliminated?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Ministers of Education of the States get together once a year at the Australian Council of Education, on the agenda of which there are usually items dealing with questions relating to States' trying to get their holidays into line with one another and other matters on which uniformity is desirable. The experience has been that it is extremely difficult to get the States to be uniform regarding educational matters. I make that point quite clear, because there are quite serious difficulties in every case where uniformity is sought. I believe the statement the honourable member referred to was attributed in the press to Senator Gorton. Although a loss of one year might be the case in some instances, I think I am right in saying that it is not general. The number of people who transfer their children from State to State would be between 1 per cent and 2 per cent of the total, and it is, of course, important to those people to try to have the education of their children flow on without any serious break. However, I remind the honourable member that if uniformity is sought, in syllabus or in any other aspect of education, and we

are tied down to uniformity, for example in text books (as was suggested in that particular statement), it becomes increasingly difficult to obtain necessary changes from time to time. I have even heard people who are advocates of uniformity at the same time say that we should be changing our educational methods as quickly as possible when the need demands. Therefore, when we look at the question of uniformity in education as between States I think we should remember that the more uniformity we get in this direction the more difficult it probably will be to achieve changes that are desirable, so that any advantage in one direction might be counter-balanced by disadvantages in another.

WINNS ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand the Minister of Lands has an answer to the question I asked him to put to his colleague, the Minister of Roads, last week concerning Winns Road at Blackwood. Would he be kind enough to give it to the House?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that a reply to the honourable member's letter relating to Winns Road, Blackwood, has been delayed due to the department endeavouring to ascertain which officer was responsible for the alleged statement that a decision on alterations to the road would be made in February. There is no basis for the rumour that an early decision would be made on this road. Investigations are being made into proposals to improve both Winns Road, Blackwood, and the present main road through Coromandel Valley. If development proceeds according to the land use indicated in the 1962 development plan, there will be a very considerable increase in the volume of traffic in this area and the improvement of these roads will be required.

The investigations in connection with Winns Road have involved some field reconnaissance work by departmental officers; however, detailed design plans have not yet been prepared. This project should be regarded as of a long-term nature, and it is not expected that any construction work will be commenced until such time as improvement is necessitated by actual traffic volume. My colleague points out that the above information is the same as previously advised to the honourable member by letter.

WESTBOURNE PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Over the last few years I have on many occasions had representations from the Westbourne Park Primary School

Committee concerning the state of the lavatories at that school, and I have on at least one or two occasions gone to have a look at them myself. I have not yet succeeded in having improvements carried out, although at the end of 1965, I think it was, I had a letter from the Minister of Education indicating that the work would be done in that current financial year. Recently the school committee, despairing of getting any action through me alone, has approached the honourable the Premier and the honourable member for Unley, both gentlemen representing districts from which children go to the Westbourne Park school, asking for their help in the matter. I was naturally apprised of this development, which I applauded, and on February 15 I wrote both to the member for Unley and the Premier saying that I was glad the approach had been made and expressing the hope that the three of us could make common cause in the matter. I have not had any reply from the honourable the Premier except a courteous acknowledgment of my letter from his deputy, the Chief Secretary. The question therefore that I ask the honourable gentleman is whether he has been able to do anything about this matter and, if so, when it is likely that the improvements will be effected to these lavatories.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question of the lavatories at the Westbourne Park school does not come under the control of my department. I do not know whether the honourable member would like to redirect his question to the Minister of Education. Whilst the question has something to do with schools, it is not entirely the responsibility of that Minister, either. In any event, it is certainly not a matter for my department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although I do so with very great disappointment, I direct the question to the Minister of Education on the assumption that the matter must have been referred by someone on behalf of the Premier to the Minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member seek leave?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have already given the reasons for the question, and all that is left to me is to ask whether the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Premier, has any knowledge of this matter.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have no knowledge of the exact situation regarding this request, but I shall obtain a report on it and see whether the work can be expedited.

DUKES HIGHWAY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In November last I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, for a report on the Highways Department's proposals concerning the re-routing of the Dukes Highway. At that stage I drew attention to the fact that the corner at Coomandook was a dangerous one at which many accidents occurred and are still occurring. I have subsequently heard that some policy decision has been made in this matter. Will the Minister obtain from his colleague a full report concerning whether it has now been decided to re-route the Dukes Highway No. 8 along the railway line through Cooke Plains to Tailem Bend rather than reconstructing it on its present course from Coomandook via Moorlands to Tailem Bend?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to accede to the honourable member's request.

WAVERLEY RIDGE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that the Minister of Works has an answer to the second part of the question I asked him recently about a water supply in the area west of Waverley Ridge. Will he now give that answer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In answer to the question asked by the honourable gentleman yesterday, I now have the full report of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, which states:

This was the subject of a petition bearing the names of 123 residents forwarded by the District Council of Stirling in April, 1965. The majority of the petitioners were the owners of building allotments in the Manoah Estate subdivision and the owners of broad acres in the vicinity of Manoah Estate; there are a few petitioners from the Iron Bank area. The department would be unable to extend water mains in these areas until the Chandler Hill to Heathfield main is complete with its permanent pumping station and tanks. It now appears that this stage will not be reached until the end of the 1967-68 summer, the controlling factor being the delivery of the permanent pumps.

The department has prepared plans showing the petitioners' properties but has not prepared water supply schemes, estimates or revenue estimates. It is intended to proceed with this towards the middle of 1967. When the above work is complete, if the return from rates is satisfactory in relation to the department's estimated outlay, or if it appears practicable to obtain an adequate return by way of guaranteed payments of above normal rates, the project will be recommended to the Government and, if approved, would be proceeded with when funds could be made available for the work.

Water supply for the Mount Lofty Summit area: This was the subject of a petition signed by 46 residents forwarded to the Minister of Works in September, 1965. As no provision was made in the Stirling-Crafers scheme for a water supply to the Mount Lofty Summit area, it would not be practicable to proceed with such a scheme until the Chandler Hill to Heathfield main is completed towards the end of the 1967-68 summer and until certain additions and modifications are made to the Stirling-Crafers scheme. Towards the middle of 1967, the department will proceed with the design, estimates and revenue estimates for the summit scheme which would require a pumping station and tank. If the return from rates is satisfactory, or if it appears practicable to obtain a satisfactory return by the payment of above normal rates, the project will be recommended to the Government and, if approved, will be proceeded with when funds can be made available for it. No construction date can be given at this stage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: THE SPEAKER.

Mr. Ryan for Mr. BROOMHILL moved:

That three weeks' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Stuart (Hon. L. G. Riches) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. D. N. BROOKMAN.

Mr. McAnaney for Mrs. STEELE moved:

That three weeks' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

THE ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (PENOLA UNDERTAKING) BILL.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to vest in the Electricity Trust of South Australia certain assets pertaining to an electricity distribution system situated at Penola and elsewhere and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Electricity in Penola is at present supplied by Penola Electricity Supply Proprietary Limited under a franchise agreement from the District Council of Penola. The franchise was granted in 1947 to a different company and transferred to the owners of the present company in 1949, and in 1957 the present company took over the franchise. The franchise provides that the

company shall have the right to supply electricity in the hundreds of Killanoola, Comaum, Monbulla and Penola. The franchise expires on June 30, 1967, being 20 years from the original grant.

Although in the past the company has provided an adequate supply of electricity in the town of Penola, it has done little to provide power to the remainder of the franchise area. The Electricity Trust, as part of its development in the South-East, has provided supply to rural consumers up to the boundary of the franchise area, but is precluded by the franchise from supplying within the nominated hundreds. The company has had almost 20 years in which to make some effort to provide power in these rural districts but has not done so. In accordance with the terms of the franchise, the council offered a new franchise to the company to commence from July 1, 1967. One condition of the proposed franchise was that power should be supplied throughout the franchise area, a situation which the council is naturally anxious to see brought about. This offer was rejected by the company. In June, 1966, the Electricity Trust indicated to the company that it would be willing to purchase its assets on the expiration of the franchise provided the company was willing to sell. An indication was given of the price and conditions which would be acceptable to the trust. The company was asked whether it was prepared to make an offer on these lines, but this approach was rejected by the company.

The council also offered to purchase the assets of the company, and the trust agreed to provide a bulk supply of electricity from its main power network a few miles away. This offer being rejected by the company, the council then decided on December 5, 1966, that it would build its own distribution system to replace the one owned by the company. This would obviously have practical difficulties, and it would almost certainly result in blackouts during the overlapping period after the existing franchise expired. In any case the Minister of Local Government did not think that he could agree to the council raising loan money to build a distribution system when a satisfactory one already existed.

After it learned that the council would endeavour to establish a new distribution system, the company made a new approach to the Electricity Trust to sell its undertaking. On December 19, 1966, the trust made an offer of \$110,000 to purchase the company's assets, leaving the offer open until January 13, 1967.

On that date the company rejected the offer but made a counter offer to sell the shares of the company plus certain other assets to the trust based on a valuation almost twice the trust's offer. The trust rejected this offer and, in view of the short time before the franchise expired, informed the council that agreement could not be reached.

On January 26, 1967, the Penola council asked the Government to introduce legislation to vest the company's distribution system in the Electricity Trust on the expiration of the franchise so that continuity of power supply could be assured. The council pointed out that unless this were done there was every likelihood that the township of Penola would be without electricity supply from July 1, 1967. Not only would this be a serious inconvenience and loss to the people in the town but it would also seriously affect public services in the area including the hospital, water supply, and important communication systems operated by the Postmaster-General's Department.

This Bill provides that the appropriate assets shall be vested in the Electricity Trust from the termination of the franchise, and that, if agreement cannot be reached between the parties, compensation will be determined by the Supreme Court. It is necessary that this legislation be passed without delay so that proper arrangements can be made to ensure that the district is not deprived of power.

Mr. Quirke: Does that refer to the whole of the assets?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No, it does not. Clauses 1 and 2 cover the title and necessary definitions which are self-explanatory. Clause 3 vests the appropriate assets in the Electricity Trust and converts to a right to compensation any estate or interest held in those assets by the company or any other person. It may be noted that the assets to be vested are set out in the schedule and in general cover the distribution system. They do not include the diesel generating plant nor the power house property. The latter is owned by the proprietors personally and not by the company. As the Electricity Trust can readily supply power from its main transmission system on the boundary of the franchise area, there is no necessity to take over the generating plant. The function of any franchise agreement is to transfer rights for a specific period (in this case 20 years). The company or its owners have had valuable rights under the franchise for this lengthy period which expires on June 30 next. Clause 4 provides that after this Bill

becomes law the distribution system shall not be altered without the consent of the trust except for normal requirements in the ordinary course of operation.

Clause 5 gives the trust power to inspect or alter the distribution system as necessary after this Bill becomes law and before July 1. It also provides that the company shall disconnect the electricity supply if required in order to do this. Because the distribution system must be connected to the trust's transmission network by July 1, it is obviously necessary for the trust to have power to make adequate preparation beforehand. In the event that the company should suffer loss as a result of any requirement to interrupt supply, subclause (3) of this clause provides that the company shall be entitled to compensation. It also provides that the trust shall not cause the supply of electricity to be interrupted any more than is reasonably necessary. Subclause (1) of clause 6 provides that compensation payable under the Bill shall be fixed by agreement, or, failing agreement, by the Supreme Court in accordance with the other provisions of this clause. Subclauses (2) and (3) of clause 6 provide that the affected parties may commence an action to determine compensation in the Supreme Court and that the Supreme Court shall hear such action.

Subclause (4) gives the Supreme Court authority to determine and apportion the compensation and to make such order for costs as it thinks proper. Subclause (5) provides that the Supreme Court's determination shall be final and conclusive and enforceable as a judgment or order of the court. As the Supreme Court will, in effect, be an arbitrator in this matter, it is proper that its findings shall be final and conclusive. Subclause (6) provides that if the trust shall add to or alter the distribution system then this shall be properly accounted for in fixing the final compensation. Subclause (7) provides that compensation payable shall be the fair value of the assets on vesting day or, if they are parts of the distribution system which have been removed and for which compensation is payable, then the compensation shall be the fair value of such parts immediately before removal. This subclause also provides that compensation in respect of any interruption to supply of electricity shall be the monetary loss suffered by the company in consequence of the interruption.

Clause 7 provides that compensation shall be payable on the vesting day. As there is a

possibility that compensation may not be determined before that day, this clause also provides that compensation not paid on the vesting day shall bear interest at 5½ per cent per annum until the date of payment. Clause 8 provides that except as provided in this Act, there shall be no claim against the trust or the District Council of Penola by reason of the vesting of the assets in the trust or the consequences thereof. The Bill provides for proper compensation to be paid and for the apportionment by the Supreme Court of compensation among different parties in such manner as it thinks just and proper. Owing to the manner in which the existing franchise has in the past been transferred between the owners as individuals and the company which they own, there could be argument about legal ownership although the same persons are involved. Clause 6 will safeguard this situation. Clause 9 is a saving clause to retain, subject to clauses 4, 5 and 8 of the Bill, the rights and obligations of the company and the district council under the existing franchise agreement. The Bill is in the nature of a hybrid Bill and should be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I could say a lot about this Bill, because it affects a number of people in my district, but as the Minister has stated that it is going to be referred to a Select Committee, I reserve the right to speak on the third reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Hudson, Hurst, Millhouse, Rodda and the Hon. C. D. Hutchens; the committee to have the power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on March 16.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY BILL.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for the safety and welfare of persons engaged on building and other works and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The first Scaffolding Inspection Act in this State was passed in 1907. It had application only if scaffolding or hoisting appliances were erected in connection with building work. In the course of the following 20 years a few amendments were made to the Act; then, in 1934 the present Act was passed. That Act, however, did not differ substantially from the 1907 Act. It was not until 1957 that any

major amendments were made. Further amendments were made in 1961 and 1963. The Act was, in 1961, for the first time extended to apply to the demolition of larger buildings and excavations for building foundations. Thus, the Act is no longer a Scaffolding Inspection Act as its name implies. Difficulties have been encountered because the Act in its present form is now largely a patchwork arrangement which basically had its origin in 1907, when building construction activities were of a far different nature from that which exists at present.

Another important omission from the Scaffolding Inspection Act is that there is no provision whereby members of the public may also have protection from building operations, particularly from hazards associated with the demolition of buildings, and from excavation work on a building site which is involved in connection with building, but not necessarily excavations for building foundations. The Act is framed to protect workmen engaged on building and demolition work. This, however, does not go far enough. An example of the need for extending the scope of the Act occurred in connection with the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where extensive deep tunnelling was necessary between buildings; but as these excavations were not for the foundations for new buildings the Act did not apply to that work.

With all of this in mind the Government has decided to repeal the Scaffolding Inspection Act and replace it with a new Act with the title "Construction Safety Act". This short title will more properly describe the scope of the Act, the object of which will be to ensure that safe working conditions are provided and observed on building work, the demolition of buildings and also the excavation, shaft sinking and tunnelling on the site of and in conjunction with buildings. In addition, the Act will empower the Governor to proclaim that it shall apply to other work of or in connection with the excavation or tunnel. This is a similar type of provision to that which was inserted in the Mines and Works Inspection Act some years ago in connection with work which is similar to mining but not undertaken in a mine. Further, provision is made for compressed air work done in connection with building work to be subject to the Act, should such work be undertaken.

Where practicable and appropriate, the provisions of the present Scaffolding Inspection Act have been retained, but a number

of new features are contained therein. I shall explain them as I deal with each clause of the Bill. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the present Scaffolding Inspection Act. Clause 3 lays down the areas to which the provisions of the Bill will apply. Although all workmen engaged on building construction work should be provided with safe working conditions, the provisions of this Bill apply only to those parts of the State to which the present Scaffolding Inspection Act now applies. The Government is satisfied that the interests of workmen in the building industry can best be served by concentrating the activities of inspectors on those parts of the State where major building activities are taking place. However, provision is included for the areas to which the Bill applies to be altered by regulation, as is the case under the present Scaffolding Inspection Act.

The various definitions of terms used in the Bill and necessary to interpret the legislation are set out in clause 4, while clause 5 deals with the scope of the work to which the provisions of the Bill will apply and to which I have already referred. The appointment of inspectors is provided for in clause 6. The requirements of clause 7 are similar to those presently applying, in that any person who intends to carry out work to which the Act applies must notify the department before work commences. In addition, two provisions have been included to cover difficulties which have been encountered in the present provisions of the Scaffolding Inspection Act. The first is to ensure that where a person undertakes some work to which the Act applies but does not do any of the work himself, he is responsible for giving notice and paying the prescribed fee. This is commonly known as the brokerage system, under which a person (who is for the purposes of this Act to be regarded as the principal contractor) subcontracts the whole of the building of a "spec" house.

Under the present Act it has not been possible to require any notification of intention to build, or to obtain a fee from such person, but this position will be altered because of the new definition of "principal contractor" which extends to this class of person. The second provision ensures that any person, who is convicted for not giving such notice and paying a fee, shall be liable upon conviction to pay the fee. A case occurred some time ago where, after a person was convicted for not giving the notice and paying the fee, the Crown Solicitor advised that the fee could not be recovered. Clause 8 empowers the making of regulations concerning

scaffolding, gear, hoisting appliances, power-driven equipment and shoring. In addition, provision is made requiring that every contractor and employer ensure that the provisions of the Act are complied with, and take all reasonable precautions to ensure the safety of workmen engaged on any work to which the Act applies.

Clause 9 contains a new, but very desirable, provision which has operated satisfactorily for some years in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand. It will apply on major work, that is, where more than 20 workmen are employed at any one time. Generally this work will be the construction of multi-storey buildings (including the excavation work for such buildings) and group cottage construction. In such cases the Bill requires the principal contractor to appoint a safety supervisor who has the necessary qualifications to be specifically charged with ensuring the safety or protection of persons employed on the work and its safe conduct generally. The safety supervisor need not be employed in a full-time capacity. The provisions of clause 10 are also new. They concern the supply by an employer to his employees of protective equipment, which, when supplied, must be worn or used by the employee. They also require an employer to provide artificial lighting when natural lighting is insufficient, and a penalty for failure to comply with the provisions of this clause is provided.

One of the difficulties of the Scaffolding Inspection Act is that no provision is made for the welfare of any person engaged on work to which that Act applies. Clause 11 empowers the making of regulations concerning drinking water, washing facilities, accommodation for meals, clothing and tools, sanitary conveniences, first aid equipment, and appliances for the prevention and extinction of fires as required on work to which the Act applies. These are matters in respect of which the Industrial Code has, for many years, provided for the making of regulations in respect of persons employed in factories. Although some of these matters are now included in awards applying in the building industry, this is not a satisfactory arrangement as invariably persons employed under a number of awards work on the same building project, and there can be different provisions in respect of amenities especially when some of the awards are made by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and some by the State Industrial Commission. In some cases awards do not make any provision at all for these matters.

In order that persons engaged on work to which this Bill will apply may be aware of its provisions and the regulations to be made under it, provision is made in clause 12 for copies of the Act and regulations to be available for perusal by workmen at all reasonable times. The Industrial Code already provides that an employer shall display a copy of the award applying to his employees at his principal place of business and at every branch or depot where a substantial number of employees are required to work or report.

During the construction of multi-storey buildings it is necessary for heavy plant, equipment and structural steel members for buildings to be lifted, and for cranes to be hoisted to the top of buildings for use in building operations, and these cranes subsequently have to be dismantled. These are examples of work which it is necessary to have supervised by a competent rigger. In New South Wales and Western Australia it is necessary for such riggers to hold a certificate of competency, obtained after examination, and the Government considers that a qualified rigger who holds a certificate of competency should be required to supervise any rigging work, whenever work to which the Act applies is being undertaken. For many years it has been necessary for crane drivers who operate large cranes on building work to hold a certificate, issued by the Engine-drivers Board constituted under the Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act, and it is equally as important for riggers to be properly qualified. Clause 13 makes provision for the chief inspector to issue the certificates of competency, but provides that this provision shall not come into operation until one year after this Bill becomes law.

Clause 14, which deals with the reporting of accidents, is in substantially the same form as the corresponding section of the Scaffolding Inspection Act, and also the Industrial Code. In order that the Bill and the regulations made under it shall be complied with and safe working conditions observed on work to which the Bill applies, it is necessary for inspectors to be given powers to give directions. This is the purpose of clause 15, which also is substantially in the same form as the provisions of the Scaffolding Inspection Act.

Clauses 16, 17 and 18 deal with the powers of inspectors, and give them power to enter any land with or without interpreters or members of the Police Force for the purpose of making inspections for the enforcement of the provisions of the Bill. Clause 19 empowers the making of regulations, while clauses 21

and 22 are consequential legal provisions. It has been the practice for the Government to observe the provisions of the Scaffolding Inspection Act, but it is considered that this should be made a matter of law, and accordingly provision is made in clause 20 for the Bill to bind the Crown.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DISEASES).

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from March 7. Page 3480.)

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This clause should be amended to ensure that, in future, companies exploring for petroleum will know that their claims to have gas transmitted through the pipeline will not be disregarded. The authority will comprise persons already engaged in this business and, having been in business myself, I know businessmen dislike encouraging competition. I should like it established that the pipeline is a common carrier and is not exclusive. Another clause provides a safeguard in that the authority has to convey gas only under existing contracts. I suggest to the Treasurer that consideration of clause 3 be deferred until I can get the necessary amendment prepared. I have been trying to draft this amendment for a considerable time, but the Parliamentary Draftsman has been extremely busy in another place and has not been able to give his attention to it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): If the amendment is not ready and this clause is postponed to enable that amendment to be drafted, it will not be considered until clause 19 has been passed. I do not think we should embarrass the Draftsman by asking him to get things out in such a hurry.

Consideration of clause 3 deferred.

Clause 4—"The Authority."

Mr. HEASLIP: Under this clause the taxpayer is being committed to an expenditure of up to \$35,000,000. We should be told more about this venture. Further investigations should be carried out. We should use the gas at Gidgealpa, provided that its use is

economical. If the cost of power to the consumer is to be reduced by the use of this gas, it should be used. However, we should not be called on to sign a blank cheque, as we are being asked to do in this case. After all, the taxpayer will have to pay.

Mr. Hudson: It is not a tax. The money is to be raised by loan.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know who must repay this money—the South Australian taxpayer. As elected members, we are responsible to the taxpayer. Before the money is spent, we should know on what it is being spent. We should know whether the money is to be spent wisely on an economic proposition or unwisely on an uneconomic proposition. We know that there is 800 billion cubic feet of proven gas in this field, of which 600 billion is deliverable if this pipeline is constructed. We should know the gas is there before we spend this \$35,000,000. Up to the present only about eight wells have been drilled. Since the report, another well has been drilled but instead of striking gas it is flowing water. How many more that we drill will do the same? Every well we strike like that means less gas for this pipeline to transport to industry in Adelaide. We have an estimated 600 billion cubic feet, but the report says we will need 750 billion cubic feet for economic exploitation. I understand that one agreement has been signed by the South Australian Gas Company to take this gas if it is available and if it can be brought down to Adelaide. However, if that company only is to use this gas, we cannot afford to build the pipeline. I know that no agreement has been signed between the producers and the Electricity Trust, which it is estimated will consume about 80 per cent of this gas. The pipeline would not be economical unless some agreement was reached between the producers and the trust.

We have been given rough estimates of the costs of the alternative routes for the pipeline, and apparently because a pipeline on one route is estimated to cost about \$2,500,000 less we are going to take it out into the wilderness where there will be no possibility of getting rid of any gas on the way down. The pipeline will not serve anyone on that route. The terrain over which it will pass is amongst the worst in South Australia, and roads will have to be made in order to transport the pipes there. On the other hand, the alternative route has a railway line and roads. Have these things been considered in arriving at these

estimates? I maintain that the \$2,500,000 could easily be saved because of the difference in terrain. Port Pirie and Whyalla have industries, and they have the potential for more, particularly if those industries can be supplied with cheaper fuel than the fuel they now use.

I wish I knew the life of the Gidgealpa field. We do not know that, and I think we should have a better idea than we have now before we commit the taxpayers to finding this large sum of money. This authority will build the pipeline on one side of the range or the other. If it built the pipeline on the western side, gas could be supplied to the industrial centres of the State. Why, as it has been said, does Whyalla not want this gas? The only possible reason is that the gas will be more expensive than the fuel now being used there. If we cannot bring cheaper fuel down to Adelaide, the Electricity Trust will not want it.

Mr. McKee: What makes you think Port Augusta wants it?

Mr. HEASLIP: Any industry depends on cheap fuel. We have made great progress in South Australia because we have kept costs down. We are trying to keep costs down further by getting this fuel from Gidgealpa, and if, following the expenditure of \$35,000,000, we cannot do that, such expenditure is unwarranted unless it is going to save our importing fuel from overseas.

Mr. McKee: Have you thought of what effect it might have on Leigh Creek, on the people employed on transporting coal, and on the power station itself?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am surprised to hear these comments from the honourable member. This is a national project, and something that we hope will help South Australia by giving us more industries and cheaper fuel and allowing us to compete with the Eastern States. If we could increase our industries, there would be no need to worry about employment. We would be able to carry on as we have in the last 20 years, until recently, but at present the State is in the doldrums. If this Government were big enough it would forgo any royalties to which it was entitled and pass them on to industry to help reduce the cost of the gas. If the pipeline were established along the western route companies at Whyalla could use the gas. As the cost to the consumer will decide whether this will be an economic proposition, more should be known about the project before the authority is given power to spend \$35,000,000 of taxpayers' money.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The member for Rocky River wants it both ways. He wants gas, but he complains about its cost of production. No arrangements have yet been made about costs to the producer and to the consumer. In my second reading explanation I said:

First, although all the evidence from the field points very strongly to reserves of gas well in excess of the quantities necessary to support the project, further wells must be drilled to obtain complete confirmation of adequate reserves. Secondly, firm long-term contracts as to price and quantity must be concluded between the producers and the main customers and, particularly, the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

It has been suggested that the Government has withheld information.

Mr. Millhouse: There is no doubt about it: it is not just a suggestion.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member would not know whether it was or not. The analysis dated December, 1965, given to the Mines Department by the Bechtel Corporation is, in substance, a preliminary survey. It deals with some things tentatively which, it was subsequently concluded, did not justify further follow-up at present. Some bases were amended on subsequent detailed examination. There were some items of a confidential nature, particularly on possible industrial users. The Government has no objection to making these copies available: in fact, I offered them to the Leader this afternoon for his consideration, in case he or his deputy desired to peruse these copies. I said that, if it was made available, the report would certainly injure some of the organizations named in it. I would not be a party to injuring any established organization.

The consultants and the department, after a broad analysis of the two routes, satisfied themselves that in the practical circumstances the western route offered increased costs without a significant compensating gain. In the early stages the additional costs (assuming an 18in. pipeline or thereabouts and the gas reserve of the order in sight) could not offer increased revenues, because all the gas known to be available, all of which could be handled by an 18in. pipeline, could be sold in Adelaide, without the additional cost of other diversions of the route or significant branches. Accordingly, the detailed survey was restricted to the eastern route. The department, on the basis of the Bechtel figures, estimated the additional cost of diversion to the west at about \$2,600,000.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a figure you could not give us yesterday.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Bechtel survey is going more closely into the alternative route and into eventual branch line possibilities. This is nearly finished, and it is hoped that it will be presented to Parliament before the recess.

Mr. Coumbe: What was the date of that report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This report dated December, 1965, which contained certain confidential information, was offered to the Leader of the Opposition for his perusal, but he said he did not desire it. I offered it under certain conditions, so that the Opposition could become conversant with the whole of the facts surrounding this matter. These facts have already been included in Parliamentary Paper 102, which has been laid on the table. It was submitted to the Prime Minister and was subsequently presented to this House, when it was printed for the information of members.

The Bechtel Pacific Corporation was asked to report on certain matters, and the Mines Department also reported. During April the Moomba field showed sufficient potential to be used in conjunction with the Gidgealpa field. Even though certain deposits have been proved, investigations will continue. The authority is being established under this Bill and I stress that, without this legislation, all the gas under the earth in the North will remain under the earth. A quantity of 72,000,000 cubic feet a day will be required to supply the Electricity Trust and the Gas Company. The gas will remain at Gidgealpa and Moomba until an economic proposition is submitted for its use. I realize that efforts are being made to reduce the cost of fuel oil, but I consider that these efforts are entirely due to this State's policy in developing natural gas deposits. Why should the trust rush into negotiations with Delhi-Santos until the field has been proved?

Mr. Heaslip: They aren't rushing in, are they?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Why should it rush in to negotiations with the company until the company is ready to do what I have described in the second reading explanation? The company has already undertaken to put down a number of wells to prove the field, and until those wells are put down there is no need to rush in. However, the authority must be appointed to take over and put this gas

where it can be used. It is not my responsibility that the Leader did not seize the opportunity I gave him.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes it is, because of the conditions you put on it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Whatever tag were placed on it, the member for Mitcham would never be satisfied: he would still find fault. The report concerning the linking up of fields in the Northern Territory became out-dated, because further evidence revealed that it was unnecessary to go farther afield. Any delay in delivering gas to Adelaide early in 1969 can be blamed only on the Delhi-Santos group, because the Bechtel Pacific Corporation is able to proceed immediately with engineering work, as well as drawing up the necessary specifications and tenders, etc. Whatever may be said during this debate, natural gas will not be delivered to Adelaide unless the authority is first established. Therefore, it is entirely in the hands of Parliament as to whether the scheme will be implemented. The people of South Australia will be the Government's major consideration in regard to every aspect of the venture.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): All the facts about this matter are not contained in Parliamentary Paper 102, as the Treasurer says they are. In fact, in his rather rambling speech the Treasurer has just indicated that the Bechtel Pacific Corporation is having another look at the western route. Therefore, if the organization cannot report on that matter to this place while the Bill is being debated, how can all the facts be already contained in Parliamentary Paper 102? Although the Treasurer said that the western route would involve increased costs, he did not say how much those costs would be. He merely said that a detailed survey was restricted to the eastern route. The Treasurer is either keeping the details from the public (as well as from the Commonwealth Government) or he just does not possess them. In either case, I believe he is negligent in his duty to the State.

Indeed, I thought the Treasurer's speech today was an apology for not having the information; yet we are being asked to pass the Bill without having the details at our fingertips. Unquestionably, we support the Bill's objects, and we know that for the venture to be effective we must have an authority. But, because the Government has demonstrated a reckless disregard for budgeting, we are concerned about this matter.

Mr. Casey: Stop making a political speech and speak to the Bill!

Mr. HALL: I reject the Treasurer's statement that all the facts are before us.

Mr. SHANNON: The Treasurer said two important things: first, no pipeline would be constructed until we knew that sufficient gas reserves were available; and, secondly, the authority would not proceed to build a pipeline until adequate quantities of gas had been firmly contracted for by consumers. They were the two prerequisites. However, I do not think that adequate reserves of gas will be proved before Parliament meets in the middle of the year. Indeed, I shall be surprised if another well is sunk by then. The timing of this Bill is therefore rather inappropriate. Naturally, I am all for trying to secure natural gas for our industries if it can be secured at a cost that will reduce South Australia's charges and at least keep the State on its feet. At the moment we are rocking. The eastern seaboard of the Gulf has many advantages from the point of view of markets and because of its power station. From what the Treasurer said, it is obvious that the 18in. diameter pipeline has been designed to provide for the transmission of gas from the Gidgealpa-Moomba field only. Therefore, it is obvious that this so-called common carrier will be a monopoly service for that field. If the amendment of the member for Gumeracha were carried, a larger diameter than 18in. would obviously be needed for the pipeline so that any other gas found by other companies could be transmitted over a long route. I believe the diameter of the pipeline has been carefully examined by people competent to do so.

It would be desirable to know whether other sources of gas could be found at Gidgealpa and Moomba so that the diameter of the pipeline could be fixed accordingly. It seems unwise to decide what diameter should be used when the quantity of gas available is unknown. The member for Rocky River wanted to know what royalty the Government could expect from this development.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to link up his remarks to clause 4.

Mr. SHANNON: I intend to link up my remarks to the personnel of the authority. We do not know how many companies will be interested in this gas if it can be supplied cheaply. However, the producers are to have two representatives on the authority. It is in the interests of the producers that the price paid at the well-head for the gas should be as

much as the traffic will bear. Therefore, the producers will not cut the cost to suit industry in South Australia. I have no doubt that Mr. Easley (Manager of Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited) is a prospective member of the authority, and I was not impressed by his remarks about the member for Gumeracha, for he has an axe to grind in this matter.

I do not believe this matter is urgent. The Treasurer has clearly shown that much has still to be done before the pipeline can be built. I entirely agree with the qualifications he presented as a measuring stick on when the pipeline should be started. Sir Fred Drew (Chairman of the Electricity Trust) will want to obtain fuel as cheaply as possible. The Treasurer said that fuel oil is the principal alternative source available at present. He also said that the prospect of natural gas could have some effect on the prices of other types of fuel, which could fall as similar projects for natural gas are implemented throughout Australia. I am sure the Electricity Trust and other large consumers are well aware of this fact. The trust has already entered into a favourable contract for fuel oil and, when it considers natural gas, an attractive proposition will be necessary before it will take out a contract. These matters should be decided before the pipeline is built.

The composition of the authority should be changed, as no need exists for two producer representatives on it. I understand that Delhi-Santos is one company, rather than two. Why should we give this company two representatives? If we approve of the proposal to make provision for any other successful explorer for gas to come into this field, we will be wasting our time inserting that provision. Why does the Treasurer say that the 18in. pipeline will supply Adelaide? He is not interested in the north of Spencer Gulf. A large labour factor is involved in the construction of these pipelines, but the labour content in the overall cost does not vary very much when a larger main is put in. As a supporter of exploiting the State's natural resources, I consider that this clause is premature. We do not know enough at this stage to come to a firm decision, and the Treasurer's statements this afternoon have confirmed that view.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The importance of the correct use of natural gas to this State cannot be exaggerated, although I consider the importance of this Bill has been exaggerated. This Bill, which sets up an authority, is but the first step in the process of obtaining a supply of natural gas. I direct my remarks to this

clause, which sets up the authority. The reason for the exaggeration of the importance of this measure is the great anxiety of the Treasurer to have something to be remembered by after he is gone. Much of the argument in this debate has been based on supposition. Not enough work has yet been done to provide information upon which to argue.

There is not very much information in the report that is annexed to Parliamentary Paper 102, and the feasibility and technical reports have not yet been made available. Quite frankly, the Government has not made a very good fist of this whole project, because there is such lacklustre leadership at the top. There was a good example of this during Question Time yesterday regarding the alternative routes for the pipeline. In addition to this, there is a refusal by the Government to disclose the information that is available. The question in everyone's mind is "Why?" I am suspicious that there may be some more substantial reason than mere cussedness for the concealment of information from the House. The Treasurer is wavering about a report of December, 1965. He has said that he has offered this report on confidential terms to the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It was to be made available to only two people on this side. Surely that is not a genuine offer to the Opposition and to the public. Even the member for Port Pirie could not say it was.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has said nothing in connection with clause 4, now before the Committee, but he is making remarks that might have been made on second reading. I ask the honourable member to direct his remarks to clause 4.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With very great respect, I shall. I am only answering points that have been made by the Treasurer in his remarks on this clause. Only 10 minutes ago the Treasurer referred to the report and said there was a matter in it that reflected on certain people. I think that was his phrase, and this is the point I am answering. He could have said the things he has said in Committee in his second reading explanation. There has been no real offer to make this report available. If the Treasurer considers that there is information in the report that could be damaging or defamatory to individuals, that could be excised from the report and the rest of the report could be given freely and openly to the Committee. I do not know whether that course has occurred to the Treasurer, but it is a commonsense approach.

Mr. McKEE: I take a point of order because the honourable member is not referring or confining his remarks to the clause in question. He has been told by you, Mr. Chairman, that he must confine his remarks to the clause. I cannot see anything in clause 4 which refers to the Treasurer offering information. This clause deals with the authority and the setting up of the authority.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been lenient. I do not want to curtail debate in Committee, nor have I ever wished to. Once again, I ask the honourable member to direct his remarks to the authority—clause 4.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall direct my remarks to the authority, but I point out with great deference that the Treasurer was not pulled up when he—

Mr. McKee: It will be on again!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member will remember, I came back and took the Chair while the Treasurer was speaking. I did not know what had been said earlier, and it took me a little while to pick up the threads of the debate. Although I had doubts about the remarks of the member for Onkaparinga, I let him go; but that attitude cannot be sustained throughout the debate. I am trying to be lenient, but if the honourable member cannot link his remarks to clause 4 I shall rule him out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This clause sets up the authority.

The CHAIRMAN: The powers of the authority are stated at greater length in clause 10.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They are referred to in this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Not the matters to which the honourable member has been referring.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One of the powers is to construct a pipeline on a route subject to the approval of the Minister. It is about the route that I have been speaking. Much controversy has been aroused about the route and, obviously, there is a later report than the Bechtel Corporation report, dated December, 1965. The only report the Treasurer has offered to make available to the Committee—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has said that clause 4 refers to the setting up of an authority with power to construct a pipeline, and to the route of the pipeline. If the honourable member can point to anything in clause 4 containing those references, I shall be happy to look at them, but on page 8 he will find in clause 10 the references

about which he is speaking. I insist that the honourable member direct his remarks to clause 4, because I think he is not taking this matter seriously.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I most certainly am.

The CHAIRMAN: From now on the honourable member will do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly shall. If this is your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I shall wait until clause 10 to develop my argument, but I am disappointed at not being able to answer what the Treasurer said in the debate on this clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Proceedings of the Authority."

Mr. COURCE: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "Three" and insert "Four."

This is a machinery amendment. In all constitutions a quorum is provided to allow for certain representatives who cannot be present. Members of this authority may not be present for various reasons, and it is provided that the Governor or Minister, in such an event, may appoint nominees or deputies. If deputies are appointed it will be less difficult to obtain a representative attendance at meetings. Originally, it was intended that four should form a quorum, but the Bill provides for three.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Before the figure was altered from four to three, the matter was given serious consideration. Because of various circumstances it may be difficult to obtain a quorum of four. However, I do not object to this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Remuneration of members."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

After "receive" to insert "from the funds of the Authority".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Powers and functions of the Authority".

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In subclause (2) (a) after "Governor" to insert "and unless the work proposed to be carried out in connection with the construction, reconstruction or installation of the pipeline has been inquired into by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works appointed under the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1955 (as amended) and that committee has made a report thereon to the Governor".

The main point arising from the debate is the lack of information available to Opposition members to enable them to make up their minds whether the Government should decide the pipeline route. A rather interesting sideline of this debate has been the refusal of members of the Labor Party representing Gulf towns to speak. The member for Port Pirie has consistently interjected without adding one fact to this debate but has refused to speak in support of one side or the other. Perhaps he and his colleagues realize that they have not the facts to definitely support the eastern route. This debate has raised many questions that remain unanswered. A press report of June 16, 1966, states:

Delhi Australia Petroleum Ltd. announced today that they and their Australian partner, Santos Ltd., have recently established 2.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves, of which 1.4 trillion cubic feet is saleable natural gas, based on engineering estimates from available data. The saleable gas consists of 449 billion cubic feet at Gidgealpa and 968 billion cubic feet at Moomba.

However, the recent Mines Department report states the reserves as 460 billion cubic feet and 340 billion cubic feet. We have asked what risk is involved, and the Treasurer has said that the Government is expected to make good any deficiencies. If sufficient money is not available from the public or if there is an over-estimate, the Government is expected to foot the Bill. Can we go against the advice of Parliamentary Paper 102, which says we should not begin to meet repayments before 1980? Why have we been denied this information? The Treasurer has made a second-class offer to us today. He has raised our suspicions that certain matters have been kept from the public and the Opposition. Why have these facts been kept from the Commonwealth Government? The South Australian public has paid for this report.

The Treasurer said that any detailed investigation had been restricted to the eastern route, yet he said today that a broad analysis of the whole question was made. A dissection of costs for the eastern route shows that 41.5 per cent of the total cost is involved in engineering, contingencies and installation, but such a broad analysis is not sufficient information on which to decide the route. Yesterday the member for Gumeracha read from last year's *Hansard* a report that the Electricity Trust expected fuel oil would enable the price of electricity from the Torrens Island power station to be reduced. The present price is about 22c or 23c a British thermal unit. These

matters raise grave doubts in our minds as to the economic feasibility of this pipeline.

The Opposition and the public are dissatisfied with the answers given on the important points raised. What is our redress in this matter? How can we find the answers to these questions? Perhaps the Government, which has already experienced its first financial misadventure in its first financial year of office, is again getting into trouble in its second financial year. Perhaps the Government's management attitude applies to this important question. If it does, this could place it in difficult circumstances in a short time. For several reasons, the Opposition sees no reason why it should place its trust unknowingly in the Government. The only safeguard is to let a Parliamentary committee consider and investigate this matter so that the full facts, which the Treasurer has not got or will not get, can emerge.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The amendment is not acceptable to the Government. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition still doubts whether we are prepared to make known matters that can be made known. The preliminary report came into my possession only today, and much of it has been outdated since the Moomba field came into operation. The only part of the 1965 Bechtel report to the Mines Department that was confidential was the part relating to people associated with certain industries; everything else is contained in Parliamentary Paper 102. If the Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to accept what I propose, that is not my responsibility. The only information we are hiding relates to matters which, if made public, could reflect against certain industrial organizations. I was prepared to make available to the Opposition all the rest of the information contained in reports.

The Public Works Standing Committee Act provides that no Bill may be introduced into either Chamber to authorize the construction of any public work estimated to cost more than \$200,000, or to appropriate money for expenditure on any public work estimated to cost more than \$200,000, unless the public work has first been inquired into by the Public Works Committee. A public work, according to the definition, is restricted to a work constructed out of moneys to be provided by Parliament. The Bill does not authorize the construction of any public work as defined; nor does it appropriate money for expenditure on such a work. The Bill does not appropriate money for capital purposes at

all: the only appropriation is to meet any guarantee that the Treasurer may give regarding any borrowing made by the authority.

The Bill does provide that the Treasurer may make advances by way of loan to the authority for its authorized purposes "out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose". The principal moneys, and possibly the entire capital moneys for the authority, however, are likely to be provided by the authority's own borrowing as a semi-governmental borrower, and out of funds advanced by the Commonwealth for the purpose. In accordance with section 35 of the Public Finance Act, such Commonwealth advances may be paid to the authority without further appropriation than is provided by that section. If, subsequently, in accordance with clause 14 (5) (a), the Treasurer should seek appropriation for capital funds to be advanced to the authority, this still would not require a prior investigation by and report of the Public Works Committee, for the appropriation would be for the Treasurer to make advances and not for him to expend money on a public work.

The procedures proposed to be authorized, so far as they concern the operations of the Public Works Committee, are entirely comparable with those in the appropriate legislation applying to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the South Australian Housing Trust, and the Municipal Tramways Trust. In each of these three cases the legislation, which is at present effective, was submitted by the previous Government, and no serious question has been raised by responsible members of the present Opposition suggesting that the legislation, or appropriation for advances in accordance with that legislation, either breached or improperly circumvented the Public Works Standing Committee Act. The works carried out by those authorities, whether financed out of moneys raised by the authorities themselves or from internal funds, Commonwealth advances, or advances by the Treasurer, have never been submitted to the Public Works Committee.

The authority to be set up by the Bill will be responsible for raising finance. Undoubtedly, the Government has appointed the Bechtel Pacific Corporation as its own authority to make all the necessary investigations into the scheme. But nothing would be gained by referring the matter to the Public Works Committee. When established, the authority will borrow \$20,000,000 in this State; and, indeed,

I have no doubt that it will be successful in borrowing that sum over the stipulated period. That is demonstrated by the extremely favourable response by the public to the borrowing recently undertaken by the Electricity Trust. That response has clearly indicated the extent of the public's confidence in this Government.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not think anybody seriously disputes the Treasurer's contention that there is no legal requirement to submit this matter to the Public Works Committee. Although it is at least arguable that this project comes well within the compulsory reference of a project to the committee, the Opposition is not raising that aspect. If we were, we would also have to argue the legality of introducing the Bill at this stage, without the reference having been made. However, the Government is seriously involved in the scheme's financial arrangements. As the Prime Minister's letter to the Treasurer clearly states, the State Treasury is obliged to underwrite the whole of this undertaking.

It also states that the Commonwealth expects (and this is implicit in the financial arrangement) that the State will meet any short-fall in either borrowing or revenues. The State, therefore, assumes the responsibility of underwriting the whole project. Consequently, I believe that no reason need be advanced for referring the matter to the Public Works Committee. Equally important, the public of South Australia have long come to regard the Public Works Committee as adequately fulfilling its role as the watchdog over Government expenditure on projects of such magnitude as this scheme. It has a reputation for thorough investigation, political impartiality, and promptitude in coming to conclusions. In my experience, its conclusions have not been challenged in this House. The committee enjoys the confidence of the business and industrial communities of the State and has engendered in every Government department with which it has dealt a desire to give ready support. I have never heard criticism of the committee's efficiency and thoroughness.

There are unusual aspects of the proposal, because the reserves are uncertain and we know little of such projects as this. The Treasurer said he was confident that the \$20,000,000 would be readily subscribed because the latest loan offered by the Electricity Trust had been over-subscribed. However, the trust's loans always have been over-subscribed, even when loans by similar authorities in other States have been under-subscribed, so there is no analogy.

Reference to the committee will establish whether the project is soundly based and whether it will appeal to the investing public. No time will be lost, because the work that has to be done before the project can go ahead can be going on while the committee is considering the matter.

Although the committee comprises Government and Opposition members, its members, regardless of political affiliations, approach matters with a completely non-political attitude and base their findings on the merits. I hope the Treasurer is not opposing the amendment purely because it has been moved by the Opposition. We are not arguing that the Government is obliged to refer the matter to the Public Works Committee, but we contend that the good offices of the committee should be used to give the public the confidence necessary to encourage them to support the project.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I strongly support the amendment, and everything that has been said by the Treasurer has confirmed me in my support. I think the Treasurer missed the point when he referred, in the report that he read out, to the functions of the Public Works Committee. The Opposition does not suggest that this project comes within the purview of the committee as the Bill is now drawn and it does not suggest that this is just another reference to it. We say that, because of the uncertainty of this project and because so little is known about it, it should not be allowed to go on without proper Parliamentary scrutiny. The most appropriate body to scrutinize the matter on behalf of Parliament (because it is obviously impossible for both Houses to do the detailed work) is the Public Works Committee. That is why we desire to make special provision in the Bill for a reference to that committee. Whether the Treasurer does not understand it or whether he is deliberately avoiding understanding it I do not know, but that is the position. As this is a big project for South Australia, it is extremely important that it be handled properly, and we, as members of Parliament, have to be certain that it is handled properly. I have no confidence at all in the way this project has been handled up to date but I do have confidence in the way the Public Works Committee tackles its job and reports to Parliament. Provision is made in this amendment for the committee to report to the Governor so that it will not be necessary for Parliament to be sitting when it makes its report. I believe that members on

both sides of the Chamber could estimate the time this investigation would take.

The reserves of the Gidgealpa-Moomba field have not yet been proved. The estimate I have been given is that it will take between four and six months at least to prove the reserves. Until they are proved it is not possible to come to a firm conclusion on two vital matters: first, the route the pipeline should take (whether the eastern direct route or the western route to feed the Gulf towns), which cannot be decided until the reserves are known; and secondly, the size of the pipeline. Parliamentary Paper 102 states that the size opted for the initial construction is an 18in. diameter pipeline. The report has nothing in it to support 18in. rather than 22in., 30in., or 10in. I do not know the reasoning behind this decision and, in any case, this matter cannot be finally decided until the reserves are known. The size of the pipeline must take priority even over the route, because before work can commence at all the size of the pipes must be known so that they can be ordered. At least, if the route were subsequently altered, more or less pipes could be ordered, but until the size of the pipe is known the project cannot be commenced. There is plenty of time, without holding up the project at all, for the Public Works Committee to examine this matter on behalf of Parliament.

The Treasurer said that the only information he possessed that had not yet been disclosed to members was a Bechtel Pacific Corporation report dated December, 1965. It is extraordinary for the Treasurer of this State—the Minister in charge of this extremely important project for South Australia—to tell the Committee that it was only today or yesterday that he was given a report dated December, 1965, and that the report is already out of date. This merely confirms the suspicions and fears I have had about his capacity to conduct the affairs of this State, particularly in relation to this project. What he has said today confirms that somebody else should examine this matter and have the responsibility for it besides the honourable gentleman who leads the Government. The Treasurer said this report was the only other information the Government possessed. Frankly, I cannot accept that; I cannot believe there is not more information. If we assume that no more information than that is available, then that is confirmation of the fact that far more must be known before any decisions can be made in this matter; it is confirmation of the

wisdom of the amendment that the matter should be considered by a body capable and experienced in making investigations of projects.

I cannot accept that there is no further information. Parliamentary Paper 102 has annexed to it the Bechtel report. At page 11 appears a map showing the direct eastern route of the pipeline which is as near as possible to a direct line from Moomba to the gates of Adelaide. The little brochure distributed to us only a week or so ago contains a similar map showing both pipeline routes. In relation to the eastern route, it is the same as Parliamentary Paper 102 but it also shows the alternative route which establishes that somebody must have done some work on this matter.

Mr. Nankivell: When was that submitted?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only date I can see is November 23, 1966, which is some time after Parliamentary Paper 102 was issued in September. Therefore, obviously more information is available, otherwise the alternative route would not have been drawn. Yet the Treasurer had the gall to say that no information was available other than the puffing report of December, 1965. Proper handling of this project is of supreme importance to the economy of South Australia. The State can be ruined if the project goes awry, resulting in financial disaster instead of success. The future of the State is at stake in this matter.

Mr. Hall: At least development would be retarded.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and heaven knows that development is needed badly enough at this stage. I hope that, even though this is an Opposition amendment and would mean a delay in the Treasurer's ambitions to get the Bill through and to get something apparently definite, the amendment will be accepted. We know that the Treasurer is pathetically anxious to have something to be remembered by when he goes out of office in a few months time, his Party replacing him with another Leader. I think he is afraid that the amendment could mean some delay in this matter. However, I have already shown that there will be no hold-up.

Mr. Quirke: What is the urgency?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the present circumstances, there can be no urgency because nothing can be done until reserves are proved. I hope the Treasurer will not oppose the amendment and that his Party will see that it is to the benefit of the whole State. I support the amendment as strongly as I can.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I, too, support this amendment. As the member who has just resumed his seat has stated, there is much uncertainty associated with this project. In particular, we do not know definitely at this stage whether there are sufficient reserves to make this an economic project. Parliamentary Paper 102 states that the reserves amount to 600 billion cubic feet, whereas at least 750 billion cubic feet of gas would have to be established before this could become an economic proposition. The report states that as a result of further drilling the deliverability of at least 750 billion cubic feet should be reached by January, 1967. January, 1967, has passed, and that amount of gas has not yet been established. Although further drilling has been taking place, the Moomba No. 3 well was recently stated to be a failure: no further reserves were established there. So at present we have not the quantity of gas necessary to make this an economic proposition.

The Public Works Committee should investigate the entire project in order to ascertain whether, in view of the quantity of gas there, the project is at this stage ready to be proceeded with. Also that committee could inquire into the relative costs of the two routes mentioned—the direct route and the alternative route via Port Pirie and Port Augusta. The Public Works Committee has in previous years been responsible for saving a considerable amount of money in connection with various public projects. The Treasurer said a few moments ago that it was not necessary to refer this particular project to the Public Works Committee. That may be so; we do not dispute his contention, but I remind him that the Leigh Creek coalfield project was before this Chamber in 1942. Legislation was then introduced to set up an authority for the development of that field. What happened at that time? It was not necessary to refer that project to the Public Works Committee, because it was certified to be urgently necessary in connection with the prosecution of the war. At that time, in 1942, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. R. S. Richards) stated in his second reading speech:

Quite frankly, I do not like the terms "probable", "if", and "but" in a proposition involving £200,000 expenditure. This point, I think, should be cleared up definitely before we are asked to sanction such a huge amount. It is true that we have a certificate from the Premier declaring this to be a war-time necessity and therefore placing it outside the scope of the Public Works Standing Committee Act.

This project, too, is full of "buts" and "ifs" and uncertainty, and the amount of money involved is not £200,000: it is \$35,000,000,

considerably more than was involved in getting the Leigh Creek coalfield project commenced in 1942. But who was so vociferous, back in 1942 when that legislation was introduced, in his demand for investigation by the Public Works Committee? It was the present Treasurer (Mr. Walsh, as he then was). What did he say on that occasion? At page 829 of *Hansard*, on October 13, 1942, the then member for Goodwood, the present Treasurer, said:

The thought uppermost in the minds of many members, particularly since the Leader of the Opposition's speech, is whether it is desirable for the Public Works Standing Committee to take a hand before the Government is committed to the expenditure of £200,000 at the outset.

He went on to say:

The Public Works Standing Committee is competent to gather the necessary information for us, and although we all agree that it is desirable to develop this field, it is also desirable that we should proceed with due caution. Some members seem to think that time is the essence of the contract but, in view of the well-known uncertainty of mining ventures the world over, we have no guarantee that this scheme will not prove a failure, although I am prepared to admit that the boring tests indicate that the Leigh Creek field is a very promising proposition.

On the next page, he went on to say:

The committee might be able to show that the Premier's estimated figures can be improved on.

I suggest that the committee that we suggest should investigate this proposition of the gas field may be able to say the same.

Mr. Millhouse: Who said this?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The present Treasurer. He said later:

I am not prepared to accept one authority on a question involving an expenditure of £200,000 at the outset, with unknown further sums before it is completed. . . . Before taking the final plunge we should at least have the benefit of evidence which could be obtained by the Public Works Standing Committee.

In due course, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. R. S. Richards) moved that the matter be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. As I have said, in his proposal that an investigation be made by that committee, he was vociferously supported by the present Treasurer, the then member for Goodwood. Bearing that in mind and the other statements made by my Leader and other speakers on this side of the Committee, I support the arguments in favour of a reference to the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. HUDSON: I oppose this amendment. I say at the outset that, if the member for Mitcham was not governed by such a degree of personal animosity towards the present Treasurer—

Mr. Millhouse: Absolute nonsense!

Mr. HUDSON: —he might be able to display more logic. I refer him and the member for Angas to the able speech made before and after dinner yesterday by the member for Torrens, excluding the last five minutes of it.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. HUDSON: Prior to the adjournment I was commenting on the speech made by the honourable member for Torrens yesterday, and pointed out that it was a very capable speech indeed. The honourable member for Torrens displayed—

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that it is not in order to discuss in Committee the debates in the second reading.

Mr. HUDSON: I stand corrected. If honourable members of the Opposition had used the information which has been made available to them in the proper manner and had digested that information, then they would have seen that the amendment that has now been moved involves a waste of time. It has been demonstrated from their own side that the information that has already been made available is sufficient for a capable honourable member to ascertain the economic viability of this proposal. I now deal with the honourable member for Angas's points. In October, 1942, the member for Edwardstown, now the Treasurer, supported a reference of the Leigh Creek Coal Bill to the Public Works Committee. This shows how much the Treasurer has been able to learn from experience, and I wonder whether the member for Gumeracha has learned from experience, because if we go back to that debate we find that the then Treasurer had this to say:

I am strongly opposed to the suggestion that the question be referred to the Public Works Committee.

The honourable member for Mitcham should take account of this, because this answers in another context the entire argument that he made. I use the words that the member for Gumeracha used when Treasurer in 1942. He said:

I believe that the Government had the entire support of the Opposition that the pipeline should be constructed. Mr. Stephens says that if this matter is inquired into we shall probably be able to undertake it on a very much sounder basis. I entirely agree. If we could take our time and systematically bore over this field until we had full information as to where the coal lies and the nature of the overburden we

could undertake development much more economically and make a much better job of it. By that time we would be able to secure the ideal machinery for shifting the overburden, but 10 years' boring would be necessary to give us that knowledge.

How far do you go in inquiring into a particular project before deciding whether it is necessary to go ahead? The member for Gumeracha, when Treasurer in 1942, recognized that there comes a point when, on the information that is available, the Government has to decide to go ahead and make a start on a particular project. The Parliamentary Paper that has been read to Parliament, and members opposite have made use of it (some have misused it) makes it clear that this pipeline project is an economically viable project. Parliamentary Paper 102 states:

The combined reserves accordingly are established at 800 billion cubic feet, with probable reserves of about 1,440 billion cubic feet in all. The estimated economic deliverability of such reserve is conservatively estimated to be at least three-quarters of the reserves or, say, 600 billion cubic feet established and 1,100 billion cubic feet probable reserves.

Later, the report states:

Whilst the availability of 600 billion cubic feet of deliverable reserves is almost certainly adequate for a viable project, it does appear that to give complete assurance of economic exploitation all planning should be based upon the deliverability of at least 750 billion cubic feet of gas.

The Government acted on this report and its case to the Commonwealth Government was based on it. The Commonwealth Government accepted it, not without some inquiry into the feasibility of the project. Surely, the member for Mitcham is prepared to trust some of his colleagues in Canberra? Let us examine the argument that the size of the pipeline and the route to be taken cannot be known until reserves are known. The honourable member will have us here until doomsday if we follow that line.

Mr. Millhouse: That is nonsense.

Mr. Shannon: Your Leader said that very thing this afternoon.

Mr. HUDSON: An economically viable proposition has been established.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you serious?

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member cannot work out the information that has been supplied, he should let the member for Torrens take him by the hand gently and lead him through the basic economics of this project. An economically viable proposition would be established with 600 billion cubic feet, yet a member and even the Chairman of the Public

Works Committee, do not know that there is an economically viable proposition here, having regard to the information supplied to them. The Leader of the Opposition said it was essential that the whole matter should be considered by an expert committee, and he wanted it referred to the Public Works Committee. Is that an expert committee! The only reason for this amendment is that certain Opposition members want to play politics. The Opposition thinks the matter should be referred to the Public Works Committee where there is a majority of their members represented and their own member, the honourable member for Onkaparinga, is the Chairman.

Mr. Shannon: That is what you would do if you were in that position.

Mr. HUDSON: I can judge the performance of the honourable member for Onkaparinga only by the standard of his interjections during the debate. If his interjections have not displayed partiality in relation to this debate, I do not know what displays partiality or prejudice.

Mr. Shannon: You are an artist on that score.

Mr. HUDSON: I listened very carefully to the interjections made by the honourable member yesterday. If I had any thoughts that the Public Works Committee might be able to do a useful job on this matter I would completely oppose such a move after hearing what has gone on here. The main point has already been established in the report submitted to the Commonwealth Government. Do members opposite really believe the Commonwealth Government would give the green light for this project if it thought it was not economically viable?

It is demonstrated, not spelt out, but it is evident from the Parliamentary Paper that the project can cover its cost and be fully amortized even if only 600 billion cubic feet of gas can be delivered. The Electricity Trust, which is a bulk buyer and an organization that is able to obtain alternative fuels on the most economical terms, can purchase fuel for 26c or 27c for each 1,000 cubic feet, which is the best commercial price at which fuel for making power is currently obtainable in Adelaide. The Gas Company does worse than that and it is demonstrable that the producing companies have a viable proposition, when gas can be delivered to Adelaide at a price less than 26c or 27c a thousand cubic feet. Do honourable members opposite really suggest that it is a reasonable proposition to refer

the whole matter to the Public Works Committee, and to take the chances of excessive delay?

Mr. McKee: What purpose would they have in delaying this?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know. I think they have only put this proposition forward because they know it cannot be accepted. I am sure the Opposition's colleagues in another place would never contemplate such a proposition, because they could force it through. The only thing the Opposition can find to give itself a feather to fly with is a lot of humbug about an alternative route and "Let's refer the whole matter to the Public Works Committee," so that its Chairman can take each individual member of the committee mile by mile over the alternative route and meet all the constituents on the way.

Mr. Shannon: Are you suggesting that the members of the Public Works Committee can be led by the nose?

Mr. HUDSON: I am not saying that, but the member for Onkaparinga knows full well that the Government is in a minority on the Public Works Committee. Can the honourable member suggest that the member for Gumeracha would have been party to referring any project, in which he, when Premier, was interested, to a committee on which his Government did not have a majority? The honourable member must be joking if he thinks that. Even the member for Gumeracha does not think that. He wants an investigation; in fact, he still has a motion on the Notice Paper in relation to referring the matter to a Select Committee—not to the Public Works Committee. If the Opposition wished to be consistent with its previous stand on this matter, at least we would have expected a motion before us to refer the project to a Select Committee.

Mr. Shannon: With the member for Glenelg as Chairman! He would be impartial!

Mr. HUDSON: I am not suggesting for a moment that I should be the Chairman or even a member of the committee. If the Opposition wished to be consistent with its previous attitude and wished to suggest something that it thought would have a chance of success, it would have adhered to the suggestion expressed by the member for Gumeracha, namely, that this project should be inquired into by a Select Committee, such a committee normally comprising five members (three Government members and two Opposition members). I think enough has already been said to show that

members opposite would never have contemplated moving this amendment if they thought it had any chance of success.

Mr. Heaslip: Why not?

Mr. HUDSON: Because they know as well as I know that, if the previous Government had been in power and the Opposition had put up this sort of suggestion, it would have been thrown out completely. All the members opposite who are committed by their Party caucus to support this amendment would have been voting the other way.

Mr. McAnaney: Where did you find the "caucus"?

Mr. HUDSON: Members opposite "caused" this morning. In fact, their colleagues in Canberra refer to their Party meetings as caucus. We realize that members opposite are more refined and do not care to use the word. However, "caucus" has a generic meaning, and members opposite "caucus" just as much as we on this side of the Chamber do.

I hope the Opposition will not persist with the amendment and that it will see that the public is not particularly impressed with it. The people, generally, are satisfied that the project should proceed with all possible haste. If it were not for the fact that certain members of the Opposition desired to obtain some political advantage through this, they would never have bothered about moving the amendment.

Mrs. STEELE: I think it comes as a surprise to members of the Government Party to find that, in principle, members of the Opposition have supported this Bill. I say "in principle" because it is evident to everyone in South Australia that the provision of a pipeline to bring gas from the fields that have been established at Gidgealpa and Moomba will mean much to the economic development of the State.

However, the Leader of the Opposition has moved this amendment because we on this side are convinced that there are so many facets of the proposition put forward by the Government which are extremely doubtful that we consider the matter needs to be referred to an expert committee (and I say "expert" advisedly) for further investigation. Honourable members know that we have not suggested that the matter be referred to a Select Committee. We appreciate that that would take much more time and that the committee would not be expert in investigating the sort of proposition involved in the Bill. However, we are confident that the Public Works Committee has the experience and knowledge necessary and the

opportunity to call on expert people to give evidence that will resolve some of the doubts that are occupying the minds of members on this side at present.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: And the public.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. Members of the public to whom Opposition members have spoken have expressed disquiet on certain aspects of the legislation. Many matters are completely unresolved and this Bill is one of the vaguest ever introduced. Many of the comments made by the Treasurer in his explanation of the Bill bear out the feelings of doubt that we have about the legislation. First, taking the explanation given by the Treasurer—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I again point out that an honourable member is out of order in referring to the second reading debate.

Mrs. STEELE: All right, Mr. Chairman. Regarding borrowings (and I understand that all such matters as this would be looked at by the committee), the Treasurer admitted that these were not as favourable as the Government would have liked them to be. After referring to the development of pipelines in other States, he said:

However, being first in the field, South Australia has made history in this regard. He was referring to the introduction of legislation for the provision of a pipeline to bring natural gas to Adelaide. I refer honourable members to Parliamentary Paper 102, which I assume was prepared with the advice of officers of the Mines Department, and refer particularly to the portion relating to natural gas supplies, in which this is reported:

The estimated economic deliverability of such reserves is conservatively estimated to be at least three-quarters of the reserves . . . It was stated earlier in the report that the combined reserves were established at 800 billion cubic feet, being the total of an established reserve of about 340 billion cubic feet and the probability that about 460 billion cubic feet of additional reserves would be established by drilling further wells. Deliverability is conservatively estimated to be at least three-quarters of the reserves or, say, 600 billion cubic feet established and 1,100 billion cubic feet probable reserves. However, the document prepared by officers of the Mines Department entitled *Natural Gas*, copies of which were sent to all honourable members, contains the statement that the probable reserves are 1,440 billion cubic feet, or about 300 billion cubic feet more than the figure mentioned in the Parliamentary Paper.

Mr. Hudson: You have that wrong.

Mrs. STEELE: I am quoting this from the pamphlet *Natural Gas* produced by the Mines Department.

Mr. Hudson: In the Parliamentary Paper, in the sentence before the part you quoted, the figure of 1,400 billion cubic feet is given.

Mrs. STEELE: If honourable members read what I have quoted they will find that, between the figures produced by the Mines Department in a pamphlet sent to members of Parliament and the figures in Parliamentary Paper 102 (which was the case presented to the Prime Minister), there is a difference of about 300 billion cubic feet in the stated reserves. Which is correct? Surely the two official documents should be identical. Because of the doubt caused by this difference, I think we are justified in saying the matter should be investigated. Parliamentary Paper 102 also states that the stage of proving the availability of gas on these two fields should have been completed by January, 1967. As the member for Angas said, January, 1967, is long past and we still have not heard whether the recommended reserves have been obtained or whether the economic operating level of 750 billion cubic feet has been reached. Therefore, this is a further reason why the matter should be referred for investigation to a committee.

Another reason why we believe the matter should be referred to the Public Works Committee is to enable the economic advantages of the eastern and western routes to be compared. The pamphlet prepared by the Mines Department contains a map showing the alternative routes for the pipeline, one of which passes through the Spencer Gulf ports, including Whyalla. There is not much difference in the length of the two routes, and we still have no proper estimate of what it would cost to have the pipeline directed through the Spencer Gulf ports. I point out that, had Gidgealpa and Moomba been another 50 miles away from Adelaide, there would have been no quibbling whatever about the extra cost that would be involved in piping the gas to Adelaide; yet we are denied the opportunity to have an expert committee investigate whether the western route would prove as economical as the eastern route.

Much has been said by members opposite about decentralization. Government and Opposition members agree that the pipeline will bring great economic development to South Australia, yet the Government, which claims to be dedicated to decentralization, is by-passing parts of the State with great industrial potential. That is another reason why the

matter should be examined by an expert committee. As the member for Rocky River said, the direct route has not yet been completely surveyed and geographical difficulties have to be overcome. Obstacles will be found on that route requiring engineering skill to surmount. The eastern route will be remote from any existing form of transport that would help to resolve some of the costs involved in the building of a pipeline; whereas, if the pipeline goes by the western route, it will be fairly close to the main railway line and for that reason stores and supplies will be easily transported, a feature obviously missing if the eastern route is followed.

Another thing that hinges on the size of the field is the diameter of the pipeline itself. If honourable members take the trouble to think about public works and how they are planned for future development, they will know that in many instances the planners try to estimate in advance the needs in a few years' time. Often, we think we provide for these sorts of things, and then we find that by the time the public utility comes into operation it is too small. Depending on the size of the field, too, and as far as the diameter of the pipeline itself is concerned, if, as we all believe, there are greater reserves in the northern part of South Australia than at present have been substantiated, it is possible we shall need a bigger pipeline than we are contemplating at the moment—it was recommended that we have a 20in. pipeline, whereas the project provides for an 18in. pipeline. Costs are rising all the time, and it could be that, if in the future the 18in. pipeline needs to be duplicated, the undertaking will be extremely costly. Most of the other points I wish to make on this amendment have been amply covered by other far more able speakers than I. I support the amendment and ask the Committee to accept it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In addressing himself to this amendment a few moments ago, the Treasurer dealt almost exclusively with the legal position. He read from a document indicating that this was not a proposition that would have to be referred to the Public Works Committee. Whether or not this is a public work within the meaning of the Public Works Committee Act is open to argument, but I believe there are firm grounds for some investigation being undertaken into this matter. Most of the responsibility for the position in which the Committee finds itself today arises from statements made by the Treasurer, because time and time again

he is making statements that on examination do not accord with fact. Undoubtedly, he is denying this Chamber relevant information, purchased with Government money, that should be available to us all.

The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) a few moments ago went back to *Hansard* of 1940 to get something to talk about. Let me tell the honourable member, as he has raised the question of the Leigh Creek coalfield, where the two projects are not analogous. In the first place the amount of money proposed to be spent on the Leigh Creek project was £200,000, which was provided by a surplus which I, as Treasurer, had accrued in revenue in the previous year. The whole undertaking (and this is something that the honourable member has completely overlooked) was covered by a National Security Regulation because of the war. The demand for coal was so urgent that a National Security Regulation under the Defence Act had been passed to authorize this work to be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: And Parliament was given all the necessary information about that project.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Bechtel report is a public document. The action the Treasurer has taken in denying Parliament an opportunity to study the document proves that there is something in it that the Government does not want the Opposition to see. This project involves the expenditure of \$35,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, but what does the Treasurer do? He goes to two members of the Opposition and says, "You can have a look at this, provided you do not show it to the other members of the Party and do not use the contents of it." Was there ever a more insolent offer made to an Opposition? Can the Treasurer say where, in all of his experience in Parliamentary affairs, he can find a similar offer made to an Opposition on a matter as important as this one? Honourable members opposite can take all of the credit for the gas pipeline; I am not very concerned about that. For many years the Government that I was privileged to lead worked very hard to find fuel, which is so necessary for the industry of this State. We examined every brown coal deposit in the State. We spent enormous sums of money. We passed the Petroleum Bill, which led to the establishment of companies which would never have carried out explorations under the old Mining Act. We established seismic teams and

built roads and we spent a tremendous amount of public money to foster this activity.

I have the utmost confidence that this activity will be in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I support the legislation, but that does not mean that there are not alternative ways of doing the job. In the past a study by a competent committee has frequently saved the taxpayer a considerable sum without delaying a necessary project. Unfortunately, the supply of gas on the field has not been proved. After two wells were sunk in the Moomba area the plant moved into Queensland with the knowledge of the Government, and recently recommenced drilling operations when the Treasurer applied to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance. However, the first hole since the drilling recommenced proved unsatisfactory, and served to cast a doubt on previous estimates.

Last year the Treasurer said that the Electricity Trust would not be ready to use gas until 1971. I believe the gas in large quantities is available in this field, but the Treasurer properly agreed that the project should not proceed until the doubt about the capacity had been resolved and that the Government was satisfied sufficient gas was available to justify the expenditure. It will take at least six months to do that, because at present one plant only is spasmodically testing for gas, having, to some extent, reverted to the original intention of its exploring for oil. Should the Moomba field not be satisfactory I believe that there are other fields in this area. The fact that the Public Works Committee may examine one or two things in connection with this matter will not delay the actual work on the field. At any rate, there would have to be at least six months' deliberation before the project could be embarked on.

What would the Public Works Committee want to examine? The consultants who were brought from America at great cost by the Delhi-Santos group ruled out the eastern route on several grounds and were going to bring the pipeline down by the western route. A 20in. pipe was to be used, there was to be one booster station, and the gas was to be conveyed at 1,000 lb. initial pressure. When the pressure fell to 700 lb. the booster would lift it back to 1,000 lb. From memory, it had a commencing capacity of over 1,000,000 cubic feet a day with one booster station. The cost at that time was about \$36,000,000. The proposed route had one or two advantages over the eastern route: it lent itself more readily to be connected with the reserves already

established in the centre of Australia at Mereenie and Palm Valley. The western route also lent itself to a spur connection from those two places, whereas the eastern route did not.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It does.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It would serve substantial population centres in the Gulf towns of this State, and I believe every member would like to see that. We have large industries at Port Pirie.

Mr. McKee: Have you an idea of the demand at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes; the demand in the Gulf towns was the subject of the report to which I have referred. The figures were presented after an investigation, made by the authorities in Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie, into the demand that existed there. Although I forget the figures, I know that it was stated to be a useful demand. The member for Port Pirie may shake his head but the fact remains that it was a useful demand that would undoubtedly have been in the interests of Port Pirie.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: By whom was the demand in Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited was one organization.

Mr. McKee: Do you know how much it wants?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope we are not living in a static community for, if we are content with conditions as they are, the State will not progress. I refer now to a project which could be encompassed within the resources of this State and which certainly would require an enormous quantity of natural gas if the scheme were implemented. Prior to the discovery of high-grade ore that led to the agreement in respect of the steel industry, the Mines Department's drilling programme established that several thousand million tons of jaspilite ore, of exactly the same quality as the ore used in an American industry, existed in the Middleback ranges.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That was established years before by departmental geologists.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall use the word "confirmed" instead of "established". A joint programme between the Mines Department and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited established that it was possible to up-grade that ore, by means of a heat treatment, to make it a good quality fuel.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! The amendment to which the member for Gumeracha is speaking relates to referring this matter to the Public Works Committee, not to iron ore.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If we are content to be static we do not need an inquiry but, if we are going to progress with the times, I point out that an enormous overseas market exists for iron ore. The gas that has been discovered would be suitable for that purpose. I believe that the project to which I have referred should be examined in connection with the Bill. Why is the Government so anxious to deny members information? The Committee agrees that it is desirable to have a natural gas pipeline and that the responsibility of financing it should be undertaken. Notwithstanding the Treasurer's public statement that he has made copies of the Bechtel report available to honourable members, the report is not available to us, although proper requests have been made by the Opposition. I assume that honourable members opposite have not copies of the report, unless a privilege to which they are not entitled has been extended to them. We are relying for a decision on five Ministers, four of whom are otherwise keenly absorbed in departmental work. I would have thought that Ministers would welcome someone else examining this in order to confirm the Government's decisions. I support the amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am disappointed at the Government's decision to reject the amendment. All members of the Committee agree that natural gas should be made available, provided that is done on an economic basis. If the Government accepted the amendment, the people would have confidence in the project. However, we are not going to refer to the committee a project that will cost about \$35,000,000, yet the Government refers other projects that are estimated to cost little more than \$200,000. Why is the Government afraid to refer this proposal? Over the years, as a result of the investigations of the Public Works Committee, the Government has been saved millions of dollars. In this case, any reduction in the cost of fuel brought about by the committee's investigations would mean increased employment. On the other hand, the people of the State will have to pay for any mistakes made in this matter. The Treasurer said that the fact that the Electricity Trust loan was over-subscribed within a few hours was evidence of the con-

fidence of the people in the economy, but that is not so: confidence has never been lower. Under the heading "Natural Gas Pipeline Route Seems Certain to go East", an article in the Port Augusta *Transcontinental* states:

Let us be frank: there is no demand at Whyalla, Port Pirie, or Port Augusta for natural gas, and the Government leans to the shorter route to pipe gas to Adelaide. This was stated at Port Pirie by Mines Minister, Mr. S. C. Bevan, when speaking to a meeting of civic and commercial representatives from Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Wallaroo.

I want to know why there is no demand for gas in those localities.

Mr. McKee: Don't you know the reason? It is that there is cheap fuel there now from Leigh Creek, and you know it.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, with a limited life. This project on which the Government will spend \$35,000,000 will make the gas too expensive for those people to use. Yet, without proper investigation, the Government intends spending that huge sum of money. It is improper to spend taxpayers' money before a proper investigation is made. Evidently, the member for Port Pirie does not want gas.

Mr. McKee: I have been assured that we shall get it at Port Pirie.

Mr. HEASLIP: Not on the way down if this alternative route is not used. I refer the member to his own paper.

Mr. McKee: You have been misinformed by reading the paper.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course, the honourable member is right and the paper is wrong!

Mr. R. Varcoe and the vice-president, Mr. W. C. Beerworth, were both disappointed with the conference.

Mr. Varcoe had this to say:

In Canberra, the Federal Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, stated that, in his opinion, the Port Augusta route seemed to be the sensible one. Mr. Bevan admitted at Port Pirie that neither the direct route through Peterborough nor the Port Augusta route had been completely surveyed.

This is one of the things the Opposition wants to have investigated and I am sure the taxpayers of South Australia do, too, because their money is involved. The article continues:

Nevertheless, the South Australian Government, without reference to its own Public Works Committee, had previously indicated that it favoured the Peterborough route.

Why? These are the things we want to know. There is no reason why the people of South Australia should not know them. The local member does not want gas at Port Pirie.

Mr. McKee: I did not say that. I have been assured that I shall get gas there.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Whyalla is supporting the eastern route.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: How do you know?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am sure that, if this gas is made cheap enough, then there will be demand throughout all the industrial areas on Spencer Gulf. Decentralization is one of the Government's planks, yet the only thing the Government wants is gas for Adelaide. If the commodity is cheap enough it will be used.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: But it would not be cheap enough, according to you.

Mr. HEASLIP: Most of the statements made in the press and over television by the Treasurer have been most misleading. On March 4, the Treasurer said that gas had to be brought from Gidgealpa and Moomba to the consumer in the most direct way. Evidently Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla have no consumers; the gas must go straight to Adelaide. This is centralization in its worst form. The Treasurer said that the Government had not the time, the money or the materials for the pipeline to go by some other route around Port Augusta. If the Government is to spend \$35,000,000, it must ensure that it is spent wisely. I cannot understand why the Government will not accept the amendment, which will not cost it anything but will give confidence to the Opposition and to the people of the State.

Mr. McKEE: I oppose the amendment, because I consider that it is only a political display by members opposite who, if it is carried, will be the most surprised people in this Chamber. The member for Rocky River said that the Government must be careful when spending taxpayers' money, and I, as a taxpayer, agree. The authority will be responsible to spend money and to deliver gas to the Adelaide market as economically as possible, and its duty will be to safeguard the taxpayers' money.

The Leader of the Opposition complained about not being given information, but Opposition members made lengthy speeches, and the Government cannot be held responsible if these members received incorrect information from outside sources. No practical reason has been advanced by the Opposition for the western route. It is unfortunate, but no demand for gas exists in the area covered by the western route, and none of the Opposition experts can show how a demand can be created. Of the three major centres of the Spencer Gulf area the heaviest demand would come from Port Pirie, but it was stated by the Assistant Manager of the Broken Hill Associated

Smelters, at the conference held in Port Pirie, that his company would require only 1,500,000 cubic feet a day. Experts have advised that at least 6,000,000 cubic feet a day has to be used for it to be an economic proposition. Companies at Whyalla have indicated that they are not interested.

Mr. Heaslip: Because it is too expensive.

Mr. McKEE: An industry cannot be forced to use natural gas. The Electricity Trust and the Gas Company want it, but they are the only large consumers of this type of gas.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Companies at Whyalla can use gas from the blast furnaces.

Mr. McKEE: Members opposite claim that the most important consideration is decentralization. Decentralization is a problem that has worried me for years, but we must also consider what effect this will have on existing industry. I understand that at least 1,000 people are doing a useful job on the field at Leigh Creek, supplying cheap fuel for the Port Augusta power station. Many railway employees are engaged in transporting coal from Leigh Creek to the power station, and 60 or 70 men are employed at the power station. If natural gas were connected to the power station (which the Treasurer said could not be done) six men could operate it.

Mr. Heaslip: But it cannot be done!

Mr. McKEE: What would happen to Leigh Creek?

Mr. Heaslip: You could not do it!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the member for Rocky River should pay the member for Port Pirie the courtesy of listening to him.

Mr. McKEE: If natural gas went to Port Augusta, another industry would need to be set up there to offset the unemployment that would be caused. I understand a claim has been made for the pipeline to go to Port Augusta because it is considered that natural gas could be exported from Port Augusta. A sizeable industry at Port Augusta would be needed to consume 6,000,000 cubic feet per day, in order to make it a paying proposition. Obviously the exporting of frozen gas has been considered. If this were done, who would benefit? A large industry would not be needed to treat gas in this way, so the South Australian public would not benefit from the cheap fuel that could be derived from it.

Mr. Hall: If Port Pirie does not require it, why is Peterborough already making plans to use gas?

Mr. McKEE: I have not heard about that, but I suppose it could be used for cigarette lighters or to pump beer in the hotels there. Indeed, I could not think of any other reason why gas would be used at Peterborough. The Leader has made statements to the press that are detrimental to the State's development. If he had stopped to think about those statements, he would have realized that he would be better employed by supporting the Treasurer, that is, by influencing the Commonwealth Treasurer, in order to assist in financing this project. However, I have not noticed one attempt on the Leader's part to support the Treasurer in this respect. In fact, members opposite were hoping that we would not obtain the necessary finance.

The latest attempt by the Opposition to thwart the Government's efforts in this respect came from the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) in his capacity as Chairman of the Public Works Committee. However, I doubt whether the honourable member was speaking on behalf of all the members of that committee when he made his recent statement to the press concerning the pipeline. He merely used his authority in an attempt to delay the project. In addition, the Opposition has attempted to stir up agitation among certain organizations in the Gulf towns for the sole purpose of bluffing the Government into building a pipeline that would become a white elephant. The Opposition wishes to see the pipeline taken all around the State. Why not send it to Mount Gambier or somewhere else in the hope that an industry may establish there? The Treasurer and the Minister of Mines, on returning from an oversea tour during which they thoroughly investigated this matter, informed us that a pipeline overseas is generally built from the field direct to the biggest consumer. If we asked private enterprise to implement the project, would it take the pipeline all around the State, hoping to sell gas in 10 or 15 years' time? Why has the member for Victoria not yet asked that the pipeline be taken to Naracoorte? How ridiculous can the Opposition become? The Minister of Education, the member for Whyalla and I have been assured that, as soon as there is a demand for gas in the Gulf towns, a branch line will be constructed.

Mr. Hall: Assured by whom?

Mr. McKEE: By the Treasurer and the Minister of Mines, and that has been confirmed by what is contained in the report. The alternative route would result in an additional cost of between \$2,250,000 and

\$2,500,000. The member for Gumeracha would know that, because he has experienced the building of water mains all over the State. Why did he not have a main constructed to Stenhouse Bay? Such a weak argument is ridiculous.

Mr. RODDA: I do not rise to put the case for Naracoorte or for Port Pirie. If the member for Port Pirie wants to draw a red herring across the trail about Naracoorte or Stenhouse Bay, the Committee will be able to judge who is being ridiculous. The Leader has shown that the Opposition has not had the opportunity of looking at the report, and it is obvious that members on the Government side have had information that has been denied to us. I support the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I compliment the member for Glenelg and the member for Pirie Pirie on the frank statements they have made about their partiality. I have never heard more frank admissions about how a chairman would conduct an inquiry and I am shocked that an honourable member would treat an investigation, such as the one we are considering, on purely Party lines. I say without fear of contradiction that I have never been a party to a minority report. The Public Works Committee, which comprises members of both Parties, reaches unanimous decisions, because the members eschew Party politics in its investigations. I hope that the honourable members to whom I have referred never have the opportunity of importing to the committee the Party bias they would evidently like to introduce.

An example regarding what may be the outcome of an investigation is the motion of no confidence that has been moved by Mr. Stoneham, Leader of the Opposition in the Victorian Parliament, in relation to the Bolte Government's decision regarding the activities of Esso-B.H.P. in Bass Strait. Mr. Stoneham contends that the Bolte Government will pay to the producing company more than it should be paying. Honourable members who read the newspaper report would have seen that it was a matter of 3c against 2.08c, the latter figure being the amount Mr. Stoneham considers sufficient for the company to pay its way. The member for Glenelg made much of the fact that the Commonwealth Government had decided to finance this undertaking to the extent of \$15,000,000. However, the Commonwealth put rather tight apron strings on the \$15,000,000: it must be paid back by 1980.

Mr. Hudson: It can be converted.

Mr. SHANNON: There is no obligation on the Commonwealth Government to convert the loan and, under the agreement between the Commonwealth and the States, the obligation to raise fresh loans to pay off old loans rests entirely with the States. I do not think the Commonwealth has as much confidence in this project as the member for Glenelg apparently thinks it has. Obviously, if the Commonwealth Government thought that this was a national project in which it must take part it would have provided finance in the most economical way through the Loan Council with the benefits of a lower interest rate on borrowing and additional assistance through the provisions of the amortization fund. The member for Glenelg placed great importance on the Commonwealth Government's assurance to the State Treasurer that this was a sound and valid scheme but, if the Commonwealth believed that, I would have expected finance to be provided in the way it was provided for the setting up and expansion of the Electricity Trust in this State.

This afternoon the Treasurer made it abundantly clear that there were certain desiderata that were needed before construction on the pipeline could commence. One aspect was proof of the availability of sufficient gas to warrant the expense on this project, and another was that some form of agreement should be entered into between the producer and consumer that would guarantee a sufficient volume of business to make the pipeline an economic proposition. I assure honourable members that the time needed to finalize those matters would be ample to enable the committee to present a report on the project. Therefore, an inquiry by the committee would not delay the establishment of the pipeline in any respect.

I have been told that the committee is a procrastinator and does not take the necessary steps to expedite the investigation of a project. One would think that this project was so large that the committee could not investigate it. However, I remind honourable members of the committee's recent investigation into the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main. That was referred to the Public Works Committee for the whole length of the line from Morgan to Whyalla as one project, for a paltry £18,000,000! If we convert that sum to dollars we reach a sum similar to that involved in the present project. The committee refused the Engineer-in-Chief (as he then was) of the Engineering and Water Supply Department the right to present a case for the whole of that

big undertaking. We said, "We shall do this project stage by stage." How wise the committee was about that project is evidenced by the fact that the department itself finally decided to cross the gulf with a submarine pipe rather than go around the head of the gulf. This saved the State upwards of \$4,000,000. It was only the committee's precautionary steps taken in the early stages of that project that gave the department time for second thoughts about the project.

It has been said that the Public Works Committee was by-passed in the matter of an investigation into the Leigh Creek coalfield project, but it is known that the Government of the day referred to that committee an investigation into a supply of water for the field and for the township that was then growing up around it, that the project was for a dam at Leigh Creek, and that upon investigation by the committee it was discovered that, had the dam been built where the department was planning it, it would have been built on a colander and the water would have run out nearly as fast as it ran in. The committee recommended another site after much investigation and largely as a result of local, and not departmental, evidence. The owner of the Leigh Creek station (Mr. Victor Hirsch) showed us some of the porous limestone formation there, which we were told persisted southwards. We finally decided to go to Aroona Creek, which today provides the water for Leigh Creek.

Mr. Clark: But there was an obligation to refer that project to the committee.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not know whether that is so or not. At that stage Australia was at war and there was some urgency about the scheme. We went up there in a hurry in one of Bond's buses to investigate that project.

I am sorry that the Minister of Mines assumed that I was only out to delay this project. I do not want to delay any worthwhile project that is in the interests of South Australia. Had I thought that this project had reached the stage where we had nothing to worry about, I would not have made any statement to the press. I am happy that the Treasurer himself supports each of the points I made. I am happy to have his support, because I know from long experience in investigations that there are aspects of projects, such as this one, which cannot be decided one way or the other. Although I am a lay person, I lay no claim to any special qualifications. I am not even an economist; if I were, perhaps I would have different ideas. However, I hope I have my share of common sense, and

it is the application of common sense to the problems and to assessing the value of the evidence tendered by expert witnesses that allows the committee to make a decision that will be somewhere near the mark. I am not suggesting that the committee is infallible; far from it, but the committee looks, without fear or favour, at the facts.

Mr. Casey: That applies to most Party committees.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Glenelg does not think it does apply. I heard him say so myself. If those remarks are not corrected in *Hansard*, they will appear in black and white for me to read. I have no doubt about what I heard. From the point of view of the investigation suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, any project of this magnitude should be supported by an investigation. The member for Glenelg would like a Select Committee, but a Select Committee has one disability, namely, it has not the authority or the power of the Public Works Committee to call witnesses and to put them on oath. Further, the committee has to report within a limited time, and unless the time is extended, its inquiry, conducted at short notice, as it would have to be in such a session as Parliament is now going through, would be such a cursory examination as to be almost valueless.

Of necessity, a Royal Commission would have to be appointed to complete such an investigation. The Public Works Committee is not a Royal Commission, but has the full powers of one. An investigation by that committee would not cost the State a penny, other than travelling expenses and the emoluments its members receive for inquiring into the various projects referred to it. Its members would receive nothing extra and there are no side issues given to the members by virtue of an investigation such as the one Parliament is now considering. Of course, I realize that my term of Chairman of the committee is drawing to a close, and I say here and now that my prospective successor has my utmost goodwill and confidence. I have worked with him for a long time and I am sure the standard the committee has set for eschewing Party politics will continue.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the amendment, and I hope the Government listens to reason and does likewise. There was an urgent need for coal in South Australia when Leigh Creek was established in 1942, but these circumstances do not exist in relation to natural gas.

It is claimed that the Opposition has received information about this project, but what it has received has been vague and contradictory. This project should be examined by the Public Works Committee, a committee of members of Parliament who are experts in sifting information supplied by experts. The member for Port Pirie suggested that the authority should assess the various economic aspects of this project, but it is to be set up only to build a pipeline and act as a common carrier of the gas.

It is doubtful whether the Electricity Trust will have cheaper fuel available by using natural gas. If this were an urgent matter we could gamble on what may happen, but no urgency exists. I think the question of the size of the pipeline should be closely examined. Those who have had experience in pumping water know how much cheaper it is to pump it through an 8in. pipe rather than a 6in. pipe. We should know more about this. An increase from an 18in. to a 22in. pipe increases the capacity by 50 per cent, and a 25in. pipe all but doubles the capacity of an 18in. pipe. These things should be considered: if there is going to be a tremendous volume of gas, surely it would be economical to build a pipeline which would be capable of supplying Adelaide's needs for a number of years.

It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government agreed to these proposals and gave the green light to go ahead, but I would say that it was a dim yellow light, because they have only supplied bridging finance at a rather high rate of interest—5½ per cent. They could get money at a cheaper rate than that. It has been stated that because the Electricity Trust loan was subscribed in a short time, the public had confidence in this State, but that is not necessarily so. If the manufacturing industries are going ahead they use up the investors' money. However, in a slack period like the present there is money available in the Savings Bank for investment in the Electricity Trust.

In the long run, we have to get the money for the pipeline either out of Loan allocations from the Commonwealth or from lending institutions in this State. If the lending capacity of the State is not up to the demand, the necessary money will not be available from the Savings Bank and the State Bank for housing. If we need this natural gas pipeline, as I believe we do, we have to take these risks. I support the amendment because there is no great urgency for the pipeline at the moment. The pipeline must come into being, but as there is no urgency at the moment, we should take

the precaution to examine all aspects thoroughly and have experts' reports analysed. This will be to South Australia's ultimate benefit.

Mr. CLARK: I think I can say in all modesty that this will be the best speech made tonight, because it will be the shortest. I have been a member of the Public Works Committee for many years, and am very proud to be a member of it. I believe it is completely unnecessary to refer this matter to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. HALL: I should like to thank members on this side of the House for their support to my amendment. Members on the other side have again demonstrated the need for this inquiry. I have yet to find any glimmer of finality to the serious questions which have been asked concerning the pipeline. The member for Gawler gave no reason why it was not necessary to refer this matter to the Public Works Committee. On the other hand, although the member for Port Pirie gave us some reasons, they were totally conflicting reasons. He clearly repudiated his district.

Mr. McKee: I beg your pardon!

Mr. HALL: He said that no demand for gas existed at Port Pirie at present or in the foreseeable future.

Mr. McKee: I have been assured that when there is a demand, gas will be delivered to Port Pirie. You have repudiated the whole State, and that goes for every member on your side!

Mr. HALL: Although the member for Port Pirie said he had been assured that, if required, Port Pirie would obtain gas by means of a lateral, I point out that, according to the Bechtel report, a lateral through Port Pirie to Whyalla would cost \$5,800,000.

The honourable member said that so cheap was Leigh Creek coal at the Port Augusta power station it would not be economical to use gas there. Reference has been made to a statement emanating from the Treasurer last year to the effect that less use would be made of Leigh Creek coal in future because it would be cheaper to produce electricity in Adelaide. That statement makes the story told by the member for Port Pirie a sad one for the metropolitan area, as well as for his own district.

According to the Bechtel report a 22in. pipeline would be the best size but the Government cannot at present afford that size. Has the Treasurer considered at what stage it would be more economical to build a 22in. pipeline? Does he realize that, according to the Bechtel report, the quantity of gas con-

veyed by the pipeline can increase by 60 per cent by 1973? We know that the larger size would represent a more economical proposition and that if the 18in. pipeline were constructed it would need to be looped, according to the Bechtel report, by 1973. The Opposition has not claimed that the member for Port Pirie was wrong, nor that the Treasurer's calculations were wrong. We say that it is a one-sided story. We have been given only some of the figures and it seemed from an answer given by the Treasurer at Question Time today that he had not tried to obtain all the information. It is suggested that the Government is not able to make provisions regarding the western route because the session has almost concluded. However, surely the route of the pipeline would be only one of the many items that the Public Works Committee would consider. The Government itself does not know all the facts about the matter and, in those circumstances, surely Parliament cannot be expected to know them.

Mr. CASEY: Not one statement made by Opposition members justifies the amendment. I had expected the member for Onkaparinga to try to justify it, because a statement he made a few weeks ago seemed to foreshadow the amendment. Even before the honourable member had his photograph so prominently displayed in the afternoon newspaper we expected that this proposal would be submitted.

Since gas has been discovered at Gidgealpa and Moomba, I have been interested in the project and have visited the field more times than has any other honourable member. That there is a large quantity of gas in the area has been proved by the sinking of wells, and the member for Gumeracha agrees that there are large reserves. The member for Rocky River heard what the member for Gumeracha said and must admit that such reserves are available. The member for Onkaparinga spoke about the wonderful work done by the Public Works Committee and about the impartial attitude of its members. Surely members will agree that all Parliamentary committees do a wonderful job and that their members are impartial. The member for Torrens made a worthy contribution to the debate in which he pointed out many things other members opposite had disregarded. If this matter is referred to the Public Works Committee or to a Select Committee, work on the project will be delayed by, perhaps, months when natural gas has virtually been promised in 1969.

Mr. Heaslip: And it is not wanted until 1971.

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member is probably aware that the Gas Company has signed an agreement with the producers on the understanding that the gas will be here in early 1969. The member for Burnside and the Leader said that the diameter of the pipeline was too small to carry the load. Parliamentary Paper 102 shows that the size of the pipeline will be sufficient initially to carry the gas required in the metropolitan area and that, as time passes, more compressor stations will be added to increase the supply.

The extra length of pipeline required for the western route would cost about \$2,500,000, which would mean raising additional funds. As the member for Rocky River knows as a businessman, the scheme must be as economical as possible, yet the member for Flinders says, "If you want more money, all you have to do is approach the Loan Council and apply for more."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I didn't say that.

Mr. CASEY: "Ask the Commonwealth to explain its Loan repayments. It would ease the burden initially on the pipeline authority." That is how I wrote it down. The Treasurer made no secret of the fact that this was a special Commonwealth loan because this was a national project. If we ask the Commonwealth Government for more money, we shall restrict this project; we shall not even get it off the ground. We have sufficient money, so let's get on with the job.

The Torrens Island power station project was not submitted to the Public Works Committee to determine where it should or should not be and where the transmission lines should go. At the time the member for Gumeracha said, "The Government has every confidence in the ability of the trust's technical staff to properly investigate problems such as I have just outlined, and we (the Government) also have adequate proof over the past 16 years that the members of the board do not make decisions on important matters without having the problems thoroughly investigated in a proper manner and by capable people." However, there was no reference to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Clark: There was no demand for it.

Mr. CASEY. Naturally. This is probably the greatest event that has taken place in this State; it will be of immense value to us in years to come. The member for Burnside said that this pipeline, if it took the eastern route, would traverse inaccessible

country, but that is not so. Some pipelines in Europe and America cross great mountain ranges of a type not to be found in Australia, whereas this is flat country for this project. But members opposite would not know because they have never been there, except for the members for Gumeracha, Flinders and, I think, Mitcham, who went up once with the member for Burra. It is silly to say that this country is inaccessible. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. HALL: We have heard bandied around the Committee the \$2,600,000 difference in cost between an eastern and a western route, but where did the member for Frome obtain this figure? The comparison is false to begin with, because on the western route two compressors are to be installed, costing \$900,000 each, whereas on the eastern route only one compressor would be needed. It is a wrong business assumption to consider one route against the other, because the capacities are different. If the figure is \$2,600,000 without taking compressors into account, it is probably nearly \$1,000,000 less taking the extra compressor into account. Why did not the honourable member say that he was not comparing equal quantities?

The Minister of Mines has gone around the Gulf towns and said that the route of the pipeline is not yet fixed, whereas the Treasurer has said that it must follow the direct route. This is a political decision, devoid of expert advice. The Treasurer attends function after function and says it shall be so because it must be so. The amazing result is that it has the support of the member for Port Pirie, who has repudiated the interest of Port Pirie.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Brookman and Ferguson. Noes—Messrs. Hughes and Hurst.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 19) passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move to insert the following new subclause:

- (3) If an application by or on behalf of a body corporate that is the holder of an oil mining licence or a petroleum production licence granted under any Act is made to the Minister of Mines that he make a recommendation to the Governor that the body corporate be declared to be a producer company for the purposes of this Act, and that application is refused by that Minister or not granted by him within two months after the application is received by him, the Minister of Mines shall make a report of that fact to the Governor and cause a copy of that report to be tabled in each House of Parliament.

This new subclause is to make it clear that the pipeline authority is to be regarded as a common carrier and that the pipeline is not built for any particular interest. When I first read the clause, I did not appreciate that the two exploration companies specifically mentioned in the clause had to be mentioned because they do not hold the necessary licence for a producer under the Mining Act. Unless they were specifically mentioned, they would not be able to nominate representatives to the board. The amendment ensures that licences will be granted unless reason exists why they should not be granted. The legislation should be administered on the basis that the pipeline authority is defined as a common carrier. In years to come there is not the slightest doubt that there will be not two but many producers of natural gas, and I hope that many commercial enterprises will establish as a result of this project. I hope the Treasurer accepts the amendment, because it does nothing to hinder the project or the Minister's authority: it merely makes it necessary for the Minister connected with the authority to report to Parliament if an application by a qualified person for a producer's licence has been refused.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am sure that, whoever the Minister will be, Parliament will be informed of any refusal to grant a licence. The member for Gumeracha will see from the Bill that "common carrier" is defined in the best possible way. Provided the exploration authorities can keep the pipeline working to capacity, they will be doing their part towards the successful implementation of this scheme. I had discussions with the senior partners of the undertaking in America, who proved a 20-year supply, so that I had a reasonable case to put to the Prime Minister in June. If additional discoveries were made between Moomba and Adelaide, I cannot see how any more

gas could be conveyed if the people already providing gas were keeping the pipeline full. I believe that additional gas will be discovered even closer to Adelaide, but I am unable to say whether it will be found by the people now doing the exploration. Much has been said about what has occurred in other countries, particularly the United States and Canada, and we have heard about the number of pipelines in different places. The same position could occur here. Many miles of pipelines belong to different companies, all of which have markets for natural gas. Gas is imported from Canada to the United States and certain charges are made. Because the companies can keep their own pipelines completely filled with gas, there is no room for anyone else to put more gas in.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Are they common carriers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In some cases, yes.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In most cases, no.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In some cases, yes. What is the difference? The Minister responsible for this project will have an obligation to Parliament and does not need to be told what he has to do. I understood the member for Gumeracha to say that the amendment was simple and that it would not have much effect. If that is so, what is the use of it? I ask the Committee to reject it.

Mr. SHANNON: Again, the Treasurer has been very frank. He has told us that this is not to be a common carrier line at all. In fact, the capacity is such that it can serve only the Gidgealpa-Moomba field. We have been told that there will be no room in this common carrier for other gas. The Treasurer has said that the Gidgealpa-Moomba field is intended to be a monopoly for Delhi-Santos. If that is so, I do not think the public will be happy about it.

Mr. McKee: You support monopolies?

Mr. SHANNON: I understand the member for Port Pirie knows all about monopolies and ardently supports them, as is evidenced by his attitude to this Bill. I am amazed and disappointed that the policy of the Labour Government seems to be to put into the hands of the producers on this field the opportunity to hold to ransom the consumers of natural gas.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was astounded at the Treasurer's statement. The provision in the amendment I have suggested is included in many other Acts. The amendment merely requires the Minister to advise Parliament if he has not proceeded with

a recommendation made to him by the Mines Department. This pipeline is to be provided by the expenditure of \$35,000,000 of public funds, and the people have been told that it will be used as a common carrier. However, only the authority established under this Bill will be allowed to build a pipeline irrespective of whether gas is found in the north or in other parts of the State.

Surely if a recommended application were turned down it should be the duty of the Minister to inform Parliament. Does the Government intend to create a monopoly to prevent any further exploration for gas in South Australia? Such a purpose could not be better achieved than by the provisions of the Bill. The authority is completely protected by clause 13, which provides that it does not have to take gas if the pipeline capacity is insufficient or there is no demand for it. Surely it would be reasonable for the Minister to report to Parliament if he refused a properly recommended application. It could be that, as a result of such notification to Parliament, action would be taken to make more funds available so that a pipeline could be established for the new undertaking concerned. The Treasurer's attitude on this matter is impossible: he is seeking to create a monopoly and protect it. He will undoubtedly inhibit other companies making investigations in the interests of the State.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Again, I remind the member for Gumeracha that it would pay him to consider what has already been approved by this Committee in clause 13 (1), which provides:

If a pipeline operated by the authority is capable of conveying natural gas or any derivative thereof of any kind when delivered into the pipeline, the authority shall, to the extent that it is not precluded from doing so by reason of any existing and accruing liabilities and obligations of the authority under any agreement or otherwise for the conveyance through the pipeline of natural gas, and so on. It is not reasonable to suggest that I am creating a monopoly. The clause continues:

(a) a person who being the holder of an oil mining licence or a petroleum production licence

(b) a person who is a gas supplier within the meaning of the Gas Act

have to be approved by the Minister. I said that, if the pipeline was completely filled to supply the market and the market could take the gas (and there might be some surplus in the pipeline), there was still an opportunity, if there was a further loan, for the construc-

tion of a loop line. That is already stated in Parliamentary Paper 102. This amendment will not assist the Bill or the proposed authority. The producer does not need to come within the meaning of "producer" as long as he is recognized as having an oil mining licence or a petroleum production licence. As I have said, if the opportunity arises, the provision is there in clause 13 (1). This amendment is unnecessary and should not be accepted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree with the Treasurer when he says that a consumer must exist in order to ensure that those people who want their product carried through the pipeline have it so carried; but that does not mean that the provision will work. If this amendment has done nothing more, it has uncovered the Government's attitude in this matter. This authority is to comprise certain people, two of whom will be representatives of the present producers.

Mr. Shannon: There is only one producer.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, but there are two people on the authority. The provision is there. It appears to be *bona fide*, but will it work? I repeat that, with the strength of the present companies as represented on the authority, there will be a grave risk that for some reason or other, which may or may not be valid, the pipeline authority will be in a position to say to the potential producer, "We have no more room for your gas."

The Treasurer has reminded the Committee that the pipeline can be duplicated or looped and that more compressors can be installed, but will that be done? We have no guarantee that it will be done. The member for Onkaparinga pointed out that this is an authority which has an absolute right, and that no-one else can build pipelines in this State. The Treasurer said earlier today in respect to another matter that he desired that every possible encouragement should be given to other companies in the gas field, but what is he doing in this regard? This amendment was designed to meet both circumstances, of which the Committee is aware. I support the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer has quoted clause 13 as justification for refusing this particular amendment. In the clause the Committee is now considering is a definition of a producer company. No company can become a producer company, except for the two companies that are already named in the Bill, unless it is proclaimed by the Minister to be a producer company. Indeed, there is even a provision to say that the Minister can revoke a proclamation in respect to a producer

company, so that it will cease to be a producer company for the purposes of this legislation. This means that, for the purposes of this Bill, to obtain the right for the transportation of gas a company must be a producer company.

The purpose of the amendment is to have properly approved companies given the right to supply gas to the pipeline authority. A second purpose is to ensure that the companies live up to their obligations; if they do not, the Minister would have the power to proclaim that the companies had ceased to be producing companies. The Treasurer will not even allow the Minister to report that, on the recommendation of the Director of Mines, he has refused to proclaim a company. The company must be reputable and should have found oil before receiving a mining licence. Apparently, the reports that have been made are exclusive to the Government, and the Opposition is not fit to have them. If that is the attitude of the Government it will receive little co-operation from me in this Chamber.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know when the member for Gumeracha has given any real co-operation in this matter. Provision is made for certain people to be represented on the authority. Two representatives will be from Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited and Santos Limited; one from each of the Electricity Trust and Gas Company; and two appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall be Chairman. There cannot be an authority, as suggested, until this clause is passed, and this amendment does not assist at all.

Mr. SHANNON: Clause 13 provides great and direct powers to the authority. The pipeline is to be 18in. in diameter and of a restricted capacity, and it will supply Adelaide's needs by the direct eastern route. Apparently, this is to be a sacrosanct common carrier to supply gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, and it is to be a common carrier for one company. The Treasurer has made clear that, if Delhi-Santos requires all the capacity of the pipeline, it may have it. If we encourage people to seek another source of supply, are we to build another pipeline? A similar problem is often faced by the Public Works Committee. The capacity is always designed by responsible Government departments to meet what is a known contingency with regard to development in the area to be served. A line is not built just to meet the immediate needs of a particular area, but only after a careful examination has been made of any possible development

which could take place. Of course, we are guided by various authorities, particularly by Mr. Hart, the Town Planner, in assessing what is likely to occur, and then act accordingly.

We are building a pipeline which is euphemistically called a common carrier, but it will be a common carrier for one field only. If another field is found, it will be difficult to place two representatives from it on the authority. If the amendment of the honourable member for Gumeracha is negatived, as apparently it will be, it is a clear indication to me that we have entered into an agreement with certain vested interests. We shall not know what is behind it until an investigation is held.

I would be interested to know whether Bechtel Pacific Corporation gave any indication of what should be done in the construction of a pipeline on the possible production of further gas. These people are well and truly qualified, as a result of their experience in the United States, to know what problems can arise. If we had the Bechtel report, the 18in. pipeline would be a thing of the past. It would be like duplicating the water main from Mannum to Adelaide which, of course, is not envisaged. The proposed link between Murray Bridge and Hahndorf has six times the capacity of the Mannum-Adelaide main.

Mr. McKee: Why didn't you build that in the first place?

Mr. SHANNON: Now you are talking! The member for Port Pirie is starting to see daylight. Why didn't we look at the prospective possibilities in the natural gas scheme? The money spent in labour costs on the construction of this pipeline will not be much different, whether it be an 18in., 20in., or 22in. pipeline. If the member for Gumeracha's amendment is defeated I shall be convinced that we have come to terms with certain people whom we wish to assist.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Broomhill, Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Coreoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Brookman, Ferguson, and Millhouse. Noes—Mrs. Byrne, and Messrs. Hughes and Hurst.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

UNLEY BY-LAW: STREET TRADER'S
LICENCE.

Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 2:

Mr. McKee to move:

That by-law No. 46 of the Corporation of the City of Unley, in respect of street trader's licence, made on November 15, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on October 4, 1966, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

UNLEY BY-LAW: RESTAURANTS
AND FISH SHOPS.

Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 3:

Mr. McKee to move:

That by-law No. 19 of the Corporation of the City of Unley, in respect of restaurants and fish shops, made on April 4, 1966, and laid on the table of this House on July 19, 1966, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 9, at 2 p.m.