

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

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

### QUESTIONS

#### COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. HALL: This morning, additional water supplies for the township of Coober Pedy were announced. In this year's Loan Estimates, \$20,000 was allocated for the extension of, and extra provision for, the water supply at Coober Pedy, and I am pleased to see that work to improve the necessary supply in this area is being carried out. The unit ordered for this supply, which is stated to be a reverse osmosis plant with a capacity of 20,000 gallons a day, is to be installed at a cost of \$35,000. Additional work on the existing evaporation and distillation plant and the provision of some other facilities will bring the total cost to about \$97,000. As the new plant, working on a different principle, will provide 20,000 gallons a day (if this statement is correct), can the Minister of Works say why it is necessary to proceed with what is obviously expensive work on a project which was established in the past and which now needs substantial rebuilding?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Leader will realize that the desalination plant at Coober Pedy is of an experimental nature; the new work will enable further experiments to be made to provide necessary water for the area.

#### STRATHMONT TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about paving and draining at the Strathmont Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A scheme including new drainage proposals and the reconstruction of various paved areas has been prepared by the Public Buildings Department to overcome the existing paving and drainage problems at the school. The scheme is comprehensive and should satisfy future requirements. The project is currently programmed for approval of funds next month. Following such approval, detailed design work will be undertaken with a view to calling public tenders at the earliest possible date.

#### SOUTH COAST SEWERAGE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates about a sewage treatment works at Hackham, and sewerage facilities at Reynella, Morphett Vale and Christies Beach, and along the South Coast generally?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Planning of the sewerage scheme for the South Coast area is well advanced, and it is expected that a recommendation will be made for the scheme to be submitted to the Public Works Committee in November, 1967. There are some well developed areas at Morphett Vale and Reynella that will require long lengths of expensive trunk sewers to reach them. The trunk sewers will be of large diameter to cope with ultimate flows, and the expense of some of them cannot be warranted at the present time. Consequently, temporary arrangements are being considered to serve some of the areas. A temporary independent system for the well developed area at West Reynella is proposed based on a temporary treatment plant, which will be later abandoned when trunk sewers are laid. This scheme will be submitted to me within the next two weeks for consideration.

Present planning of the first stage of the sewerage work is that sewerage will proceed in the following priority: (1) sewerage of West Reynella; (2) sewerage of developed areas at Morphett Vale; and (3) sewerage of Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga. Subject to a favourable recommendation by the Public Works Committee and approval by the Government for the scheme, work will be commenced this financial year. A trunk sewer and temporary treatment plant for the Happy Valley area has already been approved. The construction of the treatment works will commence this financial year, and the trunk sewer will be commenced in 1967-68 or 1968-69, dependent on the requirements of subdividers. Detailed estimates of the main scheme have not yet been completed, but the work in the first stage of the scheme, including the sewage treatment works, will run into several millions of dollars.

#### PORT WAKEFIELD CROSSING

Mr. HUGHES: For some time all members, as well as people outside the House, have been concerned about the number of rail accidents occurring at level crossings. This morning, as I was driving to the city to attend the sittings of the House, I noticed that two

small boys aged about 10 years were trying to sell fruit in plastic bags to every person who stopped his car at the "stop" sign at Port Wakefield. I consider this practice dangerous: a serious accident could have occurred if one of the boys had stepped back when a passenger train or freight train was coming, because the boys were extremely close to the railway line. In addition, the driver of a motor vehicle could have been involved in an accident with the boys. Will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague, in the interests of safety, to have steps taken to draw the attention of the police officer at Port Wakefield to this practice immediately?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take this matter up with my colleague to ascertain what action can be taken as quickly as possible.

#### STUDENT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 2 about the possibility of assistance being given to a South Australian student who must attend a course in another State because a similar course is not available in South Australia?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The type of course in which this student is enrolled in the Gordon Institute of Technology, Geelong, is covered by the Commonwealth Technical Scholarship and/or the Commonwealth Advanced Scholarship Scheme. Whether benefits can be gained from one or the other or partly from both depends on whether a student gains entry to his course on the basis of his Leaving or his matriculation results. It is possible that the Wool Board scholarship carries a bond requiring service for an employer after the completion of the course. Such a bond would automatically disqualify a person from gaining or retaining a Commonwealth scholarship. He could establish his eligibility for consideration for a Commonwealth scholarship by writing to the administering authority, which is the Commonwealth Department of Education and Science, Melbourne Branch Office, Box 4710, G.P.O., Melbourne.

This student cannot benefit under the Fees Concession Scheme, which is designed mainly to assist those who have no other award. This scheme applies only to students of the universities in South Australia and of the South Australian Institute of Technology. The honourable member refers to substantial assistance being granted to veterinary science students who have to go to a university in another

State to do their courses. For State Government scholarship awards the assistance that has been given has been to holders of bursaries. Cadetships have also been awarded by the Agriculture Department to some students in veterinary science.

#### CIGARETTES

Mr. BROOMHILL: An article appearing in this morning's *Advertiser*, headed "Smokes Here Bigger Risk", points out that Australian cigarettes are more dangerous than cigarettes in the United States, according to a survey published by the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria. The survey of the quantity of nicotine and tar in cigarettes emphasized that it was relatively easy for cigarette manufacturers in Australia to initiate a process that would reduce the nicotine and tar content. About 12 months ago I suggested to the Minister of Health that cigarettes be analysed in this State in order to ascertain the nicotine and tar content and that the results be made public. In his reply the Minister said that this action would probably serve no useful purpose, and that this view was held by the anti-cancer organization in this State. In view of the attitude of the Victorian organization, will the Premier again suggest to his colleague that cigarettes in this State be analysed and the nicotine and tar content made public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will speak to my colleague about the matter.

#### EASTWOOD INTERSECTION

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked on August 22 about the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to inform the honourable member at last that my colleague reports that there is now nothing to delay the installation of traffic signals at this intersection, and that tenders will be called by the city of Burnside soon.

#### MODBURY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 16 concerning the department's plan for the old Modbury Primary School situated at Montague Road, following the building of a new infants school on Golden Grove Road, which means that the old building is not used now?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Although a new eight-classroom infants school building in solid construction and a quadruple timber unit became available in July, all rooms at the

new Modbury school on Golden Grove Road are occupied. The new Para Vista Primary and Infants School to be opened early in 1968 will considerably reduce enrolments at Modbury. Other schools are also planned for Clovercrest and Ridgehaven, but these will not be available for at least two and possibly three years. In the meantime, numbers could rise at Modbury again, and it is considered that the old stone building should be retained for possible emergencies until these schools are built.

Inquiries have been made by the Church of England, which is interested in purchasing the site for a school but, in the present circumstances, sale cannot be contemplated. However, approval has been given for the Country Women's Association to use a room for twice-monthly meetings. In addition, the Mothers and Babies Health Association has requested that two rooms be made available until such times as they find permanent accommodation. Each of these requests has been granted, subject to the condition that approval can be cancelled should the Education Department require the rooms for accommodation purposes. Any other applications for use of rooms will be treated on their merits.

#### HOVERCRAFT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Sainsbury (Director of Marine and Harbors) is reported in this morning's paper as having said, outside the Royal Commission on State Transport Services, that hovercraft would come under his department's jurisdiction for annual safety surveys. My recollection is that the last time this matter was raised in this House no conclusion had been reached on where the responsibility for these craft lay, or whether any department or Minister in this State was responsible under Statute for them. I should therefore be glad if the Minister of Marine could confirm, or state otherwise, whether hovercraft will come under the jurisdiction of the Marine and Harbors Department and what is proposed to be done generally regarding hovercraft services in South Australia.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The last time discussions on the hovercraft were held in this House, members did not know whether it was a flying boat or a sea-going vessel, or whether it was to be used for road transport. I have not seen the statement to which the honourable member has referred but, the honourable member now having raised the matter, I will take it up with the Director of

Marine and Harbors and let him have a reply soon.

#### GAS

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Premier indicate the transmission charge a thousand cubic feet of natural gas from Gidgealpa to the city and other places, as well as the royalties a thousand cubic feet? Further, is it true that some test wells have proved to be dry? Can the Premier also indicate the result of the offshore drilling near Robe?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government and the producers have agreed in principle that transmission charges to be made will amortize the cost of the general pipeline within the period for which finance has been arranged. A specific charge a thousand cubic feet has not yet been spelt out specifically in the agreement; however, the principle is there. A feasibility study has been carried out by the producers and the pipelines authority, and I shall be able to indicate the precise amount in due course when the agreement has been signed. In reply to the second question, it is true that some wells at Gidgealpa were unsuccessful. However, a sufficient quantity of gas has been proved at the Gidgealpa-Moomba field to justify the construction of an 18in. pipeline and the necessary first stage of the pipelines authority's work.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: For how many years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For 20 years. Drilling off Robe will not start until September. I understand the *Ocean Digger* has been moved to the site where it will be anchored next week. Drilling will commence shortly after that. Naturally enough, at this stage there can be no results from the drilling off Robe. It will be some time before the drill reaches the requested depth, which should be later this year.

#### STOCK ROUTE

Mr. HEASLIP: About two or three years ago, the stock route from Wilmington to Port Augusta, through Stirling North, was closed through Horrocks Pass. This quarter-mile track is infested with the noxious weed horehound, which is carried by sheep that are transported to Western Australia. The Western Australian authorities will not allow infested sheep to enter that State. The District Council of Wilmington is not sure what is the position regarding the closing of the road. Will the Minister of Lands inquire about the position generally and about what right the council now has to deal with the matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot supply the necessary information offhand. As the honourable member will be aware, normally when a stock route is closed the strip of land remaining is attached to existing leases which front on to what was previously the stock route. In those circumstances, the people concerned would be notified, the rent would be adjusted, and so on. However, this would usually not lead to the complete closure of a stock route, the route normally being reduced to a width of three chains. I shall be happy to obtain the full information requested by the honourable member and to bring down a report as soon as possible.

#### IRRIGATION

Mr. CURREN: Last Thursday, on asking the Minister of Irrigation whether any increase in irrigation water rates was contemplated during the coming year, I was informed that the matter was still under review. Can the Minister say whether the review has been completed and, if it has, what is the result?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The review has been completed, and I have decided that there will be no increase in high-land water rates this year. Steps are presently being taken to inform all interested organizations of this decision.

#### NURIOOTPA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: My attention has again been drawn by the Nuriootpa Primary School Committee to the bad state of repair of classrooms at the school. As I understand that some of these buildings were erected over 80 years ago, no doubt the people of Nuriootpa are looking forward to the day (and I hope it will not be long) when the new primary school will be built on land picturesquely situated in another part of the town, land that was purchased some time ago. I understand that particularly the guttering and down pipes at the school are in a bad condition. As a result of recent rains, some passages at the school were flooded and could not be used for some time. Also, the classrooms urgently need painting. In March this year, the Minister of Education honoured the town by visiting the school where, together with me, he inspected the buildings. As I believe he said that he thought repairs were urgently necessary, can he now say whether he will take appropriate action to have the repairs effected soon?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to raise the matter with the Public

Buildings Department to see whether repairs to the school can be expedited. As the points to which the honourable member referred need attention, I will attend to the matter.

#### STOCK TRANSPORTS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 8 about the cleaning of stock transports?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: During March, 1967, a report was submitted to enable a reply to be given to the honourable member concerning the cleaning of stock vehicles at saleyards. As stated on that occasion, a Weeds Advisory Committee investigation had shown that at least \$10,000 would be necessary to provide a minimum number of washing points which it was feared would remain unused unless weed officers attended sales. The report further stated that the committee had decided to encourage local government inspectors to attend sales to control the movement and sale of sheep carrying noxious weeds. This scheme is still being discussed and implemented by local government authorities. To date, the important sales on Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula and in the Murray Mallee are receiving these inspection services. As previously stated, the committee intends to review recommendations, regarding additional protection that can be afforded by truck-washing facilities, after two years when the inspection service has had time to become effective.

#### UNIVERSITY FEES

Mr. COUNBE: Can the Minister of Education say whether Cabinet has decided to increase fees for students at the Adelaide and Flinders Universities? If it has, can the Minister outline the scale of the increases and say when it is likely to come into effect?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: True, a letter has been sent to both universities suggesting that, because costs have risen, the fees might be raised with advantage. As this matter is now being considered by the universities, I cannot say precisely what will be the sum involved. However, I point out that last year fees were raised in all Australian universities except those in South Australia. Cabinet deliberately refrained from raising fees last year with a view to maintaining the same rate for as long as possible. However, the time has now arrived when, in the opinion of Cabinet, the fees will have to rise. I will ascertain for the honourable member as soon as possible what the new fees are likely to be.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I heard with great perturbation the Minister's reply, as it seems that the rise in fees has been suggested to both universities by the Minister after Cabinet discussions. My recollection is that last December, the former Premier (Mr. Frank Walsh) said that he would not sanction an increase in university fees. I think that is what he said; he certainly said it concerning hospital fees, and I think he coupled university fees with that statement. If my recollection is correct, I am fortified in asking the Minister whether the Government has suggested any particular increase, either a flat rate or a percentage increase of, say, 15 per cent, or a similar increase. If such an increase has been suggested, even though it may not yet have been agreed to by the universities, can the Minister say what was the suggested increase?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: From memory, the increase suggested was 15 per cent to 20 per cent, but I may be corrected on that. Those students who are not receiving assistance from scholarships, from employers, or from other sources, can receive assistance through a university committee operating for that purpose. Most assistance for students regarding fees comes from the Commonwealth. In South Australia we have had the advantage over other universities of lower fees for the past 12 months. The possible increasing of fees has been brought more to the fore because academic salaries are about to be increased, consequently increasing costs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister implied that the reason for the increase in university fees was a rise in academic salaries. However, my recollection is that the Commonwealth Government pays a percentage (at least 40 per cent) of those salaries—

Mr. Hudson: And gets it all back in tax.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and that the State bears the remaining percentage. Is the increase suggested by the Government to the university solely on this account or is there any other reason why such a comparatively large increase should be suggested by the State Government to our two universities, especially in view of the promises given at the university by the present Premier before the last election that university fees would be reduced? Can the Minister of Education say, therefore, whether there is any other reason, besides the increase in academic salaries, for the suggested increase in university fees?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is dealing with matters of finance, and they are in my hands. True, as the

honourable member says, the Commonwealth Government (through the Universities Commission) pays a proportion of the increase in professorial and other staff salaries. However, the increase that the Commonwealth Government has promoted in academic salaries provides that Government (through increases in income tax) with much more than the outgoing which it pays in its proportion of the increase in such salaries.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you suggest that it is a dastardly trick to get more income tax back?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out (and I would have thought the honourable member would have some concern for the State's budgetary situation) that the result of the Commonwealth Government's decision in this matter is not merely to take back the amount of the increase which it pays out in outgoings: it takes out of the State Budget a considerable proportion of the money paid to the academic persons to whom these increases will be paid, and that money goes straight (by way of income tax) from our Budget into Commonwealth revenue. In other words, the take-home pay which the academic people get as the result of these increases is less than the amount of the increase in the State payment to them.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think they should have got an increase at all?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State supports their getting an increase, but the plain fact is that the Commonwealth Government can say, "We are contributing to this." That is the contention the honourable member has put forward this afternoon. That is the argument he wants to go out to the public: the Commonwealth Government is paying a proportion of this increase. The Commonwealth Government is paying out less than it is getting back. In arranging this increase through administrative channels with the Universities Commission, the Commonwealth Government is obtaining money from State revenues to provide Commonwealth income tax revenue.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow a debate during an answer to a question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me give the honourable member information on this. The increase in the outgoings of the universities will be \$1,200,000, of which the State's share is \$780,000. The outgoings of the Institute of Technology will be increased by \$200,000, of which the State's share will be \$130,000. The increase of the professors'

salary is \$1,600, the Commonwealth's share being \$561, and the State's share being \$1,039. The income tax at that rate is 55c in the dollar. The taxation on the increase of salary that is payable to the Commonwealth is \$880 as against an outgoing by the Commonwealth of \$561. This illustration makes clear what is happening in this matter. The State has tried to hold off increases in university fees. We did what no other State did: we delayed increases in fees during last year. However, when we are faced with this increase in outgoings the money has to be found somewhere.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The Commonwealth refuse to alter the subsidy to \$1 for \$1.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. We refused the Commonwealth Government to base its proportion of these extra outgoings fairly so that it would not be taking money out of our State revenue and depriving other State services of money we take in from normal State revenues. The alternative left to South Australia in these circumstances was to increase our taxes and charges in some other direction to pay for this or to increase university fees; we had no other alternative. Therefore, we have proposed that there should be some increase in university fees but that provision be made to see that those who get no assistance towards university fees be given assistance by the State, so that we are able to take back from the Commonwealth some of the money that it is taking from our State Budget. That is the only way we can get it.

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the answer given by the Minister of Education that the matter is being considered and that a figure of about 15 to 20 per cent has been considered, can the Minister say what sum he believes this 15 to 20 per cent may produce?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will bring down that information for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the Budget debate in 1964, the present Treasurer said that many families in South Australia could not afford to give their children a university education, because of the costs involved, and he expressed the opinion that it was time to reduce these fees. I think that statement was repeated by him at a meeting at the university about a week after his Party came into office. He said that the Government would certainly move to have fees reduced. In view of what he has said now and also in view of the Government's action in suggesting an increase of between 15 per cent and 20 per cent, as we are told, together with what was said in

the answer given to me a short time ago, can the Treasurer say whether, in the last couple of years since the Labor Government has been in office, there has been any change in the system by which grants are recommended by the Universities Commission and sums paid, in accordance with those recommendations, by the Commonwealth Government and supplemented by the State Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, there has not been a change. The Government made clear (and this has been repeated many times in the House in replies given to the member for Alexandra, but apparently the member for Mitcham has not bothered to apprise himself of this: perhaps he was elsewhere) that when the Government took office it was constrained to see that it carried out the undertaking that students at the Adelaide University who were paying fees would get effective relief by the reduction in fees paid. We took that action: we doubled the amount available to the university in order to make remissions in fees to those students. Students directly paying fees to the university are a small proportion of all students.

Mr. Coumbe: In all circumstances?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We asked for a means test on this, but generous instructions were given to enable the money to be used fully so that any student with any kind of hardship about payment of university fees would receive an effective reduction.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: With special provisions for country students.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Variations to the previous practice were made to ensure that that would be so. The honourable member is asking us to reduce fees paid not by students but by the Commonwealth Government and by other authorities granting scholarships.

Mr. Millhouse: That was what you yourself suggested.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, Sir.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall name honourable members if they will not obey the statement by the Chair that interjections during replies to questions are entirely out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At no time have we suggested that what we were to do was to take imposts off the Commonwealth. What we did say was that those students paying fees ought to get an effective reduction in the amount of fees. That has been done, and I am sorry that the member for Mitcham is so disappointed that it has been done.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In 1965 the Minister of Education said, in answer to a question I asked:

The Australian Labor Party's policy at the last election was stated in material issued to its candidates to the effect that there would be a reduction in university fees for those students who did not have allowances or scholarships. That was the only statement of policy in this regard contained in the material issued to Australian Labor Party candidates. The Premier recently said the reduction in university fees was subject to a means test. In view of the difference between that and the Minister's statement, which I quoted from *Hansard*, can the Minister say what reductions, if any, have been made in university fees for those students not receiving scholarships or allowances who are not under a means test? Also, will he obtain information about the total reductions made, whether governed by a means test or not, during 1965-66 and 1966-67?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

#### STIRLING BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. SHANNON: The residents of the hills are pleased with the replanting of the area of waste land between Measdays and Crafers, but they suggest that ornamental evergreen trees be interspersed with the deciduous trees so as to brighten the rather dull winter conditions. Will the Minister of Lands refer this suggestion to the Minister of Roads for possible action by the Highways Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to submit the honourable member's suggestion to my colleague and obtain a report.

#### WIRE SCREENS

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have received a letter from the secretary of the Upper South-East schools welfare group drawing attention to the fact that, although it is recognized that flies constitute a health hazard, it has never been the policy of the Education Department to fit wire screens to school buildings. Will the Minister of Education take this matter up to ascertain whether this policy can be reviewed and screens fitted in schools in those areas where flies present a serious problem and possibly a health hazard to children?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I understand that, in a few places where flies have been a bad nuisance, screens have been fitted. The honourable member would realize that, if we adopted the policy of fitting screens to windows at all schools, we should be involved in heavy

expenditure. However, we shall be prepared to examine specific cases that the member has in mind in order to ascertain whether the fitting of the screens is justified.

#### HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 17 in which I sought a progress report on the Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The preliminary survey work for the Highbury and Hope Valley scheme has been completed. The 9in. trunk sewer on the south side of Hope Valley reservoir in Lyons Road and the Lower North-East Road has been completed to a point just beyond Reservoir Road. The trunk sewer on the north side of the reservoir will commence in approximately February, 1968. Reticulation sewers have been laid in the following streets: Balmoral Road from Lyons Road to Payton Avenue; Wells Road; Sargeant Avenue; Landseer Crescent from Sargeant Avenue to Payton Avenue; Rayleigh Avenue from Lavinia Grove to lot 104; Lavinia Grove; Silver Lake Crescent to lot 25 and in easement to lot 22; Park Valley Drive from Lavinia Grove to lot 4; Valley View Crescent from Lower North-East Road to lot 26; Lake View Crescent from Lower North-East Road to lot 36 and in easement to lot 13; Reservoir Road from lot 43 to lot 46; and Edmund Road from lot 59 to lot 53. The work is proceeding to schedule and is expected to be completed in June, 1968.

#### ELECTRICITY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about damage caused by the recent mishap at the Electricity Trust's power station?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In giving this reply to the honourable member, I ask the press to report the whole of the statement, not to take parts out of context, because the statement is extremely important and has been agreed upon by a number of parties involved. Inquiries into the accident that occurred at Torrens Island on August 16 have now reached the stage when the trust is able to report on what took place. Inquiries are continuing to ensure that information obtained as a result of this accident is applied to best advantage in future. In the first place, the trust points out that it has in operation over \$130,000,000 worth of generating plant. This plant is highly complicated and operates in many cases under conditions of very high heat and pressure in order to obtain a high level of generating efficiency. With so much plant

of this complexity breakdowns of greater or less importance do occur. To cover such situations the trust makes sure that spare plant is available and that an adequate maintenance and repair staff are on hand. In view of the possibility that any particular incident may involve extensive repairs, the plant is also insured for damage beyond \$100,000.

The accident on August 16 was a major one as far as the trust was concerned, although not as severe as others that have occurred elsewhere in Australia and in other parts of the world. The fact that it was possible to continue to meet all demands for power indicates the effectiveness of a policy that recognizes that such events may occur. At approximately 4 a.m. on August 16, the operating staff at the Torrens Island power station was bringing the turbo-generator and boiler into service after they had been idle for a minor repair. Difficulty was experienced with boiler ignition and the turbo-generator, after an initial generating period, was forced to reduce its power output. An excess amount of water was pumped into the boiler and, although corrective action was taken, this was inadequate and the machine was not shut down in time to avoid damage. Water was forced from the boiler into the high-pressure end of the turbine. This led to rapid cooling of the hot casing and shaft of the machine which resulted in distortion of the metal. Because of the extremely fine clearance between the fixed and rotating parts in the high-pressure cylinder, this distortion was sufficient to cause contact between the fixed and moving blades. The machine was immediately disconnected but it was impossible to bring the rotating parts weighing many tons to rest immediately and the blades suffered considerable damage.

With the co-operation of the manufacturers it has been arranged that the high-pressure cylinder and shaft from the No. 2 turbo-generator under construction will be transferred to No. 1 machine and it is hoped that it will be back in service in about six weeks. The damaged shaft and cylinder of No. 1 machine will be returned to England for repair and, on return, will be installed in either No. 2 or No. 3 machines.

#### GOODWOOD ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: The early completion of the Keswick bridge will assist the flow of traffic to southern and south-western districts. However, because much additional traffic will use Greenhill Road *en route* to the Anzac Highway, will the Minister of Lands ascertain from

the Minister of Roads when traffic lights will be installed at the intersection of Greenhill and Goodwood Roads?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report from my colleague.

#### SCHOOL HEATING

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the heating of classrooms used for evening classes?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Until this year, difficulties were encountered in heating buildings for evening classes. However, the headmistresses of both the girls technical high schools referred to by the honourable member have stated that their schools have been adequately heated for evening classes held this year. At Vermont Girls Technical High School arrangements had been made, before the advent of winter months, for the normal forced-air heating system in the permanent structure to remain operating until evening classes were concluded. Classrooms in the wooden structures are heated by gas thermostats, which can be lit by teachers in charge of classes. At Norwood Girls Technical High School gas thermostats were installed prior to the onset of winter and, here again, they had only to operate to provide the required warmth. It would seem that only in the event of a breakdown in the equipment or neglect to operate the heaters could the comfort of students have been affected. Neither headmistress has received any complaints.

#### TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about accommodation at the Bedford Park Teachers College?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A total of 555 students in primary and secondary courses will be trained at Bedford Park Teachers College next year. Stage 1 of the new buildings at the college will be completed in early September this year. Later this year, the students at present accommodated at the Bedford Park Teachers College annexe at Sturt Road will transfer to the new buildings. In 1968, all Bedford Park Teachers College students will be accommodated in the new buildings and the annexe will be used by Glengowrie High School. The students taking university subjects will attend some classes at the Flinders University, as is the case at present, just as Adelaide Teachers College students attend some classes at the University of Adelaide.

### NARACOORTE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: I believe that last year money was voted to build a canteen at the Naracoorte South Primary School but, for some reason, this project has been delayed. As I discussed this matter with the secretary of the welfare club during the weekend, and as members of the school committee are concerned that this building is not being built, will the Minister of Education ascertain what progress is being made on it, and when the building will be erected?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

### AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question concerning the sum which is available from the Commonwealth Government and which is not to be matched by a similar grant from the State Government, to erect agricultural colleges, particularly at Loxton?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The matter of Commonwealth funds available for agricultural colleges has been given much publicity, particularly in the *Murray Pioneer*. Questions have been asked in the Commonwealth Parliament by Mr. G. O'H. Giles, the member for Angas, about this and, according to the *Murray Pioneer*, he said that funds were available from the Commonwealth Government to finance establishments such as an agricultural college at Loxton. According to the report, he said that it was the State Government's responsibility to allocate the use of these funds and that the funds had been available over the three-year period ending June 30, 1968. Also, he said it seemed doubtful whether the Commonwealth Government would continue to make this sum available to States unless the money was properly used. I think a fair inference that one could draw from that statement is that the State Government has not used the money available to it. However, that is not the case. For the period ending June 30, 1968, \$3,733,000 is provided by the Commonwealth Government for technical training institutions, but the State Government's expenditure will exceed that amount, the total amount to be spent being \$3,831,000, with a further commitment of \$627,000 on the understanding that these grants will be extended by the Commonwealth Government after that period. I will give the honourable member the amounts in a short breakup. The total grant provided by the Commonwealth Government for technical training for the four years

ending June 30, 1968, is \$3,733,000, the actual payment on technical colleges from June 30, 1967, being \$1,404,000. The estimated expenditure for 1967-68 is \$1,325,000 with a further commitment after that period of \$627,000.

The actual expenditure for the Roseworthy Agricultural College to June 30, 1967, was \$403,000, the estimated expenditure for 1967-68 being \$439,000. The actual expenditure for the Institute of Technology to June 30, 1967, was \$260,000, giving totals of actual expenditure to June 30, 1967, of \$2,067,000, and of estimated expenditure for 1967-68 being \$1,764,000, with a further commitment of \$627,000 on the assumption that the Commonwealth Government would extend this grant for a further period on those projects.

### VISTA WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report for me of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's intentions regarding a water supply for Kay Avenue, Vista? At present a water main has been extended to the second house in Mannum Street (which runs off Dillon Road, Vista) and if this main is to be extended along Mannum Street to Perseverance Road, it could allow an extension to Kay Avenue. Can the Minister say when this main will be laid?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

### PORT LINCOLN SCHOOL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week regarding a new primary school at Port Lincoln and the land for same?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Negotiations are still proceeding for 10 acres as a site for a third primary school at Port Lincoln. The proposed site consists of two areas of land in two different ownerships. One part forms portion of a deceased estate which is at present held in trust. The owner's price for the second piece is considerably in excess of the Land Board's valuation and, as agreement cannot be reached, consideration is being given to the possibility of acquiring it in accordance with the provisions of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act. However, it is portion of other land held by the same registered proprietor, and the Public Buildings Department is investigating the question of ensuring that access to the balance is not prevented. I am not able at this stage to inform the honourable member when these involved negotiations can be completed.

## KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the progress that has been made by the Mines Department in the search for a satisfactory water supply for the Keith township?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When partly answering this question last week, I said I had received an unofficial report. I want to make it clear that that report was not from the department: I was given that information off the cuff and, apparently, it might have been slightly wrong. Drilling of the first exploratory bore for a town water supply in the Emu Flat area east of Keith is in progress. Drilling conditions in the upper levels were particularly difficult and progress has been slow. The first main aquifer was found to contain water too saline for a town supply. This has now been cased off, and drilling is proceeding satisfactorily.

## SUGARLOAF HILL

Mr. CURREN: Last weekend, I received a letter from the Secretary of the Barmera branch of the National Trust requesting that an area on the southern scarp of Sugarloaf Hill be reserved from any mining operations when material is being obtained for construction of the causeway for the proposed Kingston bridge. I point out that Sugarloaf Hill is located near the proposed causeway and, in the words of the correspondent, the southern scarp is a unique area as it contains rare fauna and flora and Aboriginal relics and Aboriginal quarries. Will the Minister of Lands raise this matter with the Minister of Roads to ascertain whether the area can be reserved in accordance with the request of the Barmera branch of the National Trust?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

## ROAD TAX

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about the percentage of the money from the ton-mile tax that is allocated to councils?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that, as previously stated in reply to questions in the House, no specific allocations to district councils have ever been made from the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Fund. In the first year of the operation of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, considerably more contributions were collected than was originally anticipated. This increased the overall funds available to the Highways Department

and in November, 1964, and in January, 1965, made it possible for special grants for specific works to be made to councils, if recommended by the District Engineer and approved by the Commissioner of Highways. These grants were made from the general funds of the Highways Department and were spent largely on new construction work. Under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act all moneys collected are paid to a special account which can be used only for maintenance purposes; therefore it would have been illegal to have made grants for construction works from this account.

The whole of the moneys collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act are used as a contribution towards the Highways Department maintenance of gazetted main roads, bearing in mind that the Highways Department makes grants to councils for maintenance of public roads from the Highways Fund and the Commonwealth Aid Roads Account. The amounts collected under the Act since its inception are as follows: 1964-65, \$1,426,200; 1965-66, \$1,903,177; and 1966-67, \$2,070,118. The amount spent on maintenance by the Highways Department and local authorities over the corresponding periods were as follows:

	Departmental	Local
	\$	Authorities
		\$
1964-65 . . .	3,412,899	1,784,672
1965-66 . . .	3,729,834	1,644,930
1966-67 . . .	4,313,892	1,686,036

In my reply on this question on August 16, it was intended to convey that an amount equivalent to 85 per cent of the road maintenance collections was paid to councils during the financial year 1965-66 from the Highways Fund and the Commonwealth Aid Roads Account for the maintenance of roads.

## HOUSING TRUST STANDARDS

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week about reductions in building standards that apply to tenders being called by the Housing Trust for the construction of rental houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply has not yet come to hand, but I will inform the honourable member as soon as it is ready.

## SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR

Mrs. BYRNE: As the Minister of Works knows, from time to time I have directed questions to him concerning the need for public toilet facilities at the South Para reservoir, particularly to cater for tourists visiting the

reservoir. On March 2, in reply to a question, the Minister said that plans and estimates for this amenity had been completed and that an expenditure of \$9,650 had been approved to enable the project to proceed. He also said that it was intended that tenders would be called for part of the work and that the remainder of it would be carried out departmentally. As the work has not yet commenced, will the Minister obtain a report on the project, particularly as to when the work will commence?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the honourable member's question and the importance of the project to which she has referred. I shall certainly have inquiries made, and I hope to be able to tell her that an early start on the project will be made.

#### EDUCATION GRANTS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about Commonwealth education grants paid in this State?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Commonwealth Budget papers indicate that the \$115,000,000 referred to by the Prime Minister as intended Commonwealth grants for education purposes in 1967-68 would be as follows:

	\$
Universities . . . . .	65,852,000
Colleges of advanced education . . . . .	14,778,000
Teachers colleges . . . . .	8,000,000
Science laboratories . . . . .	12,587,000
Technical training . . . . .	13,877,000
	\$115,094,000

The proposals for South Australia included therein are as follows:

	\$
Universities . . . . .	6,216,000
Colleges of advanced education . . . . .	1,456,000
Teachers colleges . . . . .	1,067,000
Science laboratories . . . . .	1,173,000
Technical training . . . . .	1,700,000
	\$11,612,000

The grants intended for universities and colleges of advanced education are for recurrent purposes and buildings under approved programmes for the triennium 1967-69. The grant proposed this year towards teachers colleges is part of \$2,400,000 approved for the new Northern Teachers College. The total provision for teachers colleges for South Australia included in the Commonwealth legislation for the triennium ending June 30, 1970, is \$3,200,000. The grants intended this year towards science laboratories and technical training are to complete the arrangements for

the triennium ending June 30, 1968. Of the \$1,173,000 towards science laboratories \$498,000 is for independent schools and \$675,000 for Government schools.

The high schools and technical high schools listed in the Loan Estimates will all benefit from the grants towards science laboratories and in addition a number of prefabricated laboratory units will be provided at other schools. The \$1,700,000 to be provided for technical training will finance progress work at the technical colleges listed in the Loan Estimates and at Roseworthy Agricultural College. In addition, portion of the grants towards science laboratories and technical training will be used to purchase equipment for existing as well as new schools and colleges.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Doubtless the Minister of Repatriation knows that some time ago a request was made by the war service land settlers at Loxton for the appointment of a Royal Commission to make an exhaustive inquiry into the disabilities of settlers and all aspects of the war service land settlement scheme. That request was not acceded to and it has now been renewed. The settlers request that a Royal Commission or Parliamentary Select Committee inquire. Will the Minister consider the request and set up a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of war service land settlement in the Upper Murray region, including drainage and replanting?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall consider the request but at this stage I am not prepared to say what the outcome of that consideration will be. I shall reply to the honourable member in due course. As he knows, many departmental inquiries, both State and Commonwealth, have been conducted into the scheme. I think he is also aware that the department knows of most of the difficulties that have confronted the settlers for many years.

#### ORDNANCE FACTORY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week, arising out of his replies to me about housing at Elizabeth, about the proposal of the Commonwealth Government to construct an ordnance factory at Elizabeth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, in explaining his question, criticized the statement I read from the General Manager of the Housing Trust. The General Manager has supplied the following detailed reply:

The honourable member for Mitcham asked for precise details of the Commonwealth Government project and how many people are expected to be employed in the factory when completed. Probably it is in the nature of defence planning that precise details should not be available to the trust in any case, but it is the trust's experience over many years that for major Commonwealth works, and in particular defence work, very little forward information is ever given in a precise form. This is perhaps illustrated by the fact that in 1964, at very short notice, the trust was asked to make housing available for the 4th Battalion Royal Australian Regiment to be located near Adelaide. The trust took from its ordinary rental programme in the metropolitan area in excess of 160 rental houses in order to house the families of men serving in this regiment. In fact, in so doing, the trust was criticized in Parliament at the time, but the trust took the view that in defence planning, the best that could be hoped for was an intelligent interpretation of the information available to it and that sometimes sudden decisions had to be made.

Turning now to Smithfield and some of the reasons why the trust believed it could reasonably anticipate the use of this land by the Commonwealth, this information is given against a background that for a substantial area the minimum planning and building time for design, engineering development, house construction, and so on, is two years. In other words, the decision to develop Smithfield and to have houses available in 1967 was in the main made in early 1965.

The day after the announcement that a satellite town was being built north of Adelaide in 1951 the General Manager of the Housing Trust received a visit from an Army Staff Officer, who stated that the Army required in the near future a large area of land with main road and rail access and a labour supply for a large workshop and ordnance block. Following this conversation, the Commonwealth acquired just under 250 acres on what was then the trust's northern boundary. Except for the trust's planting some trees on behalf of the Commonwealth on the land, no on-site action was taken for many years. In 1959 the trust wrote to the Commonwealth and asked whether it intended to develop the land; if not, would it sell the land to the trust. A reply was received that the land was needed for its original purpose and therefore it could not be sold to the trust. In late 1964 and early 1965 the trust realized that following the completion of a trunk sewer roughly parallel with the main north line, the most convenient place for further housing development on the northern plain from a State viewpoint was in the general Smithfield area. Actually, the trust itself did not particularly wish to develop then in this area, but the economical use of State services swayed the decision.

At this stage the General Manager of the Housing Trust again approached the Commonwealth concerning its 250 acres. He pointed out that the area owned by the Commonwealth between the main road and the railway line was a more attractive area for development than other trust land to the west of Smithfield,

and again repeated the request that the land be made available for sale. The answer was that in view of the mounting defence commitments, the land could not be sold, and it was highly probable that it would be used in the immediate future. Conversations were then held between the General Manager of the trust and both the then Minister of the Army and the Officer-in-Charge of Central Command concerning this matter. However, I would like to stress that no precise details of labour requirements were given nor any binding promises made; nor did I ask for these, accepting the fact that this was not a matter which would normally be discussed.

Planning, therefore, went ahead and a number of public statements have been made concerning the possibility of both an ordnance depot and the establishing of a new training depot in the area. In October of last year, for example, the Minister for Health, Dr. Forbes, was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that he would discuss urgently with the Minister for the Army the proposed ordnance depot and new training unit in the area. At the expense of repetition perhaps I might add something contained in a previous answer, namely, that it is doubtful if the Commonwealth has a piece of land so well placed, so suitable for development and on the development of which so many discussions have been held over many years. It was the continued statements by the Commonwealth over so many years that something was about to be done with the land that led the trust to believe that, when defence has become such a national priority, the site would be used.

#### FORESTRY

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Forests obtained information I sought last week about dismissals from the sawmill at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have not been able to obtain that information yet, but I shall do so soon.

#### PETROL

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: On July 11 I asked the Premier a question about petrol and industrial pumps, and in his reply he said:

We do not intend to introduce legislation, but negotiations will be undertaken with the oil companies to see that industrial pumps are not used simply to cut out the ordinary trading of people who lease stations from oil companies and who, at the oil companies' demand, are on a tight margin.

Can the Premier say whether further negotiations have been undertaken with the oil companies concerning industrial pumps, and what is the present position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have informed oil companies of my general view about this matter as expressed here. I have asked petrol resellers for particular instances

of selling in industrial pumps so that the gallonage of petrol resellers was invaded. Only one indirect report was received, about which proper investigations have been made but so far no cogent evidence has been assembled in this case. I have had no details of other instances and, until I receive evidence on which I can approach the oil companies to tell them that the policy that I have laid down has been breached, I cannot undertake further negotiations. If any person has a complaint on this matter I should be grateful for information, but so far I have not been given any.

#### FREELING SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: On March 1 and on July 13, 1966, I asked the Minister of Education questions concerning the erection of new toilets at the Freeling Primary School. The Minister replied that the plans prepared by the Public Buildings Department for standard toilet blocks estimated to cost \$18,980 were not considered to be justified by the Education Department for a school with an enrolment of about 100 children; consequently, the Public Buildings Department had been requested to examine the practicability of designing standard toilets for medium and small country schools, with a view to keeping costs to a minimum. As the need for these toilets at this school has again been raised, will the Minister obtain a report on his department's intentions in this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

#### ORANGES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 17 about whether ungraded oranges are not now available for retail sale?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think the term used when the question was asked was "cull" oranges, not "ungraded" oranges. A letter I have received from the Secretary of the Citrus Organization Committee states:

Dear Sir,

We acknowledge receipt of the extract from *Hansard* of August 17 in which Mr. Millhouse, M.P., raised a query regarding the inability of a retailer fruiterer in his district to obtain ungraded or cull oranges. In reply we would comment as follows:

(a) Cull oranges are not an official grade under the regulations of the Fruit and Vegetables Grading Act administered by the Department of Agriculture. For this reason cull oranges are not marketed as fresh fruit.

(b) We know of no oranges being dumped at present and would emphasize that the only oranges which could possibly

be dumped at this stage would be those unfit for human consumption in either fresh or processed form.

(c) Grading regulations are designed to protect both the grower and the consumer and it is not the committee's policy to make cull oranges available as fresh fruit to be sold to retailers, as there are adequate processing outlets for this quality fruit.

(d) There is no reason why retailers should go short of supplies or be unable to obtain oranges of the various grades laid down by the regulations, which have been in existence for many years.

From the above it will be apparent that the retailer in question is quite correct in stating that he is unable to obtain cull oranges. All the oranges which are supplied through normal wholesale outlets should be graded and packed in accordance with the regulations. Any complaints which a retailer may have regarding price or quality of his supplies should be referred to the wholesaler from whom he obtained them, who can then take the matter up with the committee or South Australian Citrus Sales Pty. Ltd., the delegated authority for the marketing of citrus in this State.

#### DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier received any communication from the Prime Minister regarding financial assistance in respect of drought relief in this State and, if he has not, can he say when he is likely to receive it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have an acknowledgment of my letter, but nothing more than that. There are some matters outstanding in respect of which I am awaiting replies from the Prime Minister, but I cannot forecast when I am likely to receive them. I expect to have some words with the Prime Minister soon regarding this.

#### HIGHWAYS EXPENDITURE

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (on notice):

1. What amounts are to be expended by the Highways Department during the year 1967-68 from—

- (a) State taxation other than road maintenance tax;
- (b) road maintenance tax; and
- (c) Commonwealth sources?

2. What amounts have been allocated for this financial year for expenditure under each of the following headings:

- (a) New construction of highways by the department;

- (b) debit orders to councils and corporations;
- (c) grants to councils and corporations;
- (d) for bridges, lights and ancillary works;
- (e) for departmental buildings and depots other than the new head office;
- (f) for building additional accommodation at Walkerville;
- (g) for departmental plant and machinery;
- (h) for net amount of interest-free loans to councils and corporations?

3. What are the total allocations to each of the departmental districts for 1967-68?

4. What were the total allocations to each of the departmental districts for each of the years 1964-65, 1965-66 and 1966-67 respectively?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been asked to inform the honourable member that, because of the nature of his questions and the amount of research necessary, it has not been possible to supply a reply today. I request the member to ask his question again, on notice.

**WATER PUMPING**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What adjustments, resulting in power not being available for pumping through the Mannum-Adelaide main, were made in June, 1967, by the Electricity Trust of South Australia?

2. Have such adjustments been made in any other months of this year? If so, when?

3. How many times has this power supply not been available as a result of such adjustments?

4. For what periods on each occasion was power unavailable?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The replies are as follows:

1. On Sunday, June 4, power was unavailable to the pumps for seven hours. The transmission line was out of service in order to install additional equipment.

2. Similar adjustments were made on Sunday, May 14, for seven hours, and Sunday, May 21, for seven hours.

3. Three times as mentioned above. In addition, the power supply to these pumps has been disconnected on several occasions this year in accordance with the arrangement that this load will be "disconnectable" and thus qualify for a low tariff. There have been two complete disconnections (all pumps) and six partial disconnections as follows:

- Complete disconnections:
- One of two hours.
- One of three hours.

Partial disconnections:

- Two of one hour.
- One of two hours.
- Two of four hours.
- One of 14 hours.

4. See above.

**SCHOOL OF ART**

Mr. COUNBE (on notice):

1. What is the present enrolment of students, both full-time and part-time, at the South Australian School of Art at North Adelaide?

2. What number of teaching staff, both full-time and part-time, is engaged at this school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 352 full-time and 609 part-time students at the South Australian School of Art.

2. There are 27 full-time and 19 part-time teaching staff.

**APPRENTICES**

Mr. COUNBE (on notice): What was the number of apprentices indentured to the building trades as at June 30 in each of the years from 1963 to 1967 respectively?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The total number of apprentices indentured to the building trades as at June 30, was:

1963 . . . . .	1,127
1964 . . . . .	1,174
1965 . . . . .	1,323
1966 . . . . .	1,316

Figures for 1967 are not yet available, but there were 1,280 apprentices in training at December 31, 1966.

**ELIZABETH HOUSING**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of construction of the 245 rental-purchase houses in the Elizabeth area that are at present unoccupied?

2. What financial return has the Housing Trust received by way of rental or otherwise from these houses?

3. What rate of interest is the trust paying on any moneys borrowed to finance the building of these houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$1,773,000.

2. No return is received on houses that have not been occupied but, while occupied, the payments on the 45 houses covered interest, etc., until re-possession.

3. The rate provided in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement at present is 4½ per cent.

## MINING (PETROLEUM) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining (Petroleum) Act, 1940-1963. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Its purpose is to modernize and repair deficiencies in the Mining (Petroleum) Act, 1940-1963. The Mining (Petroleum) Act was enacted substantially in its present form in 1940. It was at that time regarded as a model Act and served as the basis upon which a number of other States enacted legislation relating to petroleum exploration and production. The Act has in the past provided an acceptable climate for petroleum exploration but has, in the course of time, become increasingly out of touch with modern conditions and methods. The amendments that are set out in the Bill arise from actual experience in the administration of the Act so far as petroleum exploration is concerned and from the need to provide specific and adequate provisions to cover the production of petroleum and the construction and operation of pipelines.

The principles upon which this Bill has been drafted have been submitted to the petroleum industry for their consideration and comment. Formal meetings and discussions have been held with representatives from the industry and the present Bill embodies many of the constructive submissions that have been made. The principles of the Bill have been approved and commended by the petroleum industry. Honourable members will notice that the Bill makes a number of formal amendments to the present Act. The first and most immediate of these is to change the title of the Act from the "Mining (Petroleum) Act" to the "Petroleum Act". This title is more consistent with modern terminology. It will also be noticed that the terms "oil exploration" and "oil mining" are to be replaced by the terms "petroleum exploration" and "petroleum production" as the use of the word "oil" as synonymous with "petroleum" is falling out of common usage.

The Act as it exists at present provides for three types of licence through the stages from petroleum exploration to production, namely, the "oil exploration licence", "oil prospecting licence" and "oil mining licence". It is found in practice that the intermediate stage, the "oil prospecting licence", serves no useful purpose except that under section 40 the Minister may require that on the expiration

of an oil exploration licence the holder must apply for an oil prospecting licence instead of the renewal of the oil exploration licence. This procedure is a device to enable the Minister to require a reduction in the area of the licence upon its renewal. Under the proposed amendments, the provision for an oil prospecting licence is repealed along with section 40 and the provisions requiring a licensee to relinquish portion of the area held by him are incorporated in the Act.

The term of a petroleum exploration licence which was previously "not exceeding five years", is now fixed at five years and, so long as the licensee has complied with the Act and the licence and has sufficient resources to continue effective exploration, a renewal for successive terms of five years is assured, subject to the relinquishment of 25 per cent of the original area upon each renewal. It is considered that at the present stage of exploration in South Australia in which considerable basic exploration has been completed, there is no hardship in requiring a licensee to undertake sufficient work in a five-year term to enable him to surrender a quarter of his area. This arrangement is by no means severe by international standards and the petroleum industry prefers it to the completely discretionary arrangement that obtains at present. In addition to substituting an automatic right of renewal and a relinquishment obligation, the amendments provide an obligatory scale of expenditure on approved works. This arrangement is considered by industry to provide a more predictable basis upon which to plan an exploration programme.

The proposed transitional provisions preserve existing licences until their expiration and provide that on their expiration renewals for the entire area held by the licensee will be granted if requested as though these were initial licences; subsequent renewals will be subject to the full provisions of the amended Act. This is a generous arrangement as under the principal Act the Minister could use section 40 to require a reduction in area. In a case in which the Minister has covenanted as provided in section 40 (2) not to invoke the provisions of subsection (1) for a period of time, that is, the provision by which the Minister could compel the surrender of portion of the licence area, the proposed transitional provisions honour this arrangement. As the owner of all petroleum in the State, it is incumbent upon the Crown

to ensure that petroleum production is undertaken without waste and with maximum possible recovery. Accordingly, new Part IIA which is to be inserted in the Act contains provisions that will ensure that waste and wasteful operations can be effectively prevented and natural deposits of petroleum preserved. The Act at present makes only very inadequate provision for pipeline construction and operation. The amendments repair this deficiency by adding completely new provisions requiring the issue of a licence covering the construction and operation of pipelines.

In a field in which the circumstances that may arise are as diverse as they are in petroleum exploration and production, it is, of course, impossible to legislate for every contingency and consequently the exercise of an amount of Ministerial discretion is an inevitable necessity. In the normal course of events, this discretion is only exercised after consultation with the licensee. However, there is always the possibility (however remote it might be) that some person may be prejudiced by the exercise of a Ministerial discretion. The present Bill frankly acknowledges this possibility and creates an independent Petroleum Advisory Committee to which any person who believes that he has been unfairly or improperly prejudiced by a Ministerial act may appeal. Honourable members might compare this with the situation under the present Act where Ministerial discretion is, in some respects, greater than it is to be under the amended Act, yet there was no right of appeal. The clauses of the Bill, in detail, are as follows:

Clause 1 deals with citation and alters the short title of the Act from the "Mining (Petroleum) Act" to the "Petroleum Act". Clause 2 provides that the Act shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 is merely formal. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act which deals with interpretation. A number of definitions which are now redundant are struck out and a number of new definitions are inserted. The most significant amendment is the insertion of new subsections (1a) and (1b). It sometimes happens that in the course of exploration for petroleum, hydrogen sulphide, nitrogen, helium, carbon dioxide or other substances are discovered in commercial quantities. It is desirable that the production of these substances should be subject to substantially the same controls as those applicable to petroleum.

Subsection (1a) thus provides that the provisions of the Act (except section 35 (1) which imposes a 10 per cent royalty on petroleum) are to apply to such substances in all respects as if the word "petroleum" denoted or included such substances. Subsection (1b) provides for a flexible basis upon which royalty is to be paid on such substances. The 10 per cent royalty which the Act imposes upon petroleum will, in most instances, be too high.

Clause 5 amends section 4 of the principal Act by striking out a number of provisions that are now redundant. It inserts a new subsection (2) which vests the property in any petroleum that is extracted or flows from a natural reservoir in which it has been contained in the person by whom it has been extracted or released. This provision enables a licensee to sell petroleum that he has recovered and obviates any possibility that the Crown might be liable in tort for any damage done by the petroleum. Clause 6 enacts a number of transitional provisions. New subsection (1) provides that an oil exploration licence in force at the commencement of the amending Act will continue in force until its expiry and will be subject to the same terms as those upon which it was previously held. New subsection (2) provides for the granting of a petroleum exploration licence to the holder of such a licence.

New subsection (3) is enacted to honour an agreement made by the Minister with the Delhi-Santos group of companies. As explained earlier, under section 40 of the principal Act which is now to be repealed, the Minister had the power to require an applicant for the renewal of an oil exploration licence to make application for an oil prospecting licence or *vice versa*. By this means he could compel a licensee to relinquish portion of the area held by him. However, under subsection (2) of that section the Minister could covenant with a licensee not to exercise this power during the period of the covenant. This was in fact done in the case of the Delhi-Santos companies. Thus new subsection (3) exempts these companies from the obligation which is now to be a statutory obligation to relinquish portion of the area held by them. It also exempts the companies from the new expenditure provisions. New subsection (4) provides that a licensee who holds an oil exploration licence that continues in force under new section 4a shall have the same rights to apply for and be granted a petroleum production licence

as the holder of a petroleum exploration licence.

Clause 7 enacts new section 4b. The provisions relating to licences in the principal Act are mostly inapplicable to pipeline licences with which the Act is now to deal. Section 4b thus limits their application to petroleum exploration and petroleum production licences. Clause 8 amends section 5 of the principal Act. The relevant classes of licence are now petroleum exploration licences and petroleum production licences. Thus the prohibition in section 5 against petroleum exploration or production without a licence is amended accordingly. Clause 9 amends section 6 of the principal Act. The amendments are mainly of a drafting nature but new subsection (2) does require the date upon which a licence will expire to be published in the *Gazette* in addition to the previous requirements that notice of the grant of a licence should be published in the *Gazette*. Clause 10 amends section 7 of the principal Act. The fees payable upon the application for a licence are increased to accord with the changing value of money.

Clause 11 substitutes a new section 11 in the principal Act. The amendment is merely of a drafting nature and does not alter the previous law. Clause 12 amends section 13 of the principal Act. It provides firstly for a decimal currency amendment and then inserts a passage which empowers the Minister to require security for the satisfaction of a bond under section 13. This provision is necessary to prevent the provisions of section 13 from being rendered nugatory by a licensee who dissipates his assets and is unable to satisfy a bond that he is required to enter into under the section.

Clause 13 strikes out the present provisions relating to oil exploration licences and inserts new provisions in lieu thereof. New section 15 provides that the area comprised in a petroleum exploration licence shall not exceed 10,000 square miles and fixes the term of the licence at five years. New section 16 provides that a licensee is to submit a programme of works that he proposes to carry out for the approval of the Minister. New section 17 specifies the expenditure that a licensee is required to undertake upon approved works. The section requires a licensee to expend \$20 for every square mile of the area comprised in the licence during the first two years of the term of the licence and \$30 for every square mile during each year of the remainder of the initial term of the licence. However,

the section provides that, if the licensee expends more upon approved works than he is strictly required to expend, that expenditure can be carried forward and is deemed to have been made during the next ensuing year and so on.

New section 17 (2) preserves the right of the Minister to accept tenders for a licence. New section 17 (3) enables the Minister in special circumstances to alleviate the obligations imposed by the section. New sections 18a and 18b deal with the renewal of a petroleum exploration licence and the obligations that flow therefrom. Upon each renewal one-quarter of the area originally comprised in the licence is excised and the expenditure on approved works in relation to the area comprised in the licence is increased. Thus operations in connection with petroleum exploration are intensified after each period of five years without requiring any substantial increase in the total expenditure that the licensee is required to undertake. Under new section 18a (3), the licensee is given the option of selecting the area to be excised but if he fails to do so, the Minister may select the area to be excised.

New section 18c specifies the obligations of a licensee upon the discovery of petroleum and provides that a licensee shall not dispose of petroleum that has been recovered from land comprised in a petroleum exploration licence until he has obtained a petroleum production licence or unless he obtains the approval of the Minister. New section 18d imposes licence fees upon the licensee. These are upon a sliding scale and increase after each renewal in the case of an ordinary petroleum exploration licence as such a licence can only be renewed three times. In the case of the Delhi-Santos licence, which can be renewed more than three times, they increase to 25c a square mile and then remain stationary.

Clause 15 enacts new sections 27a and 27b of the principal Act. New section 27a provides that the holder of a petroleum exploration licence shall, if he is not in default of his obligations under the licence or the Act, have a preferential right, subject to his complying with the provisions upon which licences are granted, to be granted a petroleum production licence in respect of the area in which petroleum has been discovered. New section 27a (2) provides that, if a licensee is in default of his obligations under the licence or the Act, the Minister shall stipulate a reasonable period within which the licensee may remedy his default. New section 27a (3) provides that, if the licensee fails to remedy his default, the

Minister may excise the area of the field from that contained in the petroleum exploration licence and grant a petroleum production licence to any person in respect of the field.

New section 27b is intended to deal with a licensee who has discovered petroleum of economic quantity and quality but who fails to bring it into production within a reasonable period. The section provides that the Minister may serve notice upon the licensee and, if he fails to apply for a petroleum production licence within 12 months of the service of the notice or such longer time as the Minister may stipulate, the Minister may excise the area of the field in which petroleum has been discovered.

Clause 17 makes a drafting amendment to section 28 of the principal Act. Clause 18 inserts new section 28a in the principal Act which provides that where two fields are so situated that they may be comprised in a single undivided area not exceeding 100 square miles in extent, the Minister may grant a single petroleum production licence in respect of that area. Clause 19 inserts new section 30 in the principal Act. The section deals with the definition of an area to be comprised in a petroleum production licence. Clause 20 repeals section 31 of the principal Act which is not now considered necessary.

Clause 21 repeals sections 32 to 37 (inclusive) of the principal Act and enacts new provisions in their place. New section 32 deals with the term of a petroleum production licence and its renewal. New section 33 defines the rights of a licensee under the licence. New section 34 provides for the fee to be paid by a licensee. New section 35 deals with the payment of royalty on petroleum. New section 35 (1) provides that royalty shall be paid on the basis of 10 per centum of the value at the well-head of the petroleum. Subsection (2) provides that royalty is not payable on petroleum that is properly expended in the course of operations in connection with petroleum production. Subsection (3) permits a licensee to set off against the amount of royalty payable in any one year the annual fee paid by him under section 34.

Subsections (4) and (5) deal with the obligation of the licensee to furnish information for the purpose of calculating royalty. Subsection (6) sets out the basis upon which the value at the well-head of petroleum is to be calculated and subsection (7) provides that the Minister's valuation is to be conclusive evidence of the value of the petroleum at

the well-head. New section 36 requires the licensee to submit a schedule setting out the rate at which he proposes to produce petroleum and a programme of works whereby he proposes to develop a petroleum field for the approval of the Minister. The licensee is required to carry out operations in accordance with the schedule and programme. New section 37 deals with information to be furnished by the licensee and with records to be kept by the licensee.

Clause 22 repeals sections 39 and 40 of the principal Act. Section 39 is to be replaced by other provisions later in the Act and section 40 is no longer necessary as the provisions requiring the relinquishment of areas held under licence are now incorporated in the Act. Clause 23 amends section 42 of the principal Act. The first amendment is merely for the purposes of decimal currency. The second provides that the Minister may require a person who acquires an interest in a licence to enter into a bond in the same way as he may make this requirement in the case of the original licence.

Clause 24 strikes out paragraph (b) from section 45 as it is now redundant. Clause 25 amends section 48 of the principal Act. The amendment enables the Minister to give approval for the conduct of operations on or under a road or street which are otherwise forbidden. Clause 26 makes a decimal currency amendment to section 48 of the principal Act. Clause 27 makes a drafting amendment to section 49 of the principal Act.

Clause 28 amends section 52 of the principal Act. The amendment merely simplifies the present section. Clause 29 makes a drafting amendment to section 53 of the principal Act. Clause 30 repeals sections 54 and 56 of the principal Act. Section 54 refers to pipeline easements and is not necessary in view of the new Part to be inserted relating to pipelines. Section 56 has been supplanted by new section 37. Clause 31 makes a drafting amendment to section 60 of the principal Act. Clause 32 makes a drafting amendment to section 63 of the principal Act.

Clause 33 amends section 65 of the principal Act. It frequently happens that, although a licensee might be unsuccessful in finding petroleum in a well that he drills, he does discover valuable supplies of water. The licensee will probably not want to use this supply of water for his own purposes but it may be of great value to other people. If the licensee proceeds to withdraw the casing that

he has inserted in the well, the well will collapse. The Act at present enables the Minister to forbid a licensee to withdraw casing from the well but it does not provide for payment of compensation to the licensee. The present amendment provides for the payment of fair compensation to the licensee. The amendment also provides that the Director of Mines rather than the Minister is to approve the method of plugging a well. This amendment is made merely in the interests of convenience.

Clause 34 repeals sections 69 and 72 of the principal Act. Section 69 is now redundant and section 72 is re-enacted in a modified form in Part IIA of the Act, where conservation and prevention of waste is dealt with. Clause 35 makes a decimal currency amendment. Clause 36 inserts new Parts IIA, IIB and IIC in the principal Act. New Part IIA deals with conservation and prevention of waste. New section 80a empowers the Governor to make regulations governing the conduct of operations for the exploration for or production of petroleum. New section 80b empowers the Minister to make orders in relation to conservation of petroleum and the prevention of waste. This is necessary because regulations cannot possibly cover the infinite variety of circumstances that may arise in the course of petroleum exploration or production. The section also gives the Minister certain specified powers that may be exercised to conserve petroleum deposits or prevent wastage.

New section 80c provides for the case where a petroleum field extends beyond the limits of an area actually held by the licensee under licence; the Minister may vary the licence to include the whole area of the field, if it does not extend into an area held by another licensee, or if it does he may require the licensees to come to some agreement as to the working of the field as one unit. New Part IIB deals with pipeline licences. New section 80d requires any person who constructs or operates a pipeline to be licensed. New section 80e prescribes the documents and information to be provided by an applicant for a licence. New section 80f empowers the Minister to require an applicant to give notice of his application. New section 80g deals with the factors that are to be taken into account in considering an application and, where there is more than one application for a licence, the Minister may refer the applications to the Petroleum Advisory Committee for a recommendation.

New section 80h deals with the conditions upon which a licence may be granted. New

section 80i provides that the term of a pipeline licence shall be 21 years and provides for its renewal. New section 80j deals with the acquisition of land by a pipeline licensee. The licensee is required to make diligent endeavours to acquire the land that he requires by agreement but if he fails to do so he may apply to the Minister for permission to acquire the land compulsorily. If he obtains this permission, he may proceed under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1966, to acquire the land. New section 80k empowers the Governor, on such terms as may be recommended by the Minister of Lands, to grant to a licensee such interest in unalienated Crown lands as the licensee requires for the construction or operation of the pipeline. New section 80l empowers the Minister to require a licensee to convey petroleum produced by a licensed petroleum producer on such terms as they may mutually agree upon or, if they fail to agree, on such terms as the Minister may determine.

New section 80m prevents the licensee from making unauthorized alterations to a pipeline. New section 80n requires the licensee to respect the safety of all persons in his operation of the pipeline. New section 80o imposes a fee of \$20 for every mile of the pipeline. New section 80p requires the licensee to furnish information in relation to the pipeline in accordance with the regulations. New section 80q empowers the Director of Mines or any person authorized by him to inspect or test a pipeline. New Part 11c establishes the Petroleum Advisory Committee. New section 80r establishes the committee, which is to consist of three independent persons appointed by the Governor.

New section 80s provides that two members may form a quorum of the committee and that a decision of any two members shall be the decision of the committee. New section 80t establishes the right of appeal to the committee. Any person who believes that he has been improperly or unfairly prejudiced by a decision or order of the Minister may appeal and if his appeal is not frivolous or vexatious he may be heard before the Petroleum Advisory Committee. New section 80u provides that the Minister is to consider any recommendation of the committee but is not to be bound thereby. New section 80v sets out the powers of the committee.

Clauses 37, 38 and 39 make drafting amendments to sections 84, 85 and 86 of the principal Act respectively. Clause 40 inserts new sections 87a, 87b and 87c in the principal Act.

New section 87a makes it an offence to contravene a provision of the Act, a term of the licence or an order or lawful instruction of the Minister. The section also provides for the penalty applicable to such an offence and to a continuing offence. New section 87b deals with an offence by a licensee. The Minister may suspend the licence until the licensee makes good his contravention or default or cancel the licence. The section empowers the Minister to seek the advice of the Petroleum Advisory Committee as to whether he should suspend or cancel a licence. New section 87c facilitates the proof of a Ministerial act. Clause 41 repeals section 89 of the principal Act which is now redundant.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) moved:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I oppose the Bill. I opposed it at all stages, even before it was altered so severely as a result of amendments moved by the Minister of Lands. It is now simply a device by which the Government Party can escape responsibility for agreeing to the establishment of a committee. Many members of the present Government were in the House in 1958, when the late Mr. O'Halloran moved for the establishment of such a committee. The members of the present Government supported that move, without any qualification about representation on the committee from another place. However, those members, now that they are in Government, do not want a committee established.

I do not want a committee established, either, because I do not think it would help. However, Government members, although they say they want a committee, have included in the Bill an amendment that I should think would ensure the defeat of the measure in another place. It would be reasonable for the other place, which is a properly constituted House of Parliament, to take a poor view of being excluded from membership of the committee. The establishment of the committee would not benefit a Government. In a democracy it is important that a Government can be elected or rejected and that the Government in power must appeal to Parliament for the passage of legislation. I know of no reason why the Executive should be

weakened by what is, in effect, a Parliamentary Standing Royal Commission having power to intervene in the widest possible way.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill in principle. The need for a public accounts committee has been emphasized by the activities of the Commonwealth committee during the past week. Although the Commonwealth Government operates on a much wider scale than does the State Government, the State is growing. We know that the loss of a Department of External Affairs docket resulted in an account not being paid for about three or four months. As there have been serious inaccuracies in budgeting, I believe that it is essential for all Government departments to be overseen in our growing bureaucracy. A Minister has an obligation to Parliament for the conduct of his department. I oppose the provision excluding members of the Upper House from being members of this committee. A public accounts committee is essential and, although politics may be played, we should be statesmen enough to support the appointment of such a committee.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): The Bill is not in the form in which I introduced it, and I disagree with the amendment providing that members of the committee shall be elected from the House of Assembly only. However, as I have moved a motion in consecutive years and, again, this year I introduced a Bill, I would be a hypocrite if I did not support the principle of this legislation. It has been the practice in this State to appoint joint House committees but, although I have argued that this should happen in this case and have disagreed to the Minister's amendment, I support the Bill in principle.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, and Nankivell, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (11)—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman (teller), Hall, Heaslip, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Shannon, Stott, and Teusner.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Ryan. No—Mr. Ferguson.

Majority of 12 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

## GOLD BUYERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 1475.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This is a minor Bill, which was given a brief second reading explanation. The Act has not been amended since 1935 and, as the Premier said, this amendment removes a discriminatory provision. The original Act was introduced in 1916, but the report of that debate does not explain why a Chinese person was excluded from the issue of a gold buyer's licence. No doubt reasons were given, but I have not been able to ascertain them. This type of exclusion also existed in the Law of Property Act and in the Industrial Code, but I do not know how the Premier's attention was drawn to the exclusion provided for in the Gold Buyers Act, although I agree that it is desirable to remove it. As the whole House agrees with this move, I support the second reading.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support my Leader. References were made to this matter in this House in 1916 when a Bill was introduced, although no precise reason was given for the exclusion of people of Chinese origin from the issue of a gold buyer's licence. It is strange to think that back in 1916 the Australian Labor Party had an aversion to coloured folk, and I am happy to know that it has changed its policy in this respect. In 1916 the Minister of Industry (Hon. R. P. Blundell), when explaining the original legislation, said:

This is a measure on which there should not be a great deal of difference of opinion. It has been discussed at nearly every Premiers' Conference since 1907, and resolutions have been carried that it should be made law in the different States. Legislation was first introduced into Victoria in 1907 so as to prevent gold stealing from the mines. While the Act had a very good effect so far as that State was concerned it was found that the people who were stealing and disposing of gold evaded the law in Victoria by removing to the States which had not any law on the subject.

In 1916 the South Australian Parliament passed an Act in sympathy with legislation in other States, so as to have some control over interstate trafficking in gold. I am pleased to support the second reading.

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

## LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 1547.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I understand that the Bill has been introduced because of the difficulty into which the arrangements in New South Wales have fallen, because the New South Wales Government has been trying, notionally, to assess the unimproved value of fresh air some distance above the ground. This has led to what is an absurdity and, being good South Australians, we do not want to fall into the same absurdity if we can avoid it. Therefore, this Bill is worthy of the support of the Opposition as it provides that in future the unimproved value of a home unit will be in proportion to the total unimproved value of the land on which it is built. I therefore support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

## STATUTES AMENDMENT (ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL, RED SCALE CONTROL AND SAN JOSE SCALE CONTROL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1598.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): The Opposition has no objection to this Bill, which seeks to clear up two matters. I think it clears up the fact that the chairman of the committee is not personally responsible: action is taken by the committee as a whole. I suggest that the second point in the Bill, that relating to the voting rights, should be looked at by the Minister before the Bill is passed. Pursuant to the three Acts involved, an owner or keeper of an orchard must register his orchard. A keeper is a person who occupies a property, whereas an owner may not necessarily occupy a property. Although the Bill provides that only one person shall be qualified to vote, it is not clear who will have the right to vote if both the owner and the keeper of a property apply for registration. It could well be that an owner and a keeper might not have the same fundamental interests. If money were required to eradicate a pest, a keeper might be disinclined to approve such expenditure whereas an owner, who would not be financially involved, would be inclined to want the infection cleared up in the long-term interests of the property.

The provision in the Bill dealing with the committees will overcome the problem that is often associated with committees of this type. A similar problem exists where councils are responsible for weed control. Apart from my concern as to who shall be entitled to vote, I support the Bill.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I, too, support the Bill. Committees have been set up in my district in recent years, and the amendments in the Bill will overcome many of the difficulties which have beset them in the past. Regarding the point raised by the member for Gumeracha about who has the right to vote, I point out that clause 3 clearly indicates that only one person may be registered in respect of each orchard and, as an owner is referred to in the Bill before a keeper, I suggest that the owner will have a prior right to registration should both the owner and the keeper apply.

New section 7a provides that each committee shall be a body corporate. This will overcome many of the difficulties and embarrassing situations that have arisen when a committee comes up against a rugged individualist who does not wish to comply with its wishes regarding the eradication of a particular pest. This is a rather unfortunate occurrence, because the committee's work is being done for the benefit of all the growers engaged in the fruit-growing district with which the committee is concerned.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the Bill. In South Australia many citrus trees are rotten with red scale. Will the provisions of the Bill help to control this? As people are fond of giving lemons away, they are distributed all over South Australia. In a country town I can show members a lemon tree the fruit of which is hardly distinguishable as lemons because of red scale. However, the lemons are all right inside and have plenty of juice. When those lemons are given away, the infection is spread. Codlin moth and other diseases affecting apple orchards, as well as diseases affecting vines, are handled wherever they occur. It is assumed in this case that all oranges and lemons are grown in plantations or orchards that grow only citrus fruit; it is further assumed that citrus fruit is not scattered all over South Australia. However, as members know, there are thousands upon thousands of citrus trees all over the State. I would not guess how many lemon trees that there were in the metropolitan area. I ask the Minister whether any effort will be made under this legislation to control isolated cases, each

one of which is a source of infection. Everyone should be told how to control red scale and should have the means of doing so readily available. Many people do not know what the infection is: they just say that the fruit is scaly.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): Regarding the remarks made by the member for Burra, this Bill unfortunately does not cover home gardens outside declared areas. I think that was explained fully to the honourable member in reply to a question he had asked. I have not been able to find the reference to the answer I gave, but I said then that the matter was being considered by the Horticulture Branch of the Agriculture Department. I appreciate the member's comments and it would be good for householders outside the declared areas to take some action.

Regarding the concern expressed by the member for Gumeracha, I appreciated his speaking to me earlier this afternoon, because that gave me an opportunity to discuss the matter. From what I have been told, it is a well known legal practice that the first one named has priority regarding registration.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The first one to apply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The first named in the legislation but, when applications were called, the first to apply would be the first to have the right to a vote. However, I shall have this matter clarified in writing and shall read the report to members in Committee. Therefore, I shall ask that progress be reported when we reach clause 3 in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1597.)

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): I support the Bill, because it increases in a broad sense the membership of the Council of the Institute of Technology. The method of doing that was discussed by the council and agreed to some time ago. That recommendation was submitted to the Minister, who has introduced the Bill. The membership of the council is being increased from 15 to 19. The Director will become a member of the council *ex officio*, two of the additional members will be appointed on the nomination of the academic

staff of the institute, and the third additional member will be an officer of the Education Department who will be nominated by the Minister. This action is in keeping with the trend of the councils of universities and other tertiary institutions. Members will recall that last year provision was included in the Flinders University of South Australia Bill so that the council of that university would comprise representatives from many walks of life other than teaching and the academic field. Representation of this Parliament was provided for.

Now the same sort of provision is being made regarding the institute. For generations it has been traditional that the council comprise practical men and women drawn, in the main, from industry, commerce and the trade unions, with few lettered people or people from the arts. Of course, outstanding members have been highly qualified in their own professions, such as in engineering and the sciences, but they have not been direct representatives of the teaching staff. This Bill brings the institute into line with the Adelaide University and the Flinders University, and gives effect to the recommendation of the Australian Universities Commission. That commission included in its report a table of the various universities in Australia and set out the representation on the councils. There is wisdom in bringing the institute into line at this time, because its importance is growing daily in necessity and stature.

We ought to consider where tertiary education in South Australia is going. The term "The importance of advanced colleges of education" was coined in the Martin report and we are saddled with it. However, today we have universities and colleges of advanced education. They have to be complementary and not competitive. I hope that the institute will never be regarded as a third university, and I know that the Minister agrees with this. At the university the main concept is the advancement of learning through research: at the institute the work is mainly practical and the application of what is taught. Although many courses at both the university and the institute have equal academic content, some courses at the university contain a greater degree of research. The Martin report states:

Education which can be provided by technical institutions has long been undervalued . . . nor is the wide function of these colleges, in fulfilling the various needs of commerce and industry fully appreciated by the public. The colleges of advanced education envisaged in the Martin report will bridge the divergence

that has arisen between the academic "ivory tower" in the universities and the requirements of the day-to-day life of industry and commerce; the graduates of these technical institutions will supply the link between pure research and discovery on the one hand, and the applications, inventions, and developments needed, on the other. The number of subjects taught today is increasing, as is the number of schools. I regret that degrees that have been conferred on graduates of the institute will not be granted in future, because of a directive of the Commonwealth Government through the Martin report.

Mr. Millhouse: This is for the reason that you supported it: that it should not be a third university.

Mr. COUMBE: I regret that a degree in technology, and a degree in other faculties, is to be replaced by a diploma. The diploma is for the same subjects as are taught by the same lecturer at the university, but now one will become not a graduate but a diplomate. Some subjects taught at the institute are not taught at the university, for instance, pharmacy. In other States there is a degree in this subject but one cannot obtain a degree in this State. Many courses at the institute are the same as those conducted previously as degree courses and the same as those conducted at the universities. It is important to widen the representation on this council, because the institute is undertaking a major developmental scheme at present. It hopes to spend about \$5,500,000, made up of Commonwealth and State moneys, in the present triennium, on an important project at The Levels. This establishment will accommodate 9,000 students, some part-time and some full-time.

An important part of the institute's work is that it offers part-time courses, which are not always available at the universities. The proposed total of 9,000 students compares more than favourably with the limit of about 8,000 on the number of students at the University of Adelaide, and with the limit of about 6,000 at the Flinders University, and indicates the expansion to take place. I welcome the expansion of the council, and I hope that its composition will continue to reflect a background predominantly industrial and commercial, rather than the academic background of the universities.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I, too, support the Bill and am pleased to associate myself with what has been said by my colleague. In the continuing development of the institute it is

most right and proper that the number of council members should be increased, and that it should be increased by adding the people it is intended to elect to the council. The institute is passing through a period of great development and the knowledge that these additional members of the council can bring to its deliberations will be of great benefit. On the staff of the institute are many well qualified and scholarly people: most of them are graduates of Australian universities who, after undertaking post-graduate work overseas, have taken up appointments on the staff of the institute. Others, graduates of English universities, bring experience of conditions, technological advances, and developments in the universities in which they have served with distinction. The suggestion that the number of council members should be increased by the election of members of the academic staff brings us into line with other tertiary educational establishments throughout Australia.

In recent years a provision has been written into the constitutions of most new universities that members of the academic staff who are selected by their fellow members may serve on the councils of universities and of institutes of technology. I was glad when the council, after representations had been made by the institute's staff association, was prepared to receive a deputation from the association, which put its case very convincingly. Subsequently, the council in its wisdom decided that the request should be acceded to. The council's deliberations will be greatly assisted by the persons selected by the staff association to serve on the council.

The member for Torrens stated that the institute is passing through a period of great development. As a member of the council, I find it exciting to be associated with this development. In the last year we have seen the erection of the building on Frome Road, which was the first major project undertaken at the institute for a very long time. Now, we have this comprehensive development at The Levels for which planning is well advanced, and it is hoped that, subject to the Commonwealth's approval of plans submitted to it, building will be commenced soon.

This has fired the enthusiasm of everyone at the institute, and there is an atmosphere of purpose abroad not only amongst council members but also amongst staff members. I pay a tribute to the members of the institute's academic staff who were responsible for planning the institute's current development, for

conducting research into its future requirements, and for making recommendations to the council. Out of this has come the decision to press on with the development at The Levels, which I am sure will add lustre to tertiary education in South Australia and play an important part in advancing technological education in this State. We await the building of these additions to the Institute of Technology with much interest.

It is right that there should be a representative of the Education Department on the council. As the Minister knows, the Director-General of Education has long been a distinguished member of the council in his own personal right. As chairman of the education committee, he has made a contribution for which he is well fitted. The institute has for many years administered certificate courses which to some extent are now being taken over by the Education Department. It is appropriate that a representative of the Education Department should be on the council at this time when, perhaps, more courses will be taken over; we shall be able to receive valuable advice from him.

Although the institute's complexion is changing to some extent and is changing the range of certificate courses offered and upgrading some certificate courses, thereby making them advanced certificate courses, I believe that the council is still responsible to a large extent for providing facilities for part-time study for many young technicians and technical people who cannot study full-time. The council will continue to conduct some of these courses, although some will come under the aegis of the Education Department. By and large, this Bill is timely, and it makes a valuable contribution to the future advancement of the Institute of Technology, which will in its turn contribute greatly to this State's educational and technological development.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I thank the two members who have spoken for their comments and for their support of this Bill. Both members are doing valuable work as members of the Council of the Institute of Technology, and it is because they hold these offices that I particularly appreciate their comments. I am sure the changes provided in this Bill will be advantageous to the council and to the development that is now taking place at the institute.

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE  
COMMISSION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments and suggested amendments:

*Schedule of the amendments made by the Legislative Council:*

No. 1. In the title—After the word “on” insert “certain classes of” and leave out the word “General”.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 12 to 14 (clause 2)—Leave out definition of “insurance”.

No. 3. Page 5, line 4 (clause 12)—Leave out “general”.

No. 4. Page 5, line 5 (clause 12)—After “insurance” insert “in respect of motor vehicles within the meaning of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1967, and employers’ liability”.

No. 5. Page 5, line 6 (clause 12)—Before “insurance” insert “such”.

No. 6. Page 5, line 8 (clause 12)—Before “insurance” insert “such”.

No. 7. Page 5, line 9 (clause 12)—Leave out whole line.

No. 8. Page 5, line 10 (clause 12)—Leave out “general”.

No. 9. Page 5, lines 11 and 12 (clause 12)—Leave out “, or any class or form of insurance.”

No. 10. Page 5, lines 38-41 (clause 12)—Leave out “may, with the approval of the Minister and the consent of the Minister controlling any department of the public service of the State, and on such terms as may be mutually agreed upon”, and insert “shall not”.

No. 11. Page 5, line 42 (clause 12)—Leave out “that” and insert “any”.

No. 12. Page 5, line 42 (clause 12)—After “department”, insert “of the public service or of any instrumentality of the State”.

*Schedule of the amendments suggested by the Legislative Council:*

No. 1. Page 7, line 18 (clause 17)—Leave out “from time to time” and insert “at least once in every financial year”.

No. 2. Page 7 (clause 17) After line 24 insert new subclause as follows:—

(1a) The Commission shall from time to time as the Auditor-General shall determine but not less frequently than once in each financial year pay to the Treasurer such sums as the Auditor-General certifies—

(a) would be payable by the Commission if the Commission in respect of its insurance business were liable as an insurance company for the payment of charges, fees

and other disbursements payable under any State or Commonwealth Act to any State or Commonwealth department or instrumentality and rates and taxes payable under any State or Commonwealth Act to any Local Government Authority; and

(b) would be payable by any other person engaged in the business of insurance to a vendor of goods for sales tax.

No. 3. Page 9, line 6 (clause 19)—After “fit” insert “: Provided that any advances made under this subsection shall carry interest at a rate not lower than the current long-term rate of interest at which the Government of the State may borrow money”.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the amendments of the Legislative Council be disagreed to.

They have the effect of so far restricting the classes of insurance that can be dealt with by the Government Insurance Commission and restricting the operations of the commission that the exercise would inevitably be unprofitable. It is impossible to cripple an insurance office in this way: to saddle it with what are acknowledged to be the less profitable forms of insurance, so that it becomes, in effect, a means of subsidizing the private insurance companies in South Australia. So far from there being fair competition, a handout to insurance companies is proposed, and I ask the Committee to reject the amendments.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition’s viewpoint was made clear when this Bill was discussed previously. We oppose the establishment of a Government Insurance Office for a number of reasons. If the Government claims that it has a right to bring in this Bill, its claim is limited to the fields which the Premier objects to at this time. Although I do not in any way support the establishment of a Government Insurance Office, I feel I have to agree with the Legislative Council’s amendments. At least they tend to limit the field of insurance.

The Government claims that it has a mandate on this matter. As this amendment comes from another place, and as it represents the distance that we as an Opposition can go, I support it and the effect it will have on the powers of the Government in relation to the establishment of a Government Insurance Office.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): It is obvious why the Legislative Council has suggested these amendments: to bring the Bill into line with what was said (although not very clearly) by the then leader of the Labor Party prior to the last election. As I say, it is not altogether clear from his language what he had in mind, but many of us have had much experience in interpreting his speeches, and to us it must be reasonably clear from what he said on that occasion that all his Party proposed at the election (and all that was put before the people of this State) was a scheme regarding workmen's compensation and third party insurance. The then Leader of the Opposition said:

It is not my intention to deal with industrial matters at this stage other than to mention that our policy on workmen's compensation in particular is to make provision for the right to receive workmen's compensation for any accident sustained whilst travelling to or from place of residence to place of employment. It appears that as a step forward concerning the implementation of this very necessary provision, a long overdue measure, it will be required that our policy consider the establishment of a State insurance scheme, and a further factor that may also be considered is that whilst it is recognized that workmen's compensation insurance cover for all persons must be provided, it is also compulsory for people who desire to register a motor vehicle to have a third party compulsory insurance policy. Under Government instrumentalities, when things become compulsory, I believe that it is reasonable to give consideration to the right of the individual to have a choice of insurance. That is all that was said in the policy speech of the present Government prior to the last election. Unfortunately, that is far from clear, but the only two classes of insurance referred to are workmen's compensation and motor vehicle insurance. The amendment cuts down the ambit of the Bill to those two matters, to the promise or the policy which was put before the people of this State and which we must assume the people of this State accepted by giving a majority to the present Government.

It is not good enough for the present Government to do what has been done by Labor administrators on other occasions, and to say, "It is all in our policy. We have a mandate from the people and we will put into effect anything in our policy—whatever that may be." That is what Mr. Chifley said in 1947, when he suddenly introduced a measure to nationalize the banks even though it had not been mentioned prior to the 1946 Federal elections: He said, "It is in our policy. The people of Australia know what our policy is and they will endorse it." This is what the present Dunstan Government, following in a

minor way in the footsteps of the Chifley Government, is trying to do. It says, "It is in our policy. The people of South Australia know that we are Socialists and that we stand for a State Insurance Office to cover all risks; therefore we will put it into effect."

Mr. Langley: What about the other States?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not dealing with other States at the moment. I am reminding the honourable member of the platform upon which he was elected, and the policy to which he subscribes. If the honourable member wants us to deal with other States, we can remind him of Victoria and Western Australia where, if my recollection is correct, Government insurance business is substantially restricted to these matters. I support my Leader in opposing the Premier's attitude.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): The effect of the Legislative Council's amendments amounts to the use of taxpayers' money to subsidize private insurance companies. Most members are aware that workmen's compensation and motor vehicle insurance are not profitable forms of insurance for private companies.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did your then Leader mention only those?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is quick on other occasions to quote from the Labor Party rule book, but on this occasion he does not seek to do so. If he did, he would find provision for the establishment of an insurance office to cover all forms of insurance. This was certainly the way I talked about the proposal prior to the election, as I am sure many other members talked about it. If the previous Premier had realized that his statements would be subject to the kind of misinterpretation that members opposite are now seeking to put upon them, he would have altered them substantially. Those statements cannot justify the Opposition's supporting a Bill that will use taxpayers' money to subsidize private insurance companies; that is what the present Bill would amount to.

The Labor Party's rule book states "a State Insurance Office covering all insurable risks". I do not know how members opposite can justify the Bill in its current form. They know full well that, for private insurance companies at present, motor vehicle and third party insurance and workmen's compensation are all claimed to be non-profitable. If a Government Insurance Office were established and confined to those fields and if it charged the same rates as the private insurance companies charge, then presumably it would not cover costs and any deficit would have to be

made up out of taxpayers' money. Alternatively, the Government Insurance Office would be forced to push up rates, and that increase also would have to be met out of the pockets of ordinary individuals of the community. On the other hand, the private insurance companies would have passed over some of their unprofitable business to the Government and they would be making increased profits. Therefore, the effect of the Legislative Council's amendments and of the support to them by the Opposition in this place this afternoon would be to transfer funds from the taxpayers to the private insurance companies. How members opposite can support this I do not know.

I was pleased to see that one member of the Legislative Council (Hon. Mr. Geddes) was reported in the press as saying that he could not support the establishment of an insurance office where it was bound to be unprofitable. I commend Mr. Geddes for those remarks. At least he is prepared to be honest in relation to the matter, and is not prepared to play ducks and drakes with the funds of ordinary individuals, which is what the Bill does as formulated at present. I cannot see how any member can, with any honesty, support the Legislative Council's amendments. Members opposite should vote to throw out the Bill altogether or disagree to these amendments so that, if we are going to have a Government Insurance Office, it can be established reasonably, as an institution that can compete on all fours with private insurance companies, using any profit it makes to reduce premiums in the interests of the people of this State. If members opposite are not prepared to withdraw their support of the Legislative Council's amendments, then they stand charged, in my view (and I am sure the people of South Australia would agree), with supporting the subsidizing of private insurance companies by the use of public moneys. That is wrong: I do not care how the Opposition looks at the matter or whether it talks about what was said prior to the elections or anything else, that is wrong and stays wrong.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I have never seen the member for Glenelg in such a mood to misrepresent the attitude of the Opposition so blatantly as he has misrepresented it. Nor have I heard him so weakly try to impute on the Opposition something in which it does not believe. Over and over again during debates on this matter, we have said that we do not believe in a Government Insurance Office. We still do not

believe in such an office: we think that any type of Government insurance is a silly type of venture. Therefore, at any time (and particularly at this time) any suggestion that we favour a Government Insurance Office is a serious misrepresentation. We opposed the Bill and voted against it in the hope that there would be no Government Insurance Office. However, if there is to be one, then the more limited is its business the better.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I want to try to sort out just what the Opposition is trying to say. The member for Alexandra said that the Opposition was against all forms of Government insurance. That is the first time I have heard that: throughout the second reading debate, I understood Opposition members to say that they were not prepared to agree to all forms of insurance. However, the honourable member now says that the Opposition will not have Government insurance at any price. I do not think the Opposition knows where it is. To suggest that the member for Glenelg does not know what he is talking about is so much bally-hoo, because I think the member for Glenelg summed up the position very well indeed. It is high time the people of South Australia were told the real situation on this matter, namely, that an insurance company (or any company for that matter) cannot be established unless it is allowed to cover the whole ramifications of the business with which it is concerned. That puts the matter in a nutshell. The Opposition suggests that a Government Insurance Office should work in a restricted way and, of course, the Legislative Council takes its cue from what is said by the Opposition in this House. It seems to me that the Opposition was determined from the first not so much to oppose a Government Insurance Office (as is suggested by the member for Alexandra) but to restrict it in such a way that it would be impossible for it to run at a profit. Therefore, I oppose the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I cannot understand the case that members opposite have tried to make out. First, they say that a Government Insurance Office should make a profit; then they say that private insurance companies in South Australia are making too much profit now. Government members say that a Government Insurance Office must make a profit (that should be condemned by Socialists) if it is going to exist and that otherwise we should not have such an office. However, if the Government office is to make

a profit, why not carry on with the existing commercial companies, most of which make a modest profit and serve the people well?

Members opposite say that the Government Insurance Office should not be restricted to a few unprofitable forms of insurance. If insurance is unprofitable, why have an office at all? The administrative costs of the office will be much higher than those of private offices and will become a burden on the taxpayer rather than an asset to him. I was interested in the member for Glenelg's weak apologia for the Bill. He has mentioned that the only reason for its introduction has been the inclusion of the establishment of a State Government Insurance Office in the Australian Labor Party rule book by the 146 or 126 so-called faceless men at the Trades Hall, who will continue to lead South Australia along the rocky road to ruin, as they have led this State in the last two and a half years. Why do members opposite not make common cause with the members of the Legislative Council and have established an office that can render a benefit to the State?

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Ryan. No—Mr. Ferguson.  
Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; Legislative Council's amendments disagreed to.

*Suggested Amendments Nos. 1 and 3.*

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments Nos. 1 and 3 be agreed to.

These are merely amendments relating to financial provisions and make no amendment of substance. The Government is prepared to accept them.

Suggested amendments agreed to.

*Suggested Amendment No. 2.*

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

This amendment requires that the Auditor-General determine not less frequently than once in every financial year such sums as are fixed and requires that the sums would be payable

by the commission to the Treasurer if the commission, in respect of its insurance business, were liable as an insurance company for the payment of charges, fees and other disbursements payable under any State or Commonwealth Act to any State or Commonwealth department or instrumentality and rates and taxes payable under any State or Commonwealth Act to any local government authority; and would be payable by any other person engaged in the business of insurance to a vendor of goods for sales tax. This matter was fully debated. The provisions in the Bill adequately cover the position regarding competition and the suggested amended provision is undesirable.

Suggested amendment disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments and to suggested amendment No. 2 was adopted:

Because they defeat the purposes of the Bill.

#### PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for assistance to primary producers in necessitous circumstances as a result of drought, fire, flood, frost, animal or plant disease, insect pest, or other natural calamity, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*  
While the Bill's main purpose is to provide the appropriation and machinery to enable the Government to make financial assistance available to primary producers who are in necessitous circumstances because of the present drought conditions which have prevailed in parts of the State, the Bill also provides for continuing appropriation and machinery to deal with such similar assistance as may be necessary as a result of other natural causes such as flood, fire, animal or plant disease, insect pest and the like as may occur from time to time.

Even before the present drought conditions occurred it had been part of the Government's plans that it should be able to give immediate and effective aid to primary producers whose financial situation had been affected through no fault of their own but who, notwithstanding that they met certain criteria as to their ability to carry on and eventually rehabilitate their position, were unable to obtain the necessary finance from what may be regarded as normal sources. This Bill, therefore, is directed towards providing such

assistance and will be invoked immediately to the extent required to meet the present drought situation.

Members have been informed that an approach has been made to the Commonwealth in the present instance requesting financial assistance along the same lines as that given to the States of New South Wales and Queensland. Some members have asked whether assistance to primary producers in their present problems is contingent upon the Commonwealth agreeing to assist in this fashion or whether the State intends to act independently in the matter. Acceptance by Parliament of this Bill will enable the Government to deal with applications for assistance as they are submitted without waiting for a final determination by the Commonwealth, and then, if the Commonwealth agrees to assist, to continue with assistance in accordance with the terms and conditions of such assistance.

The Government intends to draw on two funds at the Treasury to provide the finance necessary to make assistance available to primary producers who are in necessitous circumstances as a result of the factors mentioned in this Bill. First, more than \$200,000 stands to the credit of the Farmers Assistance Fund at the Treasury. This balance is made up of unexpended loan moneys and of repayments of advances, including interest, made under various Farmers Assistance and Drought Relief Acts of earlier years. Under present legislation the purposes for which such funds may be used are mainly debt adjustment and drought relief (with some restriction on the persons qualified to be assisted).

Secondly, nearly \$300,000 is held in the Marginal Lands Improvements Account at the Treasury. This balance derives, in the first instance from grants made by the Commonwealth in the early 1940's to assist economic settlement in marginal wheatgrowing areas. The grants were used for purchasing holdings, which did not constitute living areas, and these holdings were then aggregated into larger holdings and re-allocated under marginal lands perpetual leases. The State has accounted fully to the Commonwealth for the amount of the grants then made. In fixing rentals under those marginal lands perpetual leases, rentals were determined separately in respect of unimproved values and improvements. Rentals in respect of unimproved value were paid to General Revenue, and those in respect of the value of improvements were paid to the Marginal Lands

Improvements Fund. There was no requirement in the arrangements with the Commonwealth that rentals in respect of improvements should be credited to a special fund. These rentals could equally have been credited to Revenue along with the rental applicable to unimproved value.

These moneys have, in the past, been used from time to time for assistance to producers in marginal areas, such assistance being in the nature of payments towards pasture development to arrest sand drift, materials for fencing and water supply, etc., and have been given to settlers needing such assistance to give them a reasonable chance of reaching a stage where they could carry on. No payments have been made from this account since 1961. It is, therefore, intended to appropriate \$150,000 of these moneys to the Farmers Assistance Fund for expenditure on the purposes set out in this Bill. Action will be taken later to seek appropriation of the balance of these moneys for such purposes as combating soil erosion on Crown lands, control and eradication of vermin by the introduction of rabbit control schemes, and possibly by the introduction of some limited subsidies to district councils, particularly those in the former marginal areas whose rate revenue is limited, for vermin control work.

Clause 3 provides for payment into the Farmers Assistance Fund of any moneys received from the Commonwealth for the purposes of giving assistance to primary producers in the circumstances contemplated, sums up to \$150,000 from the Marginal Lands Improvements Fund, moneys provided by Parliament for these purposes, and all sums, including interest, received as repayments of advances made. Clause 4 authorizes payment from the Farmers Assistance Fund of the additional assistance to be authorized by this Bill, and the expenses of administration of schemes of assistance.

Clause 5 enables assistance to be given to primary producers in the various named circumstances that give rise to the necessity for assistance. It authorizes the Minister of Lands, to whom administration of the Primary Producers Assistance Act is committed, to make advances to primary producers, who are in necessitous circumstances as a result of the contingencies set out, to enable them to continue in the business of primary production. This section also authorizes the Minister to make certain payments towards the cost of fodder or water for starving stock. Any advances or other payments to be made by the Minister of Lands will be so made upon

the advice and recommendations of the Minister of Agriculture that will be given after considering reports by departmental officers or, where it is considered desirable, by a committee appointed to deal with applications made by primary producers. In this present instance the Government, having had the advice of a committee, which was set up to consider the necessity for and nature of governmental action, intends to constitute substantially the same committee to report on applications for assistance.

Clause 5 (2) sets out the conditions under which advances may be made. I do not intend to recite these conditions, but merely to say that it is not intended in the present situation, or any comparable one which may arise in the future, that advances from the Government should be a substitute for normal avenues of farm finance. These normal avenues should be utilized to the full extent available, thus restricting advances under this Act to the additional amount necessary to finance the rehabilitation needed to enable the applicant to get back into successful primary production.

I emphasize that the application of the scheme envisaged by this Bill is limited to those persons whose financial need is wholly or substantially brought about by causes listed in the Bill. It is not for general application to persons whose failure is due to other causes. Further, such persons must have a reasonable chance of recovery, and regard will be had to such chances in the determination of possible remissions of interest or principal for which provision is made in clause 5 (2) (d). At this stage, it is proper to say that I believe that in present circumstances, and any future cir-

cumstances contemplated in the Bill, the banks and stock firms will do their part in supporting the primary producers who meet their criteria for advances. Indeed, I know that they are at present viewing applications, which meet these criteria, with the utmost fairness.

Clause 5 (3) deals with payments made in accordance with any arrangements made with the Commonwealth under which moneys are made available by the Commonwealth for the purpose of assisting primary producers in the circumstances contemplated in the Bill. Clause 6 protects recipients of any payments from claims, which may be made by prior creditors, so that advances may be used by the recipients for the purposes for which they are made. Clause 7 exempts from stamp duty or registration fee any documents executed for applicants in accordance with the requirements of the Minister of Lands.

Clause 8 provides that it shall be an offence to make a false statement in connection with any application for assistance, and that any moneys advanced to an applicant as a result of a false statement shall be immediately recoverable. Clause 9 makes the necessary financial provision. I commend the Bill to honourable members, and ask for its speedy passage in order that assistance may be made available to those persons who are now in need of it as a result of the drought conditions that have obtained in certain areas of the State.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 30, at 2 p.m.