HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 28, 1970

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL FIRE

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should like to give to the House the following information on the action that is being taken following the recent fire which occurred in the Seacombe High School and which destroyed four wooden classrooms and the canteen building at the high school. Since the fire, the classes that normally would have occupied the wooden classrooms have been accommodated in the various science laboratories at the school. That inevitably has meant some interruption to science work within the school. Two transportable rooms that were ready to go to Amata have been diverted to Seacombe High School and should reach there, one tomorrow and the other on Friday. A dual room now at the Salisbury Teachers College has been made available and will be taken to Seacombe High School over the weekend. For more permanent arrangements, these four transportable rooms will be held at Seacombe High School pending the building of a new wing at the school in two years. For the time being, the Headmaster has moved the canteen to a small room. He has received donations of equipment and the canteen is now functioning. The Headmaster considers that this is a satisfactory arrangement until Christmas. During the Christmas vacation it is intended to provide a canteen shell or, more probably, to partition off a canteen in the shelter area at the school. Subsequently, more satisfactory canteen accommodation will be provided as a part of the new wing. Either alternative is acceptable to the school.

The school is working on lists of belongings of students and teachers, which will be replaced at departmental cost. The canteen equipment has almost all been replaced but any which has not been replaced or which has been replaced by inferior equipment will be replaced at the Education Department's cost. I am happy to be able to report to the House that Seacombe High School is working normally. Inconvenience arising from the fire has been reduced to a minimum by the excellent co-operation of the Public Buildings Department, the Head of the school, the staff and administrative officers of the Education Department.

QUESTIONS

MURRAY STORAGES

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say whether the Government will reconsider its attitude towards the Dartmouth dam agreement, bringing legislation into this House to have it ratified this session? I am sure that the Premier and the House would be aware that the previous Administration negotiated a settlement for the construction of the dam that gave immense benefits to South Australia, resulting in a usable water increase of 37 per cent beyond the present entitlement that South Australia has. The Premier will know that the increase is far greater than that when compared to the lowest allocation South Australia has received in the driest year it has experienced. The Premier would also be aware that, before a further dam was built, the Chowilla dam proposal would have to be compared to what other schemes could be devised on the river to see which was the most beneficial to South Australia. I ask this question of the Premier because we know that South Australia is subject to periodic droughts, and we should therefore urgently provide for work to be started on the dam during the summer months.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is perfectly prepared to ratify an agreement relating to the immediate construction of the Dartmouth dam. There is no question of the Government's being prepared to proceed with the Dartmouth dam immediately—it is. That was communicated to the Commonwealth Government and to the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria from the outset of this Government's taking office. The Parliament of this State instructed the previous Government that it could not agree to a proposal which spelt the doom of Chowilla for all time.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been asked a question, and I intend to answer it; if members opposite do not want to listen, the people of this State do. The Parliament of this State instructed the previous Government that it was not prepared to agree to any proposal, which would put an end to Chowilla for all time, as a price of agreeing to some other dam on the Murray River. The previous Government made an agreement contrary to

the instructions of this Parliament. When that agreement was brought to this Parliament, because it meant not only the construction of the Dartmouth dam but also the end for all time of the Chowilla dam the Parliament would not agree to it. That matter was tested at an election, and the people of this State upheld the view that was then taken by the majority of this Parliament. We then sought talks with the other State Governments involved and the Commonwealth Government on the proposed agreement relating to Dartmouth. It took us an inordinate length of time to get a meeting of Ministers, but that was only because the Prime Minister was not prepared to engage in an immediate meeting. Eventually we did get a meeting of Ministers, and the proposal put before that meeting was that the South Australian Government would present to this Parliament an amendment to the agreement and ask the other Parliaments to be presented with the same amendment, which would ensure the immediate construction of the Dartmouth dam and would still leave the way open for the construction thereafter of the Chowilla dam.

The Commonwealth Government and the other State Governments refused to listen to any proposition, and they made this perfectly clear at the meeting: they would listen to no proposition whatever that altered one word of the agreement that had been rejected by this Parliament and by the people of this State. They would not listen to any compromise in any way that altered a single word of that agreement. True, this breach in the front was obtained: we pointed out that for the other States, in deciding on the next storage on the Murray River, to take into account, as against the competing storages, the cost of works at Lake Victoria would be unfair, and the Commonwealth Government agreed that this was so. It said it would not amend the agreement but would be willing to let us have a letter of intent stating that it was not going to take that into account, but New South Wales and Victoria would not agree to that. They said they were going to take into account, despite the things said in this House by the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite, every cent spent at Lake Victoria as costs counted against Chowilla, and any construction of Chowilla, as honourable members know, would flood any of the inlet and outlet works to be constructed at Lake Victoria. In those circumstances, this Government has gone with a reasonable compromise proposal to the other States, but the other States will not listen to a word. Indeed, Sir Henry Bolte has stated today that, as far as he is concerned, we can get out of the River Murray Waters Agreement. I do not know how he proposes to expel us, but Sir Henry says some strange things on occasion.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'll have to bring him to heel!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall be grateful for the honourable member's assistance in doing that: I am quite willing to accept his assistance. This State has made a reasonable proposal, but what has happened is that there has been a consultation between the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the other States about the attitude they would take to South Australia, and that attitude is, "Darn whatever the Parliament of South Australia has said and darn what the people of that State have said. You do as we tell you, or you will get nothing." That is precisely what the Prime Minister said to me when I was at the Premiers' Conference last June. He would listen to nothing. South Australia cannot be put in that position. The other States made it clear last Friday that as far as they were concerned the Chowilla dam was dead forever and that they would insist on the provisions in the agreement that provide them with the right to say that that is so. We are not prepared to submit to that kind of bulldozing. We are not being stubborn; it is the other parties to this agreement who are.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We came to the meeting with a series of specific proposals for compromise, and the answer of the Commonwealth and the other States was that there was to be no compromise; South Australia was to take the medicine that they were to give us, and that medicine was the end of Chowilla for South Australia not only for now but for the rest of time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Even though the compromise accepted the fact that Dartmouth would be built first.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We told them that we accepted that Dartmouth should come first (that it should be the next major storage to be constructed on the Murray River) and that we would support (and we have said this from the outset of our representations) the immediate resumption of work on the Dartmouth dam.

Mr. Coumbe: Planning could have been started—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that construction work on the Dartmouth dam cannot start before next March and that, in fact—

Mr. Coumbe: Planning could have started six months ago but for your attitude in April.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have been, in fact, informed by the Engineer-in-Chief that there will be no delay in the construction programme of the Dartmouth dam, provided agreement is reached before next March. We have been proceeding to try constantly to get agreement with the other States, but this Government does not intend, the people of South Australia having voted this way, that the rights we had to the Chowilla dam are forgotten forever and that we simply say to the people of this State, "Well, hard luck; the other States and the Commonwealth are going to say to us that all the benefits for the future are going to derive to us only from upriver storages, and the other States are going to tell us that it is only storages on the basis of a maximum yield to them, with no special advantages to South Australia, that will be agreed to." South Australia is not in a position of having to agree to that situation. We are putting forward a reasonable and reasoned compromise proposal. We have been told that the other States will accept no argument, no compromise, not a single dot on an "i" or a letter to be altered in the agreement rejected by this Parliament and by the people of this State, and that they would not in any circumstances, no matter what proposals we put forward, present to their Parliaments an amendment to the agreement. I see no reason why South Australia should submit, and, if members opposite intend to haul down the flag over South Australia, we do not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier and with your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House, briefly to explain it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It concerns the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Will the Premier disclose to the House now the precise proposals to which he has referred? The Premier will recall that in April this year, when it was announced that this House would meet to consider the Bill to ratify the agreement to build the Dartmouth dam and to give South Australia a significantly increased allocation of water, he expressed confidence in his ability to renegotiate the agreement within a couple of months, well knowing at that time the facts that he now knows and knowing the persons with whom he would have to deal in that renegotiation: the Prime Minister and the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. Jennings: How could he know—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wonder now how long he intends to maintain the attitude he expressed previously.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is the honourable member asking a question or a series of questions?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked the Premier whether he would table—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not ask him to table the proposals: I asked the Premier to give the information.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has proceeded not to explain his question but rather to try to introduce another matter. I now call on the Premier to reply to the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On July 8 this year, following conversations that took place in Canberra, I wrote to the Prime Minister and the other Premiers in similar terms, as follows:

I refer to the River Murray Waters Agreement amendment, which has been ratified by the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Parliaments but for which the necessary Bill lapsed in the South Australian Parliament immediately prior to the recent State election. In order that agreement may be achieved, I request a meeting of yourself, the Premier of New South Wales and the Premier of Victoria with me during the next month.

The Prime Minister later decided that that meant I had written to him alone and asked him to arrange the meeting, but that was not the case and it was obvious he had not even read the letter properly. In my letter I also stated:

I summarize below the matters proposed to be inserted in clause 24 to put an end to any existing agreement concerning the Chowilla reservoir, and produce the same effect as if it were not mentioned in the agreement at all. Without those words Chowilla could not proceed without the unanimous decision of the Commissioners, or an order from an arbitrator, so that the right and interests of the other parties to the agreement would still be protected. We therefore seek the deletion of the words quoted.

The proposal to provide for additional works at Lake Victoria by amendment to clause 20 assured that these works will be flooded if the Chowilla reservoir is later built to full capacity. South Australia believes a special provision should be inserted that the expenditure on those

works shall not be taken into account by the commission in determining the site of the next major storage.

We would support that being done. The other States did not even support planning work proceeding with the Dartmouth reservoir even though we had specifically said that we supported it. The specific proposals for amendment of the River Murray Waters Agreement that we put forward at last Friday's meeting were as follows:

Clause 13, paragraph (*a*)—Delete "completion of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir shall be deferred until the contracting Governments agree that the work shall proceed. Furthermore,".

After "in the case of any work" insert "approved after the first day of October, 1970".

The effect of that amendment would be to cut out the veto power of the other parties to the agreement over the construction of the Chowilla reservoir at all or over its construction as a result of a previous escalation in costs; any subsequent escalation of costs could be taken into account but any previous escalation of costs would not be taken into account. The proposals continued:

New Clause. After clause 13 insert new clause as follows: 13A. After clause 24A the following clause is inserted:

24B. (1) As soon as practicable the Commissioner shall make a study of the River Murray system, including the proposed Chowilla reservoir, with a view to determining where the next storage for that system after the commencement of work on the Dartmouth reservoir is to be situated to meet the needs of persons relying on the waters of the river.

(2) For the purposes of the study, so far as it relates to the proposed Chowilla reservoir and in estimating the cost of that reservoir, no account shall be taken of the cost of the works referred to in paragraph (ii) of clause 20 or of the cost of dismantling or flooding those works.

The effect of that amendment was to provide that the agreement, which the other States had made, not in the agreement itself but by letter, that work on deciding the next major storage should proceed, would be written into the agreement and, in addition, in making a decision on that matter the cost of works at Lake Victoria would be considered lost cost and not taken into account as opposed to the consideration of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir. Although that was what members opposite said was the effect of the agreement, the Commonwealth Government agreed that that should be contained in a letter of intent. The other States said they would take into account the cost of works at Lake Victoria and count it against Chowilla. There was a further proposal that, after clause 49, the following clause should be inserted:

If, by reason of any work commenced after the commencement of work on the Dartmouth reservoir, there is an increase in the storages in the River Murray system, the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia shall share equally the waters made available by such increase.

This is necessary in relation to any additional storage. That was a proposal to which the other States and the Commonwealth would not listen for one moment. South Australia could not have been more reasonable or given more in the way of a compromise to achieve an agreement, but the attitude of the other parties was that not one word, not one letter and not one dot of an "i" was to be altered in the existing agreement, which they clearly admitted spelt the doom of Chowilla for all time.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say what agreement was reached at the conference in Sydney on Friday regarding the release of statements to the press and public statements generally? The following report appears in this morning's *Advertiser*:

Mr. Swartz (the Commonwealth Minister) claimed that Mr. Dunstan and the South Australian Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) had breached an agreement not to make any statement on the Chowilla-Dartmouth controversy. This agreement had been reached during the conference between the Commonwealth and State Ministers concerned in Sydney on Friday, he said. Mr. Corcoran represented South Australia at the meeting. "I can say with authority that the Ministers agreed not to make any statement on their return to their States and agreed to a joint communique after the meeting, which was released," Mr. Swartz said.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the conclusion of the conference on Friday last, Mr. Swartz suggested that a statement be issued to the press from the conference, and this was agreed to, provided that all Ministers agreed to the wording of that statement. After about two or three alterations had been made to it, agreement was reached among the Ministers present that the statement should be released. When I agreed to the statement's being released, I made it perfectly clear to the conference that, on my return to South Australia, I would not make any press statement on the outcome of the conference until I had reported to Cabinet on Monday, and I kept that undertaking strictly. When I was asked by pressmen to comment, I said simply that I had undertaken to report to Cabinet,

which I would do before I or the Government made any statement at all on the matter. However, the Victorian Minister (Mr. Smith) did not stick to this agreement, as he stated to the press on Saturday that South Australia had been taught its lesson and told to go home and lick its wounds. I did not break any undertaking given to the conference, for no statement was released by the Premier or me until after Cabinet had discussed the matter on Monday, and then releases were made.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works say whether a verbatim report was taken at the conference in Sydney and, if it was, will he make it available as soon as possible?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No verbatim report was taken at the meeting. I should think the honourable member would realize that conferences of this sort are not reported. As it was not reported, I cannot accede to the honourable member's request, because I do not have a report.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: How long does the Premier intend to maintain his refusal to introduce ratifying legislation to the Dartmouth agreement if the Commonwealth and the other States fail to satisfy him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a hypothetical question. I do not know how long the recalcitrance of the other States towards any reasonable proposition will last. If the honourable member thinks that we should simply sit down and do whatever the other States dictate, I suppose I could introduce ratifying legislation tomorrow; but that is not how this Parliament voted or how the people of this State voted. I believe, contrary to the view often expressed by members opposite, that the majority of the people in this State has a right to say what is done by this Parliament.

HAWKER-WILPENA ROAD

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport see that more publicity is given to the fact that the Highways Department is carrying out several planting programmes to replace trees destroyed in road-making? I was disturbed last week to read in the *Advertiser* of October 23 that the Secretary of the Town and Country Planning Association (Dr. J. R. Coulter) had said that creeks were being filled and flattened to make way for a road 100 yds. wide between Hawker and Wilpena. This is certainly not the case. I have driven on this road several times lately and have seen how the engineer in charge is proceeding extremely carefully. The Minister said the road was being built to rural road standards at a normal width of 42ft., not 100 yds. He concluded his statement as follows:

The engineer in charge of this project is eager to avoid any unnecessary clearing.

I support that statement, because I spoke to the engineer a few weeks ago and he told me that he was disturbed at Dr. Coulter's approach. The Highways Department has spent much money in recent years in replacing trees. In 1969-70, $55,000 was set aside for this purpose and $25,000 of that was for the Northern Division. Unfortunately, it is only a few years since this programme of planting was started and the trees are not yet high enough for the public to see them, but I am sure that, when the trees get bigger and people see what has been done by the Highways Department, they will have a different view of that department's work. This road will be no exception, and trees will be replanted to replace those that have been destroyed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with the Highways Department to see whether the honourable member's request can be acceded to by giving publicity to the extremely commendable work that the department is doing in this regard, as the honourable member has rightly acknowledged. I am equally pleased to hear his comment about the road in the Flinders Ranges that came into question last week. Although I have not seen the report, I understand that today's newspaper contains a small paragraph submitted by a person who would be perhaps better informed than was the critic referred to in the report last week. I think the person who contributed today's report is the Manager of the Wilpena Chalet (Mr. Rasheed) and I understand that he expressed an opinion completely contrary to that expressed by the critic last week. I am completely satisfied that the Highways Department is extremely tree-conscious and that, wherever practicable, it tries to reduce the cutting down of trees to an absolute minimum. The department is certainly engaged in a gigantic task in planting trees and, if I can do anything to give greater publicity to this work, I shall be only too pleased to do so. I will certainly discuss the matter with the department.

SOCIAL WORKER

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my question regarding the appointment of a social worker at Port Pirie?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Applications were invited and some have been received. They are being considered at present. I have conferred with the department and also with the Public Service Board about the matter. This is an extremely important appointment. I suppose the appointment of any welfare officer is important, but in this case the welfare officer will be operating some distance from the head office of the department and very much on his own initiative, and it is extremely important that a proper selection be made and that the person with the best qualifications be selected. I cannot tell the honourable member when the appointment will be made, but it will be made as soon as possible.

ADVERTISING

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about doubts that people have as to whether they will receive watches that they have purchased in response to advertisements in this State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The trader's advertisement which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* dated September 26, 1970, has been examined by the Prices Department because of its doubtful and misleading features. Discussions have been held with members of the Horological Guild of South Australia and a local distributor of imported watches. An apparently identical type of watch to that illustrated in the advertisement has been sighted and the distributor stated it had a landed cost of $4.50 plus 27½ per cent sales tax (a total cost of $5.75) and suburban stores would retail such a watch for approximately $11.00 to $12.00, depending on the type of band included in the price. The special retail price quoted in the advertisement was $15.99. Trade representatives contacted considered that the advertised watch would most likely be of poor quality. It is considered that the advertisement could be misleading. This applies particularly to the word "Clearout", as inquiries show that there is not a limited clearout, as additional supplies are being sought from wholesalers to enable all orders to be filled. The words "all orders processed within 48 hours of receipt" are also misleading. A consumer would assume delivery within this period, but this is not so, as "processed" means cashing and clearing cheques and money orders. The Prices Department has been in touch with the trader at Surfers Paradise and also with his advertising agency in Sydney. It seems that there was such an overwhelming response to the advertisement (6,000 orders were received from all States) that it was not possible to despatch all orders immediately. Additional supplies of watches had to be obtained from New South Wales. The trader has, however, indicated that all watches have now been despatched from Brisbane. All newspapers were requested not to publish further copy from this source until investigations were completed. The information obtained indicates that the value of the watch is well below the price charged but, despite the delay, watches should be received by customers.

MODBURY DEATH

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier ask his officers to examine whether the Building Act, as it applies to ventilation, and the safety regulations, as they apply to gas heaters, are adequate, in view of the City Coroner's report about the death of a young girl at Modbury last month and the evidence given at the inquest? The Premier will be aware that I raised this matter yesterday at some length, and I will not go into that again. The Premier replied that, following the inquest, he had received a report from the South Australian Gas Company, the essence of which stated that the fact that natural gas was being used had no bearing on the accident. This information was given as a result of a question I had asked previously. Because of the evidence tendered to the Coroner, I now request that these two new avenues of investigation be pursued.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will find out whether any action can be taken by regulation or administratively to cope with the problems the honourable member raises. Under the Builders Licensing Act we may be much better able to ensure that there is in houses proper and much better ventilation than was available in this case. If the ventilation had extended not merely to a wall cavity but to the outside of the house, this fatality would not have occurred. Also, a gas installation should be fitted by a registered tradesman, not in the way it was put in in this case. I will get a report to see whether any further action can be taken administratively to avoid any occurrences of this kind in future.

NURSES

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to expedite the reply to the question I asked the Attorney over five weeks ago about nurses who have reached the age of 60 years but can be gainfully re-employed in our public hospitals?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up this matter with my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Attorney-General consider the matter of nominations that are made by groups or branches of the Justices Association, that is, when names are submitted from various areas for the purpose of appointing justices of the peace? There is a need in my district, as in other districts throughout the State, to appoint further justices, and active branches of the association in specific areas have a better knowledge of prospective appointees than have the people at present performing this duty.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Under the present system of appointment there is no provision for consultation with anyone. The member for the district endorses the nomination; the police make inquiries concerning character; and then the matter comes to the Attorney-General for the purpose of making an appointment. I have said more than once in the House that I am not at all satisfied that this system is an adequate approach to the appointment of justices of the peace but, while it prevails, I do not think there is any way I can consult any groups or interests in this regard. However, as I have also said more than once in the past, I think the whole system needs carefully examining to see whether it adequately meets the needs of the community, and I should like to be able to devise a more satisfactory system.

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Attorney-General say whether officers of the Royal Association of Justices of South Australia Incorporated have approached him in respect of setting up a different system for the appointment of justices of the peace and, if they have, can he give any details of the system suggested?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not think it would be correct to say that officers of the association approached me for this purpose (I should not be prepared to go so far as to deny that), although my recollection is that they called on me as a normal courtesy call on the new Attorney-General. While they were there, a discussion developed about the method of appointing justices; whether it was on my initiative or on theirs, I do not know, because we were both interested, I think, in devising a new and more satisfactory method. It was a general discussion on the subject. Without having notes of the discussion in front of me, I think their attitude amounted simply to this: they considered that there should be a more satisfactory method of dealing with appointments, and they were happy as an association to play a part in any new system devised. As I recall, those present offered the services of the association in that connection and the matter was left there, to be further considered. I do not think that the association put forward anything that could be described as a concrete proposal for a new system: rather, it indicated its interest in revising the system, and offered the assistance and services of the association in relation to any new system that was being considered.

MURRAY RIVER FLOWS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I recently asked about Murray River flows?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The flow at Albury over the past three months has varied from 3,000 cusecs late in July to 51,000 cusecs at the end of August, following heavy rain in the Hume catchment. It reduced to 17,000 cusecs by mid-September and rose to 44,000 cusecs on September 25, following further heavy rains. The flow has decreased to a present value of some 16,000 cusecs. Corresponding flows in the main tributaries have been as follows:

Kiewa—Peak flow of 7,500 cusecs at the end of August, quickly reduced to the present value of 1,500 cusecs.

Ovens—Peak flow of 24,000 cusecs at the end of August, reducing to the present value of 2,500 cusecs.

Goulbourn—Peak flow in early August, 6,000 cusecs, rising again in September to 16,000 cusecs and reduced to present flows of some 4,000 cusecs.

Murrumbidgee—Low flows of 1,000 cusecs during August and September, now rising to an expected peak of about 7,500-8,000 cusecs at the end of October.

Darling—Negligible flows for the three months of August, September and October.

The net result of all inflows to the Murray River will be a peak inflow to South Australia of about 30,000 cusecs, with high flows sustained probably to the end of November.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, I point out that this reply refers only to the flow recorded at Albury and to the tributaries below Albury. Will the Minister obtain from the department a report indicating what percentage of the flow occurring above Albury was the result of the flow in the Mitta Mitta River?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAY

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about Eyre Peninsula railways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The ballasting and re-laying work on the Port Lincoln Division is to be continued. The cost of these works is apportioned partly to Loan and partly to working expenditure.

CLARE ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 20 about the Auburn-Clare road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department gang which is at present working near Peterborough is programmed to move to the Clare area to commence work on the Auburn-Clare section of the Main North Road during February, 1971. It now appears that the completion of work at Peterborough may slightly delay the transfer of the gang by perhaps a month. This will not significantly affect the programme for the Auburn-Clare road.

FARMERS' ASSISTANCE

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about interest rates charged on funds disbursed through the Primary Producers Assistance Fund?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where the Commonwealth Government advances money to the State for a scheme of assistance to primary producers, the terms and conditions under which moneys are advanced to farmers are such as are stipulated by or agreed to by the Commonwealth Government. This is in accordance with section 5 (3) of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967. The Commonwealth supplied all of the funds for assistance to farmers in relation to the 1967 drought, some of which was by grant and some was repayable. It agreed that no interest would be charged to the State Government and that the State Government in turn could advance the money at 3 per cent, the interest charge being designed to meet State administrative costs and losses. The loan portion is to be repaid by the State over a period not exceeding eight years commencing March 31, 1970.

The State in turn has fixed a five-year repayment period for the advances made to farmers. The Commonwealth funds to which the Leader has referred represent moneys repaid by farmers but which are not yet due for repayment by the State to the Commonwealth. These moneys may not be re-used for advances. The Commonwealth, in fact, has informed me that it will only consider assisting the State if the cost of assistance measures exceeds $1,500,000. If this occurs, it is possible that the Commonwealth may authorize me to use the Commonwealth moneys presently held in the Farmers Assistance Fund. There is therefore no arrangement with the Commonwealth, as is contemplated by section 5 (3) of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, and advances to farmers must be made under the authority of section 5 (2), one of the conditions of which is that advances to farmers shall bear interest at the rate charged by the State Bank in respect of overdraft loans made to primary producers at the time of making the advance. I said that each case would be considered on its merits and that the Minister would have power to review interest rates in appropriate cases.

BALLOT-PAPER

Mr. CURREN: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is possible to withdraw the ballot-paper that has been issued to citrus growers in the Berri-Barmera district for a poll on the dissolution of the Red Scale Control Committee and to redraft the question on it? This morning I received a letter from the Berri-Barmera branch of the Murray Citrus Growers Association requesting that this action be taken and pointing out that, because of the way the question on the ballot-paper was phrased, if the growers want the committee to continue to operate they must vote "No" and if they want it dissolved they must vote "Yes". This is causing much confusion to settlers, many of whom are New Australians and do not understand the English language very well. I also received another letter last Monday from Mr. Mullins, the sponsor of the petition submitted by the growers for the poll for the dissolution of this committee. Both bodies claim that the ballot-paper is loaded against them. Seeing that the poll is being conducted by the Returning Officer for the State, will the Attorney-General investigate this matter and obtain a reply for me?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am intrigued to know what inference is to be drawn from the fact that both sides involved claim that the ballot-paper is loaded against them. As the honourable member drew this matter to my attention and conferred with me this morning, I have had an opportunity to examine the Act. I have no doubt that the question asked on the ballot-paper is a correct one and, indeed, the

only one that could be asked in accordance with the terms of the section of the Act, which authorizes the Minister to direct the holding of a poll on the question whether the committee should be dissolved; that is the precise question that is asked on the ballot-paper. I cannot say whether potential voters could be confused by this. However, whether or not this is so, the question asked is the only one that could be asked in accordance with the law and, therefore, no action can be taken.

BUSH FIRES ACT

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Education, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked recently regarding amendments to certain sections of the Bush Fires Act?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Agriculture has informed me that the Bush Fires Advisory Committee recommended a number of important alterations to the Bush Fires Act, 1960-1968, in October, 1969. The proposed amendments, which include the provision of higher penalties for breaches of the Bush Fires Act, have been submitted to the Parliamentary Draftsman for the preparation of draft legislation. Other important proposals include provision for district councils to compel removal of fire hazards or construction of fire breaks in specified areas, and for the standardization and control of fire hazard indicator signs.

METROPOLITAN SCHOOLS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Education say whether officers of his department have commenced investigations into the upgrading of old schools in the metropolitan area? Several such schools have been used for over 75 years, and the condition of three in the Unley District has understandably deteriorated. Facilities at new schools today leave little to be desired, with adequate playing areas being made available for schoolchildren. However, it is not practicable to provide such spaces in the older schools, where land is not available. Another problem in respect of the older schools is that facilities for teaching lessons are not up to standard. I realize that the Minister is interested in the future well-being of education in this State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Investigations into the problem of upgrading older inner metropolitan primary schools have been commenced. There are serious difficulties in the way of upgrading these schools because almost invariably they are situated on very restricted sites, and it would not be possible on the existing site in many cases to rebuild without entirely disrupting the work of the school during the rebuilding period. As a consequence, the purchase of adjoining properties has to be arranged so that the school area can be expanded. As the honourable member realizes, the process of purchasing adjoining properties so that the total area of the school can be expanded to enable rebuilding to occur away from traffic noise, and without interference to the normal function of the school during the transition period, means that the upgrading of the inner metropolitan schools is likely to be a somewhat slow and drawn-out process.

HOUSING TRUST APPLICATION

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 15 regarding an application for a Housing Trust rental house?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports that the applicant is an English migrant who arrived in Adelaide on March 19, 1970, after spending 2½ years in Perth. He brought his wife and children to Adelaide in May, 1970. At the time of his arrival in Adelaide, he lodged an application for rental housing. As is normal with applicants with large families, this application received early attention and has already been investigated. While it is recommended for housing, there are still a number of local applicants with large families who have already waited much longer. The trust will make an offer of housing just as soon as is possible but cannot promise early assistance because of the uncertainty of larger rental houses becoming available for reallocation and the fact that it cannot, without being most unfair, overlook other applicants.

USED CAR DEALERS

Mr. SLATER: Will the Attorney-General say whether any unsatisfactory reports regarding used car dealers are being received by his department and, if they are, to what extent are they being received? One of my constituents has sent me a letter, in which he states that he purchased a 1965-model Holden and was assured by the dealer from whom he purchased the vehicle that the body had negligible rust content and that it would not need attention for some years. Part of his letter states:

However, after only three months it became obvious to me that the body had been patched

and resprayed, obviously to hide these conditions during the time of sale.

My constituent later states in his letter that on October 26 he took the car to a body repair firm and was told that it would cost $400 to correct the rust fault. He refers to other factors involved, and in his last sentence my constituent asks whether I can help him in respect of this blatant fraud.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is regrettable that a constant stream of complaints is received by my department, and I think by members of the House, relating to used car transactions. One of the significant features is the constant recurrence of the names of certain dealers in relation to these complaints. I think it is fair to say that the fact that certain names do recur indicates that the general body of the trade does not engage in the sort of practice which causes such loss to the public and which seems to be almost part of the ordinary business of certain dealers. The complaints invariably relate to the sale of vehicles without disclosure of defects: the appearance, after the purchaser has had the car, of some defect of which he was unaware and of which he was not told when the purchase was made. In most cases the nature of the defect is such that it is certain that the dealer either knew about it at the time of the sale or, if he did not know of it, he certainly could have made himself aware of it by even a cursory examination.

I am fortified by this constant stream of complaints in the belief I have previously expressed that this situation can only be met by legislation that places responsibility on the dealer to disclose to the purchaser the existence of defects of which the dealer is aware or of which he could become aware by reasonable examination. I have previously announced to the House that the Government intends to introduce legislation for that purpose. The only consolation I can offer the honourable member is that the legislation is being carefully prepared by a small committee possessing expert qualifications for the purpose, so that the legislation will so far as human effort and ingenuity is capable be free of loopholes in what is undoubtedly a difficult area of law reform. Interested parties are being consulted and I hope that, when the Bill is introduced, it will provide a great measure of relief to members of the public who are suffering at the hands of the unscrupulous minority of used car dealers.

LAND TAX

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of this House rural land tax should be reduced by 50 per cent in this financial year, and after the operation of the new five-yearly assessment in June, 1971, further reduced to yield about $300,000 per annum to the Treasury.

This motion expresses the policy put forward by my Leader prior to the last State election with a view to helping the rural producers of this State who are having trouble in meeting the capital taxation that is levied on rural producers. Farmers are having trouble in meeting their commitments not only in respect of land tax but also in respect of council rates and rural land rents.

Mr. McKee: Are you having any problems?

Mr. GUNN: If that is the only comment the honourable member can make, I think he should have a look at rural affairs and try to help the rural community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There are two members disobeying Standing Orders. I ask those members to give the member for Eyre the opportunity to put his point of view.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Land tax is levied on land whether a farmer produces 1 bush. of wheat or 1,000 bush. of wheat, 1 lb. of wool or 1,000 lb. of wool and it is a tax that has to be met in good and bad years. It really cannot be justified in today's serious situation. I am concerned about the new assessment which the South Australian Valuation Department has recently carried out. The present land tax on a property valued at $20,000 and not exceeding $30,000 is $94.50 plus 2.25c for each $2 over $20,000. This is not a large sum and most farmers at present come into this category. The only new assessment figures that I have relate to the District Council of Streaky Bay. In an attempt to save the ratepayers' money, which is a responsible action, the council decided to accept the valuation of the Valuation Department.

A property that was previously valued at $1 an acre has had its unimproved value increased by the Valuation Department to $12 an acre. One of the worst blocks in the district had a valuation of $1 an acre and that has been increased to $18 an acre—a tremendous increase. These figures can be checked at the Valuation Department's office, and the reference numbers are 16060S and 16067S. When looking at the rise in the unimproved value, one can see what will happen to the land tax in South Australia. I understand the Premier has stated that a review has been carried out

and he has seen a deputation from the United Farmers and Graziers organization and the Stockowners Association, which were told that they would be given an advance copy of the new valuation, but I understand that they have not received it. This valuation was considered in my area, and no doubt if a valuation of this type was carried out in one part of South Australia a similar valuation would have been carried out in the rest of the State by the same unrealistic people. I believe they were more interested in getting people off the land than in keeping them on it. No doubt some of them are merely carrying out Socialist policies. We know that one of the methods that Socialists use to get people off the land is to levy this heavy capital tax on landholders.

Mr. Clark: That isn't right.

Mr. GUNN: I am only saying what is Labor policy, and it must be the truth because the honourable member is objecting to it. The district council, which is a responsible body, thought so much of this valuation of which I have been talking that last year it cut it by half, and this year it has reduced it by a further 50 per cent, getting back to the original assessment. The present trend should not take place in the Valuation Department. Anyone who knows anything about land values, particularly unimproved values, will realize that, over the last few months, they have fallen drastically. This would be only a small way in which the Government could help the rural sector, as land tax is not a big problem.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It would be a start.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. This Government has done nothing to assist primary producers. During the election, a rather obnoxious little card was sent by the Labor Party to all districts stating "If you need help—". Photographs of various people appeared on these cards, the photograph of the member for Unley appearing on the card I had. The card referred to a better deal for the man on the land, and so on. If the Government wishes to help primary producers, one of its first steps will be to abolish land tax. In New South Wales land tax on rural land has been progressively reduced, and the Premier of that State has announced that it will be abolished in 1970-71. In Queensland, land tax applies only to freehold properties. I understand that in Victoria land tax has been abolished on primary producing properties. This motion does not seek the total abolition of land tax.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you know that in Queensland the rents on leasehold property are—

Mr. GUNN: We are not discussing rents: that is a matter that I had hoped to bring up at a later date, although from what I have heard today from the Premier I believe that that will not be possible. This motion will result in the reduction of land tax and put a stop to irresponsible increases in land tax by the Government. I hope members will support the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I second the motion *pro forma.*

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NURSING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Dr. Tonkin:

(For wording of motion, see page 824.)

(Continued from September 16. Page 1417.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): When this debate was adjourned on September 16, I was reviewing developments that had taken place with regard to the total health scheme, and not just with regard to nursing, since the Labor Government was elected. I had just concluded referring to home care projects concerning mainly our elderly citizens. Also, approval has been given for the creation of new positions in the Hospitals Department designed to enable further assistance to be provided in the development and efficient operation of hospital services of the Government and Government subsidized hospitals. The member for Ross Smith referred to the Government's establishing a committee to inquire into various aspects of communications within Government hospitals, with particular emphasis on communications affecting student nurses and resident medical staff. It is expected that this committee may make recommendations that could overcome some of the difficulties in the settling-in period of nursing staff members who transfer from the country to the large city hospitals.

Also, reference has been made to the Government's proposal to establish an independent committee to inquire into all aspects of the health and hospital services of the State. I refer to this again because of a debate that took place about seven weeks ago. Such a committee will inquire into public health services, general hospital services, mental health services, maternal and child health services, nursing homes, domiciliary supportive services, community health centres, and so on. The co-ordination and possible reorganization of medical, dental, nursing, paramedical, and social work services will be an important aspect of the committee's report.

The initial committee set up by the Government has a prime responsibility to submit recommendations concerning means of improvement in communications between nursing staff members of Government hospitals and the administration. Obviously, in its discussion of communication aspects, attention will also be paid to aspects involving recruitment, training, retraining and the role of the nurse within the hospital situation. It is considered that the material thus obtained will prove of considerable use to the second committee, which will be asked by the Government to look at all the broad aspects of the health and hospital system. The terms of reference of the second committee have been endorsed by Cabinet, and there is no doubt that the Government plans to include on the committee persons of eminence in the medical, administration, nursing, sociological and community fields. Such an expert committee will be specifically asked to make recommendations on the role of nursing and training programmes involving nursing staff in order to ensure that nursing is placed on a footing that is quite comparable with the status of the other professions in the health field. I believe that the member for Bragg and all other members will be pleased when they see who will constitute the personnel of this committee.

The Government considers that nursing cannot be looked at in its broad aspect without reference to important developments in the medical, paramedical, dental and social work fields. I stress that nurses both now and in the future do not and will not limit their activities purely to work in hospitals. Present indications are that nurses will play an increasing role in the community aspects of health care and an increasing role in the services available for the frail and infirm aged, in nursing homes and in the patients' own homes alike. The nurse is a most important and vital member of the total medical team, and it is essential that her role both now and in the future be defined in relation to all other members of the medical team. It is for this prime reason that the Government has been reluctant to look solely at nursing aspects without regard for the other members of the total health team. While there is no doubt that nursing is a profession in its own right, it is a profession that is inseparably interwoven with activities in the medical and paramedical professions. Consequently, the Government believes it is not sufficient just to look at current difficulties experienced by nurses in hospitals but, if something really productive is to be done, the status and involvement of the nurse in health services generally should also be considered.

The Government is also aware of recent reports in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory that have dealt with all aspects of nursing. While these reports have proved valuable, there seems little point in perpetuating further reports purely on nursing aspects unless consideration is given to the situation confronting nurses in the total health and hospital system over the next several decades. An example of this is the recent development of community health centres in the United Kingdom. It is understood that, by the end of this year, about 300 community health centres will be established in the United Kingdom, based on the concept of team work by general practitioners, visiting specialists, community nurses, social workers, and ancillary aids. If these centres prove successful, it is expected that a larger number of nurses than ever before will be engaged in the community and visiting aspects of nursing, in contrast to the traditional role of the nurse at the hospital bedside. Until all these factors have been investigated and explored, it is difficult to define the future role of the nurse in our society.

The member for Bragg, in moving that this House appoint a Select Committee to inquire into all aspects of nursing in the State, rightly observed that there was a definite need to equate the status of the nursing profession with that existing in other branches. He considered that the standard of nursing conditions and facilities should be brought up to the level of medical, paramedical, and other facilities in South Australia. For this very reason I believe that it is important that an inquiry into the future of nursing, both in regard to conditions of service and training, should not be conducted in isolation from a full consideration of the future roles of all medical, paramedical, and other allied services in the health and hospital field. Future developments in the total health and medical area must affect nursing vitally, and for this reason I believe that the Government's proposition of a broadly-based committee of inquiry into all health and hospital needs is preferable to any separately organized committee to look at nursing only.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I have listened with much interest to everything that has been said by members on both sides about this motion, and I have greatly appreciated the comments made and obvious thought given to many of the ideas expressed. I think the members for Flinders, Light, Davenport, and Tea Tree Gully,

and even the member for Ross Smith, have really given attention to this problem, and I thank them very much.

I thank the member for Ross Smith for the congratulations that he extended to me and, although I am not very much of an old hand, I am certainly a little older than I was when I moved this motion, and I am disinclined now to take his congratulations at their face value. If I remember correctly, he suggested that I should move that this motion be read and discharged, but that is the last thing I want to do. I feel strongly about the plight of nurses in our community, and I intend to say what I can for them.

As the member for Ross Smith has said, many things that have been said in this debate were said by the Premier at one stage. I suppose some credit would be due to the Premier and to everyone else who brought up these matters if they had not been used specifically for political purposes. If they were not so used, I ask why a full statement of the Premier's views on this matter was circulated outside what was, apparently, to be a non-political meeting of nurses at the Apollo Stadium before the last general election. I have tried to treat this matter as not being Party-political but, if Government members choose to regard it as being Party-political, that may explain why the first committee of inquiry (that into communications within hospitals) was set up within a few days of my giving notice of this motion and why the second committee was set up in the second week after I gave notice. I should like to think that the appointment of these committees was not a direct result of my giving notice of motion, but I cannot help believing that it was.

The member for Ross Smith has accused other Liberal and Country League members on this side of jumping on the band waggon. Well, why should we not jump on the band waggon, if that is what he cares to call it? We are all concerned with the problems of nursing and the health and wellbeing of the people of this State, so why should we not say what we think should be done to help nursing in South Australia? I, like the member for Tea Tree Gully, certainly welcome the announcement of the appointment of the inquiry into health matters generally and into health needs of the community in the next 20 years. I shall be interested to know the composition of this committee, but it can do nothing but good, and I agree with the honourable member that the appointment of such a committee is thoroughly desirable.

However, I take issue with her on her statement, made some time ago, about the nursing curriculum introduced since the new Government came into office, when she implied that the Government could take credit for its introduction. Certainly, it was introduced since this Government came into office, but senior nurses have been working on and preparing this curriculum for many years and they deserve credit for bringing forward these proposals. I thoroughly support and pay a tribute to the senior nurses who have worked so hard to upgrade the profession. Amongst other things, the difficulties of introducing a 40-hour week with the block system has resulted in almost double the complement of staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The administration has been fraught with difficulties, and it is to the great credit of those concerned that they have managed to overcome these.

Although all this work has been done, I still question whether nursing has caught up to the stage where it can be considered by a general inquiry. I do not know that it has, and I consider this of major concern to the general community. I think the member for Ross Smith said that the terms of reference of the first inquiry, that relating to communications within hospitals, were not entirely satisfactory. The honourable member indicates that he said that. I emphasize that I do not consider the terms to be satisfactory, and the activities of that committee speak for themselves.

It was necessary to advertise the committee and its activities very widely. I understand that the preparation of a special issue of the *Nurses Journal* was necessary to attract attention to this inquiry, and I still have not heard whether people giving evidence before this inquiry have any protection at law from allegations that they may make and whether other people who may have allegations made against them have any protection. Going through all this is a fear that some recrimination could occur as a result of giving evidence to an inquiry. In this regard, I was particularly surprised at the Attorney-General's attitude. I am quite astonished that a man who also has the portfolio of Social Welfare, because of which he should be well aware of the problems and fears of the people and considerate of their feelings, and who should have much insight into individual problems in this community, should express himself as he has done. He stated:

The only suggestion made by the member for Bragg (indeed, it was made faintly) was that nurses might be deterred by their tradition of discipline from making information available to or giving evidence before any inquiry on which senior representatives of the nursing profession had a place. The suggestion was made, at best, only faintly, because the member for Bragg immediately added that it was not his opinion that nurses would have anything to fear in that regard, but he considered that the impression was abroad that they might.

This is not the interpretation that I intended and certainly not one that I think does the Attorney-General any credit in reading into my remarks. Referring to nurses, I repeat what I said, for his benefit, as follows:

They are concerned that, if they are involved in an inquiry with senior nursing representatives on the committee, they may be victimized in some way. Once again, I doubt whether this would be the case, but this is a belief held widely by many of the nurses who are afraid of such a committee.

The important thing is that this belief is widely held by members of the nursing profession. It is no good saying that I do not believe that nurses would be victimized, without keeping in mind the fact that these people believe that that would occur; their feelings must be considered. A further example of this, I think, has taken place over the last two days, commencing when a letter from many nurses was circulated regarding the payment of their recent salary increases and the fact that these have been delayed. A statement on the matter by the Chief Secretary appeared in this morning's paper.

Although it may seem only a small thing, it is important to note that these nurses who are now being rostered for a 40-hour week, and are thus losing eight hours' overtime a fortnight, are not being paid their increased wages to make up for this. Admittedly, only a short period is involved (I suppose a matter of a few weeks), but even this period and the sums involved are important to these young girls who depend on this income. A parent of two daughters on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital telephoned me this morning to register a protest at the statement on this matter made by the Chief Secretary and said that he did not agree with what the Minister had said. He considered that nurses genuinely did not know what had happened about their pay rises. Indeed, he said (and I have no reason to doubt him) that the Matron at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital about two weeks ago called a trained staff meeting and said that a pay rise could be delayed for several months if the court case took that long to settle.

He said, too, that he thought it was reasonable that, if a pay rise had been gazetted, it should be paid, and he strongly resented the remarks and implications of the Minister's statement reported in this morning's paper. I must admit that I thoroughly agree with this: it shows a gross lack of understanding and consideration of the individual and of the problems of the individual nurses. When I asked the parent concerned whether I could quote him and perhaps use his name, the first thing he asked was this: "Will my daughters be victimized in any way?"

Mr. Curren: Oh!

Dr. TONKIN: Members opposite may laugh and scoff; have they no insight? This is quite typical of their attitude. We must consider the concern of these people and the fact that justice must not only be done but that it must be seen to be done. These girls must be reassured because, if we are to find out what is the true situation regarding nursing in this State, we must offer them the reassurance and protection that they believe (not necessarily what we believe but what they believe) is necessary. I agree with the member for Tea Tree Gully that nurses have a tremendous part to play in the future health services of this State. I strongly favour domiciliary services, but I think that we shall not be able to manage this without nurses trained in community health.

However, the present state of nursing, I think, will govern to what extent they are valuable and useful in the future. I think this is every patient's worry and concern and, as potential patients, I think we must all be worried and concerned, too. I believe that we shall soon see whether the Government regards this as a matter of politics or whether it actually considers that it is a matter of vital importance.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. McAnaney. No—Mr. Lawn.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MARIHUANA)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 1927.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The Bill contains an amendment to the definition of "Indian hemp" that is designed to ensure that all parts of the plant used for the smoking of marihuana are covered by the law. I remind the House that during the recent election campaign the Premier stated in his policy speech that if the Labor Party was elected to office the law on dangerous drugs would be tightened and strengthened. When we took office, instructions were given to prepare a Bill designed to achieve this purpose. Much work had been done as a result of conferences between Commonwealth and State Ministers in the previous two years, and when the Bill was being prepared it was found that as long ago as May, 1969, the Government was told that the definition required tightening in order to cover the use of portions of the plant other than those covered by the existing definition. Consequently, instructions were given for this to be done in the Bill that was prepared. As I gave notice yesterday of my intention to seek leave to introduce that Bill today, it appears that no useful purpose would be served by putting two separate amending Acts on the Statute Book, one covering the expansion of the definition, the other containing the other remaining provisions relating to dangerous drugs.

Mr. Carnie: Are they identical definitions?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, they are, possibly because the two Bills were prepared by the same draftsman. The alteration of the definition in the honourable member's Bill now before the House is identical with the altered definition that forms part of the Bill I will introduce later today. For that reason, it would be appropriate for the House to adjourn consideration of this Bill so that the member for Bragg could examine the Government's Bill in order to satisfy himself whether it achieves the objectives that he is trying to achieve by his Bill. I hope, therefore, that the member who follows me will move for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOOK ALLOWANCE

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

That in the opinion of this House the decision of the Government to provide for an increase of only $2 a student a year in the secondary school book allowance is inadequate, and will not provide the relief expected by parents, and that this amount should be replaced at least by the scale promised by the Liberal and Country League Government at the last State elections, namely $6 a secondary student a year, this increase to take effect as from January 1, 1971.

(Continued from October 21. Page 1933.)

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I do not intend to take much time speaking to this motion, which presumes that no difficulties are involved in providing the necessary finance to give effect to an immediate $6 increase in the secondary school book allowance. It has always been my view, a view that would be supported by most people, that a policy speech sets out the policies that are to be followed by that Party over its full three-year period of office if it is successful at the election. There is never an implied promise in such a speech that the policy being enunciated will be implemented immediately.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is a Labor Party interpretation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is also a Liberal Party interpretation, and the honourable would know of many examples that occur not only at the Commonwealth level but also at the State level where that sort of approach has been taken and, indeed, where it must be taken because of the financial problems involved, or does the honourable member for Alexandra not recognize financial difficulties once he is in Opposition? Does he just want to be irresponsible in relation to this matter?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I can clearly remember the previous Minister of Education making similar remarks—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can dispute it: he disputes it for political reasons, and this motion has been moved only for political reasons. It was not stated in the policy speech that this policy would be introduced immediately. The member for Torrens assured the House that, as Minister, he would have this policy implemented straight away, but I point out that when budgeting for the finances of a department one does not have complete freedom, and I am sure the honourable member is fully aware of that. For example, the $2 a year increase that we

are providing will cost an additional $170,000 this financial year; a $6 a year increase would cost $510,000 (or an additional $340,000) for a full financial year. To have provided that sum in order to give that extra assistance to parents would have meant that we could not this year have appointed teacher aides and the additional guidance officers that we need within the department, we could not have expanded the department's research and planning office, which has been grossly understaffed for many years, and we would not have been able to appoint the additional caretakers for schools whom we have appointed this year and who are so vitally important. We would probably have had to halve the number of additional teachers appointed during the year, and we would perhaps have had to reduce expansion of teacher training programmes.

The honourable member knows this full well. As an intelligent man, he knows that this is the kind of decision one has to take. He knows, too, that in circumstances in which the quality of education needs to be improved it is perfectly legitimate to ask parents to wait a little longer for extra assistance. Every member opposite knows that that is a perfectly legitimate stand to take because of the needs to expand the quality of education on the one hand and the financial problems arising in so doing on the other. I make no apology for the decision that has been taken in this matter.

Mr. Rodda: The crisis is over?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not say that. I make no apology for deciding that the amount of additional assistance to be given to the parents had to be limited because of the real need to provide other improvements in the standard of service that we were aiming for in the field of education generally. Such a decision is fully justified. There are difficulties in the current situation which I think should be drawn to the attention of members of Parliament and members of the public. First, the cost to parents of textbooks depends very much on the provision they can make for selling secondhand textbooks which are no longer required at the end of one year and, if they need, for purchasing secondhand books at the beginning of the next year. The ability of parents to do this depends on the arrangements in the local school. Some schools do this very well indeed, whereas others make very little effort to do it. Where little effort is made, the cost to parents is higher than it otherwise need be. Even where a school makes the most detailed arrangements at the expense of teachers' time to allow for secondhand book exchanges, difficulties arise through changes being made in the textbooks prescribed and through new additions being produced of old textbooks, and there are circumstances in which the books that have been used in one year within a school become virtually valueless within that school at the end of that year because the textbook prescribed for that course is altered for the following year. I know of instances where one school has dropped a textbook which another school has taken up.

I have had a committee investigating the practicability of getting an exchange scheme established between schools so that books no longer in use in one school can be sold in another school. As a consequence of that type of arrangement the cost to parents might be reduced. The administrative problems relating to this are difficult and complex and we need the full co-operation of teachers, whereas teachers are more and more taking the view that they should not be involved in the arrangements for the sale of books within a school. In this respect one school has sent out the following circular to parents:

For a number of reasons, some of which are listed below, this school will not sell textbooks in February, 1971, or December, 1970. The teaching staff provided this service in the past in the first two or three weeks of the term under conditions most unsuited for the handling of the volume of the sales and the variety of books involved.

The circular then goes on to deal with the accommodation problems they have in the school and to say that arrangements have been made for John Scott Educational Book Supply, which has successfully carried out this system of supplying textbooks for schools in the Eastern States, to cater for students' requirements. If that sort of arrangement is introduced, the company concerned gets the franchise to supply the books to the school and it pays 10 per cent of the cost of the books to the school. This type of situation underlines the fact that there are great difficulties in getting an effective exchange system for secondhand books. We are arriving at the situation in schools where teachers are avoiding handling even new textbooks.

If a parent has an allowance of $20 and the textbooks supplied new cost $32, that parent, if arrangements could be made to supply secondhand books, could use this secondary school book allowance to cover fully the cost of the books required for that year, whereas if new books have to be purchased there is a deficit. The extent of the difference between the cost of secondhand books and new books

is double the $6 increase ultimately proposed for a secondary school book allowance.

Mr. Coumbe: You still admit there are hardship cases?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and these are dealt with by a means test. I admit parents have difficulty in meeting the cost of education but that difficulty is symptomatic of the whole system and the lack of a national priority being given to education in Australia. It is not a separate problem: it is one aspect of an overall problem. If we cannot get satisfactory secondhand exchange arrangements, it will be necessary, in my opinion, to consider the possibility of introducing an entirely new scheme.

We have had a scheme in operation in the primary schools for three or four years which has become generally accepted, although protests were made when the scheme was first introduced. This scheme enables schools to provide textbooks for students at the beginning of the school year so that within primary schools one almost never hears a complaint regarding late supply of textbooks. The reason for this is that requirements for primary school textbooks have to be placed within the Education Department by the end of the first term and tenders are then called for the supply of textbooks for the following year. Secondary schools put in their orders towards the end of the second term and this three months' delay in the ordering of books is one reason why there are occasional difficulties in the supply of books at the beginning of the following year in our secondary schools.

We are not far from a situation where it would be cheaper for the department to purchase on a bulk order basis all the textbooks required and supply them direct to the students. The reason for this is that the department, by bulk buying, can obtain substantial discounts on the purchase price of books, discounts not available to the ordinary student who buys a book privately, or to the school, which receives only a 10 per cent discount. Indeed, when one considers that the likely life of a textbook under the kind of scheme that applies in primary schools is at least two years, a scheme similar to the primary school scheme adopted within the secondary schools could well, after the initial year, turn out to be cheaper than the current scheme of making available secondary school book allowances. In view of the difficulties with which we are confronted in maintaining and expanding satisfactory secondhand book exchange arrangements, we will now consider the possibility of introducing an entirely new scheme for secondary schools similar to that which operates within primary schools.

I hope that any remarks of mine that are reported on this subject will also carry this point with them: if we introduce the kind of scheme for secondary schools that now applies in primary schools, the 10 per cent benefit that the secondary schools now obtain from the Government scheme for their school fund will still be made available to those secondary schools. There will be no cut-back in the sum that the school has available for expenditure at its own discretion. In circumstances where we want to secure greater and not less independence for schools, it is absolutely vital that there be no cut-back in the sum that schools have available to spend at their discretion on various items of equipment, maintenance, and so on. In the meantime, while this matter is being investigated, I argue most strongly that in the situation that confronts us today in education it would be irresponsible to advocate a full $6 a year increase this financial year in the secondary school book allowance, because to pay that sum within the terms of the current education budget would lead to a reduction in the improvement of the quality of education that we are able to achieve this financial year. Although they recognize the financial difficulties that they have in meeting their own costs of education, many parents also recognize the grave need to improve the standards within our schools. Indeed, many parents will accept the kind of proposition I am putting up at present, saying that it is the right kind of priority to adopt. I make no apology for it: I think that in the current circumstances it is completely justified.

Also, this matter must be looked at in terms of a budget for education which, at this stage of the year, provides a record proposed increase. The budget for education this year is not very stringent when compared with what the budget has been in many past years. However, it is still a difficult budget because of the teacher shortage and because there is a great need to expand teacher training. The biggest part of our increased expenditure will go into the expansion of teacher training facilities. Of course, that expansion, although it will give us a benefit in 1974, will not give a benefit within the schools this financial year or in 1971, 1972, or 1973: it is a delayed benefit. Nevertheless, in our current circumstances it is a decision that simply had to be taken.

Our current resignation rate of teachers is about 13 per cent, which amounts to about 1,400 teachers every year resigning from the service of the Education Department. In addition, we need to appoint another 300 or 400 teachers each year to cater for the increased number of children in our schools. Also, we need to appoint a further 300 or 400 teachers each year in order to get some kind of reduction in class sizes. While the current resignation rate continues, each year we need to appoint between 2,000 and 2,200 teachers. From 1971 and 1972, the number of exit trainee teachers coming out of our teachers colleges will be only 1,000. The gap between 2,000 or 2,200 teachers and the number coming out of our teachers colleges currently has to be made up out of re-employment of previously employed teachers, recruitment overseas and, if past practice were followed, the employment of unqualified people. We are no longer in a position where we can continue to employ unqualified people within our education service, at least not on the scale that has occurred in the past. We cannot do this without some attempt to secure qualifications for the unqualified people that we wish to employ.

I believe honourable members can see that, for the next few years, we will have a tight situation. We must attempt to remedy that situation by expanding teacher training. Although we have a generous provision in the education allocation in the Budget this year, the extent of the generosity in producing an improvement in quality within the schools is not as great as it might otherwise be, because of the great need to expand teacher training and the costs associated with that expansion. In this connection, I am certain that the members for Davenport and Torrens will be aware that, while better conditions within the teaching service may have some impact on the resignation rate, the impact is not likely to be great, because most of the resignations are of women teachers for reasons associated with pregnancy, caring for children, family, and the transfer of their husbands, particularly to other States and overseas. We must also recognize that our teachers are now much more mobile economically than they have ever been in the past.

Mr. Coumbe: You were most critical last year about this.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, but I also admitted the problems associated with it. I am pointing out that, in my view, teachers in the future are likely to become more mobile because the young teacher will want to go overseas to a greater extent than he has in the past for additional training and experience. As I think I have said in this place previously, we are now taking into account oversea experience in judging the salary at which we appoint a teacher who has come to us from overseas or who has previously been employed by us and returns from overseas to employment in South Australia. Because we have adopted that policy, there is no disadvantage to promotion for a teacher who takes on oversea experience. Also, we have to recognize that the methods adopted in our teacher training scheme and in selecting trainees for teachers colleges have taken into our teachers colleges a fairly high percentage of the age group leaving school.

Because of the great shortage of trained teachers within our schools, some attention, but not too much, has been paid to the possible suitability for work as a teacher of the applicants for teacher training. When some of our teacher trainees go out to schools, they discover that the job is much more difficult than they thought and find that they have not the kind of personality that makes the job enjoyable and easy. The satisfaction that teachers can gain from teaching is very much a function of the kind of approach they have to the job, the kind of personality they have, and their ability to get along with the children and older students. For any teacher who has little control over students and has great difficulty in getting along with them, the job of teaching can be extremely difficult, and I consider that that is another cause of resignations from our service.

The pattern of resignations in South Australia is not peculiar to this State: it is repeated in every other State in Australia. However, because of the high percentage of women employed in the department and the problems associated with families and moving around because of the transfer of husbands in their employment, while the resignation rate may come down a little, it is likely to stay fairly high. Therefore, the only real solution to the teacher shortage is expansion of teacher training. Even the oversea recruitment programme is of little value in obtaining trained teachers. That programme, which was undertaken overseas last year and early this year by Mr. Anders, has resulted in our obtaining for South Australia this year about 60 teachers from overseas.

We hope to obtain 300 teachers from overseas next year through recruitment, but there

are serious difficulties in obtaining suitable recruits and in making sure that we are not buying problems rather than solving them. Consequently, it is better administratively to err on the side of caution and to make sure, as far as we can, that the teachers that we recruit from overseas will be suitable appointees and will fit in well in the South Australian service.

Mr. Coumbe: Last year you expressed criticism of the then Minister of Education on this subject.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I supported the programme. If the honourable member checks what I have said in this House on education, he will find that I did not indulge in a personal attack on the then Minister of Education. On certain matters I attacked the Government of the day, particularly relating to the school-building programme. I certainly asked questions, as it was my duty to do, about conditions in the teaching profession and about action that was being taken and, if I was not satisfied with the replies that I got, I asked further questions. I hope I fulfilled my duty as a conscientious member of the Opposition, but I also hope the honourable member recognizes that I did not indulge in any personal attacks on the then Minister of Education. In fact, I still say, as I said then, that the difficulties experienced were the fault not of the Minister but of the Government and were caused by the lack of backing from the Government for the Minister. However, that is in the past and, unless the honourable member wishes me to cover the ground again, I do not intend to do so.

Mr. Coumbe: I would prefer the Minister to speak to the motion. It's about time he did.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We cannot expect miracles from oversea recruiting unless we are prepared to buy trouble. We cannot expect a dramatic reduction in the resignation rate to, say, below 10 per cent. Regarding long-term training, it may be that the resignation rate throughout Australia is likely to increase as teachers become more mobile. Consequently, the only solution to the shortage is the expansion of teacher training in South Australia, but that is a costly process. It takes up much of the extra money that one has available for discretionary use in any year and does not give an immediate benefit within the schools. We must wait three years to get the benefit in the schools in terms of having more and better qualified teachers.

It is partly for this reason that, when I examined the budgetary situation in the Education Department and found that what we intended to do would cost more than even the record amount that we had available, and when we started to consider where cuts had to be made, one unpleasant decision that had to be made was the decision that the full $6 increase in the secondary school book allowance could not be granted within the one year. I make no apology for that decision. I think the priorities that I applied in reaching the decision were correct in the circumstances.

I think that, if these priorities are fully understood by members opposite and by the general public, these priorities will be accepted as right and proper in the circumstances. We cannot expect, within our education system, to say, "In order to get one improvement completely up to target immediately, we will hold back everything else." That kind of approach will not wash with the teaching profession or with those who have to administer education in South Australia, and it should not be accepted by the majority of members of this House. I ask honourable members not to accept the motion.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): I support the motion. At the outset, I take issue with the Minister, who, unfortunately, has to leave the Chamber, on one or two things he has said. Frankly, I am sure that all honourable members (certainly, those on this side) saw all of his talk of secondhand textbooks, teacher training, teacher resignations, and all sorts of other things as a diversionary tactic to take the pressure off the Government regarding this motion. Much of what he said had no bearing on the motion, and I was sorry that the Minister adopted that sort of attitude. It is most interesting (and the member for Torrens took the Minister up on this point) that the Minister has now become a realist, because he now holds a position the occupant of which he criticized so vehemently last year on so many of the points that he is now trying to defend.

Mr. Coumbe: It's quite a change of position.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, and he is a little uncomfortable when he is on the defensive. I make it quite clear that, when the Liberal and Country League policy speech was delivered before the last State election, we gave a firm undertaking that this increase of $6 would be implemented in full from the beginning of 1971. I say this because of suggestions from the other side that this was not our intention. I also make it clear that every Cabinet Minister understood this clearly, as did other members of the L.C.L. Party, at the time of the election. Of course, the Minister of Education is aware,

as are the member for Torrens and I, that there are not unlimited funds at the disposal of the Education Department any more than unlimited funds are at the disposal of any other department. However, I suggest that, if there is a pressing need (and I believe that the alleviation of hardship experienced by the parents concerned is a pressing need), naturally priorities have to be established.

I instance a difficulty that confronted the two previous Governments involving the Hon. R. R. Loveday as the then Minister of Education, later involving me, when I held the Education portfolio, and, later still, involving the member for Torrens, who subsequently took over the portfolio. I refer to ancillary staff. When I took office in 1968, I discovered that ancillary staff in schools had been proposed to be implemented by the Education Department for some years. The proposition was certainly initiated before the term of the Hon. Mr. Loveday, who was not able to implement it, because of the lack of funds. When I took office as Minister of Education in 1968, schools were in such dire need of ancillary staff that I said, "All right, in 1969 this has to be implemented, and something else will have to go in order to pay for it." These are the kinds of decision that Ministers of Education and other Ministers have to take in order to establish priorities within their own departments.

We went ahead and appointed ancillary staff in schools; in fact, we appointed more staff than the South Australian Institute of Teachers had suggested was necessary. Although this is not the only matter that Ministers of Education have to decide, Ministers have to let some things slide in a certain year so that they can implement other things. I am suggesting that alleviating the hardship of parents by increasing book allowances is one of these priorities that is high on the list. I am glad that the member for Torrens has moved this motion, for two reasons: first, he has brought the Government's niggardliness into the open; and secondly, the motion shows how deliberately the Government misled the public into believing that its promise of a $6 increase in the first, second, third and fifth years and $4 in the fourth year would be applied as a total increase as from January 1, 1971.

The main purposes of this motion are, first, to encourage the Government to recognize the immediate hardship of parents in this matter and to show that it is really concerned about trying to alleviate that hardship; and secondly, to keep faith with the promise made by the Government at the last election. There is no doubt, on my understanding anyway, that the public would have interpreted this election policy in the way that I have suggested: that the increase in the first, second, third, and fifth years was to be $6 payable as from the beginning of next year and that it would be a $4 increase in the fourth year. The Government, through this motion, is shown in its true light regarding its concern about the costs that parents have to meet. Book allowances were first implemented in 1960 by the then Minister of Education; in the first, second and third year, the allowance was $16; in the fourth year, $18; and in the fifth year, $20.

They were not altered for nine years until 1969, when I recommended to the then Government that we should increase the book allowances in the fourth and fifth years, leaving the allowances applying to the first, second and third years as they were. The allowance applying to the fourth and fifth years was to be increased by $6. The funds were to come through the discontinuation of the payment in connection with bursaries and scholarships as a result of the discontinuation of the Intermediate examination. The money previously spent on these scholarships and bursaries was available for implementing such a policy, and in 1969, with the approval of Cabinet, I announced that for the fourth and fifth years the book allowances would be increased from $18 to $24 and from $20 to $26 respectively. These increases were applied to those years of secondary schooling when parents most feel the pinch in regard to education expenses.

Prior to the election last May, the Liberal Party proposed that the allowance in each of the five secondary schooling years should be increased by $6, our Party promising that for the first, second and third years the book allowance would be $22; for the fourth year, $30; and for the fifth year, $32. The Australian Labor Party, on the other hand, promised that it would increase the allowance by $6 in the first, second and third years, by $4 in the fourth year, and by $6 in the fifth year. That puts the actual payment of the increased book allowances in its proper perspective. Of course, following the announcement made by the Treasurer when he presented the Budget, we see that the Government's intended (and now revealed) implementation of the increases that it promised is certainly a letdown for those parents who were expecting that they would have the benefit of the increases as from the beginning of next year. The

increases are certainly not as generous as those we promised. Ours was a firm promise that these increases would be implemented at the beginning of next year; it was a genuine promise that was costed, as were all our promises made prior to the election. Nothing that we offered to the people of South Australia was offered without its being costed completely, and we knew that we could afford to implement our promises.

Mr. Simmons: What were you going to leave out?

Mr. Coumbe: Who said we were going to leave anything out? Don't forget that we had an overall surplus.

Mrs. STEELE: I am glad that the member for Torrens has referred to this. When referring the other day to the education increases enunciated prior to the election, he said:

The Minister may recall that we were responsible for an 18.9 per cent increase over the budgeted figure. We met all the increase that we had to meet under the new teachers' award, part of that increase being retrospective, and the Minister is now relieved of that increase to some extent. Although we spent more, the State Budget finished up overall with a credit. We find that the whole line of the Minister of Education for the current year involves 16.2 per cent more than the actual expenditure for last year, whereas in the last year of office of the L.C.L. Government the increase regarding education generally was 17.8 per cent.

Those figures speak for themselves. I refer now to the steps taken last year by the present Minister of Education when, as the member for Glenelg in the former Opposition, he moved for the disallowance of regulations relating to the discontinuance of the Intermediate bursaries and scholarships. Those members who were in the House at the time will remember that I was chided by the Minister for not implementing some form of scholarship, even though there was no examination on which to award them on a means test basis, in order to provide help to children who were considered by the member (and, presumably, by his Party) to be disadvantaged by virtue of their parents' economic status. It is interesting to note that only one person (the Premier) supported the honourable member in that disallowance motion.

Mr. Coumbe: How does that fit in with what he says here?

Mrs. STEELE: Exactly, it is a complete contradiction. I remind the House that the abolition of scholarships and bursaries was approved by the Minister of Education in the 1965-68 Labor Government (Hon. R. R. Loveday). Did he put anything in their place? No, he did not. It was the present Minister of Education, then in Opposition, who was so critical of the fact that we had taken away from these children of what he calls disadvantaged parents something he believes they ought to have.

Mr. Coumbe: And that was at a time when there was no examination on which to base it.

Mrs. STEELE: Exactly. The previous Labor Minister of Education did not put anything in the place of those scholarships; nor did he intend to help the parents of the students who were thereby deprived of the advantages of the scholarships. I cannot help feeling sorry for the Minister of Education because I should have thought that one with such a great interest in education (and this was shown by the way in which he attacked all the policies adopted by the previous Government in the field of education) would have persuaded his fellow Cabinet members to implement this book allowance in full from January 1, 1971. But what has happened? The Minister announced that the increased allowances would be applied in $2 increments over a three-year period. I should have thought that, as he was so keen about this scholarship idea, one of the first things he would do would be to introduce some kind of scholarship system whereby the parents for whom he was so sorry last year could be helped. It appears (and one can only take a charitable view in this respect) that he was perhaps overruled in Cabinet in his intention to provide bigger and better benefits in education. But after the Minister's outburst last year, I confidently expected that some form of bursary and scholarship sceheme might have been re-instituted. Instead, what has happened? The Government has come out with this idea of a scheme which does not give as great an increase in the fourth year (for what reason I cannot imagine) but which provides other increases that are now to be implemented over a three-year period. As the member for Torrens said when moving this motion, it looks very much like a confidence trick.

If this motion does nothing else (and, of course, with the Government's superior numbers this Opposition motion is doomed to failure), it has enabled the Government's real intention to be aired in this Parliament. I hope, as a result, that the public generally and the parents of schoolchildren particularly, will have been altered to the way in which they have been led up the garden path by a

Government which claimed it had their interests at heart and which, additionally, has made a great play of its concern for education generally.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I rise to support this motion in the knowledge that I am still somewhat new in this House and have been inclined to take things at face value. Both the member for Torrens, who moved this motion, and the member for Davenport, who has just spoken, know far more about these subjects than I do. Indeed, they have given facts and figures of which I have no knowledge and on which, therefore, I do not intend to speak. However, regarding other aspects of the motion, and particularly the Government's attitude towards it, I have been rapidly disabused as to motives since entering this House. It is obvious that both Parties recognize the need for aid in this field of subsidies for school books, and both referred to this aspect in their policy speeches. I should like now to read the following part of the Liberal and Country League policy speech dealing with this matter:

On re-election we will increase the book allowances for all secondary students in State and independent schools by $6 a student over the full five-year course and liberalize allowances for school materials for deserving cases in primary schools.

In the Australian Labor Party speech, the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, stated:

A regular review of secondary school book allowances (to provide $32 for fifth year, $28 for fourth year, and $22 for first, second and third year), and the nationalization of textbook arrangements to avoid the current excessive costs for parents . . .

At first sight, apart from the comparatively minor difference regarding the allowance for fourth-year students, those two statements are much the same, and I am sure the public took them in that way. One can now see when one examines them that the L.C.L. did make a definite statement on this matter. It said that action would be taken "on re-election". Both the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labour and Industry have tried very hard to indicate, by way of interjection when the member for Torrens was moving this motion, that the Liberal Party did not promise that this would be done within the first calendar year following its re-election. However, I contend that "on re-election" means what it says: it means on re-election and not in two or three years. That is a specific statement.

Looking at the A.L.P.'s statement with hindsight, one can see that it was not so definite, and the Government is now using this as a reason for its present action. The Labor Party said that a regular review would be undertaken, and it has shown that that is what it intends to do. Having looked at the Labor Party's policy speech, I agree that it did not promise that this action would be taken in the first year, although I should think the public thought it would. The people who voted for the Labor Party would certainly have interpreted its policy speech in that way, and I guarantee that if this part of the Labor Party's policy speech were shown to the man in the street, he would say that is what is meant. This is just another example of the smooth talk that was used by the Labor Party prior to the last election. The A.L.P. stated that it wanted to avoid imposing excessive costs on parents of children attending secondary school. As I have said, it gave a definite indication that a $6 increase for first, second, third and fifth-year students, as well as a $4 increase for fourth-year students, would be introduced in the coming calendar year. The public would have expected this of the Liberal Party, which would have honoured its policy. As the member for Davenport said, this was a firm undertaking of which we all knew and on which we all spoke. The Budget shows that the Government will introduce a $2 increase which is to be the first of three annual steps. This is the first indication that three payments were intended. Payments for textbooks have become a heavy burden for parents to bear. Even the provision of $32, $28 and so on promised by both Parties would not have been enough. After careful costing by the previous Government, it was found that this was all that could be done at this stage. Although I do not think this is enough, it would certainly have been better than the $2 increase now proposed. To spread a $6 increase over three years is shocking and is against the implied promise made by the Labor Party.

A few minutes ago the Minister of Education made the extraordinary statement that a policy speech always gives the policy that is to be spread over three years. I admit that I am a very new politician, but that statement sounds strange. If it is true, it would have been much better if it had been spelt out in the Labor Party's policy speech that this thing (whatever it may be) was to be spread out over the three years of the Government's term of office. When a statement of this type is made, the public expects that what is promised will be carried out as soon as that Party gets into office, and not spread out over three years. To me this is gaining Government by false

pretences. I repeat that the L.C.L. policy speech did not do this: it simply stated that, on re-election, the L.C.L. would do this. The Minister referred at some length to increased expenditure on school buildings, teacher training and so on. I was assaulted with his flow of words, something that we have come to expect from him. However, when one gropes one's way through the smokescreen of verbosity, one finds that it is nothing more than a smokescreen to cloud the real issue and that really little has been said. As the member for Davenport said, it had nothing to do with the motion.

Mr. Coumbe: A lot was talked and nothing was said.

Mr. CARNIE: That is a fairly usual condition with the Minister of Education. All the things that the Minister spoke about are certainly important, but so is relief of the heavy financial burden borne by parents in this regard. All the things the Minister referred to (increased training for teachers, increased expenditure on school buildings, and so on) are most important, but they were also to have been carried out by the L.C.L. had it been re-elected, and we intended as well to pay this $6 a year increased book allowance over the full five years of secondary school. The Minister said that, in view of all the things the Government was doing for education, it could not afford to provide $6 at this time. The policy of my Party was that all these things could be done, as they had been planned anyway. The previous Cabinet believed, after careful costing, that it could afford to give this $6 a year increased book allowance to all secondary school students. As I have said, the cost of school books is a heavy burden for parents to bear, and I contend that the burden is slightly heavier for country parents. As a country member, I know that many country parents, either by choice or, in many cases, by necessity, send their children to boarding schools of one type or another. Many parents do not have the opportunity to send their children to local schools, because there are no such schools. Boarding school fees are a heavy burden to bear and paying for school books on top of that makes the position worse for these parents.

Regarding the expenditure payment for school books, the average family in the community is hit hardest. In almost every connection, it is the average person who is hit. This allowance would not be so important in the case of a wealthy person, and hardship cases, through a means test, can obtain free books. However, average parents (and that includes most members of this Chamber) are most heavily hit by the imposition of school book charges. The purpose of the motion is to give relief to these average parents. Irrespective of which Party is in Government, $2 is not enough to relieve this imposition. Like everything else, the price of school books is increasing constantly, so that the expenditure is higher each year. Therefore, the Government allowance for school books must also be reconsidered each year. The $2 increase is only a temporary measure at best, and next year the position will be even worse, although according to the Minister another $2 will be provided, making the total increase $4. However, by that time, the Government payment will have fallen even farther behind.

Mr. Coumbe: This is a drop in the ocean.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes. The Minister said that it would be irresponsible to provide the full sum of $6 in one year, but the Premier certainly did not say that when presenting the Labor Party's policy speech: he implied a promise of $6 in one year. The Minister of Education spoke about secondhand books, resignations of teachers (he even spoke about the inability of teachers to get along with children), and about all the things that money could be spent on. I fail to see that any of these things has anything to do with the motion. As I have said, the members for Torrens and Davenport, who have both held the Education portfolio, know far more about this than I do. However, I believe that it must be pointed out how the present action of the Government constitutes the direct breaking of an implied promise. I support the motion.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I move:

To strike out all words after "That" first occurring and to insert "this House supports the fulfilment of the Government's election pledge on secondary book allowances through three successive increases of $2 per student per annum."

I move this amendment, as I do not believe that the motion, as it stands, reflects the opinion of the House accurately. The motion states that the increase of $6 a secondary school student, promised by the Party of the member for Torrens, was to have taken effect as from January 1, 1971. As I believe that the member for Torrens is an honourable member, I accept his statement that he intended to try to implement the payment in 1971. However, that is not to say that I can accept the claim either that the L.C.L. did promise to

carry this out in one step or that the honourable member would have been able to carry the day in his Cabinet. The Minister has said that the annual cost of implementing the payment of $6 a student would be about $510,000. Because of the stringency in State finances and the many items of heavy expenditure in education, it is unlikely that the member for Torrens would have been able to carry out his wish, desirable though it might be, if he had remained in office. He would have been forced to do exactly as the Government has done, and he could have done that without any charge that he had broken his promise being made against him.

The same postion applies to my Party. Our election policy speech set out the policy for the term of office of this Government, which term will not expire until March, 1973, and I am confident that, with co-operation from another place, that policy will be put into effect by that date. Unless the Party had explicitly stated when a particular proposal would be implemented, the Government would have flexibility and freedom to deal with it in the light of other demands on its resources in time and money.

The member for Flinders has said that our promise to undertake a regular review of the position was so much smooth talk and was a shuffle, because the man in the street would take "regular review" to mean "immediately". I consider that the man in the street has a better understanding of the English language and more common sense than members opposite give him credit for, and the man in the street indicated that clearly last May. The member for Davenport has spelt out fully the necessity for Ministers of Education to assign priorities, yet she has criticized the Minister's statement about items that he considered to have a higher priority. The honourable member described the Minister's statement as being merely a smokescreen.

We have two problems. The first is whether the Government's promise to carry out a regular review means a promise to carry out a review immediately (and I cannot agree that it does mean that) and the second is that, given the necessity to implement the policy in accordance with available finance, what priority should be assigned to the various items of expenditure? I think the latter matter is a big question and, as it has been dealt with to some extent but not fully by the Minister, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 13 (clause 4)—Leave out "four" and insert "three".

No. 2. Page 2, line 25 (clause 5)—Leave out "four" and insert "three".

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Having been in Parliament for some time, I am a realist and, although I would have preferred the Bill to pass in the form in which it left here, the other place has seen fit to amend the minimum estimated cost of projects that must be referred to the Public Works Committee from $400,000 to $300,000. My figure of $400,000 was comparable with the $200,000 that was fixed in 1955. However, to preserve the Bill, I have moved that the amendments be agreed to, and should like to hear the Government's views on the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I fully support the remarks of the member for Torrens. Even though the honourable member has pointed out that the $400,000 proposed in his Bill is, in fact, equivalent to the $200,000 set down in 1955, I can say that, after the due deliberation given to the matter in another place, the Government agrees with the honourable member's contention that we should accept this sum, and we are therefore happy to support him.

Mr. EVANS: I was the only member in this Chamber who spoke against the Bill when it was considered in this place, claiming that the proposed limit was too high. I said I believed that the limit should be $200,000, and I still believe that. In his report, the Auditor-General says he believes that the sum should remain at the lower limit and that it is within this limit that most work can be done by the Public Works Committee, as has already been said by members of the committee itself. However, I accept the amendment as a compromise, for at least it is $100,000 less than was first proposed and brings the matter back on to what one might call a reasonable basis. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

RURAL INDUSTRIES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

(For wording of motion, see page 1408.)

(Continued from October 21. Page 1945.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I should like to quote some of the remarks made last

week on this matter by the Minister of Works, who said:

For the benefit of the member for Rocky River, I say at the outset that we are not opposed to primary producers in this State receiving help in their present crisis.

He then went on to make his speech, at the conclusion of which he said:

Therefore, for no other reason than that we believe that what would flow from the motion would be ineffective, the Government opposes the motion.

Since then, many primary producers throughout the State, particularly those in the Mallee areas, have suffered further severe setbacks inasmuch as severe frosts have damaged their wheat and barley crops, and this is following two years of drought. Therefore, we can see that the primary producer is at present in a fair amount of trouble. I was concerned to hear the Minister of Agriculture say recently that we needed a new breed of farmer. What is required is a new breed of politician, particularly on the Government side, who can examine these problems properly and bring about some relief. One of the aspects highlighting the situation of Government members has been the recent references in the House to the pledge that they make to their Party. I refer here particularly to the shop trading hours situation. This aspect highlights their situation to the degree that when people vote for an Australian Labor Party candidate anywhere throughout the State, irrespective of what they might think of that candidate, they are voting not necessarily according to his capabilities but for the policy laid down by his Party.

This matter is of grave concern in relation to the future of the State. When leaving the district of the member for Millicent after the by-election that was held in that district, it was my view that if the Minister belonged to a decent Party it would be difficult to defeat him, because of what he is and what he stands for as an individual. However, he is pledged to a Party and whatever he may appear to be does not mean a thing. Therefore, concerning country people who support an A.L.P. candidate, the Party may as well appoint the member for Florey as, say, the Minister of Agriculture. He would be just as good, because the capabilities of the individual do not mean a thing: the person concerned is still tied to A.L.P. policy. For that reason, I say that the member for Florey would make an ideal Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Wells: Thank you very much indeed.

Mr. VENNING: Virtually every inch of the Australian coastline is covered by the tariff law, to the extent that it is having a serious effect at present on the rural community. The tariff law represents about $1,500,000,000 worth of protection to Australia. In a recent study of problems of rural producers, it was estimated that the rural indebtedness amounted to about $2,000,000,000, so that if we compare this indebtedness with the amount of tariff protection, a difference of $500,000,000 is involved. Therefore, this matter warrants further consideration.

It was alarming to view a recent programme in which an effort was made to prove to the taxpayers of Australia just what it costs to maintain the rural industry in this country. One of the points made was that direct and indirect subsidies involved the taxpayers in the payment of $500,000,000, and it was stated that only about $2,600,000,000 came from rural industry. I consider that, for an outlay of $500,000,000, to receive about $2,600,000,000 in 12 months is a fair investment. The most unfortunate point made in the programme was the fact that the average wool income of about 40 per cent of Australian woolgrowers is only about $2,000.

Mr. Burdon: Tax free!

Mr. VENNING: One can see how much the taxation on $2,000 would amount to. It was suggested that this figure could be compared with that of the average wage-earner in the metropolitan area. This statement is simply not true, when one considers that a husband-wife partnership on the farm only contributes to one income, whereas husband and wife working in the city can double their income; the programme did not take into account the fact that to earn $2,000 from wool a year, the capital investment is in the order of $50,000 to $60,000 on average. That is the problem facing the rural industry today, and it is not getting any local support to help the situation.

In Adelaide a few weeks ago, the primary producers of this State organized an orderly march through the streets to Elder Park, where they were met by notorieties (the Leader of this Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and members from both major Parties in the Commonwealth sphere) but it was obvious that the right place for them to have marched to was straight to Trades Hall, where they might have got some results because, after all, the Premier of this State still has to have his proposals for various things ratified by Trades Hall. One thing that has emerged strongly

since the shopping episode is that members opposite pledged themselves to an undertaking prior to their nomination; so it is evident that to short-circuit the situation the primary producers on that occasion should have marched straight to Trades Hall.

It is interesting to hear members opposite talk of their policy. Recently, the member for Peake referred to the Dunstan portion of the Australian Labor Party policy. The Corcoran portion of that policy did not appear to be in his hand. I talk of the Corcoran policy as being that delivered by the Minister at Gawler, which was the rural aspect of the A.L.P. policy; but this does not seem to interest them very much. They still stick to the Premier's portion of the policy. It concerns me that this attitude is being adopted by members opposite and they do not view with any concern the problems confronting the rural industry today. Last week, I said I had a cutting from a newspaper but, because of the limited time available, I did not read it. I have it here again and should like to read a portion of it to members opposite. It is headed "Goodbye to the rustics". The Leader of the Government is reported as follows:

We are, of course, still attached to the hard-dying myth that Australia is really a land whose population has as its ideal image the man of the outback, the Chips Rafferty style, the rugged individual who spends his blood, sweat, toil and tears in winning a difficult living from a harsh environment, he said. How many still believe that the only real Australian is someone who is engaged in commodity production in pastoral or agricultural pursuits—that those who live in towns are merely second-class citizens beholden for their very existence to the foresight, courage and hard work of the farmer and the stockman?

In fact, only a very small part of our commodity production is from agricultural or pastoral pursuits, and a good deal of this production is heavily subsidized by the earnings of secondary industry and of people who are not engaged in commodity production at all.

He talks about the secondary industry that I spoke of this afternoon which is protected by a tariff wall around the whole of Australia to the extent of about $1,500,000,000 a year. So I view with concern the attitude of members opposite and their leaders that they will not support this motion in an endeavour to assist primary producers. They state that they are limited in the ways and means by which they can assist primary producers, but let us look at a report of what was said by the Premier when he addressed the rural march meeting at Elder Park back on July 23:

State Governments were limited in what they could do in agriculture, but the South Australian Government would try to tackle some of the problems over which it had some control, including special remissions in succession duties on primary producing land.

This Government has now been in power for some four or five months, yet we have heard nothing about that. Our primary producers are becoming deceased and families are in trouble wth probate duty, but all this Government can think of doing is getting on with social legislation, which means nothing at all to the man on the land. He goes on to say—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot read his paper.

Mr. VENNING: I am only quoting from it; there is not much I can quote. The report goes on to refer to the Government's intention to revise land tax on primary producing properties and to set up a wheat quota committee. We can see that the Premier and his Party are not very conscious of the problems of the primary producer. We on this side are concerned that they are not supporting this motion. I support the motion.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I oppose the motion. Having said that, I should like to say that I appreciate very much the problems of the rural industry and the effort that the member for Mallee has obviously put into the motion and the speech he made when moving it. I appreciate, too, the motives behind it because, of the members opposite who continually support the primary industry, I believe the member for Mallee has the most responsible attitude. He is certainly the most sincere. There is no doubt that the rural industries are facing a critical situation and that much assistance should be given to them. We on this side of the House do not oppose that point of view.

The suggestion of the member for Rocky River that Government members dislike the rural industries is unfounded: we on this side appreciate that a vital and virile rural industry is of great importance to South Australia. Secondary industry and rural industry go hand in hand. It is not feasible or reasonable for the Government to suggest that the Socialist policy is to take all farmers off the land. We do not wish to starve: we think that livng is enjoyable and we like to have somebody on the land growing our food for us. The suggestion made today that we are following a Socialist policy of trying to force all farmers off the land is ridiculous. I oppose the motion because it asks the State Government to do something that it is not capable

of doing, namely, rectifying the problems of the rural industry.

All members realize that the problem in the rural industry is one of marketing rather than of production, and marketing research is the field in which the Commonwealth Government can give the greatest assistance. More money spent on such research would return great benefits to the rural industry. It has been said that the Australian farmer is the most efficient farmer in the world from the viewpoint of production for each man unit. I do not doubt that the figures are correct: I have not heard them refuted. However, I have heard it suggested that, whilst the Australian farmer may be the most efficient from that viewpoint, he may not be the most efficient on the basis of production from each acre.

The problem is that the wheat farmer has been encouraged by a Commonwealth policy to grow as much wheat as possible. We have seen people develop marginal land and clear land to grow more wheat. That was fair enough, because the farmer was sure that his product would be marketed and that he would receive a return from his labour: he was guaranteed that by the Commonwealth Government. As we have seen, recently the tide has turned. Whilst the Commonwealth Government was encouraging the farmer to produce more, the same Government was unable to (or, probably, it did not want to) increase the sum spent on marketing research. China, which was one of our best wheat customers, will probably shift its support to Canada.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: China purchased 99,000,000 bushels from Canada this morning.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, and this should greatly concern the Australian rural industry. We may lose the Chinese market because of the policy of the Commonwealth Government, which has the same political philosophy as that of Opposition members here, namely, the policy of not recognizing China. Before Opposition members press the Government to set up a commission to investigate rural industries, they should speak to Liberal members of the Commonwealth Parliament and encourage them to recognize China, because that would be a practical way of ensuring a market for our wheat. Some Opposition members have suggested that the main way of solving the problems of the rural industry is to reduce succession duties and land tax. Succession duties, being duties on wealth, are not paid by the rural industry alone: they apply to everyone.

Mr. Gunn: Do you favour reducing succession duties on the rural industry?

Mr. KENEALLY: Obviously, they do not concern me personally, because I simply do not qualify. However, I am concerned that succession duties are being held out by Opposition members as being the key to solving rural problems. If farmers had an assured market for their products and were able to produce to the maximum, there would not be so much concern about South Australian succession duties, which are the lowest in Australia anyway; nor would they be concerning themselves about land tax. Which is more important—an assured market so that farmers can produce and sell more or, on the other hand, concentration on succession duties and land tax? Even if we reduced succession duties and land tax, some farmers might still go broke if they were unable to sell their products. I do not think Opposition members can refute that statement.

Opposition members refuse to face facts in this House, but the rural industries must face facts. The small farmers and the farmers on marginal land are in a very invidious position and can no longer afford to exist. Unfortunately, they will probably have to leave the industry because they are finding it very difficult. I suggest that the only way in which the small farmer will be able to exist in a few years is through co-operatives. Each farmer would have to outlay less capital expenditure if he used headers, tractors, etc., co-operatively with other farmers. It is no good members opposite saying that this is ridiculous, because it is working in South Australia at present. If a small farmer over-capitalizes his property, he will not be able to compete. Mr. Geoff Treasure, the 1970 South Australian champion farmer, said this about our farmers:

Australian farmers will survive only if they learn the super-efficient methods of big business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are making far too many interjections. They should know that interjections are entirely out of order.

Mr. KENEALLY: The following is the press report of Mr. Treasure's statement:

In the past high prices for primary products had allowed farmers enough margin for mistakes. Now the squeeze was on there was no future for the semi-efficient farmer. . . . . Small farmers, like small businesses, would have to apply basic business principles or get off the land. This meant keeping methodical records and learning to budget correctly, and, to be successful, farmers would need to be

highly educated and trained in business management.

I am sure members opposite would agree that Government members should read the magazine *Farmer and Grazier*. In the October issue of that magazine Professor Flentie, a member of the committee of inquiry into agricultural education, is quoted as saying:

> Of almost 30,000 farmers in South Australia, less than 2 per cent have been educated beyond secondary school level, and this should be borne in mind when you consider that the average farm investment is between $100,000 and $150,000.

He asked who else in the State would manage such a large investment as this. He felt it would be restricted to large companies only. Of course, that is correct. When we speak of farmers and the farms they own, we are speaking not about small industries or about people with no capital investment but about farms whose values average between $100,000 and $150,000.

Mr. McAnaney: You try to get that today.

Mr. KENEALLY: This industry must face up to rationalization: the longer it puts it off the bigger the problem will probably become. Apart from that, there is also the problem of diversification. This should not be a problem, as it should already have been effected. What has happened in this case, too, is that because farmers have been encouraged to grow wheat, which has been easy to grow and to sell, they have been lulled into a false sense of security. I do not blame them: if I were a farmer I would do the same because, when a farmer can grow and market a crop easily, that is the crop to grow. This is the problem of the Commonwealth Government, which should have investigated regarding markets and let the farmer know that the crunch was coming. I understand that in world markets there is a growing demand for what is called coarse grain, while there is probably a reduced market for the wheat we are selling. I should have thought that, as coarse grain could be sold, there would be some movement into that field in South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: There is.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am pleased to hear that there has been this diversification, because that is what should happen in an industry. All the problems referred to in this House regarding rural industry indicate that wheat and wool are the only two products we are interested in. We have heard nothing about maize, so obviously farmers can grow and market that.

Mr. McAnaney: Irrigation is necessary.

Mr. KENEALLY: Obviously there are crops that can be grown and marketed successfully, so I suggest that farmers who are finding it difficult to grow and market wheat should get into those fields; that is a fact of life. In secondary industry, if a manufacturer is unable to sell a product he is set up to manufacture, he does not go to the Government and say, "We are having trouble in selling this, so what about helping us?" and the Government does not say, "All right; we will give you a subsidy." In secondary industry that manufacturer just gets into another field.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: If members opposite are patient I will say something about subsidies later. I am pleased that at least I have their interest; talk of subsidies seems to raise the interest of members opposite.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You haven't finished expounding on diversification yet.

Mr. KENEALLY: Diversification in grain growing is easily explained. If a person is unable to sell wheat, he diversifies by growing other grains. If a farmer cannot sell wheat, what is the good of continuing to grow it? That does not seem reasonable to me, and I am sure it is the quickest way to bankruptcy. If farmers are not prepared to help themselves by diversifying, it is no good their complaining and asking Governments for help. Surely there must be a certain degree of self-help first.

I also wish to speak briefly about what I believe is essential in rural industry: that there must be some sort of organization and joint effort. In the last few weeks a motion has been moved in this House by the member for Mallee to have appointed a committee to look into rural problems. Senator O'Byrne, who is a Commonwealth Labor Senator, has suggested that one of the Senate Select Committees should investigate rural industry. The Democratic Labor Party in the Senate has moved that a Royal Commission be set up to investigate rural industry. However, at a meeting of farmers at Jerilderie in New South Wales the vote was 964 to 4 against a Parliamentary investigation into the rural industry. I suggest that people in this industry should get together and find out whether or not they want Parliamentary investigations into it. They must organize themselves first. It is no good asking the Government in South Australia to investigate rural industry when the problems of that industry are Australia-wide. The problems faced by this industry in South

Australia are similar to problems being faced in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, so I can see no purpose in setting up a committee to investigate the problems in South Australia: obviously these are national problems.

Mr. McAnaney: What about a Royal Commission into the secondary industries that we carry?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in interjecting.

Mr. KENEALLY: We may well get to that point later on. Having dealt with wheat, I now wish to refer to the wool industry. Professor K. O. Campbell, the Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture at Sydney University, is reported as saying:

The wool industry urgently needs intelligent reconstruction. The reconstruction programme should include the phasing out of inefficient wool growing properties too small to be profitable and improvement in the overall management level of property owners.

That is another statement by a learned man, who is talking about the wool industry. Many other statements have been made by leading people in Australia about primary industry. Obviously, members opposite are not very pleased with the trend that my little talk is taking. They are not used to being on the defensive. They like to be aggresive. Unless they are attacking one Government or another about the lack of help for primary industry they are not happy; to defend is not part of their make-up at all. With regard to the build-up of breakaway farm groups, an article in the *Australian* (and if nothing else, I am proving to members opposite that I read the newspapers) by Mr. A. G. Lynch states:

State Agriculture Ministers and farm organization leaders are keeping a close watch on recent breakaway—

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You called the member for Rocky River to order for reading a newspaper, and now you are letting the member for Stuart read from a newspaper without stopping him. You have to be consistent on these things.

The SPEAKER: I object to the honourable member's remarks about my not being consistent. I ask him to withdraw those remarks immediately.

Mr. McANANEY: No.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not withdraw his remarks?

Mr. McANANEY: No.

The SPEAKER: I again ask the honourable member, who rose to take a point of order and reflected on the Chair, to reconsider his attitude.

Mr. McANANEY: I will withdraw my remarks if you—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will withdraw his remarks unconditionally: they are a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: No, I won't.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw unconditionally?

Mr. McANANEY: No, definitely not. There must be a bit of dignity in this place.

The SPEAKER: I again ask the honourable member whether he is prepared to withdraw those remarks unconditionally.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr Speaker, may I suggest—

The SPEAKER: No. Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw?

Mr. McANANEY: Well, I will give you another chance. I will—

The SPEAKER: Order! Are you prepared to withdraw?

Mr. McANANEY: No.

The SPEAKER: Then I name the honourable member for—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will you please allow me to speak?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows that, when the Speaker is on his feet, the honourable member is out of order in rising. I have named the honourable member for Heysen.

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

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I insist on my right at least to state a point of order to you. How can you rule on whether there is a point of order before you have heard it?

The SPEAKER: State your point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that, in fact, the member for Heysen, by what he said, did not reflect on you and it is quite obvious that he did not intend to reflect on you. What he said was in the form of a question and, therefore, I suggest with very great respect, there is no reason for asking him to withdraw. It was not a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. McKee: Why didn't he withdraw it, then?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are you seized of the point I am making, that what the member for Heysen said was a question and not a reflection on the Chair at all?

The SPEAKER: I tell the honourable member for Mitcham that there is no point of order. Standing Order 168 clearly states:

If any member persistently or wilfully—
(*a*) obstructs the business of the House, or
(*b*) refuses to conform to any Standing Order of the House, or to regard the authority of the Chair;

The honourable member for Heysen refused to regard the authority of the Chair, and there is no point of order.

Mr. McANANEY: With all due respect, Sir, could you tell me how I refused to regard the authority of the Chair? I raised a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the right to make an explanation.

Mr. McANANEY: I raised the point of order that the member for Stuart was doing something that the member for Rocky River was not allowed to do, and I think I phrased the question in these terms: "Is this being consistent?" I do not think that is reflecting on the Chair in any way, shape or form.

The SPEAKER: Your accusation was one of inconsistency by the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: With all due respect, I asked a question, for you to give a ruling and, in asking that you give this ruling, I asked, "Is this consistent?" I was drawing your attention to the fact that one member was doing something that another member could not do.

The SPEAKER: No, you did not do that.

Mr. McKee: Withdraw!

Mr. Millhouse: What is there to withdraw?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Speaker has asked him to withdraw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What is the honourable member asked to withdraw?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have named the honourable member for Heysen, and Standing Order 170 states:

Whenever any such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology. . . .

I have given the honourable member the opportunity. I shall give him a further opportunity, if he so desires.

Mr. McANANEY: With all due respect, I uttered a certain number of words. Which words do you request me to withdraw?

The SPEAKER: The words that I am asking the honourable member for Heysen to withdraw are his reflection regarding the inconsistency of the Chair. The honourable member—

Mr. HALL: On a point of order—

Mr. McKee: Sit down.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You weren't even here.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. After naming the honourable member, I have given him the right to withdraw. I have named the honourable member. The honourable member has the right to be heard in explanation and apology, if he so desires.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, how can you rule that there is no point of order when you have not heard my point?

The SPEAKER: Order! I am conforming to Standing Orders, which provide that the honourable member can be heard in apology.

Mr. McANANEY: With due respect, I still ask you what are the words you wish me to withdraw.

Mr. McKee: He just told you, you dill.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member for Heysen to withdraw his reflection on the Chair regarding the inconsistency of the Chair.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order, according to Standing Order 159. My point of order is that I came in late to this discussion and, as I shall be asked to vote if the naming of this member is taken further, I want to know upon what I am voting and, therefore, I request that you state what words you ask the honourable member to withdraw. Otherwise I am unable to vote properly on the question that may be put.

The SPEAKER: In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that the honourable member for Heysen rose to take a point of order. He reflected on the Chair, or the consistency of the Chair, and they are the remarks that I have asked the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. Millhouse: What did he say, Sir?

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask you how you can ask me to vote soon, if this honourable member is named, on remarks that I do not know about.

Mr. Ryan: He's not asking you to vote.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can go outside, if you like.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was given the right to explain the situation, after having been named. There is no point of order.

Mr. HALL: There is no anything.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Heysen has the right to explain.

Mr. McANANEY: I rose on a point of order and said that, although the member for Stuart was reading, the member for Rocky River had not been allowed to read. I did not say you were inconsistent. I said, "Is this being consistent?" Those were the words I used. I do not think asking whether you were consistent was reflecting and saying that you were inconsistent. I think there is a vast difference in the phraseology. I am sorry if you misheard me and thought I said you were inconsistent.

The SPEAKER: Those were the words of the member for Heysen heard by me. In taking the point of order, he proceeded to reflect on the Chair and referred to the inconsistency of the approach of the Chair. If the honourable member for Heysen had said what he is now saying (that he did not reflect on the Chair) his explanation would have been accepted. If he had said he did not reflect on the Chair and that the words he uttered were those to which he just referred, I should have been prepared to accept his explanation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think it could be considered that the member for Heysen has apologized, in the sense that he has explained what he actually said.

Mr. Millhouse: It's not an apology at all.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He has explained to the House, although probably not in precise words, what his intention was, and I think that in view of his explanation this could be accepted.

Mr. HALL moved:

That the member for Heysen's explanation be received.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

Mr. KENEALLY: I point out that there is a lack of co-operation and co-ordination within the rural industry as it exists in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. People in this industry in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria have set up various bodies. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1934-1955. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It incorporates substantially, although not in every detail, the recommendations of the National Standing Committee on drugs of dependence, which have been made with a view to combating the developing drug problem in Australia on a uniform basis. The National Standing Committee was set up following a meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers in February, 1969. The purpose of establishing the committee was to create a body capable of advising upon drug problems and of examining avenues of co-operative action between Commonwealth and State authorities.

The present operation of the Dangerous Drugs Act extends only to narcotic drugs. It is desirable that non-narcotic drugs of dependence (for example, the amphetamine stimulants) be brought under the control of the Act. In consequence of the proposed extension of the application of the principal Act, the Bill alters its title to the "Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act". This title accurately describes the kinds of drugs that produce drug dependence. Similar terminology is employed in the International Convention on Narcotic Drugs and in the present draft international protocol on psychotropic drugs prepared by the World Health Organization.

The Bill introduces severe penalties for drug "pushing", which the Government hopes will prove to be an adequate deterrent against the exploitation of young people by unscrupulous profiteers. The Bill makes several other amendments of a technical or administrative nature that are designed to improve the general efficacy of the principal Act. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. However, it should be noticed that this clause provides for the change in the title to the principal Act to which I have previously adverted. Clause 2 provides that the amending Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends the definition section of the principal Act. The amendment defines the expression "drug to which this Act applies" as this expression is frequently employed throughout the principal Act. A new definition of Indian hemp (marihuana) is inserted. The previous definition referred only to the dried flowering or fruiting tops of the plant *cannabis Sativa L.*, which are in fact the portions of the plant containing the highest concentrations of active resin. The extension of the definition is necessary because it has been discovered that active resin is dispersed throughout the whole

of the plant. A definition of the "owner" of premises is included. This definition is merely transferred by the Bill from its present position in the existing section 5 of the principal Act. A definition of "prohibited plant" is inserted. This definition anticipates a later provision to be inserted in the Bill making it an offence to cultivate a prohibited plant.

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act. The amendment includes "prepared opium", which is opium reduced into a form suitable for smoking, as a drug to which the Act applies. The specific reference in paragraph (*b*) to "any extract or tincture of" Indian hemp is no longer necessary in view of the revised definition of "Indian hemp". The unnecessary words are therefore struck out. The amendment redrafts section 4 (3). The old provision provided that only drugs that produced ill effects similar to morphine, that is to say, the narcotic drugs, could be brought within the provisions of the Act. The amendment permits the extension of the principal Act to psychotropic drugs that do not fall within this category.

Clause 5 repeals and re-enacts section 5 of the principal Act. The section is re-enacted in a more comprehensive form. Subsection (1) deals broadly with the individual drug-taker and provides penalties for the possession or consumption of a drug to which the Act applies or the possession of equipment for the purpose of preparing or administering such a drug. Subsection (2) provides a heavier penalty for the production of the prohibited drugs or the supply or administration of those drugs to other persons. The penalty here consists of a fine of $4,000 or imprisonment for 10 years.

The new section also provides that a person who is in possession of more than a prescribed quantity of the prohibited drugs shall be deemed to be a trafficker unless he proves otherwise. This reversal of the onus of proof is in this instance thought to be justified in view of the grave social consequences that may be caused by a trafficker and the relative difficulty in proving that a person who is caught in possession of substantial quantities of drugs is engaged in trafficking. The National Standing Committee has recommended that the prescribed quantity of marihuana cigarettes should be 50 cigarettes. It is necessary to prescribe these quantities by regulation not only because it may be necessary to deal with changing patterns in drug distribution but also because of the wide range of drugs of dependence that will be controlled by the legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The Attorney-General is making a second reading explanation, but I cannot hear it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Clause 6 amends the regulation-making powers. These powers are widened in order to enable adequate control to be asserted over the new drugs that are to be introduced into the ambit of the legislation. The regulatory powers relating to the issue of prescriptions by medical practitioners and veterinary surgeons are extended to the issue of prescriptions by dentists. Dentists have not been authorized to issue prescriptions for the narcotic drugs but, because some of the new drugs that are to be controlled may have a genuine use in dental practice, it may be necessary to authorize dentists to issue prescriptions for certain of the controlled drugs. These will be specified in the regulations.

Clauses 7 and 8 make consequential amendments to sections 9 and 10 of the principal Act. Clause 9 amends section 11 of the principal Act. The power of search embodied in this section is extended to persons authorized in writing by the Minister. At present this power resides only in members of the Police Force. The amendment is made in order to enable the Minister to appoint certain customs officers as authorized officers under the section. The Commonwealth provisions in relation to drugs of dependence relate only to imported drugs. There is some difficulty at times in establishing whether or not illicit drugs have in fact been imported. In such cases it has been the practice for a partially completed customs investigation to be handed over to the State police. This is not an altogether satisfactory situation. Accordingly, under an authorization from the Minister customs officers will in future be able to complete their investigations under the provisions of State law. This system has been recommended by the National Standing Committee and accepted by the States generally.

Clause 10 amends section 12 of the principal Act. This section empowers certain authorized persons to enter upon the premises in which a drug to which the Act applies is manufactured, to inspect books and records on the premises and stocks of the drug. The present provisions limit this right of entry and inspection to police officers of or above the rank of sergeant. Not all members of the police drug squad are sergeants and it is necessary for efficient investigation that all officers be duly authorized. The amendment therefore removes the requirement that a member of the Police Force

operating under the section should be an officer of or above the rank of sergeant.

Clause 11 amends section 14 of the principal Act, which deals with penalties and legal proceedings. The general penalties are raised from a maximum of $500 to a maximum of $2,000, with no alteration to the existing maximum term of imprisonment, which remains as two years. There are, as members will remember, specific penalties provided for illicit manufacture of, or trafficking in, drugs. Offences carrying these higher penalties will be disposed of upon indictment. The new penalties conform to the recommendations of the National Standing Committee.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 5. Page 525.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This Bill was introduced early in August, when we were given to understand that it was due for a fairly quick passage. However, about two months has elapsed and we are now considering the second reading, so that the Opposition has had a good look at the Bill. Although we believe that, as the second reading explanation states, there should be a balance between economic and environmental considerations, we have some misgivings about the Bill. It breaks new ground, as it sets out to bring some industries that are vital to this community within the ambit of mining operations.

Early in his explanation, the Minister said that the Bill was designed to ensure that mining operations were carried out properly with a minimum of environmental damage. We were also told that these mining operations would include quarrying operations. The people of the State know well what valuable enterprises these quarry corporations are: they are one of the chief contributors to South Australia's being a low-cost State, and I will say something about that in a moment. There is a vast difference between a quarry and a mine. To show this, I do not think one could do better than quote from the Extractive Industries Act of Victoria wherein "quarry" is defined as follows:

> (*a*) a pit or excavation made in land to a depth of more than six feet below the natural surface for the purpose of extracting stone;
>
> (*b*) a shaft bore-hole or any other opening in the ground made for exploring for stone; or
>
> (*c*) any place or operation declared by the Minister by notice published in the *Government Gazette* to be a quarry—

and includes the works machinery plant equipment buildings and structures above or below ground used for or in connexion with—

> (i) making enlarging or deepening the pit excavation shaft bore-hole or opening;
>
> (*ii*) carrying on the operation;
>
> (iii) the removal of stone from the pit or excavation; or
>
> (iv) the treatment on or adjacent to the land in which the pit or excavation is made of stone extracted therefrom or the manufacture on or adjacent to that land of bricks tiles pottery or cement products substantially from stone so extracted.

"Extractive industry" is defined as follows:

> "Extractive industry" means the extraction from land down to a depth of more than six feet below the natural surface of the land of stone for commercial purposes and, where stone is treated or bricks tiles pottery or cement products are manufactured substantially from stone on or adjacent to the land from which the stone was extracted, includes that treatment or manufacture.

That is the definition in the Victorian Act with reference to the quarrying industry, which we know to be associated with the mining industry. The definition describes a mining operation as being different from a quarrying or extractive industry. A mine is operated at great depth and I am fair enough to accept open-cut mining, some of which is practised in this State. The mining company takes only the ore body that it is mining, and mining companies have overburden to put back into the excavation, whereas the quarry takes all the material that it wants.

This is the vital difference between the two operations and we consider that special extractive industries legislation should be introduced to cover this industry. We consider that these building materials should be correctly labelled. The Bill is short, containing only four clauses, but it is far-reaching. Clause 2, which sets out the operative functions and refers to the powers of an inspector, amends section 10 of the principal Act by inserting the following new subparagraph:

> (*f*) the effect of any mine, mining operation or practice, or operation or practice incidental or ancillary thereto, upon the amenity of any area or place;

In other Acts the amenity of any area or place is defined and the meaning is extremely far-reaching. The powers of the inspector are set out in clause 2, which provides:

He may order the cessation of any mining operation or practice, or any operation or practice incidental or ancillary thereto, that in his opinion, has or is likely to impair unduly the amenity of any area or place and he may give such other directions as he considers necessary or desirable to prevent or reduce undue impairment of the amenity of any area or place.

The Opposition knows that there are reasons for giving the inspector some power in these matters but we consider that the Bill does not contain sufficient safeguards for an industry that is vital to the future development of this State. Clauses 3 and 4 are also far-reaching and give the power to make regulations. The quarry industry in this State has been co-operative and would welcome some control that gave the industry guide-lines so that it would know where it was going and what could be required of it in the general ambit of carrying out work, whilst at the same time preserving the natural beauty of the areas being quarried.

It is no secret that some people hold strong views about preserving the beauty of the Adelaide Hills, and we must be frank about this matter. The views held by certain conservationists and field naturalists are well known, and every member has in his district people who are interested in this matter. As stated in the second reading explanation, it is desirable to keep a proper balance between economic and environmental resources. Bearing in mind that the quarrying industry is a multi-million-dollar industry, we believe it is only right that it should have certain safeguards. It is indeed fortunate that the metropolitan area has a supply of quarry materials close at hand, and several large quarries are operating in the hills face zone. A report of Mr. H. W. Jones of the Highways Department, states, in part:

Quarrying activities on the faces of the ranges overlooking the urban area have created quarry faces which in the opinion of many people offend the natural beauty of the background of the city. The reserves of quartzite in the ranges are sufficient for several decades and new workings should be confined to areas which are not readily visible from the plains. There is, however, no assurance that reserves further in the ranges will always be available for quarrying.

This underlines the need for sober and rational thinking on the matter before we make final decisions on the legislation that brings this industry within its ambit. We must ascertain what this great industry means to the State. The total annual production of the quarrying extractive industries in 1967 was as follows:

	Weight (tons)	Value $
Roadmaking materials	2,575,000	2,834,000
Concrete materials ..	905,000	1,357,000
Other materials	496,000	533,000

The total tonnage of these materials amounts to nearly 4,000,000 tons and its value amounts to over $4,700,000. This indicates that the quarrying industry near Adelaide is a substantial one, and it is interesting to note that a significant part of the materials extracted is used for roadmaking purposes. Materials produced by the quarries are used by Government departments, State instrumentalities, local councils, roadmaking contractors, the building industry, commercial and industrial firms, and private individuals. The following table relates to the quantity and value of the materials used by the various bodies:

	Weight (tons)	Value $
Government departments	1,046,000	1,122,000
Local government and State instrumentalities	975,000	1,002,000
Roadmaking contractors	527,000	676,000
The building industry	779,000	1,093,000
Commercial and industrial firms and other users	649,000	831,000
Total	3,976,000	4,724,000

The total capital invested in land, plant and equipment amounts to $10,000,000 (asset value). The true value of plant and equipment and of the stone deposits would be far more than this figure. The industry employs about 500 men. It is forecast that by 1988 the population of metropolitan Adelaide will be 1,300,000, and, assuming that the same usage rate is maintained, the estimated annual requirement will then be 6,500,000 tons. In the 20-year period, 100,000,000 tons of material will have been used. The total reserves of suitable stone are not known accurately, but it is considered that there is sufficient stone to last several decades provided that the removal of great quantities of material is not prohibited.

It would appear that practically any form of control imposed on quarrying operations would lead to an increase in the cost of quarry materials. The amount of the increase would depend on the type and extent of the controls and could vary from a few cents a ton to between $1 and $2 a ton. Some effects of a significant rise in the price of roadmaking materials and concrete aggregates are as follows. South Australia has about the cheapest

crushed stone and ready-mixed concrete in Australia. It is the most ready-mixed-concrete conscious State. It would be a great pity to increase ready-mixed concrete costs and lose the advantage of providing cheaper homes than can be obtained in any other State and to increase costs to industrial organizations attracted by the advantages of starting operations in South Australia. The encouragement of migrants and increased industrial activity are essential features of this State's future progress. This is assisted by the present arrangements for providing cheap concrete from quarries in the hills face zone.

In an average home, about 70 tons of concrete aggregate is required for foundations, solid floors, etc., and an increase in price of $1 a ton would add $70 to the cost of a home. This would be an added burden to young home builders in our community. The construction of multi-storey flats and office buildings, factories and warehouses involves the use of large quantities of concrete and some road-making materials. These operations would also be affected by any increased costs inflicted on the quarry industry.

Government departments use concrete to a considerable extent in most public works, and roadmaking materials are often involved as well. Increased costs in this sphere would cause an increase in Loan Fund requirements, meaning either an increase in the State's interest payments or a deferment of essential construction projects. Roadworks form a large part of local government expenditure, and increased costs could lead to increased council rates. In new subdivisions, increased costs of roadmaking and concrete materials would tend to increase the prices being required by subdividers for buiding blocks.

The Highways Department currently allocates about $4,000,000 to be spent on road and bridge construction in the metropolitan area. Any increased costs could lead to the curtailment of essential roadworks. I am sorry that the Minister of Roads and Transport is not here to hear this. The advent of freeway construction will cause an increase in roadmaking material requirements and an increase in the use of concrete. These materials form a considerable part of the cost of a freeway, and it is vital that costs are not increased without due consideration being given to the effects on the community. The cost of freeways is enormous at present and nothing should be done that would tend to increase these costs.

Generally, it is considered that only very few individuals would willingly agree to an increase in taxation, council rates and costs of Government services for the sake of achieving an improved appearance of the hills face zone. Whether quarry faces are really detrimental to the appearance of the hills face zone is debatable. The hills have a fairly uniformly even colour at any one time throughout all seasons of the year. These colours vary from time to time and from season to season.

I have been speaking about the value of the quarry industries to South Australia, and in particular to the metropolitan area. This Bill is not without some virtue, but we on this side believe it should contain some safeguards, so we have taken steps to propose certain amendments to it. I notice that the Premier, too, has some amendments on file. The last thing we want to see is these industries so affected that they would have to move to other sites some considerable distance away.

Mr. Langley: Will they have to move out?

Mr. RODDA: I hope the member for Unley is not suggesting that these people will have to move out. That is not the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. Langley: You are saying they will, though.

Mr. RODDA: I am not saying that they will have to move out: I am only pointing out the consequences if they have to. For this reason, we do not like the power to be vested in an inspector. That may be all right with the present Minister, but a future Minister may not be so charitable. Once this legislation is on the Statute Book, its provisions are spelt out and it will be the inspectors' charter. We on this side want these great industries to have the protection to which they are entitled. Therefore, we have looked deeply into this matter and that is why we shall be moving our amendments at the appropriate time.

My colleagues and I have done much research into this matter, and my colleagues will be speaking on the facts that I have just given. We intend to support the second reading and then in Committee we shall move our amendments with the idea of getting a Bill that will contain safeguards for the quarry industries and for the people who are contributing much to this State. Theirs is an industry that makes probably the foundation contribution to South Australia's being a low-cost State. I am sure that, if the Government looks at our amendments, it will see that they give practical effect to the significant utterance by the Premier when, in his second reading speech, he said that the Bill would maintain a proper balance

between the economic and environmental considerations.

This is an extractive industry, which has to dig deep holes because of the deposit it is winning for the aggregate materials so vital to this State. The hole has to be big and there is no spoil to put into it but, under proper management and with proper co-operation, this industry can continue to prosper. The last thing we want to see is a conservationist with probably the sincerest of views interfering with such a vital industry. Therefore, the Opposition thinks some safeguards must be inserted in the legislation.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I support the principles of this Bill and am pleased that the debate is at last proceeding, because, as we all know, this Bill was introduced earlier in this session but it has not been considered for some time. This is one of the most important Bills to come before the House this session. Of course, it is unfortunate that such a Bill is necessary. The result of a recent court case showed the inadequacy of the existing legislation, and of the provisions in the Planning and Development Act. This is regrettable, as it was thought that sufficient power already existed to ensure that mining operations, mainly quarrying, could be carried out with a minimum of environmental damage, particularly in the hills face zone.

Portions of my district (Houghton and Anstey Hill) are situated in that zone. Since my election as member for the district, I have received complaints from people who live near the quarries, and I have inspected quarrying activities on many occasions. I wish to refer particularly to the activities of one company, which I shall not name. At one stage I received a petition from some of the property owners near this company's quarry. The petition, which was in the form of a letter, was duly forwarded to the Minister of Mines. It says:

Our properties, in a residential area and in the hills face zone, are in close proximity to a quarry. Building permits for most of our homes were issued before the quarry commenced its activities, and before it had expanded its activities to its present level. In recent years portion of the top of one hill has been removed and the unsightly overburden has been dumped in a prominent place. This activity has produced dust and noise in excess of what could be termed a reasonable level . . . In addition, the blasting from the quarry has several deleterious effects on our homes. Shock waves are transmitted through the ground and through the air causing the windows to shake, and creating tremors which we suspect are responsible for damage to window frames, plaster and ceilings . . . Heavy dangerous pieces of blue metal have landed on property . . . We repeat that we consider the activities associated with the quarry constitute a hazard to our physical and mental well-being. Inadequate or non-existent fencing, insufficient warning notices, etc., make the quarry a danger to the children of the area, and to any inquisitive young visitors to the hills.

Another quarry nearby had inadequate fencing although that has since been improved. Its activities also extend right to the edge of the road, and I consider this to be dangerous. The petition continues:

The casual visitor is not able to appreciate the extreme nuisance and discord that such an industry can produce when one is subjected daily to its activties. We feel we are entitled to protection from the noise, dust and blasting by careful regulation of their starting times and blasting hours.

I agree with this statement. As a casual visitor, I cannot appreciate the problems of these people as well as they themselves appreciate them. I do not suppose that many members can understand the problems, because they probably do not have to put up with this extreme nuisance. However, some people have to put up with it. One can readily notice from this letter that many of the side effects of quarrying operations are not evident to everyone. As the member for Victoria said, quarrying activities are essential, but it should be possible for such activities to proceed to the satisfaction of the general public, of residents who live nearby, and of the quarry owners. I hope the Bill will lead to that end.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): I support the second reading but I have some reservations that are covered to some extent by the amendments on the file. I find it significant that, although the Bill was first introduced on August 5, it has remained in a more or less static position, about fourth on the Notice Paper, for the past two months. Its elevation to first place amongst the Government business on the Notice Paper has, I believe, resulted to some extent from the outburst by Sir Mark Oliphant who came to Adelaide at the week-end to attend a seminar. As a result of this, the Minister of Development and Mines has had an opportunity to make public statements referring to the preservation of the hills face, and he has been able to make much of the aesthetics of the situation. All this has spurred on the Government to bring the Bill to the top of the Notice Paper. Members on this side of the House and representatives of extractive industries have for some weeks expected

the Bill to be debated. Now the Bill has come before the House at the same time as there has been a spate of publicity in the press, including cartoons, feature articles and leading articles. This publicity drive has then had the effect of bringing the second reading debate on this Bill before Parliament today some two months after it was introduced.

My interest in the Bill is mainly in connection with quarries. Although I have some sympathy with miners at Coober Pedy who are affected by certain clauses of the Bill, I do not understand this problem, but there are other members on both sides of the House who will be able to deal with that aspect of the Bill adequately. In my district two of the major quarries in the Hills are located. In my former district of Burnside there were many more quarries than in my present district, but Davenport has in it the Stonyfell and Greenhill quarries, which are two of the biggest quarries in the Adelaide Hills. I am particularly familiar with one of those quarries, as I live within 400yds of it. I mention in passing that, although blasting takes place at various times during the day on probably all the working days of the week, I must admit that I do not experience the sound waves or sense of shock apparently experienced by some people living in other parts of the metropolitan area, as mentioned by the member for Tea Tree Gully. This could be because sound waves register more noticeably farther away from the quarry face than they register where I live close to it. Over the years, I have had mixed feelings about the quarries on the hills face, but I believe the quarries lend drama to the Hills. I consider that, in some ways, while not breaking a monotony (because I think our hills are beautiful), they bring a sense of grandeur to the hills. However, like anyone else, I think this should not go too far and steps should be taken to strike a balance between retaining the quarries and their potential for the development of the State and having due regard to the aesthetics of the Adelaide Hills. For this reason, I consider that we should be trying to take steps that will, in future, rehabilitate some of the worked out quarries.

I have heard people who have returned to South Australia by sea from abroad, some after a long absence, saying that they have the feeling of being home once they see the scar on the hills face. People coming to Adelaide by air say much the same sort of thing. This may sound maudlin or sentimental, or anything else that people may care to term it, but it shows how much these people recognize them as part of the Adelaide quarries. Perhaps the spills that we see are one of the unattractive features of the quarries, and even these have a virtue, because, with treatment, these provide the fertile soil in which creepers, hanging plants, and eventually, when the quarries are worked out, trees can be grown, and so provide for the future rehabilitation of the particular area.

There is a famous quarry that is famous for its rehabilitation and known to people from all over the world who have travelled in Germany. This is a quarry between Heidelberg and Frankfurt that I have had the pleasure of seeing. Frankly, as one approaches the quarry, it was hard to tell that this particular hillscape was at one time an extremely active quarry.

To understand the background to the development of quarries in the Adelaide Hills, we must know something of the geology of South Australia and we must know particularly of the formation of the escarpment that forms the Mount Lofty Ranges. South Australia is composed mainly of sedimentary rocks that were deposited about 50,000,000 years ago, when the area was a vast inland sea, and the escarpment is the result of a great upthrust of the sedimentary deposits. These sedimentary deposits are mainly sandstone and they are variable in quality and location.

To have a true realization of this problem, we need to compare the availablitiy of our quarry materials with those available in other States, and for the information of honourable members I should like to explain how much we in South Australia are at a disadvantage compared with the other States in accessibility of the necessary and desirable rocks for quarrying. For instance, Queensland has vast deposits of granite. New South Wales has diorite, Victoria and Tasmania have basalt, and Western Australia has granite. These are all igneous rocks, and are close to the surface of the earth. Here in South Australia the area of greatest quarrying activity is in the Mount Lofty Ranges, where there are 41 known and possible sites for quarrying activities, stretching from Gawler to Noarlunga. Of these sites, 15 are operated by Quarry Industries and all the time experimenting and research into quarrying is going on on these sites.

This, then, fixes the places where quarrying can take place, and it is no use suggesting that we should go behind the hills' face to quarry, because there are no usable deposits there. Reverting to what I was saying about igneous rocks, I point out that the nearest deposits of

black rocks are near the Murray River and north of the Barossa Valley, and this introduces the matter of economics into the whole consideration of quarrying, and the availability of the supply. I should not have to remind the House that, if quarrying activities were to be removed from the present sites, it would entail 40 miles of dead-loss haulage to the city at 5c a ton-mile and it would double the cost of processing.

The costs to quarry and win (that is, crushing) this granite would be $1.50 a ton instead of 80c a ton to process the quartzite which we are using now and which is nearest to the city itself. Because of the nearness of the quarries to the city of Adelaide (they are virtually right on our doorstep), South Australia produces the cheapest concrete in Australia, and the nearness of the quarries contributes greatly to the low overall cost factor. I understand that those engaged in quarrying industries in other States are amazed at the low prices paid for quarry materials in South Australia which are, indeed, so much cheaper. I remind the House also that the price of quarry materials in South Australia is under price control, but if this Bill is passed the extractive materials will become the most expensive in Australia, having hitherto been the cheapest. Because of the poor quality of the local aggregate in South Australia, more concrete is needed for beams in building work. It is a case of needing quantity to make up for the lack of quality.

The poor soil, of which we are all aware, particularly on the Adelaide Plains, is another factor. Stronger foundations are required, and for this purpose more concrete is needed and, therefore, more extractive materials. I refer now to the reasons why at this stage I have some reservations about the Bill. I believe that this measure was hastily drafted and that it is ill-conceived, as is so much other legislation introduced in this Parliament and in previous Parliaments by a Labor Government. I say deliberately that the measure has been hastily conceived, because, as I said earlier, it was introduced on August 5, and no action has been taken on it since. We know that the quarrying industry has since then been holding meetings with the Premier, as have also miners from Coober Pedy. Also, we know that before the Bill reached the stage of debate on the second reading the Premier had amendments put on file. Additionally, members on this side have prepared amendments.

Mr. Langley: Didn't your Whip adjourn it? Didn't he ask that it be adjourned?

Mrs. STEELE: The Government controls the business of the House and it is its responsibility to decide when the Bill should be debated. I believe that insufficient thought was given to the many angles and facets of the Bill. I wish to debate four main points. First, there is no definition of amenity; and secondly, we are concerned at the almost unlimited powers under this legislation of the inspector. Thirdly, until recently, when the relevant amendment was put on file, no provision existed for appeals against the actions or directions of the inspector. Fourthly, there is no provision for compensation.

One of the proposed amendments is aimed at controlling the amenity of the area. As I have just said, no attempt has been made to define "amenity", and in fact it is very difficult to do so, because it is a matter of personal opinion and decisions accordingly could change from inspector to inspector. For instance, what may appear to one inspector as an offence against the aesthetics of an area may not be considered so by another inspector. There would be no guarantee of uniformity of opinion about an amenity, and the powers provided to control the amenity are similar to the powers that are provided for the control of safety. However, safety tends to be a matter of fact and not one of personal opinion, which is what "amenity" is or could be under this Bill. Therefore, in essence we find a materialistic business being controlled by an indeterminate and personal opinion.

The power to be given to the inspector under this Bill is one of the most frightening things about the Bill, and it is amazing that this Government, which is always flaunting the words "democracy" and "democratic", intends to give almost complete autocratic and dictatorial powers to one man at one time. Let me say here and now that operators of quarries (that is, the owners or the management) recognize the Mines Department inspector to be an expert in his own field, and they are most willing to co-operate and in fact always do work in the closest co-operation with him. But indicative of the power of the inspector is the fact that, for instance, he can say that the props in a mine are not sufficient and that work cannot proceed until steps are taken to meet his ideas of safety. The management co-operates because it dare not do anything else. He might also say that the vehicles used in the mine or quarry cannot use a road because the gradient is too great or it is not sufficiently formed and it is dangerous

to the people who use it. He can also say that it does not meet the specifications that he considers desirable and that no-one shall use the road until it is fixed up or until it meets his specifications; and again the mine or quarry management is obliged to co-operate and does so willingly because one of its first considerations is for the safety of the people who work in the quarry or mine.

There are, of course, many other instances, but in all cases the mines inspector is recognized as the man with the final say and what he says goes. His expert opinion is invariably accepted. However, it must be remembered, as I said earlier, that, as the arbiter of what is an amenity as suggested in this Bill and its aesthetic effect on a particular area, his is a personal opinion only and it can vary from mine inspector to mine inspector.

I now deal with the third point, namely, the lack of an appeal against the actions of an inspector. Since I first prepared these notes on this Bill (which I did some weeks ago, thinking on every day that it could be brought to the top of the Notice Paper), this has been remedied to a certain extent by amendments that have been placed on the file. However, we must remember that the extractive ore industry is of some magnitude both in terms of capital invested and in the scope of its operations. Let me dwell for a moment on the extent of these operations. As the member for Victoria said, $10,000,000 is invested in land, plant and equipment in the crushed stone and extractive ore industries. Additionally, the brick industry since 1960 has spent a similar sum on the installation of more modern brick-producing plants. Employees in the crushed stone industry number about 500, and wages and salaries amount to $1,400,000 a year.

In the brick industry there are about 550 employees, whose wages and salaries amount to $1,750,000 a year. It is not a small industry. In addition, many haulage firms and private truck owners are involved in either the crushed stone or the brick industry. These people are engaged in hauling extractive materials from their source to the point of consumption—a fact with which I personally am acquainted because, as members know, one of them came into contact with me on the morning of the opening day of this Parliament! However, it should be recognized, when all is said and done, that most people associated with mining and quarrying have been in the game all their lives, and from experience they have developed the industry to the high point at which it operates today. They are practical men, vitally concerned with the safe operation of their undertaking. They should have an opportunity to put their point of view and have their case considered by a competent appeal board. I hope the amendments placed on the file will have just this effect and that such amendments will meet the objections that have been made to the lack of this power in the Bill as drafted.

I come now to my fourth point—no provision for compensation. I should like to explain this, which is my fourth objection to the Bill. I again emphasize the magnitude of the extractive materials industry. It takes into account all the other factors that I have previously canvassed. I point out that the decisions for investment in quarrying are long-term and any closure, which could be subsequent to the possible direction of a mines inspector, in the short term could nullify the high costs of site preparation. I point out that the alternative quarry sites are uneconomically located and higher quarrying costs would result if the industry had to go farther afield than the quarries at present being excavated in the Mount Lofty escarpment at present.

It is an economic fact that quarries are operated where the required materials are found in economic quantities. The increased cost of crushed stone and of bricks (because they are a by-product of quarries) must be borne by all sections of the community, and the community would, if the quarrying industries had to go farther afield, be obliged to pay more in council rates, and for public services, house building, and the like. In all probability, the public would not be very happy if it was confronted with increased costs, but this misconception is, I find, in general commonly held in defence of the so-called defacement of the hills face. Increased costs, too, would affect industrial development, and I cannot believe that anything that would imperil this would not be regarded with great concern by the Government of the day. So it all boils down to the conclusion, irrespective of individuals or Governments, or a Government's likes and dislikes, that the curtailment of quarrying operations by too rigid controls must be related to economic considerations.

There is another fact to which I do not think the Bill gives any consideration—retro-activity. Broadly, quarrying operations are limited by price control. When imposed, this did not contemplate the costs of environmental control, which is what this Bill is all about. The Government cannot, on the one hand, have the

benefits of low prices and, on the other, expect discipline to be imposed without cost increases.

I have been doing some reading on this matter, and I understand there is a classic case illustrating the danger of retro-activity (that is, making the quarry owners do something to rehabilitate quarries long since worked out). I believe that the Government should be made aware of these dangers, if it is not already aware of them. The incident I have referred to concerns an American company that operated a sand pit just outside Chicago many years ago. The sand pit was worked out and the company's operations were transferred elsewhere. Years later the local governing body of the area insisted that the company should restore the quarry to a satisfactory condition. Urban development had caught up with the area in which the sand pit was located. Because of a court order, the company had to convert the pit to a lake surrounded by lawns and, in carrying out this work, the company went bankrupt. This is an instance of what retro-activity can cost that is well known in the quarrying industry. The possibility of such a problem is involved in this Bill, and members should be made aware of it.

It should be realized that the situation in connection with existing quarries is not recoverable: cessation of production will not cause them to return to their virgin state. We all know what could be done to rehabilitate many of the defunct quarries in the hills, but only if much money was spent on them. I was intrigued by the estimate given in the press either last night or this morning; it said that all quarries in the hills face zone could be restored for between $5,000 and $10,000. This sounded a very optimistic estimate to me.

The control of new quarries, of course, is dealt with in the Planning and Development Act, and it is unlikely that any more quarries will be commenced in the Adelaide Hills, because the extractive industries companies already own sufficient potential sites. Members are doubtless aware of a recent court case successfully initiated by a quarrying company in the Adelaide Hills. That case established that quarrying interests can fully utilize their land rights. I said earlier that provision for future operations had been made by the acquisition of 41 properties in the Adelaide escarpment from Gawler to Noarlunga. In fact, I believe that the State Planning Appeal Board recently permitted an old quarry on private land to be reworked.

Steps can be taken to rehabilitate worked-out quarries, and these steps can be implemented side by side with current quarrying operations. Some worked-out quarries and mines should be fenced in, because their steep faces and deep shafts present potential dangers to adventurous small boys and bush walkers who like to explore the Adelaide Hills. An officer of the Mines Department should be sent overseas to see how other quarries are coping with this problem and the steps they are taking, because this problem is not peculiar to South Australia.

Finally, I know that the quarrying interests themselves are anxious to contribute on a co-operative basis to preserving the aesthetics of the areas in which they operate. However, I know, too, that they will not be happy to do this as a result of threats of enforced action by one inspector, and this provision is the greatest danger I see in the Bill. The public interest in this very controversial issue of hills defacement can best be served by a balanced approach to quarrying in relation to location, operational costs, and to the amenity itself. Extreme measures in relation to any aspect can only detract from the most desirable result.

Although I agree that some steps need to be taken to preserve the hills face, to rehabilitate worked out quarries, and to make plans for quarries now in use, the Government must realize that the extractive industries are vital to the economic development of the State and must bear in mind that any serious restriction placed on their operations will hamper the State's development. As I have said, I support the second reading because I believe that the amendments on the file can do much to remedy the defects that members on this side see in the Bill. I hope that in Committee the Government will consider these amendments, which have been thoughtfully prepared by the members on this side who are in charge of the Bill for the Opposition. I hope that a balanced approach can be brought to bear on this complex problem by everyone who has the interest of the Hills and the development of the State at heart.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I have a deep concern for the effect this legislation will have on opal-mining activities, especially at Coober Pedy and, to a lesser extent, at Andamooka. I believe that the Government has failed to consider the wishes of the opal-mining community in these centres, and this is a breach of faith on the Government's part. It would be relevant at this stage for me to read the following letter circulated to residents at Andamooka and Coober Pedy by the Hon.

R. R. Loveday during the last election campaign:

To the electors of Andamooka and Coober Pedy: Owing to the change in electorate boundaries, you are now enrolled in the electorate of Eyre for the forthcoming State election. The Australian Labor Party candidate for Eyre is Peter Kennedy of Poochera, a man thoroughly conversant with your problems. I strongly recommend him to you. The election of a Labor Government will ensure that the two leases covering 1,721 sq. miles near the opal fields, granted to a mining company, will be terminated as soon as possible and no further leases of that type will be granted. The miners on both fields will be consulted before overdue amendments are made to the Mining Act. Under a Labor Government, the welfare of the miners, stability of the industry and increased value of output will be the prime considerations of policy. As your retiring member, after 15 years' service, I convey my best wishes to you.

That is what the Government promised before the election.

Mr. Payne: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: It is all right for the trendsetter who can wear coloured shirts and take off his coat to say that, but I do not think he knows anything about opal mining or about the problems that face opal miners at these two centres. The following is what a deputation had to say after it had met the Minister of Development and Mines:

Recently a deputation consisting of two appointed miners met with the Premier to discuss the proposed legislation. We were disappointed with the reception given to our opinions on this occasion and it is felt that perhaps not sufficient emphasis was laid upon our objection, or that the Premier was not in possession of all the relevant facts.

After that deputation met the Minister, the Minister of Agriculture went to Coober Pedy in relation to another matter. He did not even have the courtesy to inform me that he was going there, yet I happen to be the member for the district. However, we have come to expect this type of thing. The Minister of Agriculture tried to make a fool of the opal miners in the area.

Mr. Rodda: He realizes his mistakes.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. If he stuck to woolclassing, he might know something about that, but he was of no assistance to the opal miners in these areas. The first point that concerns the people in the area relates to the powers of the inspector. I do not claim to know much about opal mining and perhaps the member for Pirie, who is very quiet now, may know something about it, although we have not heard him speak this evening. The powers of the inspector, as provided in this legislation, would jeopardize the position of the average opal miner. If the inspector was inconsistent, the opal miners would not know from day to day whether they could continue their mining operations, and I do not think this situation will attract people to the area or benefit the people as a whole. The other main objection was to the proposal on backfilling. This is dealt with in clause 4, which inserts new paragraph 25 (*d*) in the second schedule, providing that regulations made may—

regulate, restrict or prohibit the treatment or disposal of overburden or waste products in prescribed areas or places, or in areas or places of a prescribed kind.

Much of that provision refers to the restoration of the surface of the land. Anyone who has been in these areas realizes that they are mainly desert and that the value of the country, even for grazing, is limited. When one sees the area that the bulldozers are working on, it may seem to be large. However, it can be seen from the air to be only a small portion of a large expanse of country, and it would be a long time before a great amount of damage was done. However, if the opal miners are required to backfill, it is estimated that the cost will be between $1,200 and $1,500 for each cut. This would put out of business most of the bulldozers operating in the area, and there are about 60 operating. In turn, this would force many people into bankruptcy. It is estimated that between $3,500,000 and $4,000,000 worth of machinery is operating at Coober Pedy, and many people are obtaining a livelihood from the operation of this equipment. Further, the 2,000 people living in the area are certainly reaping the benefits derived from these people being there. It is estimated that, if the backfilling provisions become law and the bulldozers are forced to leave Coober Pedy (because backfilling would make it uneconomic to stay) the reduction of machinery operations would be about 70 per cent.

Mr. Payne: We all got that letter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I know that, but obviously no Government member has considered it.

Mr. Clark: Let them make a mess and leave the lot there!

Mr. GUNN: That may be the attitude of the honourable member, but it is not mine. The opal miners and everyone else in the areas are concerned about the surface of the land, but they are also realistic. Anyone who looks at the operations will see that one cut is not started in an area until another cut in that area has been put in and worked out, and the

bulldozer operater automatically back fills into the cut that has been worked out. We know that the total amount of material dozed out of a cut cannot be placed back in the cut: a large quantity of dirt remains. Although I have not much more to say at this stage, except to point out that I will speak in Committee, I hope that the Government will seriously consider the points made by the opal miners in the letter circulated to all members of the House, because I for one should not like to see the opal-mining industry wrecked. However, I believe that this legislation will go a long way towards wrecking the industry if the measure is passed in its present form.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): This is a far-reaching Bill, which I think will pass the second reading without strong opposition, if there is any opposition at all. However, several matters will need to be carefully examined in Committee. I intend to canvass some of the problems with which this Bill seeks to deal, and I intend also to discuss the way the Bill deals with those problems. First, I think that two matters are uppermost in the minds of the people of the State and more particularly of members of this House. One matter relates to the appearance of the Adelaide Hills as it is affected by quarrying operations, and the other relates to mining that is taking place at such places as Coober Pedy. There are many other instances in which the landscape is being altered and in some cases undeniably marred as a result of mining activities.

We cannot have mining, particularly mining of an open-cut nature, without altering to some extent the appearance of the landscape. I remind members that under this far-reaching Bill every mining operation throughout the State could be severely affected not only in the places to which I have referred but also, for instance, in the Middleback Ranges. Therefore, we must know what we are doing and not merely pass a Bill that has such wide powers that the Executive is left with power to do what it wishes. When opening this Parliament, His Excellency the Governor's Deputy said, after referring to the hills face zone:

A Bill to amend the Mines and Works Inspection Act to provide better control of quarrying in and restoration of the area will be introduced.

That is fair enough, and this Bill is designed to provide better control. However, it is not providing much control over the controllers, and this is the basis of the main complaint that has been raised by members on this side. The member for Victoria dealt with this matter in detail, and the member for Davenport, who made an extremely learned speech on the subject, dealt with it in great detail also. I believe that what trouble exists in this matter it partly compounded by the fact that mining and quarrying are not really the same thing, although their operations merge and one overlaps the other. The quarrying and extractive industry is the type of industry that uses almost all the material it removes. On the other hand, the mining industry, while it perhaps has overburden to deal with, is looking for something well below the surface. The extractive industries have very little overburden and use a great part of the material they are moving. Of course, under the Act the definition of "mining" includes quarrying. Therefore, we can see that there are two kinds of activity which are really distinct, even though they overlap.

There is a widespread feeling that the hills face zone is being ruined by quarrying. People have come to accept that idea without much thought, because the quarries (one in particular, the largest of them) have become more prominent in people's minds. Incidentally, not everyone agrees that these quarries are ugly. I can recall meeting at the Outer Harbour some time ago an elderly woman who had spent most of her life in South Australia. She was a woman with at least some appreciation of the aesthetic side of life, yet she commented on what a wonderful improvement the development of the quarries had made to the Adelaide Hills. She maintained that it showed up the Adelaide Hills and focused them very much better than they had ever been before.

If honourable members pause in the passage just opposite your office, Mr. Speaker, they will see a painting of a quarry. This painting, which has hung there for many years, is by Gustave Barnes, and in its own way it is not unattractive. I am not arguing that quarries are pretty things. In fact, I believe that they certainly should be controlled and that their unlimited development is to be frowned upon. I think the quarry interests themselves would agree with that view, for I know that they do not want to see uncontrolled expansion of the operations and that they themselves make some efforts to see that the aesthetics can be maintained as far as possible.

However, it is of some importance to note that the materials that have come from these quarries have for many years been under price

control, and there is no provision in the price that has been set for the cost of rehabilitating the landscape after the operations at a quarry have finished. Therefore, there has been no incentive to rehabilitate in that way. However, I believe that most of the interests concerned with quarrying will be happy (in fact, they probably intend to do so in any case) to rehabilitate their quarries when the quarries are exhausted. It would cost them something, and no doubt they would want to pass that cost on to the community to whom they are selling their products. Quarries can be rehabilitated effectively. In many parts of the world and, in fact, in South Australia, without any really positive effort in the past, certain quarries have become relatively disguised just by time and the growth of various trees and plants.

However, it is not easy to rehabilitate a quarry that is being actively used. Most members here would know the method of cutting faces and steps into the hills. In fact, that is prescribed by regulation: the depth of each face is limited by regulation to, I think, 65ft., so the quarry goes back in the form of steps and it is not possible to rehabilitate it as it goes.

For one thing, the face is being worked upon and, for another thing, any part that is not will probably be affected by future blasting nearby. The Adelaide Hills have been a source of great admiration for most people in South Australia and for our visitors, and it is to our own interest to see that we can control and make the operations on the hills face zone as inconspicuous or as unharmful as possible. After the circle of park lands was established around the city of Adelaide, Adelaide has lately extended considerably without a further belt of park lands being made; but we have always looked upon the western face of the hills as a green belt, which, to some extent, defines the metropolitan area.

I do not think for one minute that the Government intends to stop quarrying in the Adelaide Hills. Indeed, I should be astonished if it did. There is no suggestion from what it has said that it intends to stop it. I think the Government intends to exercise what powers it can get from this Bill to control and guide the future development of quarrying, but there seem to be many people in the community who would be happy if all quarrying in the Adelaide Hills was stopped immediately and a rehabilitation programme was instituted; but those people have, I believe, never thought of the alternative for the industries that must use these materials, for those industries are mainly the Government itself in its roadmaking. The quartzitic and sandstone we get from the western face of the Adelaide Hills is not necessarily of the highest quality, but they make a very good foundation for roads, although not for the actual bitumen surface. They are, of course, suitable also for concrete. These quarries could not easily be replaced within a reasonable distance of Adelaide. The eastern side of the range is not so well suited for the materials and any alternative would have to be some 40 to 50 miles away—if indeed the material was available there. In those circumstances, there would be an enormous increase in cost to the industry and, when I say "the industry", I mean mainly the Government.

Let us briefly see what would happen. I think that the cartage rate is about 7c a ton-mile. If carriers had to go 40 miles, the rate would be about $2.80 a ton extra—far more than the cost of the material itself, which at present is about $1 to $1.50. That material would undoubtedly increase in price if new quarries had to be opened, because of the new installations and the cost of movement. As the member for Davenport has said, about 4,000,000 tons a year is used at present in South Australia. If we had to find that, the cost would be fantastic. The honourable member has also said that the cost of such material at present is, happily, cheaper than it is in the other States. The price of concrete aggregate in Adelaide is about $1.45 a ton, whereas in Sydney it is $2.40 a ton and in Melbourne $2.70 a ton. The price of A grade fine crushed rock for road purposes in Adelaide is about $1.45 a ton, whereas in Sydney it is $2.40 a ton and in Melbourne $2.60 a ton. Our present advantage would be completely lost if we had to move away from the hills face zone.

So, there is no case for complete removal of the industry. The only case (and in this respect I agree with the Government) is for proper control of the industry to see that the alteration of the appearance of the hills is made as small as possible, while being consistent with the health of the industry itself. I do not think that the quarrying interests themselves have objected to the advance of control measures by the Government. However, they are no doubt apprehensive as to the method and extent of control. They are really warning people of just what will have to happen, whether they like it or not, as regards the added cost, should some major upheaval be caused by legislative action.

I repeat that the South Australian Government uses 70 per cent of these materials. Most of us agree that there must be major freeways. Even the Government, whose views on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan seem to be lost in obscurity but seem to be vaguely critical, agrees that there must be some freeways. These freeways, on any sort of system that has been agreed upon in outline, would become almost impossible to build at a reasonable cost if there was a heavy increase in the cost of materials, either through making the industry move or through applying such onerous conditions that it had to increase the cost.

The worry that one has is not that there will be some control—that is accepted. The worry concerns what will happen to the people who now have some interest and some heavy investment (running into many millions of dollars) in the industry. Will they be subject to compensation if their operations are greatly affected? Obviously, they should be entitled to compensation. In fact, it is possible to argue that they would not be able to survive without it. What is intended with regard to compensation is not made clear in the Bill or in the Minister's second reading explanation, yet that is of vital concern. This case is not similar to ordinary town planning provisions where, in many cases, compensation is not provided under a town planning decision, even though hardship may be caused in such cases. In this case, however, an industry with specific and large investments can be virtually turned upside down as a result of the wrong or far-reaching decisions that can be made. The matter of compensation should receive full and public consideration at the earliest moment.

Now I turn to the far-reaching provision in relation to the inspector's powers. In this connection, the Bill deals not only with the hills face zone but also with Coober Pedy, Iron Knob, Leigh Creek or any other place in South Australia where mining activities are carried out. The Bill provides that the inspector may order the cessation of any mining operation or practice, or any operation or practice incidental or ancillary thereto that, in his opinion, has impaired unduly or is likely to impair unduly the amenity of any area or place. I have included the words "impaired unduly", which the Minister intends to add to the new paragraph by amendment, and that is a good amendment. The inspector can order the cessation of any of these operations as a result of deciding on this question of undue impairment of the amenity. What constitutes impairment of an amenity is completely within the judgment of an inspector. Although an inspector can be trained to detect failure by people to maintain safety standards and in various other aspects normally associated with mining operations, whether an amenity is impaired is strictly a matter of opinion, and it is difficult to offer appropriate training in that connection. The opinion given would be difficult to sustain without much argument by other people.

As I do not believe this sort of power should be given to an inspector, I intend to move an amendment in Committee to provide that the cessation of the work may be ordered by the inspector with the specific written approval of the Minister. This means that the Minister will have to consider the matter and give written approval before action is taken on the ground of impairment of an amenity. I believe they will see the wisdom of this amendment when they consider how this question of impairment of an amenity is so much a matter of judgment. Other amendments on the file have been referred to by previous speakers, and I am not able to discuss them in detail. However, they are designed to give some standing and power to the present proposed advisory committee.

Apparently a group of quarrying interests wrote to the Minister on August 10 this year. The person who wrote was Mr. J. N. Yeates (who is well known to members of this Parliament as a former Commissioner of Highways) on behalf of Quarry Industries Limited, the Readymix Group (S.A.), and White Rock Quarries Limited. The letter set out the problems that these companies could see and the matters that they were concerned about, some of which I have mentioned in detail. The letter is too long to read, but I think the representatives of the companies saw the Premier several times after they sent the letter. They hoped to get some safeguard against the more rigorous provisions of the Bill.

It is probably as a result of this approach that the Minister has filed amendments providing for the establishment of an advisory committee, to be appointed by the Governor. The Minister will be obliged to refer any appeals to the advisory committee for advice but, after considering the advice, he may vary or revoke the order or direction that is the subject of the appeal. In other words, the Minister has complete power, other than the obligation to refer the matter to the advisory committee. After referring it, he can do what he likes. The amendments to be moved by

the member for Victoria provide for a different organization, to be known as the Mines and Works Appeal Board, to be appointed. Some of the interests concerned will at least have an opportunity to nominate a panel of names for the Minister's consideration when he is recommending appointments to the board.

The four board members are to be appointed by the Governor. One panel is to be nominated by the Institute of Mining and Metallurgy and one by the Institute of Quarrying. That will ensure that, however the committee is to be composed, it will at least have on it people who have some experience in the industry and know its problems. Inadequate experience amongst the members could lead to bad decisions. This appeal board will hear and determine appeals and, as is the case with the authorities set up under the Planning and Development Act, its decisions will be subject to appeal to the Supreme Court. That provision seems to me to be as reasonable as it could be. If it is good enough to have such a provision in the Planning and Development Act, it should be good enough to have it here.

I repeat my feeling about the Bill. It is a good thing to exercise some control over this industry, whether the industry is dealing with the hills face zone or carrying out any operation in the State. It is important to have a balanced view and to bear in mind the economic and other effects of any decision. It is important that the inspectors appointed under the Bill to carry out the work will not be left entirely on their own to determine the very vexed question of what is an impairment of an amenity. Therefore, the Minister should be concerned when a far-reaching decision is taken. It is important that there should be some provision for compensation in the event of far-reaching decisions. It is important, too, that there should be an organization that can hear and determine appeals. With those reservations, I support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I know that some members will automatically think that, having had an interest in quarries, I will adopt the attitude that those engaged in quarrying activities are always right. However, I point out at the outset that the type of quarry in which I had an interest, in which I worked, and in which I suffered at times was small compared with the type that most members have in mind. I suppose that those who work in the bigger quarries would say that those in which I had an interest were only post holes. However, there is no doubt that when one works in a quarry one appreciates the effort involved and is aware of the shortages, at times, of the type of material being sought. I assure all members that the stone, clay, sand, or whatever the material may be that lies underneath the surface of the soil will be found only where it is; it will not be found anywhere else.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: When we hear some people, whom we perhaps class as conservationists, saying that quarries should be closed down yet offering no alternative in regard to finding the material in question elsewhere, one wonders whether these people really appreciate the situation. I wish to refer in particular to one or two articles on this subject that have been written by people in relation to other States, because I believe that the statements made are true and tend to bring together the two lines of thinking, namely, that of the conservationists and that of the person who is interested in extracting the materials necessary to develop the State, whether he be actually extracting it from the earth or whether he be making use of the material, and whether he be engaged in a Government undertaking or in private enterprise. A report of the remarks of the Western Australian Minister for Industrial Development (Mr. Court), dealing with this subject, states:

In Western Australia there was tremendous scope for partnership between developers and conservationists. The greatest enemy of conservation was the fanatic conservationist who did not realize that there had to be such a partnership. Often natural assets were so lacking in development that humanity suffered, and sometimes natural assets were so wrongly used that environment was damaged or destroyed. The ideal was a balance. The physical survival and progress of man demanded development, but the true developer looked beyond the needs of the body for food and fibre and recognized that life was not just a matter of quantities but of qualities. The quality of environment was not just a physical thing like clean air, clean water and nature preservation. Too much talk on conservation surrounded physical things. The pollution of people's minds and the total way of life had also to be considered.

The true developer recognized that full development must include the all-round development of man himself so that his capacity for civilized behaviour more than matched his acquisition of material betterment. Some people became highly emotional, not because damage was being done but simply because changes were being made. They equated change with destruction. The important thing was to give

change an attractive face to the limit that could be afforded, and it must be recognized that there was not unlimited wealth and everything wanted could not be implemented at a given point. The evolution of a community required tolerance and understanding between those making changes and those experiencing them.

I do not believe that I could have told the story in any simpler or better form than Mr. Court did in that statement—that is, the environment, the effect of quarries on the environment and the amenity of the area, and the benefit of the goods extracted from those quarries. When he introduced the Bill the Premier said that a proper balance must be kept between economic and environmental considerations. I believe that in saying that the Premier would like us to think that his thoughts were the same as those of the Western Australian Minister.

Mr. McKee: Aren't they?

Mr. EVANS: I trust that they are. I trust that is the intention and that it will be adhered to. However, I make the point now because at some time in the future one may have to refer back to it, and it will be interesting to come back to it if one desires to do so. Victoria has an extractive industries law. That State set up the State Development Committee on Extractive Industries, and in 1964 it issued a report, one brief statement from which is as follows:

In short, the products of the industry are wanted but its presence is not.

I think that is the attitude of many people in our society. If it were possible to have the goods that come from this industry yet not have the industry, it would be a wonderful thing. However, we know that the only places from which the goods can come are the pits or quarries from which they are extracted. One of the terms of reference of the committee to which I referred dealt with the stepping up of the geological survey of the State's mineral resources. This is possibly where we are falling down a little, for we are not providing for any survey of the resources that we may have in the State of these particular materials. We know that the people interested in the industry have themselves carried out a substantial amount of surveying to find the best materials. We must realize that much of the crushed rock we are using is not quite of the high standard that we would like it to be. However, it is the best available. As I began to say, the terms of reference of the Victorian committee were as follows:

Stepping up of the geological survey of the State's mineral resources to ensure:

(*a*) that materials such as sand, gravel, clay, rock and other substances commonly the subject of quarry operations in both rural and urban areas or likely to be needed to meet future production requirements are not unnecessarily sterilized by surface development but are kept available for exploitation, and

(*b*) the most effective land use in accordance with the principles of modern town planning, having due regard to the need for siting quarries so as to avoid unjustified interference with the comfort and living conditions of people in the area concerned, or amenities generally.

I think that leaves us with the message that in planning and in opening or working quarries we must realize that it is important to protect our resources of quarry materials and at the same time not interfere with or to allow urban development to come so close to the quarries that those urban residents complain about the activities of the quarries. This has actually happened in this State in the past, and it was the subject of some dispute in Parliament between the Government and local councils. I make no apology for saying that. I was not a member of that particular Parliament; the pressures were not on then, nor were the town planning authorities looking very far into the future at that time. It was not mentioned by members opposite to any great extent until the 1960's, so I make no excuse if this is used later. But we made the error in the past of allowing urban development to encroach on the deposits of materials that we are likely to need in the future. In particular, I think of an area in the south-west around the Linwood quarry where there is an excellent type of material for the finishing of bitumen work or the finalizing of road construction. We have had complaints from residents in the area in the past about dust and noise from the quarry.

The present Minister of Education, when the member for Glenelg, used to mention in this Chamber complaints by residents in his district, but we cannot blame these quarries: it is the fault of the Government, local government, town planners and the like, who create these circumstances. So we face the problem now that we have within our community a fairly strong group of people concerned with only one aspect of the problem—conservation. Another group is concerned with the unsightliness (as they call it) of quarries but, to me, that is

debatable. I do not want to be accused of being biased so I will not push that too far, because I have a soft spot for quarries, to such an extent that, when I enter them, I can appreciate some of the better points of quarries which would not appeal to other people.

Another group earns its livelihood from these industries. Those people can live within the metropolitan area, educate their children within the metropolitan area, have their children come home and themselves have employment within a reasonable distance of their homes whereas, if the quarries were pushed out to where the only other known deposits of this material lie, as far as we know today, they would have to travel, say, 50 miles away or camp out there or build their houses there and put up with many of the the inconveniences that country people must endure because of the distance they are from the major towns of the State and because they lack universities, schools, hospitals, and other amenities. When we speak of shifting quarries farther out, if that is desirable, we must also consider what it means from the point of view of pollution to move into the catchment area. In this respect about 600 square miles of the Adelaide Hills, a substantial part of them, is eliminated immediately, because, if we moved in there and started quarrying on a large scale, people would complain about pollution.

The Bill covers a wide field. Most of the debate and discussion by conservationists and by those objecting to quarries will centre on the hills face zone, but the Bill relates not only to that: it relates to the whole of the State. Let us remember Leigh Creek and that, if we ever reached the stage of being told to fill in the hole at Leigh Creek, we must realize how impossible it would be to do that or even to attempt to beautify it because of the lack of water in that area. It would be diffcult to beautify an area like Leigh Creek. People would say, "It is a long way from Adelaide, so it does not matter", but the cement works, which are not that far from the city, may come into the same category. Sydney has a surburban development up to 50 miles away from the centre of the city. Even if we go only 40 miles out, in later years we shall still face the same problem of people complaining about the development in a specific area. A..., on the main Melbourne Road at Callington, with a hole 600ft. deep a whole hill will be taken away. It is possible afterwards to go an even greater depth. At this stage the mine that will be opened there will go down 600ft., and possibly 1,200ft. The first 600ft. will be by the open-cut method, and it must be remembered that this mine will be adjacent to one of our main highways, which is considered to be the scenic way to Melbourne by both South Australian travellers and travellers from other States. We must consider, too, how we will beautify the area when the excavation is completed.

So, luckily, right at our backdoor we have some of the best deposits of stone available in the State. That is one of the reasons why we have had a lower cost factor in respect of development in this State than the other States have had. This was demonstrated by the prices given by the member for Alexandra in connection with aggregate material in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. Over the last few years we have all realized that our cost structure has gradually been catching up with that of the other States. As a result, the advantage we used to have in encouraging industry to come to this State is being lost. Now, we do not have the added attraction of lower costs to encourage business men to invest in this State. In addition, we may actually become the stagnant State that we sometimes talk about in this place.

I am worried, too, that the Government, through the Highways Department, and councils make large excavations on properties for gravel for road construction throughout the State. However, such excavations do not go to any great depth: many are very shallow. The depths are sometimes no greater than 12ft. or 15ft. but, because the excavations are not very deep, they cover large areas. Consequently, they impair the beauty of the area for the people there. Because there are few people in some such areas, it seems that it does not matter to the authorities. If there were a larger population in the area there would be pressure upon the authorities to carry out the operation more satisfactorily.

What is the position of Government departments? Are they subject to the same conditions as private enterprise? At present most of these pits do not come under the jurisdiction of a Mines Department inspector. They would not even be considered on most occasions. The original purpose of the Mines Department inspector was to check the safety factor within quarries so that quarry proprietors did not put quarry workers and machine operators in dangerous positions. I must say that the inspectors have been very good. The safety record of both large and small quarries has been good, too. Most of the accidents that

have occurred (and we have had several—some fatal) have been brought about through the neglect of the individual. Perhaps through carelessness, over-confidence or through neglecting some precaution, an employee has taken a risk. This cannot be pinned down to the fault of the quarry inspector or the mine management. At times a tradesman can make that one mistake which brings about an unnecessary and regrettable accident. Mainly, the inspector's purpose is to consider safety factors, and they are matters of fact more than they are anything else; on such matters a person can make a decision. However, to decide whether a quarrying operation is impairing an amenity or the beauty of an area is more a matter of discretion, and it is much more difficult on such matters to make a clear-cut decision. It is much more difficult to educate a man in this field so that he will come up with a reasonable decision. I agree with those members who have said that they would support an amendment to provide for some avenue of appeal before any final decision was made. I will speak on this matter in Committee.

It is clear from the press that those quarry proprietors who have been interviewed have stated strongly that they have no objection to any regulation or control that can be brought in to help rehabilitate with plant life areas where quarries are worked out, to help beautify areas where quarries are being worked, or to try to conceal some parts of a quarry area in an effort to improve the environment for the betterment of the area. However, they object strongly to having decisions left in the hands of one man or two men (the Minister being the second man), without any right of appeal. Anyone who believes in fair play must believe that there should be a right of appeal. Also, many quarries that have now been abandoned as quarries are being used as a means of disposing of much of the waste of our city. A week or so ago when I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he thought that there should be a refuse disposal plant built in Adelaide to dispose of waste, he said that it was being carted and disposed of by a good land-fill method and was filling up many of the old clay pits and quarries. If society can accept this as a good method of waste disposal, the holes dug for quarries and clay and sand pits will become important to the State in future and will actually end up being an asset rather than a liability.

After they have been filled in they can be used as recreation grounds, as they have been in the Burnside and Mitcham areas, as well as in other areas. Had these old holes not been worked as clay pits or quarries over the past 70-odd years, the areas involved would have been built on and the recreation areas now being used would not have been available to the community, unless the Government had been prepared to buy up established properties, demolishing them to provide the playing fields. Even these bigger excavations now being made can be used in the future as playing fields, as long as they are worked in the right way. I invite members to speak to the managers of quarries and to inspect the workmanlike way in which operations are carried out. They will see that every effort is made to work the quarries so that the amenity of the area is not greatly impaired. The member for Alexandra made the point that quarries can be worked only on limited faces and in steps. Some of them may be to a depth of 600ft. to 700ft., and I do not consider that the scar is becoming any worse in most of the quarries. The scars cannot become bigger, because they have already reached the peak of the hill, and many members would know that, in the last few years, the quarries have not really gained in visible size. I cannot compliment the *Advertiser* on the photographs in that newspaper recently. I consider that the one that brought the quarry up close was trick photography. I think that to bring the quarry right over the city was hardly a fair way of showing how the size of the quarry compared with the size of the city.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you really think that?

Mr. EVANS: Perhaps the Minister of Labour and Industry has never looked at the scene: perhaps I should apologize and say that he has not seen it, because of poor eyesight. Probably, he has never taken an interest in the matter and cannot say whether it was a poor photograph. I could not condemn the *Advertiser* for bringing the matter to the notice of the people, but the newspaper should do it in a fair way. Of course, sensationalism is popular.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you know what—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher is making his speech.

Mr. EVANS: I have some comments from a speech made by Mr. John N. Yeates at a seminar held at the Adult Education Centre at Adelaide University from July 25 to July 27 last. Mr. Yeates stated:

At the outset it must be stated that the author is delivering this paper at the request

of the Institute of Quarrying, which represents a body vitally concerned with crushed stone production. Its policy is one of sympathy with the preservation of the aesthetics of the hills face, visible from the plains. However, it contends that as its members are supplying material that is vital to progress, it must adopt a realistic attitude. The industry is prepared to co-operate with the planning authority in complying with reasonable requests or suggestions, provided increased costs of appreciable magnitude do not result. In the final outcome, obviously the consumer and the public generally would be called upon to meet such increased costs.

He also stated:

It has been said that the crushed stone demands of a city, State or country are an index to its progress and development.

I do not necessarily argue that the magnitude of the quarrying industry in this State should enable it to act to the detriment of the community in which it operates, but I consider that members must consider the magnitude of the industry when making decisions such as we are making in this Bill. Mr. Yeates also stated:

Some $10,000,000 is invested on land, plant and equipment in the crushed stone industry. Since 1960 a similar amount ($10,000,000) has been expended by the brick industry in the installation of more modern brick producing plants. This is additional to the investment prior to 1960. The number of employees in the stone crushing industry is approximately 500, wages and salaries amounting to $1,400,000 a year.

This is going back to 1969. Mr. Yeates also stated:

In the clay and brick industry there are some 550 employees, and the wages bill is approximately $1,750,000 a year.

Mr. McKee: What's this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. EVANS: It has a lot to do with it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKee: You're playing politics.

The SPEAKER Order!

Mr. EVANS: This may be the only opportunity that I as a Parliamentarian have to speak on this subject, and I wish to ensure that recorded fairly and squarely in *Hansard* are both sides of the issue, so that people who read *Hansard* and who are interested in this matter will know what are our views. Whether it be people working in clay pits, extracting crushed rock or working in any other area, the whole of the quarrying industry is directly affected by this measure. Mr. Yeates continued:

The current average cost of crushed stone is about $1.40 a ton—

That is the cost at that time. I do not need to repeat what the member for Alexandra said on this matter except to say that the cost of cartage could be increased by as much as three times the present cost. Mr. Yeates continued:

The population of the metropolitan planning area in 1968 was 750,000, or thereabouts. The population in 1991 is estimated at 1,380,000.

Mr. Yeates has adopted a population figure of 1,000,000 over this period, in order to assess the requirements regarding products we are likely to use during this period. In 1968, 4,000,000 tons of crushed stone was used, or 5 tons a head a year; 500,000 tons of clay was required (.7 tons a head); and 1,500,000 tons of sand for construction was required (2 tons a head). Mr. Yeates continued:

The total demand over the next 20 years for a population of 1,000,000 will therefore be: crushed stone, 100,000,000 tons; clay, 14,000,000 tons; and sand, 40,000,000 tons.

Mr. Yeates has estimated that a total of 116,600,000 tons of material will be required in the next 20 years from the hills face zone. If those engaged in quarrying activities in the Hills at present have to leave that area, they will have to commence operations in an area where the hills are only half as high as those in which they are now working near the city. If we plan to extract 116,000,000 tons of material over 20 years, assuming that operations will extend to a depth of 60ft., 1,000 acres will be required to produce this quantity. However, as quarries are at present operating at a depth of 600ft. to 700ft., and possibly more, the acreage used at present is reduced. If quarrying takes place in hills that are not so high, the surface area that will be bared will be considerably increased, and this aspect must be considered. In this regard, it is much more advantageous if higher hills can be used. Mr. Yeates concluded by making seven points, as follows:

(1) Objections that the scarring of the hills face zone by excavations are frequently forthcoming by sections of the community. Whether these are detrimental depends on one's point of view. It might be argued that isolated quarries break the continuity and perhaps the monotonous outline of the hills and are therefore not unattractive.

I think that point was made by the member for Davenport. The honourable member said that she first thought that the quarries were not ugly to any great degree and that at times she thought they tended to break the monotony and make the landscape a little more attractive. The conclusions continue:

(2) Irrespective of the particular individual's likes and dislikes, curtailment of quarrying operations on too rigid controls must be related to economical considerations.

(3) Increased cost of crushed stone or bricks must be borne by all sections of the community, who would be obliged to pay more for council rates, public services, home-building, etc. The public would in all probability not be prepared to pay such increased costs.

I do not necessarily agree there, because if members of the public decided they wanted to pay more there would be nothing wrong with that, possibly. However, in all probability the writer is correct. The conclusions continue:

(4) Increased costs would affect industrial development, a matter of great importance to the Government.

(5) The stone and clay industries are large and well established. Large sums of money are invested on them and employment is provided for a considerable number of people.

(6) The possibility of demands in the future for the establishment of more industrial areas in the hills face zone for the production of allied products, ready mixed concrete, cement bricks, etc., should not be lost sight of. The economy of manufacture, at the source of the raw materials, for these products, is of importance.

(7) Finally, over the next 20 years, 117 x 10^6 tons of stone and clay will need to be extracted from the hills face zone. Naturally this will continue at an increasing rate, beyond the arbitrary 20-year period selected.

I have made use of this gentleman's speech because I believe it is important for that side of the issue to be placed before the people. I now return to my own attitude regarding whether this sort of control should be imposed and whether there should be some control of the methods by which quarries or pits are operated, particularly close to urban development. Outside of that, I do not think we should go to the degree of control as is perhaps provided for in the Bill.

I have some sympathy here with the member for Eyre and the people in his district in relation to opal miners and other types of miner that operate in a similar field. My own feeling is that this type of control is necessary. However, it is necessary to have all avenues covered in relation to who makes the decision to bring about the control and in relation to whether the individual or company on whom the control is placed has the right to compensation, whether there is a right of appeal, and whether those people have some representative from their own organization, namely, the extractive side of the mining industry, representing them when decisions are made. If this is not done then one must feel that the action to be taken by us is unjust.

In the hills face zone, where we have a fairly high rainfall, the effort that will be needed to rehabilitate plant growth will not be great. Having had some experience of this, I know that the natural soil on the hills face zone is not good; it is very shallow, and in the main it is sitting practically right on top of rock and usually the rock is very near the surface. Therefore, once we put some type of top-soil back it will not be difficult to regenerate the plant growth and get it back to what we like to call "something like its natural state", apart from the point that the hill will be removed. Naturally, someone will say, "That has impaired the area by removing the hill." If the area has been bad and is regenerated, it will not spoil the scenic beauty or the aesthetics of the area, because the hill behind will tend to take the place of the one that has been removed and we shall not be able to see the bad areas. The Minister of Education can laugh at that, but it is a fact. It can be done, and the industry will have to face an addition to the cost of its material that it supplies to the consumer and something towards the cost of rehabilitation. Also, of course, the consumer will have to face the fact that he will have to pay that extra cost. It will be paid for not by the quarries but by the people. That is the decision we have to make.

I support the Bill on its second reading. I believe it was necessary for us as a Parliament to make this sort of move to have some form of legislation available so that we can say that we are now in a position to ask quarry proprietors to bring their areas back as nearly as possible to their original state in respect of plant growth when the quarry operations are finished; we should be able to say to them, "We want you to operate in such a manner that you do not impair the area any more than is absolutely necessary."

Mr. McKee: That is what the Bill proposes to do.

Mr. EVANS: The Bill leaves it open for an inspector to have just a little too much say without there being a right of appeal against him—and that is the only adverse comment I have made against the Bill, as the member for Pirie knows. However, it is usual for him at this time of the night to start interjecting and causing trouble. I am amazed that he has been able to sit for so long tonight without doing so. We in Parliament will have the support of the industry if we make the

right approach to this measure. I believe it will be a good Bill if is completed in the right manner.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Already, speakers on this side have covered the ground and put all the arguments adequately in connection with the Bill, and I congratulate them on the way in which they have done so. This means that it is not necessary for me to repeat the points made tonight. The *News* today summed it up pretty well. We have two considerations: first, there is the desire, widespread throughout the community, to preserve what most people regard as the beauty of the Adelaide Hills. On the other hand we have economic considerations: that this is the place where we get good cheap road metal and metal for other purposes and, if that is abandoned, costs will rise. That is the position in which we find ourselves. The quarries can be abandoned and others opened up elsewhere, but the community will have to pay for it. The *News* in its editorial asks, "What about a compromise? There must be some compromise reached." That is undoubtedly the position. Unfortunately it does not go any further than that, and it does not suggest what the compromise should be. That is the difficult question with which we are faced. I do not think that the Bill as introduced is in a proper form, and I do not believe it is a fair compromise. Regarding the verbiage of the Bill, we have a number of amendments, but I cannot canvass them at this stage.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): The honourable member cannot canvass amendments at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have just said that: I do not propose to do so. I shall stick to the Bill as it appears at present. The nub of it is in new placitum IVa, which it is proposed to add to section 10 of the principal Act. The placitum states:

He—

an inspector under the Act—

may order the cessation of any mining operation or practice, or any operation or practice incidental or ancillary thereto, that in his opinion, has or is likely to impair unduly the amenity of any area or place and he may give such other directions as he considers necessary or desirable to prevent or reduce undue impairment of the amenity of any area or place;

That puts quarry operators, and so on, absolutely and entirely in the hands of an inspector. He has the discretion: it is his opinion which is to be decisive, and it is his opinion on matters which are necessarily vague. When we look at the new placitum that is to be added we see the exercise of a wide discretion not once but several times. First of all, he has power to order the cessation of any mining operation or practice that in his opinion (that is the first time) has or is likely (that, again, is his opinion) to impair unduly the amenity.

What on earth "unduly" means I do not know. That word may mean one thing to one person and another thing to another person. Here we have the opinion of an inspector and, as the Bill at present stands, it is an opinion without any appeal. There is no safeguard whatever against the exercise of the discretion and the formation of the opinion of the inspector. The placitum uses the term "the amenity of any area". "Amenity" is becoming a term of art in town planning: a much simpler and better understood word would be "pleasantness". Broadly, that is what it means. It is not defined, incidentally, in this Act: it is defined in a long roundabout way in the Planning and Development Act (I say this with respect to the Parliamentary Draftsman). We have here an inspector who really has no more qualifications to form an opinion on an important matter like this than the member for Pirie or I have. The inspector has the power to stop an operation that, in his opinion, is likely unduly to impair the area.

Mr. McKee: We have mining inspectors now, you know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but they do not have this power. The power we are giving them in this Bill does not relate to their duties as mining inspectors, and that is one of the vices of it. It relates to other matters on which there could be an enormous range of opinion and on which the inspector's opinion is certainly no better than other people's opinions, and his training does not qualify him to give a better opinion. Yet, in this Bill, we are giving inspectors the sole discretion to stop an operation if they form the opinion that it is likely to impair unduly (whatever that may mean: it has no precise meaning) the amenity of any area or place. I believe that, to put it moderately, the provision is undesirably wide. Incidentally, I think that the member for Fisher was extremely moderate in his reference to this clause, because I believe it gives an administrative discretion to an official which he should not have and which he is not qualified to have.

Therefore, I do not believe that this power, which is the crux of the Bill, is a proper compromise of the problem we have of the two conflicting considerations before us. That

is not the way to tackle it, because it puts the extractive industry operators entirely in the hands of a public servant, and I say that without derogating in any way from the mining inspectors. I believe this is bad, and I hope it will be amended in Committee, although some of the Government's amendments give me little hope that they will be effective in doing that. However, I know that I must not develop that point. If we are to find a compromise, for heaven's sake let it be a compromise that involves common sense and justice. As it stands, the Bill does not do that. However, as other members on this side have said, I believe there is a problem to be remedied; therefore, I am prepared to support the second reading. However, I will not be prepared to support the Bill at the third reading unless it is amended to provide some safeguard to owners and operators from the exercise of the undesirably wide discretion at present given to inspectors by the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

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

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to an advisory committee.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BUILDING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 1160.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is an important Bill, which the Minister took about 20 minutes to explain. That was a marathon effort on his part. After the Minister had conceived it with very great difficulty and then explained it, the debate was put off. However, at last it is seeing the light of day. I intend to speak in broad terms on the second reading. I have in mind one or two amendments that the Opposition intends to move, to the advantage of the effective working of the Bill. Many members have served on councils as councillors or aldermen. In fact, one honourable member is a sitting Mayor, so I suppose many members would be conversant with this Bill through their membership of councils or as members of Parliament dealing with problems.

I support the provisions of the Bill as a whole. I will give the Minister, as soon as possible, the amendments that the Opposition intends to move. They will be designed in a constructive way and I hope that they improve the working of the Bill. The present Building Act, under which the State has laboured for many years, is extremely important and affects every householder and all occupiers of all types of building. The revision of that measure is overdue. As the Minister has explained, the revision was commenced in 1964, when the Hon. Sir Norman Jude was Minister of Local Government.

This matter has been taken up by the Building Act Advisory Committee on a national basis and it has been considered on that basis. However, it is impossible to have the Building Act as a national code in South Australia, because of certain aspects to which the Minister has referred. I emphasize that we must not think of this Bill as one dealing only with cottages or dwellings, although it plays a significant part in controlling the construction or alteration of those buildings. It also covers all other types of building in South Australia in the proclaimed areas. For instance, it applies, at one extreme, to a building of 20 storeys or 30 storeys, down through dwellings, to the simplest carport or outhouse (the word used in the existing Act is "privy"). There is a great range and scope, and I emphasize that we must not consider this matter in relation to one narrow aspect: we must include the tallest building in, say, King William Street down to the smallest outbuilding in the smallest and humblest house in the State. Since the Act was originally conceived, many aspects of building construction have changed radically, great advances having been made, for instance, in regard to the steel construction of multi-storey buildings. I refer here to the new type of beams being rolled at the Whyalla mill. The member for that district would appreciate that this process was introduced for the first time in Australia at the Whyalla mill and it is now widely accepted by architects.

There have also been remarkable advances in relation to reinforced concrete, particularly concerning the prestressed concrete beams used in many large buildings, as well as in some two-storey and three-storey home unit projects. Different methods of prefabrication have been introduced into the building industry, and much research has been instituted into new types of foundation to be used not only in large buildings but more particularly in dwellings, or cottage construction as it is commonly referred to in the building trade. This latter aspect is

of great importance to South Australia where, in certain parts, builders have to contend with Bay of Biscay soil.

Many of these aspects were not even thought of (perhaps even dreamed of) when the original Act was drafted. The original Act has been amended from time to time and, with the advent of prestressed concrete and steel, some of its provisions have become outmoded. The restrictions on where a building shall be sited, for instance, are somewhat outmoded.

The common clay brick, which everyone is conversant with and which possibly many of us have laid in our spare time, has changed from the old, rough brick to a highly decorative and ornamental brick. More particularly, bricks have been designed with a very high compressive strength that has enabled the erection of a building of four storeys without any steel skeleton frame. The Craminster building in King William Street was designed as a load-bearing unit without a steel structure. On the other side of the street, a conventional steel structure with brick in-fills was erected. Concrete blocks and bricks of a more sophisicated nature than was dreamed of many years ago are now manufactured. I mention these things to remind the House that we are dealing with a Bill which is all-embracing and not confined to just a house or any one particular type of structure.

The Minister, in his second reading explanation, paid a tribute to the Building Act Advisory Committee. These gentlemen are well known to me, and I join in paying a tribute to them for the work they have done since 1964. I believe that there have been one or two changes in the committee in that time. In my opinion, the committee has done a remarkably good job. This Bill is considerably shorter than the rather cumbersome Act under which we are operating at present. Perhaps it has been shortened a little too much in one or two instances, so much so that I intend to move one or two amendments to overcome what I think are a couple of unfortunate short-cuts. However, I am full of praise for the work that has been done. The gentlemen to whom the Minister referred cover a wide spectrum of those who are concerned with building in various aspects. Whilst the Minister did not say that the committee would be reappointed, I sincerely hope that he will consider the reappointment of those men. He does not say in the relevant clause of the Bill who they shall be.

The Minister went on to say that this matter was being considered by an interstate committee. Apparently we cannot adopt the recommendations here in their entirety because of the classification. I have had a look at the classification clauses, and I can see what the Minister is referring to. This Bill is mainly a Committee Bill, for there are many clauses that need clarification and close examination. Also, the Bill relies very heavily on regulations to be introduced. Instead of many of the items being spelt out as they are under the Act, many of the provisions under this Bill will be introduced by regulations. It will be the duty of this House, when the regulations appear, to scrutinize them closely to see, first, that they carry out the purport of this Bill that I am supporting, and, secondly, that they protect the rights of individual people who live in houses, the rights of councils, and the rights of builders, architects, engineers and those people connected with the industry.

I note that the Bill refers to amenities. I heard that word mentioned in an earlier debate this evening, and it has been mentioned in other debates. "Amenity" can be used in many ways, as the Attorney-General well knows. A problem that confronts many councils and householders today is that, with an upsurge in the building of home units, people's privacy can be affected. For instance, the Minister may enjoy the privacy of his own home, a single-fronted house, and then suddenly he finds on either side of him a three-storey block of units going up, and the privacy of his back lawn is lost to him completely. Those are merely one or two preparatory comments.

I now turn to the provisions of the Bill. The Minister explained the clauses to us. I note that in the principal Act there is a comprehensive definition of "building" different from the new definition. It is as follows:

"building"—

and, after all, this is the main purport of the Bill—

includes shed, outbuilding, stable, workshop, garage, privy, and any other building of any kind whether used for human habitation or not.

The definition goes on to state:

"building of the domestic class" means (*a*) a dwellinghouse, office, hotel, boarding-house, hospital or club; (*b*) a shop and dwellinghouse or shop and office . . .; (*c*) a stable, workshop, or outbuilding . . .; and (*d*) any other building not being a public building or a building of the warehouse class.

It then defines what a "building of the warehouse class" means. We must remember that

in this Bill we are dealing with factory buildings. All the present definition, amounting to some 15 lines, is omitted, and "building" is defined simply as "including a portion of a building". So, if we want to know what a building is, we refer to the Bill, where it states:

"building" includes a portion of a building.

Therefore, let us be clear that it is very plain and there is no ambiguity whatever! Having solved that problem, we find sprinkled throughout the Bill the words "building or structure". Can any member show me in the Bill the definition of "structure"?

The Hon. L. J. King: You would have to go to the dictionary for that.

Mr. COUMBE: I have been to the dictionary, but I am still trying to come up with a suitable definition. Because many matters in this Bill are subject to appeal to referees and in some cases to a court, there should be some attempt to define the terms clearly. Clause 6 provides:

"building surveyor" or "surveyor" means a person for the time being holding the office of building surveyor pursuant to Part III of this Act:

Part III states what the building surveyor can do and cannot do, but at present we do not know what his qualifications will be. There are many more building inspectors than building surveyors, but there is no definition of a building inspector. Every metropolitan council and most country councils have building inspectors. Some larger councils have building surveyors and several even have building engineers. Some councils engage building surveyors as consultants.

I point out to the Minister that the word "clerk" is used ambiguously. No definition of this term is given in the Bill. I take it that it refers to a town clerk or district clerk, but there is also a reference in the Bill to the clerk of a court. This matter must be cleared up so that we do not get confused. In addition, there is no definition of "fire zone". Provision is included to make regulations regarding fire zones. Although I know what a fire zone is, I wonder whether everyone who is affected by this Bill will know what it is.

I am interested in several clauses that deal with recommendations and powers of a building surveyor. It appears to me that a building surveyor has fairly wide powers. In several cases, I believe that his activities should be more closely associated with the decisions of a council. In other words, I believe that he should report back to the council instead of being able to act on his own initiative by virtue of powers afforded him by this Bill. Penalties are provided in certain clauses. I point out that a $400 fine is provided in some cases for non-observance of the Act, and this would certainly be a deterrent to someone building a house, but it would not be very suitable in the case of a company erecting a multi-million-dollar building. An appropriate scale should be applied in this regard. I draw the Minister's attention to clause 10 (4) which somehow or other is included in a clause subheaded "Penalties for improper performance of building work," although it has nothing to do with this. It provides:

A person shall not without the approval of the council sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any land comprised within the site (not being the whole of the site) of a building to any other person.

Why should a council have the right to say whether or not a person leases his land? I cannot see what that has to do with this Bill. This Bill contains some important improvements, particularly those relating to dangerous buildings and excavations, and to the overloading of structures, foundations, and so on. Provisions in this Bill affect the Construction Safety Act and the Builders Licensing Act, and the policing of several Acts concerning the Labour and Industry Department. Even though some of these provisions may be redundant, it is wise to have them in the Bill so that they are spelt out. We have, with these new provisions and the other Acts that I have mentioned, become fairly well covered in this regard. One of the problems in the Local Government Act is the unsightly goods and chattels provision, to which I hope the Minister has found a solution. I have read the report of his expert committee on this, and the matter is tied up a little with the building legislation, because that legislation provides that a person shall not demolish unless he gets the permission from the council. I have particularly unsightly premises in my district, as most members, particularly the Minister of Works, know. If this legislation helps to overcome that problem, it will have my full support.

As is provided in many Acts, this Bill contains a provision that exempts the Crown from the provisions of the measure. I have no quarrel with that, but it involves an anomaly. I noticed this first when I was a member of a suburban council, and I think we should try to overcome the problem. When I was Minister of Works, this problem also arose, and I am sure that the present Minister has followed

the practice adopted previously of making *ex gratia* payments to overcome particular difficulties. I suggest to the Minister in charge of the Bill that, whilst I agree that the Crown should be exempt from the provisions, it would be of advantage to a council if the Crown, when designing a building (and it could be a large high school building or a building such as the Highways Department building, the largest in my district) were to submit to the council an overall ground plan indicating, for instance, the stormwater drainage required and the access and egress proposed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They do that where it is required.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but at present it is done as a courtesy and I suggest that the Crown should submit the lay-out or ground plan of what it intends to do. I do not suggest that the Crown should submit the details of the structure, as other people are required to do, but what I have suggested would be an advantage to councils. An example of what I mean would be a large building suddenly being erected by the Government, without the council's knowledge. The council might be installing a large stormwater drainage system in the area, and the new building could pose problems. In such circumstances what I have suggested could be done to advantage. The Minister said that by-laws under which councils operate at present will continue to exist until they are superseded or re-enacted by new regulations. Councils in my area are concerned (and I have explained this matter to them) to see that their by-laws will continue unimpeded until the new regulations are introduced. When the new regulations are introduced, I trust that the Minister will not, without consulting councils, take away their powers under existing by-laws. I refer, for instance, to street alignment by-laws or height regulations that may exist in certain council areas.

I emphasize that members must be vigilant in ensuring that the regulations to be introduced at a future stage are carefully scrutinized. I come now to the wide and all-embracing last clause (clause 60). The committee dealing with this matter is apparently trying to shorten the Bill down to the bare essentials. In relation to the Building Act Advisory Committee, the committee that has examined this matter until now is fairly representative and comprises Mr. Stuart Hart (Director of Planning) as Chairman; and also Mr. Farrent, who is extremely well known to me as an engineer and who has been at the university for many years; Mr. Melbourne, a former Town Clerk of Burnside; Mr. Nurse, who is a prominent builder; Mr. Stan Ralph, an architect in the Public Buildings Department; and Mr. Short, who is a surveyor. I should think that such a committee would be an excellent body to form an advisory committee such as the one contemplated. I commend the Bill to the House, because it will overcome many difficulties at present being experienced by various citizens. I refer to the person who wants to build a house; the person who is designing a house, whether he be an architect or an architectural designer (there is a difference); an engineer; the councils; the building inspectors; and the building surveyors. I trust that it will lead to uniformity of interpretation as between councils. Unfortunately, I experienced under the principal Act officers of one council giving an interpretation different from that given by officers of an adjoining council. I point out that this legislation will apply to the Adelaide City Council and to the humblest or smallest but equally important rural council in the State where this Act is to be proclaimed. Therefore, we must aim for uniformity. I believe that it will also afford protection to many potential home owners who want to build a house or buy an already existing house.

The member for Tea Tree Gully yesterday and today referred to the case of a house erected with insufficient ventilation. I do not know whether the council concerned or the builder was to blame. However, I believe that this Bill will overcome these problems. As I have said, I am preparing several amendments which I hope to get to the Minister tomorrow. I shall certainly have them to him as quickly as possible so that we can get on with the debate. I commend the Bill to the House, for I believe it will be of great importance and benefit to the State and particularly to local government. I believe it will confer a great benefit on many people in this State.

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER TORRENS ACQUISITION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 6 (clause 3)—After "bank" insert "and shall not, at any point exceed a lateral distance of two hundred feet from the top of the river bank".

No. 2. Page 3, line 6 (clause 5)—Leave out "or any other purpose".

No. 3. Page 3, line 14 (clause 5)—Leave out "or any other purpose".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

If it pleases the honourable gentleman of the other place to have the amendments inserted, I am happy to accept them because they do not materially affect the operation of the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: I appreciate the Minister's action in accepting these amendments. I followed the debate in the other place with interest, and I have examined the effect of the amendments suggested by that Chamber. I believe that these amendments will not materially affect the operation of the Bill. In fact, one or two people in my district have expressed a similar opinion. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 29, at 2 p.m.