

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 3, 1970

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

FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BETTING)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS**ISLINGTON CROSSING**

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have an investigation made into the traffic problem created on Regency Road at the Islington station railway crossing? Although Regency Road, which runs both east and west of the railway line, is a wide road carrying several lanes of traffic, a bottleneck is created where it crosses the railway line at this point.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

WORKING HOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier, and I ask your leave, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whether the Government has made any decision with regard to a 35-hour week. Now, if I may proceed with the explanation of the question: About a fortnight ago, I asked the Premier, as Leader of the Government, whether it was intended to press for the introduction of a 35-hour week in South Australia. At that time, the Premier said that the matter was being considered or that no decision had been reached (he said one or the other: I forget which). Since then, Mr. Whitlam, who I understand is the Leader of the Party to which the Premier belongs and who is Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament, has, to say the least, expressed grave reservations about this, and has apparently tried to avoid the issue. Dr. Patterson, who I understand is spokesman for the same Party on rural affairs, has opposed it, as far as rural industry is concerned. In view of the lack of enthusiasm by Mr. Whitlam and the opposition of Dr. Patterson, I therefore ask the question of the Premier in the hope that the Government has decided not to proceed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The statements made by the honourable member explaining his question were characteristically inaccurate. As a lawyer, the honourable member must be well aware of the fact that constitutionally the Commonwealth Parliament is unable to legislate for hours of work. Therefore, his statements concerning support or opposition by Commonwealth Labor members of particular aspects of activity by the Commonwealth in the matter of hours have no basis whatever.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member says "Nonsense"; perhaps it would have been a good idea for him to attend a meeting last evening at the Adelaide Town Hall at which Mr. Whitlam explained the matter in considerable detail. It would have been interesting for the honourable member, as obviously he has no knowledge of the subject, and it would have been good for him to be instructed.

Mr. Millhouse: Compulsorily.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not concerned about compulsory instruction for the honourable member, as he seems at times to be beyond the school leaving age. The South Australian Government does not intend to legislate for a 35-hour week.

CHRISTIES BEACH CROSSING

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Road Traffic Board to investigate the possibility of providing a push-button pedestrian crossing at Dyson Road, Christies Beach, near Elgin Avenue? In the Christies Beach area there is a primary school to the west of Dyson Road, and a high school, as well as a technical high school that is to be amalgamated with this high school, is east of Dyson Road. Foot traffic in either direction is considerable, particularly following the build-up of population in the Christie Downs area. I understand that the proposal contained in my question has been rejected previously because it was considered that traffic lights would be installed at the intersection of Beach Road and Dyson Road. It now seems that this scheme will not be proceeded with, and the parents of school-children in the area would like to have some alternative available.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It seems from the honourable member's explanation that the matter has been investigated previously, and I shall certainly be pleased to get the relevant information and find out whether further investigations can be made.

RURAL WATER SUPPLIES

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Works say what proposals the State Government, through the Engineering and Water Supply Department, has submitted to the Commonwealth Government for subsidies on extensions of water supply in rural areas, in the same way as the Keith to Taillem Bend main was submitted and approved earlier? Further, can he say in respect of what schemes applications have been made, and what progress has been made with them?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give all the details to the honourable member off-hand, but I think submissions may have been made to the Commonwealth Government on about 13 or 15 individual proposals. Recently representatives of the Commonwealth Government visited South Australia and investigated the Lock-Kimba scheme, in the District of Eyre, and they complimented officers of my department on the submission made on this proposal. I was told that the submission was an improvement on the application made in connection with the Keith to Taillem Bend main and was set out more in the form that the Commonwealth Government required. I shall be pleased to obtain the detailed information

for the honourable member and let him know what stages the various applications have reached.

MOORLANDS JUNCTION

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 20 regarding the Moorlands junction?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An advanced direction sign for erection on the Coomandook side of this junction has been ordered, and it is expected that it should be erected within the next three weeks.

PARA VISTA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me information about the dimensions of the area to be developed at the Para Vista Primary School for an oval or playing fields? The Minister will be aware that I asked a question about this matter on October 15, and he replied on October 21, saying that it was expected that tenders would be called soon but that planting was now unlikely to be carried out before next autumn. I have given this information to the members of the school committee, who have now asked me to seek this additional information.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

MENGLER HILL ROAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question regarding Mengler Hill Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The sum of \$40,000 has been allocated in the current financial year for construction work on the Mengler Hill road. Of this amount, \$16,800 has been allocated to the District Council of Angaston and \$18,500 to the District Council of Tanunda, with the remaining amount representing Highways Department expenditure. As funds become available, it is intended that further annual allocations will be made to the councils to enable the work to proceed progressively, and it appears at present that the whole length will be sealed in three years.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the presentation of the Railways Department's accounts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that in recent years there has been no move either on the part of a Government or of

senior financial advisers to have the form of the State's accounts changed in any radical way. However, while the traditional form of the accounts has been maintained, there have been minor changes in presentation from time to time in an effort to make them clearer and more meaningful. The compilation of the accounts on a cash basis, still the common approach of Governments, is a relatively simple way of putting the whole picture before Parliament and of obtaining Parliamentary approval of appropriations. To give information beyond this or in a different way would be possible, but the question arises then as to how extensive is the need for more or different information and what resources would be needed to provide it all in printed form.

Members may be aware that there has been a move in some overseas countries to introduce programme budgeting to show information about the objectives of Government and the commitments extending beyond the limits of financial years. Although this approach has, I understand, been much less effective than first hoped, it no doubt has some advantages. Here again, one must ask what resources would be needed to implement such a scheme and what advantages would be gained. I suggest that, at this stage, the presentation of the State's accounts in the traditional form, supported by very detailed reporting by the Auditor-General on individual departments (including the business undertakings on an accrued basis), and coupled with the opportunity for members to ask questions of Ministers, gives a reasonable volume of information.

I should add that the difference between cash and accrued figures instanced by the member for Heysen in the matter of Railways Department accounts is only one of a number of variables affecting the State's Budget at points of time within a year or at year's end. Other variations that occur from time to time and affect monthly figures would include variations in the time of settlement of periodical claims on the Commonwealth for special purpose grants, retrospective payment of wage and salary awards, deferments in payments to contractors because of delayed performance of service, and so on. For the present the Government would prefer to retain the existing form of published statements and to assist members by providing additional information on the specific points that interest them, whether they be in respect of business undertakings, social services, or other areas of the Budget. However, I will keep in mind the honourable mem-

ber's comments as well as any other suggestions that have been made.

PORT PIRIE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McKEE: Ever since I have represented Port Pirie I have received numerous complaints regarding the unsatisfactory quality of water being supplied to Port Pirie through the Morgan-Whyalla main. The number of such complaints has increased during the last few weeks, no doubt as a result of the present flooding of the Murray River. My constituents have requested me to ask the Minister of Works whether something cannot be done to rectify this position and improve Port Pirie's water supply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Engineering and Water Supply Department in order to ascertain what is the cause of the complaints referred to by the honourable member. The honourable member will appreciate, however, that the department does not set out deliberately to create these causes for complaint. Indeed, it does everything possible to provide water of a quality about which people will not complain. The honourable member states that the river is high at the moment and this level could cause discolouration. I shall be happy to take the matter up and bring down a report for the honourable member.

WANILLA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Works say when it is expected that an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will visit the Wanilla-Edillillie area to ascertain the wishes of the farmers in the area concerning a water scheme?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The honourable member cannot be heard.

Mr. CARNIE: On July 28, I asked a question concerning the water scheme for this area and on August 5 the Minister of Works said that plans for a scheme were being prepared and that an officer would visit the area within two or three months. Although it is just three months since I received this reply, some residents are becoming a little concerned because they have not yet been approached.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to find out what progress has been made and inform the honourable member.

REMARK WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say what action has been taken by the Government to improve the water pressure in the

Housing Trust area at Renmark? The lack of water pressure in the new housing area in Renmark has recently been brought to my notice by way of a petition signed by most of the residents of the area. They complain that during hot weather and other times at which much water is being used their supply is reduced to practically a trickle.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: For some time now, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been aware that there is a need to improve the water supply in Renmark, particularly to cope with the peak demands on hot summer days. During last summer, pressure recordings were taken in various parts of the system and, on occasion, these showed that pressures fell as low as 17 lb. a square inch on hot days. An investigation revealed that to remedy this position an additional elevated tank was needed at the south-western end of the town. This tank, which would fill overnight when pressures were high, would supply the heavy demand in the day-time without allowing pressures to fall appreciably, although there would be a slight drop. A possible tank site has been selected and approval given for the expenditure necessary to allow soil tests for foundation conditions to be made. If these tests prove satisfactory, action will be taken to acquire the necessary tank site and to seek the necessary approval to allow a new elevated storage tank to be built. In the meantime, to ensure improvement to supplies in the Renmark Housing Trust area, further investigations will be made to see whether temporary improvements can be effected.

PIANO SALESMAN

Mr. EVANS: Can the Attorney-General say what action can or will be taken in relation to the activities of Atlas Piano Services and the manner in which Mr. David Christopher Morgan, one of the organization's representatives, is operating? On July 29, the member for Kavel asked the Attorney-General a question on this subject and he was told that the matter would be investigated. The person concerned telephones a householder and asks whether he has a piano or pianola to sell and tells him that he has a buyer willing to pay between \$1,000 and \$2,000 for it. After he inspects the instrument he tells the owner that it needs repairs that could cost between \$500 and \$600. This person gets the householder to sign a contract and to give him a cheque or cash, which he uses for his own personal purposes; then he takes away certain parts of the

piano and, in many cases, never returns with the repaired parts. I believe that this person was arrested and charged on one count, although I will not discuss that matter, because it is *sub judice*, having been adjourned to December 7, 1970.

However, while the man in question was waiting to come before the court he again began operating in the same way and was arrested on August 26. Although the police on that occasion opposed bail, he was allowed bail in the Adelaide Magistrates Court, and he appeared in court on October 22 to face criminal proceedings. On that occasion the magistrate (Mr. Grieve) said that there was no case to answer, but no reasons were given for that decision. Since then, this person has continued to operate in the Waikerie area and has taken at least \$1,000 collectively from three people.

Over a period, he has been convicted of the following offences: possession of a concealable firearm; unlawful possession; resisting arrest; offensive behaviour; stealing; assaulting police; drunkenness; indecent language; breaking, entering and stealing; maliciously damaging a police cell; escaping from lawful custody; failure to answer questions truthfully; and common assault. This person can still operate in this way, and I believe that is a serious matter; indeed, the people of this State should be made aware that he is apparently operating within the law and that nothing can be done about it through court action. Will the Attorney-General see what can be done to try to curtail the activities of this person?

The Hon. L. J. KING: It seems that the only action that can be taken under the existing law to deal with a person operating in this way is to prosecute him for offences that he commits, and this has been done. I shall now draw the attention of the police to the further information supplied by the honourable member (namely, the allegations that the person concerned is still operating in the same way) and I am sure that, if police investigations disclose that offences are being committed, prosecutions will be launched. The facts that have been detailed by the honourable member do, however, raise in my mind a further matter, because, as the honourable member will know, the Government intends to introduce legislation to tighten up the law regarding door-to-door sales, and it seems, from what the honourable member says, that this person is operating by directly contacting members of the public at their homes.

One of the aspects of door-to-door selling which I am investigating is whether the provisions of the Hawkers Act should be strengthened so as to make more effective the licensing provisions and to see that they extend to all forms of door-to-door contact, for commercial purposes, with members of the public. It seems to me that probably the only effective way of dealing with a person who persistently imposes on members of the public by approaching them in their homes is to have an effective licensing system that will enable the officers concerned to refuse to grant a licence to persons whose character justifies refusal, or if some other factor justifies it. I will certainly bear in mind the matters raised by the honourable member when considering the form of proposed legislation on the topic.

OVERLAND CLUB CAR

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the new club car on the Overland caters only for first-class passengers and, if it does, whether a similar arrangement will be made in order to cater for second-class passengers and when it is likely that that arrangement will be implemented?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The car that was introduced last evening on the express, from Adelaide and Melbourne respectively, is purely and simply for first-class passengers. The Railways Department is currently working on additional cars, which will provide facilities for second-class passengers. I am not certain at this stage what type of facility will be provided, nor am I certain of the date; but I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member and to let him know.

NURSES

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I recently asked about the re-employment of trained nurses who have reached the age of 60 years?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary reports that under a proclamation issued on February 29, 1968, section 107 of the Public Service Act, 1967, was proclaimed to apply to any employee of the State. This of course, would include nurses employed in Government hospitals. Section 107 provides:

Where an officer . . . being a female attains the age of 60 years and in the opinion of the board it is in the interests of the State that the officer should continue in the performance of the duties of (her) office

and the officer is able and willing to do so, the board may approve the officer continuing in office for a period not exceeding 12 months otherwise every officer on attaining the age of . . . 60 years being a female . . . shall retire from the Public Service.

In brief, female nurses, subject to the requirements of the above section, are able to be re-employed, after retirement at the age of 60 years, for periods of up to 12 months at a time. However, it is the policy of the Government that such periods of re-employment should not extend beyond the nurse's 65th birthday. There are a number of instances of nurses being re-employed in Government hospitals after retirement (subject to the provisions of section 107), but no cases are known of retired nurses undertaking refresher courses prior to re-employment in the circumstances outlined by the honourable member. The practice of the Hospitals Department regarding re-employment of nurses after their formal service has been completed is essentially the same as the practice referred to in the Education Department.

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the great difficulties in financing proposed expansion programmes being experienced by church-governed, non-profit-making hospitals, will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to take urgent steps to increase the subsidy which presently applies from a \$1 for \$1 to a \$2 for \$2 subsidy, thus bringing these important nurse-training schools into line in this respect with community hospitals?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will direct my colleague's attention to the honourable member's question and let the honourable member have a reply.

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to a question I asked some time ago on the training of nurses?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary has forwarded the following report:

Refresher courses are conducted at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and nurses who have been absent from nursing for some time are able to attend. The Nurses Board requires nurses to undertake a refresher course where applicable, but does not conduct any courses.

Cabinet has recently approved Nurses Board proposals for the overall improvement of nurse training in this State. Included in these proposals is the intention that as from January 1, 1972, the minimum education standard required to undertake general nurse training is the Leaving Certificate with passes in four subjects including English and a science subject.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on October 15 about hospital benefits?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that a perusal of the brochure issued by the Mutual Hospital Association shows that "outpatients treatment (except for X-rays and pathology tests which attract Commonwealth benefit only)" is excluded from benefits. The approved fee for attendance at outpatients departments at the general hospitals in the metropolitan area is \$1 an attendance. However, pensioners are treated free of charge, and persons in indigent circumstances may have the fee remitted, either in full or in part, according to their financial position. Section 19 of the Commonwealth Health Act, 1953-1970, provides that Commonwealth benefit (and thus also fund benefit) is not payable in respect of a professional service where the medical expenses in respect of that service are paid or payable to an authority conducting a public hospital, except for radiology (X-rays and radiotherapy), pathology, and electro-encephalography, which attract Commonwealth benefit only. This matter has been the subject of numerous submissions to the Commonwealth by State authorities and has been raised at the Health Ministers conferences on a number of occasions. One of the recommendations of the Nimmo report is for the introduction of the payment of Commonwealth medical benefits in respect of outpatients treatment, but this has not as yet been introduced by the Commonwealth.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to try to prevent a recurrence of the mistakes made last year by the Wheat Quota Committee? As members will be aware, last year the fact that many wheat quota forms were lost caused much inconvenience to growers. Again this year, some growers in my district (and no doubt this applies to growers in other areas) are receiving from the committee duplicated letters which give no explanation but which simply state that the grower's quota has been reduced, in some cases by 2,000 bushels and in other cases by any number of bushels. Will the Minister ask his colleague to see whether a more adequate explanation can be provided and to ensure that the mistakes are not made again this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague, although the honourable member will appreciate that there is a 20 per cent cut on last year's quota.

INSURANCE

Mr. CRIMES: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Motor Marine and General Insurance Company Limited is unable to meet its policy commitments in this State, and whether or not policies may still be taken out with this company?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I suppose that it is common knowledge that questions have been raised about this company by, I think, members of this House; I think that the member for Mitcham has asked a question previously. It is the duty of the Attorney-General to have inquiries made whenever a question is raised about a company. The information in my possession does not enable me to comment on this company at this stage.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last Thursday regarding the purchase of motor vehicles for the Government by the Supply and Tender Board?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In the past, departmental Holden vehicles were purchased from four metropolitan distributors and country dealers at Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier, Crystal Brook, Port Pirie, and Berri. Prices submitted by General Motors-Holden's for supply of vehicles for the 12-month period commencing March 1, 1970, stated that an additional charge of \$30 a vehicle would be levied on all country deliveries. When considering tenders, the Supply and Tender Board decided one contractor only should supply departmental needs, and a metropolitan dealer was appointed. Where special circumstances have existed, and with the agreement of the contractor, some vehicles have been purchased from country dealers. This arrangement will continue during the course of the present contract.

SERVICE PAY

Mr. GROTH: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether there are any steps that he can take to ensure the payment of service pay to employees of local government bodies?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to the honourable member—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

Mr. Millhouse: Don't fight amongst yourselves.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My colleague was just making a most worthwhile suggestion that I greatly appreciate. Unlike members opposite, we do not fight amongst ourselves. The matter raised by the member for Salisbury falls partly outside my ambit because local government bodies generally are autonomous and are charged under the terms of the Local Government Act with the duty of determining their own conditions. However, one aspect of this matter involves the Government. I am pleased to be able to say that, where councils work virtually on behalf of the Government on debit order work, arrangements have now been made for the Highways Department to reimburse such councils to the extent of the payment of service pay, so that employees engaged in that work will receive the same service payment as applies to employees of State Government departments. However, the basic requirement is that the council must assume an equal responsibility so that, when it does work on its own account, it must also make the payment so that the payment will be continuous over 12 months. The Highways Department is providing councils with the additional finance to enable them to pay service pay for the period of work done by employees when they are engaged on debit order work.

LAMBS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about lamb storages?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the rated holding capacity at Gepps Cross is about 450,000 carcasses, and there is ample space for the storage of fat lambs.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Slaughtering of lambs for export this season up to and including Sunday, October 25, 1970, total 319,832 carcasses, of which 243,742 carcasses have been approved for export. Shipments to date number 164,570 carcasses, leaving a balance in cold store of 79,172 carcasses.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question about the promotion of the sale of lamb in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am informed that, following a meeting of inter-

ested organizations, the Australian Meat Board was requested to conduct an advertising campaign to promote the sale of lamb in South Australia again this year. Early in September, poster kits were distributed to over 1,000 meat retailers. This was followed by an issue of leaflets for handing to the customers. These leaflets provided recipes and enticing pictures to encourage the housewife to use lamb. On September 2, a full-page advertisement appeared in the *News*. A radio advertising programme involving four advertisements daily over two days in each of four weeks between September 3 and September 25 was conducted. It was hoped that this programme would have commenced at least a month earlier than it did, to meet the unusually early lamb season in South Australia this year, but, as the campaign was designed to suit all States, it could not be advanced sufficiently to meet this early season. It is expected that next year the State representative on the Australian Meat Board will request that the promotion campaign commence earlier, if that is deemed necessary.

LAKE ALBERT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the future of Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I was not in Adelaide on Friday and as the Director and Engineer-in-Chief was away yesterday, is away today and will be away until Thursday morning, I have not had an opportunity to discuss this matter with him. When the opportunity presents itself on Thursday morning, I undertake to discuss the matter with the Director then.

SOCIOLOGICAL REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Premier say whether the report of the Sociological Committee will be made available to members of this House and, if it will, when it will be provided? The former Government appointed this committee to take evidence and inquire into the problem of people coming within the jurisdiction of the Underground Waters Preservation Act. I understand that this committee sat for several weeks, visited the area concerned, took evidence, and consulted many people. I also understand that interim reports have been submitted by this committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far, only interim reports have been submitted on this

matter: no final report has been received. These interim reports are being examined at present. If and when a final report is received, whether it should be made available to all members will be considered.

MINING LEASES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, a reply to the question I asked about mining leases in the Kapunda-Freeling area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mineral claims and leases are subject to the requirements that certain minimal labour requirements are observed. Failure to meet these requirements places the claims and leases in a position where they may be challenged by a second party, or they may be declared abandoned by the mining warden. In the Kapunda-Freeling area mineral rights are privately owned, and agreements have been made by many of the owners with certain parties in which exploration and mining rights have been assigned. These agreements are probably the "leases" to which the question refers. Such arrangements are one of the unsatisfactory aspects of private ownership of mineral rights. There are usually no specific obligations and systematic work is rarely undertaken. The Mines Department has no jurisdiction over such arrangements. A special mining lease has been granted to Utah Development Company in the Hamley Bridge area in return for a specific work obligation. However, over 90 per cent of this area is also "private land" in terms of the Mining Act, and the lease applies only to the mineral land portion of the area: that is, land on which mineral rights are held by the Crown.

PORTNOY'S COMPLAINT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Attorney-General and, with your permission—

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

The SPEAKER: Would you say what the question is?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Attorney-General intend to take action on the selling of the book *Portnoy's Complaint*? The Attorney-General has replied in this House to several questions on this matter, both to questions without notice and, last week, to a series of questions (it was very kind of him) that I had put on notice. In his reply last Tuesday he said (and I am paraphrasing the reply) that the police were keeping an oversight of the

matter for him and that nothing had been brought to his attention which would warrant action being taken. I notice on page 3 of this morning's paper that one bookseller, who is not named in the paper, is advertising the book by the use of stickers on his window, and the report suggests that, technically at least, this action comes within the principles that the Attorney-General has stated as to the selling of the book. Of course, there is no mention in the report of selling the book to persons under the age of 18 years, which I think is the age laid down by the Minister, although it shows that many copies of the book have been sold. Therefore, in view of the latest development which is reported and to which I have referred, does the Attorney intend to take action?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If a report is made to me of the sale of this book in circumstances that require the exercise of my discretion as to whether a prosecution should be launched, I will consider all the circumstances of the case and then make a decision. I do not know anything more of the circumstances of the sale of the book by the bookseller referred to in this morning's *Advertiser* than I have read in that newspaper. So far as I was able to gather from that report, the bookseller was merely advertising the fact that the book was for sale, and I remind the member for Mitcham that, when I stated the principles that would guide me in relation to the exercise of my discretion, I said that one factor would be the advertising of the book for sale by reference to its contents. The words were rather carefully chosen, as the honourable member would appreciate. Obviously, what I had in mind was that in my view it would be undesirable for booksellers to advertise this book in a way that sought to promote sales by referring in some way to the contents of the book. However, if a report comes to me about the sale of the book by a specific bookseller in circumstances that warrant the exercise of the Attorney's discretion I shall consider all the circumstances and decide in that case.

PORT PIRIE HOUSING

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, a reply to my question regarding housing at Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust is much concerned about the slow progress in the construction of rental and rental-purchase houses at Port Pirie and is continually pressing the builder. There is no doubt that the builder has difficulty in obtaining labour and,

in fact, often has to rely on casual labour, using workmen employed at the Broken Hill Associated Smelters in their off time. In July this year the trust called tenders for the erection of 10 single-unit houses at Port Pirie and only three tenders were received, one from a local builder and two from Adelaide-based firms. The lowest tender was submitted by the local builder, who was awarded the contract. The second lowest tender was, on average, \$696 a house higher, but this builder, Adelaide-based, pointed out that he could complete the 10 houses in 28 weeks but had been forced to include an amount in his tender for taking labour from Adelaide, as he was certain that if his tender were successful he would be unable to obtain labour in Port Pirie. However, to have accepted this tender would have been very unfair to the local builder. In consequence, we are faced with the difficulty of obtaining local labour.

OH! CALCUTTA!

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Attorney-General's attention been drawn to the fact that negotiations are proceeding to put on the play *Oh! Calcutta!* at a theatre in my district? Doubtless, the Attorney knows that this controversial play has run into some problems in the other States, where I understand certain restrictions have been imposed or the play has been banned. Has the Attorney been approached about the production of this play in this State and, if he has, will he state his views on the matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: An entrepreneur wrote to me, I think some weeks ago, forwarding what purported to be a modified script of the show *Oh! Calcutta!* Apparently, the modified script had been based on the script of the play as it was presented in New York but, as I was told, modified considerably. I think that must have been so, because I have been told that it played for about 4½ hours in New York, whereas this script would have involved a much shorter performance than that. Although I read the script, it is difficult for one to judge from a mere perusal whether the performance would involve a breach of the law. I replied to this entrepreneur (and I am speaking from memory because I have not got the letter here today) that it seemed to me from a perusal of the script that it was likely that, if persons under the age of 18 years were admitted to a performance based on the script, I would have little alternative but to consider whether a prosecution should be launched. I do not think I could put it any higher than that on a mere perusal of the script.

I also informed the person concerned that, if offences against South Australian law were committed by persons acting on the stage, any police officer charged with the responsibility could (or it would be his duty to do so; I do not remember how I put it) take action to enforce the law. That is the last I heard of the matter officially. However, I did have a casual conversation with a solicitor who told me that he was acting for this entrepreneur. He commented on the fact, which I confirmed, that my letter merely said that if persons under 18 years of age were admitted it was likely that I would have to authorize a prosecution (or some such words), but that there was nothing in my letter to suggest that the mere fact that persons under 18 years were excluded would necessarily mean that there would be no prosecution. This must depend on what the actors do on the stage and how the script is interpreted when being acted out. In my opinion it is impossible to decide whether a breach of the law will be committed until a performance takes place. However, if the actors on the stage commit breaches of our law in circumstances that justify or seem to justify a prosecution, the law will be enforced. On the other hand, if they observe the ordinary laws of South Australia there will be no offence upon which to prosecute. True, the degree of tolerance (if that is the expression) that might be extended to this type of performance must depend to some degree on whether those conducting the performance take care that the only persons admitted to it are adults. However, no real decision can be taken on matters of this kind until a performance takes place, when it can then be determined whether an offence has been committed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Attorney-General, and with your permission—

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

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education is ever early in his interjections when I get up to ask questions and, as that interjection was several words earlier than it has been previously, I congratulate him. The question that I desire to ask the Attorney-General concerns the play—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is it?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must state his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Attorney-General whether he intends to see the play himself before it is publicly shown and now, if I may—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I may seek your leave now and the concurrence of the House to explain the question, I may say that in the few months before I went out of office there was no topic on which I received more letters than those from people asking that the play should not be performed in South Australia. At that time, to the best of my knowledge, there was no proposal to perform it here, although there had been some newspaper reports to that effect. As I had no approach whatever, I merely acknowledged the letters. As I have said, there was no topic on which I received more correspondence than this topic. The correspondence that I received in regard to the play *The Boys in the Band* paled into insignificance compared with that which I received in regard to *Oh! Calcutta!* In the case of *The Boys in the Band*, at the request of the entrepreneur I took the step of seeing the play before it was put on, thereby subjecting myself to the attempted ridicule of the then Leader of the Opposition at public meetings, although I still regard that as the proper course to have taken, and I have no regrets at having taken it, irrespective of the merits of the play itself.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You cut out the four-letter word referring to excretion and left in the other four-letter words.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know, and I know that this had some peculiar fascination for the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was you who said that it was lavatory humour that upset you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly will not comment on the decision I made in that case: I leave that to those with less taste.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! The honourable member is not permitted to make comments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I therefore ask the Attorney-General whether he intends, before making any decision, to follow the course that I followed in the case of the other play.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have made no decision whether I will view this show; frankly, it seems to me that the question that has to be asked in a matter such as this is whether an offence against the law is committed by those

who are acting on the stage. I cannot see how viewing a performance on one evening can assist one to decide whether offences might be committed at subsequent performances, as this all depends on what the actors do on the stage. This is not similar to seeing a film which, of necessity, shows the same action each time the film is played. I should think that, if an offence were committed by persons acting on the stage, it would be the duty of those who were responsible for enforcing the law to take the necessary action.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't intend to attend every performance then?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not intend to see every performance. I am by no means decided that I will see any performance, but that will depend on the circumstances when they arise. I will make a decision at that time.

MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: My question, which I direct to the Minister of Works, concerns the erection by the Public Buildings Department of cyclone fencing in front of the Mount Gambier High School, and with your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House, I should like briefly to explain it.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. BURDON: It concerns a fence that has been erected in front of the Mount Gambier High School.

Mr. Millhouse: You didn't ask the question.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's the question?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Works investigate the level of the fence fronting the Mount Gambier High School? During its erection, a dispute seems to have occurred between the Mount Gambier council and the Public Buildings Department regarding the level of this fence. Although the council has declared one level for the footpath, the Public Buildings Department has erected the fence at another level, as a consequence of which much disquiet has been caused, the level of the bottom of the fence being above the footpath. It has been suggested that the department, through the Minister, should be asked to place a concrete strip underneath the fence so that it will protect the lawn that has been sown inside the schoolground from falling away to the lower level of the footpath that has been built by the council.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to have the matter investigated and to ask that a satisfactory solution to this problem be found. The honourable member said that the council had struck one level for its footpath and the Public Buildings Department had struck another for the school fence; I should think that the latter would be more correct. If so, I think the council should foot the bill for the concrete strip.

TOURIST BUREAU

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say when construction is likely to commence on, and what is the estimated completion date of, the proposed new Tourist Bureau building? I recently visited the bureau in its temporary premises in King William Street opposite its old building. Apart from the street level office, I was appalled at the working conditions that the staff experience in other sections of the building.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member. There has been a slight delay in construction of the new building because of some technical aspects.

ROAD MARKINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take steps to ensure that warning markings painted on roadways are kept in good condition? Recently some such markings were completely obliterated in an accident, and several near misses have occurred lately near the Unley post office pedestrian crossing. As this main road is used extensively by motorists from all suburbs, new markings on the roadway would be most helpful to pedestrians and motorists alike.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be happy to have the matter investigated.

HOUSEBOATS

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Government has any proposals regarding sanitation of houseboats and other vessels used for domestic habitation? For several years local government boards of health on the Murray River have expressed concern that all vessels using the Murray River have not been equipped with sanitary facilities.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter has been considered. Indeed, only yesterday I received a copy of a letter from the Minister for Tourism in Victoria (Mr. Dickie), in which he stated that the Victorian Government was proceeding in respect of sanitation of houseboats on Lake Eildon. From memory, I think about 1,200 houseboats are involved in that exercise. Such boats will be required to install a proper facility on the vessel, which

will have to be emptied from time to time by means of a barge, and steps will have to be taken to dispose of the sewage at treatment plants to be established on shore. Although no positive steps have yet been taken in this State, we are investigating the establishment of disposal points at various places along the river to enable houseboats to dispose of sewage. I discussed this matter recently with the Engineer-in-Chief, but I will obtain an up-to-date report for the honourable member.

MEASLES IMMUNIZATION

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether a statement could be issued to parents concerning the effects of immunization against measles? I have been informed that there has been some public concern about the reaction suffered by some children as a result of immunization.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will direct the honourable member's question to my colleague's attention and get a reply.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the metropolitan water supply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: With the present storage holding in the metropolitan water supply system of 37,001,600,000gall., the Engineering and Water Supply Department does not anticipate any problems in meeting the demand during the coming summer. It will only be necessary to pump from Mannum during off-peak tariff hours and at a rate sufficient to meet distribution needs in the areas supplied directly from the Mannum-Adelaide main. The pumped water will be fed directly into the distribution system, and the number of pumps required to operate will vary from time to time as the demand in this system varies. At no time is it anticipated that more than three pumps operating during off-peak tariff hours will be required. The storage holdings in the individual reservoirs are as follows:

	Capacity	Storage at
	M.G.	3/11/70
	M.G.	M.G.
Mount Bold . . .	10,440	10,129
Happy Valley . .	2,804	2,441
Clarendon Weir . .	72	71
Myponga	5,905	5,820
Millbrook	3,647	3,506
Kangaroo Creek . .	5,370	4,121
Hope Valley . . .	765	611
Thorndon Park . .	142	124
Barossa	993	976
South Para	11,300	9,203
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	41,438	37,002

O'HALLORAN HILL SCHOOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the erection of a new school in the O'Halloran Hill and Braeview area?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not possible at this stage to say when a new school will be built in the O'Halloran Hill and Braeview area. However, it is likely that a new school for Braeview will be included in the design programme soon: a site is at present being acquired. In the meantime, the situation is being watched carefully and close liaison has been and will be maintained with the Headmaster of the Reynella Primary School.

TEACHER TRAINING BOND

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Education state his policy regarding the bonding of teacher-trainees?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The policy that we follow in relation to the bonding of teacher-trainees is the same as that which has been followed in recent years with one modification: that as from next year students who enter a teachers college will not be required to sign the bond until they have completed nine months at the college, which will take them to the end of the second term. This will enable a proper assessment to be made by the college and by the student of the student's suitability for teaching as a profession and it is likely as a consequence that fewer mistakes will be made in the future. Care is taken in the administration of the bond to see that students' rights are maintained: on the marriage of a female student the amount of the bond owing to the department is halved (that has been a long-standing policy) and, if a teacher becomes pregnant and resigns to look after her child, the total amount of the bond is waived. In general, it costs the Government an average of \$1,000 a year for a trainee teacher's allowance, which in three years amounts to \$3,000, but some students do a four-year or five-year course of training. In addition, all costs of running teachers colleges are met by the Government, and these costs are substantial. It would be fair to say that the cost to the Government in this regard is \$750 a year for each student. Therefore, for a three-year course of training the total cost to the Government is over \$5,000 and for a four-year course about \$7,000. These are substantial sums to pay out in order to train teachers, and in the circumstances I think it

is reasonable to expect that, as these sums are paid by the community, the individual trainee-teacher should provide some service to the community in return. Problems are met in staffing country schools, particularly those in the remote areas and in the country industrial cities. If we did not have a regular supply of young teachers from teachers colleges available for country service, the difficulties of providing adequate staff in country areas would be greater than they are at present, and in some cases the standard of education provided in country areas would suffer if there were no bond. I point out that those countries which do not have a bonding system and which have education left as a local responsibility provide a poorer standard of education in the disadvantaged areas of the country concerned. This is true both in the United Kingdom and in the United States, and it is a feature of our own system of education where we perform better. I believe that, although our general provision of education services is not as high as that in the United Kingdom or the United States, we certainly do a better job in the disadvantaged areas of the State compared with those areas of other countries. It is partly the bonding system that enables us to do that job.

COROMANDEL VALLEY ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Coromandel Valley road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The provision of pedestrian facilities is the responsibility of the appropriate local government authority. Although the Highways Department has no plans to provide footpaths on the two bridges referred to the matter will be discussed with the local council to see whether the department can assist in alleviating pedestrian problems in the area.

RIVER FLOWS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about flows into the Murray River from the Mitta Mitta River above Albury?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The flow in the Mitta Mitta River represented, respectively, 28 per cent, 20 per cent and 23 per cent of the flow above Albury in the months of August, September and October to date. The actual volume entering Hume from the Mitta Mitta River for the period August 1, 1970, to October 30, 1970, was 762,000 acre feet.

PROFESSIONAL SALARIES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about professional salaries?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The aspects of the use of staff resources in the Agriculture Department canvassed by the honourable member do result in some conflicts of interest, both departmentally and personally, and further discussions will take place with the present Director on any practical proposal that he may bring forward for the modification of the present arrangements. In recent years, the Public Service Board has provided the opportunity for progress through the classification structure to take account of the need for professional and sub-professional officers in the department to be paid according to the increased value of their work and to recognize the desirability of staff's continuing to work in a specific project area. The following points are relevant in the context of the present discussions:

1. The scientific and extension functions of the Agriculture Department are carried out in an increasingly complex organizational structure.

2. The resources of the department should be directed to the achievement of the clearly defined objectives of the department in the most effective and efficient manner. In such use of available resources much will depend upon the quality of management in the department.

3. In accepting that research and/or project work should be adequately serviced to completion (which should include the writing and publishing of papers) recognition of the value of varying experience in staff training and development for greater responsibility, professionally and managerially, is also important.

4. In considering applicants for promotional vacancies, merit and aptitude for the discharge of the duties and not seniority are the selection criteria.

5. A significant number of officers of the department is given opportunities for post-graduate work nationally and internationally, and the board recognizes the value of such experience in assessing salaries on return to duty.

6. Any departmentally-supported proposal for its officers to be seconded to another appropriate organization for a specific period or a particular project would be favourably considered by the board if it could be established to be in the State's interest and the outside organization was agreeable. (It is

usual for departmental staff to work at the Waite Research Institute on joint projects with university staff.)

7. Industrially, the board must pay regard to the concept of pay rates being related to the level of work within the department and within the appropriate professional criteria within the Public Service.

The board would be happy to discuss any aspect of the situation with the honourable member, and this could be of mutual assistance.

SNOWY MOUNTAINS SCHEME

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier say how much money South Australia has contributed, either directly or indirectly, towards the Snowy Mountains scheme since its commencement? If it has contributed, can he say how much of the amount has been repaid? It is often claimed that South Australia has contributed large sums to the scheme. However, all the records I have seen show that the Commonwealth Government has lent money to the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity Commission, that money to be repaid by capital payments plus interest, and the cost of the scheme, as it applies each year, is borne by Victoria and New South Wales in proportion to the volume of electricity consumed in those States.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get the figures for the honourable member, although I point out that the former Leader of his Party (Sir Thomas Playford) over many years stated that South Australia, through taxation, had contributed considerably to the capital payments and moneys lent in relation to the Snowy Mountains hydro-electricity project and its water conservation schemes, and that South Australia had therefore contributed to capital payments that provided for cheaper electricity and water supplies in Victoria and New South Wales from which this State derived no direct benefit. I will get the figures for the honourable member in detail in support of what Sir Thomas Playford has said over so many years.

COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the desalination plant at Coober Pedy is now working at full capacity? If it is not, will he say when it is likely that the plant will commence operating? In addition, will he say what plans his department may have to ensure that there are always modules as a stand-by?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I cannot say whether the plant is operating, I know of moves being made to get it functioning again. I assure the honourable member that the department is doing everything possible in this matter, because it does not like paying \$30 a thousand gallons, as it has been paying, for water cartage. The contract for carting water was extended recently, because of the delays occurring in repairing the solar system. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him know what is the present position.

MARINO QUARRY

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take up with the Highways Department the possibility of co-operating with the Brighton council in providing spoil for filling the quarry near the Kingston caravan park? Residents in this area have for some time been negotiating with officers of the Brighton council and the Highways Department to provide this spoil. The quarry has been half-filled, so that people are now faced with having the worst of both worlds in that the quarry has lost whatever virgin beauty it once had and yet is not in a position where it can be improved. One of the local residents has given to me in writing an undertaking that he is prepared to spend a considerable sum in tree planting to improve the amenity of the area, if the quarry can be filled.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If anything can be done to rehabilitate some of the ravaging caused by quarrying, I will be the first to do everything possible to bring it about.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that, in this respect, members opposite do not agree with the Government, which is determined in its efforts to try to prevent any further rape of the metropolitan area. If it is possible to restore these areas, in some measure if not fully, we will certainly proceed along those lines. I will have discussions with officers of the Highways Department to see whether the honourable member's request can be complied with.

ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about an advertisement concerning a youth pill?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health states that this question refers to an advertisement, for a youth pill, which appeared in the press. The product is based on flower

pollen and royal jelly. It is believed that the claims made in the advertisement are misleading. Royal jelly has been used as a general tonic to ward off the effects of old age and to ease sufferers from chronic degenerative diseases but, of the many claims made for its therapeutic value, none has been substantiated. The publishers of the paper concerned are members of the Australian Newspapers Council, which through the Media Council of Australia operates a censorship of the advertising of proprietary medicines based on a code that has been prepared in co-operation with Commonwealth and State Health Departments. Unfortunately, owing to an oversight, the advertisement in question was not referred to the Media Council prior to publication. The publishers have suspended all advertisements for the product and the distributor has been asked to furnish full details to the Media Council for examination and clearance of any further advertisements.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about any possible gain to State revenue from the implementation of the Commonwealth hospital insurance scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible for the Hospitals Department to say what has been the effect on State revenues of the Commonwealth scheme of assistance to low-income earners in the payment of hospital insurance. The scheme provides for payments by the Commonwealth Government to the various hospital benefit funds on behalf of the low-income earners concerned and in accordance with the scale of assistance. The Hospitals Department has no part in the administration of the scheme and is affected only when it receives a payment from a hospital fund or from a person who proposes to seek reimbursement from a fund. When payment for an account for hospital accommodation is received, the department has no means of knowing whether the payment has been supported by the individual's own contributions to a fund or whether it has been supported entirely or in part by Commonwealth contributions towards membership fees.

EGG CARTONS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about egg cartons?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that there were two instances

of carton discrepancies involving members of the Egg Board. In one case the shortage was infinitesimal and considered to be less than normal wastage for the period under review. In the other, the member concerned has no producer exemption under section 21 of the Marketing of Eggs Act, and therefore has no carton transactions with the board. At present, there are legal impediments to the introduction of procedures necessary to correct irregularities in the handling of cartons, and amendments to the Act designed to enable easier reconciliation of carton transactions are now being considered.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether he or his department has considered the advancement of teachers who choose to concern themselves with the education of retarded children or of other children who require special attention? In a radio session yesterday a person, who purported to be from the Education Department and who was associated with teaching in the specialist field of teaching students who learned more slowly than average students, said that, by continuing this activity, he was jeopardizing his chance of advancement in the department. This may or may not be so but, certainly, it seems that some people who set out to provide a specialist service, whether in education, agriculture, or any other specialist field, do so with a sense of dedication and their academic and/or economic status suffers as a result. I ask this question to find out whether such officers will receive any special consideration over a period of time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certainly it is true that, if we wish to develop education in special schools and remedial and opportunity classes, we must provide greater opportunities for promotion for special class teachers than exist at present, and that matter has been concerning me. The problems involved in creating the extra promotional positions are difficult and will take some time to solve. The other aspect of the matter that also is highly relevant is that, although several special class teachers have not the normal qualifications for continued promotion as ordinary class teachers, they show tremendous ability in the specialist field of dealing with handicapped children. Clearly our approach to the matter of promotion within the normal promotional scale must be altered with respect to people such as special class teachers who have this special talent but who have no specific academic qualifications. It has always seemed

to me that there is a great danger in becoming too formalistic in our attitude to qualifications. After all, the Professor of Far Eastern History at the Australian National University, at the time of his appointment, was the most outstanding scholar in the whole field of Far Eastern history, but, when appointed to the Australian National University as the professor in this faculty, he had no university degree of any kind. We ought to make the same kind of provision within the Education Department, with suitable protection for the interests of those who are properly qualified.

RUMBLE STRIPS

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport comment, or obtain a report, on the legality of crossing rumble strips? This matter was referred to in a newspaper report, I think last week, in which a proprietor of a business displayed a notice saying that the crossing of rumble strips was legal. In other words, he was inviting people to cross the rumble strips to enter his property. I take it he was alleging that these strips were interfering with his business. This matter has application on the Main North Road, in my district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In view of the possible implications of replying to this question, it would be desirable for me to get an opinion from the Crown Law Department. However, in the meantime I can tell the honourable member that I have inquired about this matter and it seems that crossing rumble strips is not prevented by law. These strips are there to protect motorists but, unlike double lines on roads, as far as I am aware it is not illegal to cross them: they are purely and simply designed as a warning to motorists that they ought not to be in that place and should be going down the road under normal conditions. In the light of this, there is no prohibition against people crossing them, as in the case in the honourable member's area. The only comment I can make in that matter is that the person concerned in the honourable member's district is no longer involved in the crossing of rumble strips, because sufficient of them have been removed to enable him to have a path into and out of his own property.

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently regarding rumble strips on the Two Wells to Mallala road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Several measures were taken some years ago to warn motorists

of the hazard at the Korunye level crossing on the Two Wells to Mallala road. These measures included the provisions of warning signs, safety fencing, pavement markings and rumble strips. Although the number of accidents at this location has been reduced, it is doubtful whether the rumble strips have been the major contributing factor. A State-wide investigation of the safety aspects of railway crossings is proceeding and, in the meantime, it is not intended to install any further rumble strips at level crossings.

PRIMARY PRODUCTION

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture concerning a statement by his colleague about the future possibilities of primary production?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague suggests that the honourable member has drawn incorrect conclusions from the press report of his remarks. The Minister has said that an enormous quantity of cereals is produced in the world today, and this production can, and no doubt will, be stepped up in the future to meet the growing populations. For instance, during the last 10 years the scientific and technological advances in the growing of cereal crops have resulted in the development of the Mexican strain wheats (so-called "miracle strain" wheats), which, when grown under irrigation, will produce a yield as high as 175 bushels to the acre, as compared with Australia's present average yield of 20 bushels to the acre. The difficulty of Asian peoples appears to be a lack of protein rather than lack of food and, if they get the right types of high protein food, it would seem that their food problems could be solved.

FIRE BANS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works take up with the Minister of Agriculture the matter of fire restriction advertisements broadcast during the summer months, asking his colleague whether those responsible for the advertisements could be more accurate about the instructions given? Last year an incident occurred in which no report was made in the early morning radio session at the time when the notice is usually given (whether at 6 a.m. or 6.30 a.m.) and it was not until 8 a.m. that an instruction was issued that lighting of fires was restricted or banned on that day. I understand that a similar thing happened this morning: the early report at 7 a.m. implied one thing and at 8 a.m. that was withdrawn and

the error rectified. These changes cause confusion in the community.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

STUDENT TEACHER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Education 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: For the benefit of the Minister, and to put his mind at rest, my question is whether he will furnish me with a report on a letter that was written on October 31 to the Director of Teacher Education and Services by Mr. Lionel Spence (whom I have known for a number of years and who is a former member of the A.R.A.) of Hawthorndene, which used to be in my district. The letter, which runs to nearly three full pages of typed foolscap, concerns the bonding of Mr. Spence's daughter as a teacher and her subsequent resignation. I notice that, besides my copy, copies of the letter have gone to the Premier, to the Leader of the Opposition and to the member for Fisher, with whom I have discussed the matter. In view of the contents of the letter, which are strong and which may well be justified (although on that I express no opinion), I ask the Minister the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member would be good enough to provide me with a copy of the letter, I will have the matter investigated and provide him with the information he requests.

RIVER MURRAY COMMISSION

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Premier say whether he supports Mr. Whitlam's proposal, which is, apparently, to abolish the River Murray Commission and to replace it with some sort of Commonwealth control? If he does not, will he do something about curbing Mr. Whitlam's ideas which would, apparently, take away from South Australia something that we already have?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Whitlam's ideas are entirely in accord with those of the South Australian Government: that all elected bodies in this country have the right to an effective say in matters that affect the people who elect them; that a Commonwealth body for the national conservation of

our water resources should be duly representative of State and Commonwealth bodies together; and that, instead of the present situation in which the Commonwealth Government utterly ignores the elected Government of this State and the wishes of its people, there should be a national body conserving water in this country, with priorities being determined on the basis of national and local considerations properly represented.

SCHOOL SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education anything further to report regarding the erection of swimming pools at one central point within a community, contributions for the construction of which pools could be made by the local people, local councils and Government departments, particularly the Education Department? About three months ago I asked the Minister whether he thought this idea was better than building pools at individual schools, in reply to which he said that the matter was being considered in relation to another part of the metropolitan area and that he would inform me later when a decision had been taken on the matter. My constituents have for some time been concerned about the lack of swimming pools in the Adelaide Hills, where I believe it is more important to have them than it is in the inner-metropolitan areas that are closer to the beaches at which people can swim. As there are in the Hills many water holes and creeks in which children may drown if they cannot swim, it is more important that children in those areas be taught to swim. The areas in which these children live should therefore be considered more favourably in the provision of swimming pools. Further, a committee in my district that is interested in this matter has waited for some months for the Minister to give a direction, and members of the committee are becoming more anxious. Will the Minister therefore give me a report on this matter now, or bring one down for me?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter is nearing finality and, when the Government has made its final decisions, a public announcement will be made. However, it is not possible to distinguish for which section of the public the provision of pools is more important. People who live near the beach are inclined to say that because of the likelihood of their children wandering onto the beaches, where they are not supervised, the need for their children to be taught swimming is greater than it is for those who might go to the beach

less frequently. The argument is an endless one. The question is how much money we can provide for the pools that people want.

WEEDS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding weed control in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that the Weeds Advisory Committee works in close collaboration with the Adelaide Hills Noxious Weeds Committee. The Weeds Advisory Committee is impressed by the helpful attitude that the latter has adopted in its approach to the problem of noxious weeds in the Adelaide Hills. Regarding the African daisy problem, the Government's policy is to treat this weed on Crown Lands so as to contain it, and action has already been taken to engage contractors and prison labour this season. The Government will also continue to give technical advice and encouragement to local government authorities in relation to noxious weed control. However, it is emphasized that the success of any control measures is dependent on the extent to which councils and their ratepayers meet their responsibilities in this regard.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. Langley: What's the question?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't ignore the Speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I might ignore the Minister of Education but I certainly do not ignore the Chair, even though he does.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member ask his question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I intend not to take the slightest notice of the Minister of Education in this context, Sir.

Mr. Clark: The Speaker asked you—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When the Speaker asks me I am always happy to comply. We are not under a dictatorship yet.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member ask his question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question I desire to ask the Attorney-General is whether it is

intended that the Attorney-General's Department and the Crown Law Department should move. The Attorney-General will be able to answer the question himself, I remind the Minister of Education. Some weeks ago—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you seek leave?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. Some weeks ago it came to my ears that it was intended to move the Attorney-General's Department and the Crown Law Department from 24 Flinders Street to other accommodation, although I do not know where that accommodation is to be found. I am reminded that the site at 24 Flinders Street is designated in plans of the City Council as, I think, a very attractive park. I concede that the present premises are cramped and that it is very difficult for many of those who have to work in the Attorney-General's Department and in the Crown Law Department. Although the accommodation for the Attorney himself and the standard of service I received as Attorney-General left nothing to be desired, I know that the service was rendered under some difficulty. I therefore ask the Attorney-General whether it is intended to move and, if it is, where to?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The accommodation in which the Attorney-General's Department is operating at the moment is overcrowded and inadequate and it makes no provision for possible expansion in the staff and service of the Attorney-General's Department. It is therefore intended to move, and at present the Public Service authorities responsible for arranging these things (I think the Public Service Board and, no doubt, the Public Buildings Department) are engaged in arranging alternative accommodation for the Attorney-General's Department and the Crown Law Department. I do not think that any final decision has been made, although I have seen tentative plans. I cannot at the moment say when the move will be made or where the office will be, although I think a decision is imminent.

SOCIAL WELFARE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Social Welfare say whether he has completed an investigation, which in reply to my question of September 1 he said he would undertake, into the use of voluntary workers to supplement the work of the professional workers in the Social Welfare Department, in this way helping to lighten the current case loads of these officers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have discussed this subject with the Director of Social Welfare and plans are in hand to arrange for the training of voluntary welfare workers to supplement the work of professional welfare workers. I hope that in a few weeks' time I shall be able to announce definite plans for the training of voluntary welfare workers. The discussions I have had have convinced me that considerable use can be made of voluntary workers to supplement the work of professional welfare workers, provided that such people have had adequate training. My discussions have also convinced me that it would be wrong to turn loose on the people who need welfare assistance half-trained voluntary workers. I hope that I may be able to give further information later.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

HIGHWAYS GRANTS

Mr. WARDLE (on notice):

1. What sums were made available to the Highways Department from Commonwealth and State resources, respectively, for the financial year 1969-70?

2. What sums, respectively, have been made available from those sources to that department for this financial year to date?

3. How much in total was given to councils in grants and debit orders for the financial year 1969-70?

4. What total is intended for councils in grants and debit orders for this financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 1969-70:

(i) Commonwealth .. \$21,000,000

(ii) State *\$18,411,522

* Including short-term loan allocation of \$1,000,000.

2. 1970-71:

Total for financial year:

(i) Commonwealth .. \$23,500,000

(ii) State *\$18,974,000

* Including short-term loan allocation of \$1,000,000.

Total to October 30, 1970:

(i) Commonwealth .. \$7,833,332

(ii) State \$5,779,610

3. 1969-70:

(i) Ordinary grants .. \$4,105,454

(ii) Debit order grants \$6,736,334

4. 1970-71:

(i) Ordinary grants .. \$4,104,000

(ii) Debit order grants \$6,000,000

FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE)
ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2212.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition):

It gives me pleasure to speak briefly to this Bill because it indicates that the Government is placing before Parliament the final proposals (I suppose one could call them) for building for this State a festival theatre that has been a long time in coming. The length of time it has taken to plan a viable proposal is indicated by the fact that we are amending the original Act of 1964. Since that time the festival theatre has been a subject of conjecture, negotiation and planning on the part of members from both sides of this House, and we see the adoption today of negotiations that were successfully completed in the main during the term of the previous Government.

I take pride in the fact that I was able to play a significant part in negotiations to acquire the site and the financial negotiations necessary to have this building progress. This venture was first placed before Parliament when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier and, since then, there have been numerous changes in the Government. However, the construction of the foundations and the site works of the theatre are progressing and the Bill is now before us in this form. The proposals entered into by the previous Government were for a theatre costing somewhat less than the figure now given us, but I believe that it was not unexpected that the tender prices should be higher than the original figure projected by the designers and the architects. When the design was conceived, South Australia was emerging from a building slump and there have been considerable rises in the prices of materials and in labour costs since that time. I have no doubt that a very keen estimate of the designing architects has meant that the Government has had to consider raising its financial involvement in the construction of the festival theatre.

I support the Government in this move to raise the amount beyond that which was entered into by the previous Administration. I believe it now has a firm contract and we need not expect a significant rise in the figure indicated in this Bill, because the contract is a firm one. I understand that the Bill provides for rises in wages, but these should not be much more than the figure indicated in this Bill. Obviously, for this sum this State will get a theatre of distinctive design, and I con-

gratulate the designers and architects on producing this plan. I believe it is something different and that it will give South Australia something that will be notable in theatres around this continent.

I know that we all pay a tribute to a former Lord Mayor (Mr. Irwin) for the initial work he did in formulating plans for the festival theatre. I think the member for Torrens was on the first Lord Mayor's committee that investigated the proposals for establishing a festival theatre. This proposal seemed to get off to a bad start as a result of the purchase of Carclew, a site the suitability of which raised much controversy and which seemed responsible for prolonging any eventual settling of the project to the form in which we now see it.

Members will realize that the present Premier, I think in his last few months of office in the former Labor Government, adopted a proposal to construct the festival theatre in an area between the Torrens parade ground and Government House, a proposal that I vigorously resisted. I am pleased that I vigorously resisted it, for I believe that it would have spoilt for all time a desirable site in the city of Adelaide. Whatever may be the future of Government House and its grounds, I am sure that posterity will approve its being retained in the present unrestricted area. It would have been just as much a desecration of that area to crowd in a festival theatre as it would be to mar the Hills as a result of present quarrying activities. I am pleased that I had the ability and opportunity as Premier to reject that plan and that I was able personally to influence the decision to use the present site. My championing of this site followed my visit to London in 1968, when I was able to see the London festival theatre, which is located alongside the Thames.

With the proximity of the Torrens Lake, while it may be only a puddle by interstate or international standards, the present site is certainly, in my opinion and that of experts, the best site available in Adelaide for the festival theatre, and I congratulate those who helped the former Government in 1968-69 in investigating the present site. Mr. Dunn (Director of Public Buildings), Mr. Hart (Director of Planning), and Mr. Irwin, who was associated with the project right from the beginning, were the members of a most valuable committee, which was able to assess the aesthetic and practical value of the site as a venue for the theatre, and they played an

important part in expediting the matter to the point where designs could be called for. Once the Government Printing Office is no longer required for its present purposes, and is demolished, the construction of the plaza in its place will give this city a pleasing new area which, as I have said, will for South Australia distinguish the theatre and its surroundings from anything to be seen in any other State. The actual siting of the theatre and the organization that took place in order to get the project going were by no means simple matters, and members may recall the discussions that took place in this House, mainly in questions, and also public discussions on the future of the Railways Institute, the State migrant hostel and the city baths, which occupied the present theatre site.

It is pleasing to know that all of these matters were settled without much dispute, although there was some dispute, raised mainly in questions originating from the present Minister of Roads and Transport, concerning the Railways Institute. I believe that these matters have been satisfactorily resolved, and we now find that a site that was, indeed, a second-grade or third-grade area of Adelaide will become the venue for one of the city's newest and most prominent structures. This is an example to the present Government of the activities of an Administration that grasped the nettle and got on with solving the problem at hand. That the present situation happens to be the result of negotiations undertaken by a previous Government should in no way dampen this Government's attitude to the Bill, and it apparently has not done so.

I congratulate the Government on deciding to adopt the larger loan required in connection with the final tender price for this project, and I reiterate that the present situation is an example of a Government's getting on with the job. This project joins the list of several other difficult projects considered by the previous Administration, and there is no need for me to detail them here. However, I point out that the industrial reorganization of South Australia, such matters as fluoridation, and the reconstruction of Government finances are only some of the items which, included with the project being considered in this Bill, were settled by the previous Administration. Knowing that the member for Torrens will address himself to other aspects of the Bill, I content myself with having referred to the general matters that preceded the introduction of the measure. I support the second reading.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. This project has been under consideration for a little longer than the Leader indicated because, to my knowledge, it is at least eight years since I was appointed an original member of the then Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee, which set out to plan a festival hall for the city of Adelaide. We had high hopes that by this time we would be holding productions in Adelaide's own festival hall, as it was then to be called. The then Lord Mayor (Mr. Irwin) set up this committee to consider the festival hall project, and we know what happened. The report of the Select Committee appointed to consider this matter is contained in the 1964 Parliamentary Papers, that committee being under the chairmanship of Sir Baden Pattinson, the then Minister of Education, and the other members of that committee are still members of this House, namely, the members for Ross Smith, Adelaide, Heysen, and me. That report was unanimously adopted by the House, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford (the then Premier) having introduced the relevant measure.

However, after a change of Government, either the late Hon. Frank Walsh or the present Premier, who may have been Attorney-General at the time, planned to establish the hall at the rear of Government House, part of it extending, I think, underneath the grounds. I read the report submitted by Mr. DeGaetani, who came out at the time to consider this matter. However, after a subsequent change of Government, the present Leader of the Opposition had the idea of establishing the theatre on the present site. When I travelled overseas last year on behalf of the Government, I took the opportunity, at the then Premier's suggestion, to look at festival theatres, and I was greatly impressed with the complex of three theatres that make up the Royal Festival Theatre in London, on the banks of the Thames. Although I also saw some of the older theatres in London, I had the opportunity to spend four or five hours inspecting this complex in company with Mr. Dunn (Director of the Public Buildings Department) and the Director of the theatre, who is an able and accomplished gentleman. As I wandered around the various rehearsal halls, I was able to see the recording facilities available. I studied the acoustic provisions, which were adjustable, in the various halls in which they were installed. Also, I saw the dining and other refreshment facilities, and I was especially interested in the continental-type seating, a type that we rarely see in

this State. It is quite different from what we have here, allowing for much quicker and safer ingress and egress of people without great disturbance to other people in the theatre. While there, I had the opportunity to see part of an orchestral concert. I was most impressed, too, with the aspect from the parts of the theatre that looked out over the water of the Thames. Patrons of our theatre will be able to look over the Torrens River and, although the Torrens cannot be compared with the Thames, perhaps there is not as much sewage in it as there is in the Thames at present.

In Amsterdam I inspected a theatre, taking particular note of the facilities provided for players behind the scenes. The mistake is often made in theatres of not providing sufficiently for change rooms and other facilities for players. I saw a most expensive theatre at Los Angeles. I only wish South Australia had a few more millionaires to make the sort of grants here that were made in Los Angeles for that theatre. Los Angeles has a magnificent complex that includes several smaller theatres adjoining the principal theatre. When I returned to South Australia, work started on a feasibility study of the project which we are now discussing and which is for a festival theatre to be sited to the north of Parliament House on the near banks of the Torrens River. We are indebted to Messrs. Dunn, Hart, and Irwin, who carried out the feasibility study to see whether this site could be used. In that study they found that a large water main ran through the land. They also considered the question of the underground railway, as envisaged by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, the adjoining properties of the Railways Department, parking facilities, and access of the general public to the site. I must emphasize that the future development at the rear of Parliament House, or what is called the southern plaza, was considered.

Some more detailed drawings were then organized, which I went through in consultation with the then Premier (Mr. Hall). It was clear at that stage that a hall could be built on this site. Hassell, McConnell and partners, in conjunction with the Adelaide City Council, eventually produced a model, which I hope members saw; it was on display in the foyer of the Adelaide Town Hall for some time. The building will be rather an odd shape, but it will lend itself readily not only in respect of the viewing of a performance but in respect of use by people during their leisure time as a place at which to dine or take refreshments

while looking out from these areas over the pleasant river aspect.

Naturally, the cost has increased. Whatever we do in this place, with regard to cost we must never allow this project to become another Sydney Opera House. When the project was first thought about some years ago, we optimistically spoke of a figure of about \$2,000,000. That sum increased to \$4,000,000, and now we are thinking about \$5,750,000. I realize that the tenders received are for a larger sum than was originally expected, and the Government has wisely included in the provisions relating to the Adelaide City Council and the building of the theatre rise and fall clauses which provide that, if the total sum exceeds a certain amount, the Government will contribute its proportion of the cost, whereas, if the sum is less than a certain amount, the Government will receive a rebate.

I want to emphasize that, in planning this project, the planners, and I as Minister of Works, always envisaged that there should be near the theatre building proper, on the western side, an area reserved for the future development of the performing arts when the time was reached for such a facility to be erected; I know I have the present Premier's support in this regard. I have studied the schedule of the Bill with some interest (the print is so fine that it is difficult to read), seeing there that a section is to be reserved for this purpose.

The original design envisaged that the southern plaza should be extended to the rear of Parliament House. When I was Minister, some work was done with regard to the expansion of Parliament House which tied in with this southern plaza and which would have provided some underground car-parking facilities for the benefit of honourable members, who have enough trouble as it is in trying to park their cars. This applies especially in hot weather when, if a car is left in the sunshine, it becomes as hot as an oven.

I was interested to see in the Bill financial arrangements made for the eventual disposal of the Carclew property, which includes not only the house and immediate grounds but also other properties in the area bought at the same time. I appreciate the action of the Government regarding the Bunyip Theatre in this connection. Eventually it is envisaged that, when the Adelaide City Council and the Government decide that this property should be disposed of, the money that accrues from the sale will be repaid to those two bodies according to the proportions of money they have paid out. Apparently, the question of

the Railways Department property has been resolved. I do not cavil at the change in the name from "festival hall" to "festival theatre". Perhaps "theatre" is a more adequate description. Of course, the building will not be used as a theatre throughout the year; I am not sure that it will be used throughout the year, whatever the purpose for which it is used. I see this project as a major cultural centre for this State; not only can it be used for theatre and ballet productions but it can also be used for major conventions and meetings (and I do not mean political meetings).

Mr. Jennings: Your Party couldn't get a major meeting.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member has never majored in anything. I see this building as a place where we can hold major conventions. I recall saying several times when I was a Minister that Adelaide was rapidly becoming the convention city of Australia, and the Premier has said something about that recently. The number of conventions held in Adelaide is increasing. People find it more convenient to come here, because it is the central State, and the number of national conventions held here is surprising. By some quirk of fate, however busy those attending these conventions are, they always seem able to take a day off to go to the Barossa Valley, and I have no complaint about that. I consider that this building will be a cultural centre for South Australia, particularly for Adelaide.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think people will be able to afford to hire the hall for a convention?

Mr. CUMBE: The Government has seen the light and included in the Bill a provision that the losses in the first 10 years will be met. The servicing of the loan, maintenance of staff, and upkeep of the hall will be fairly costly. I cannot see this festival hall becoming a paying proposition for a long time.

Mr. Ryan: The taxpayer will have to pay the loss but won't be able to afford to go into it.

Mr. CUMBE: I hope he can go into it. It would be a tragedy if he could not. This matter must be referred to a Select Committee. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, states that the consultant's fees will be included in the cost of the winding up of Carclew, and that is all right with me. He said that the total cost would be about \$5,750,000, of which the Government would contribute about 70 per cent, or about \$3,950,000.

The Government is to reimburse the Adelaide City Council for the loss in the first 10 years of the life of the theatre, provided that the amount of reimbursement, when averaged out, does not exceed \$40,000 a year. This is the matter that the member for Price has raised. A theatre of this kind rarely makes a profit, and anyone who studies the history of similar types of hall throughout the world will find that most are subsidized by the Government of the country concerned. Because of the enormous cost not only of servicing loans but also of upkeep and other incidentals, they rarely make a profit.

Mr. Ryan: If there is a profit, the Government won't get a percentage of it.

Mr. CUMBE: If a profit can be made, well and good. The Bill provides that, if there is a loss in the first 10 years, the Government will make good that loss.

Mr. Ryan: But if there's a profit, the Government won't get the benefit of it.

Mr. CUMBE: Trustees will be appointed, and, if there is a profit, I should think that this would go to amortization. I support this measure, because of my long association with the project. Eventually, a Bill will be introduced to deal with the southern plaza provision as it affects the festival theatre and the area at the rear of Parliament House. I am extremely pleased that this site has been chosen rather than the site behind Government House, which I think would have a restricted outlook. The site we are now considering will open an entirely new vista. There is room for extension and it provides for realistic and imaginative design, as one can see from the drawings and the model.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I want to speak only briefly in reply to the second reading debate. Some members opposite have referred to the history of this matter. The Government considers that, as this project had been undertaken to the stage to which it had advanced when it took office, it should proceed with it. Personally, I regret that the basis upon which it proceeded was not one of considering all the functional aspects of providing facilities in the city of Adelaide recommended originally to the Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee by Sir Robert Helpmann and other witnesses or on the basis on which Mr. DeGaetani was brought here by a previous Government. The recommendations at that time were that we should not be so much concerned with the architectural exterior of a building or with whether one

could sit on a terrace and get a view of water during a performance of Hamlet or at any other time, but that we should be concerned about what took place inside and whether the building gave facilities to the performing arts in South Australia in accordance with the needs that were shown to exist.

Mr. Coumbe: I've read the report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report was explicit that what we had to do was use our facilities as cheaply and functionally as we could to provide what was needed, and what was recommended in that report as being needed in South Australia to provide the necessary facilities for the performing arts has not been provided for in this hall. That is a pity. In consequence eventual provision of the necessary facilities in Adelaide will be much more expensive.

Mr. Ryan: We won't be able to afford it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will have to afford it.

Mr. Ryan: I'm talking about the public generally.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will have to provide facilities that the public will be able to go to without paying too much, and that will be done at much more expense to the State as a whole.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you made plans for this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: When will you announce them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member contents himself in patience, I am about to come to that. The Government, having announced that it believed in the provision of the necessary facilities for the performing arts in South Australia, has provided in this Bill for the necessary transfer to the State from the Railways Commissioner of the area for the provision of the performing arts facilities, and the Government has already engaged Mr. Brown, the original theatre consultant for the existing festival hall proposal, to submit proposals for the development of the remaining necessary facilities to provide a home for the South Australian Theatre Company and the Children's Theatre Company, and that feasibility study is proceeding at present. I assure members opposite that we will provide the facilities recommended in the original DeGaetani report.

It is unfortunate that that will now cost much more than was originally intended, but the people of South Australia need these

facilities if this State is to become the performing arts centre of Australia, as we have said it should be, and if between festivals we are to have the performing arts activities in South Australia that can give real meaning to the Festival of Arts. I assure the honourable member that he does not need to be impatient. The Government has already done what his Government did not do when it was in office. The feasibility study is under way, and I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Mrs. Byrne, and Messrs. Brown, Coumbe, and Hall; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 12.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 1950.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): When explaining this Bill, which touches everyone's pocket, the Minister of Roads and Transport referred to the road toll, a matter that concerns all of us. He said the Government intended to do all in its power to reduce the appalling loss of life and human suffering, and to this end it was intended to increase the driver's licence fee from \$2 to \$3 so as to make available a maximum amount of \$250,000 in any one year, about \$77,000 of which would be spent in the first year and about \$60,000 a year of which would be spent thereafter on a driver-improvement programme proposed by the Road Safety Council of this State. I do not think any fair-minded person would quibble with the motive behind this increase.

It is extremely disturbing for one to read each weekend of the serious loss of life occurring on our roads. Only today I have been told that there has been another fatal accident in my district because a motorist failed to take a bend. It is clear that much can be done to make the public more aware of road safety. However, one never likes to have taxation increased, especially at this time when farmers are already facing enough difficulties. I am sorry that the member for Rocky River is not present at the moment.

Mr. Gunn: He is checking on his rural problems.

Mr. RODDA: In any event, this will be yet another cost that my constituents and those of the member for Rocky River will have

to bear. I hope it will be recognized in any plans that are being made that primary producers' costs are always increasing. I suggest that ultimately such costs should be recognized in some way in a formula covering productivity. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Accordingly, provision is being made by amendment to that Act to ensure that not more than 50c of each dollar of the increase proposed by this Bill will be paid to the Treasurer where it will be available for appropriation by Parliament for road safety purposes.

This statement is somewhat nebulous. However, I dare say that when the Minister replies he will amplify that matter. Clause 2 amends section 76 of the Act by adding the following paragraph after paragraph (ii) in the proviso:

The fee for a licence issued to a person who is in receipt of a pension paid or payable under any Act or law of the Commonwealth and who is, by virtue of being in receipt of such a pension, entitled to travel in any public transport in South Australia at concession fares under any Act, regulation or by-law for the time being in force, shall be \$2.

It appears, therefore, that not all pensioners will pay only \$2. However, the Minister will probably have a complete answer to my question. It appears that the driving test referred to in the Bill will be undertaken only by those persons who are obtaining a licence for the first time and by those whose licence has lapsed for three years or more. I should be pleased if the Minister would, in addition to answering my other questions, explain why only \$77,000 a year out of the maximum of \$250,000 that will be available in any one year has been set aside for road safety purposes. As in the past members opposite have criticized my colleagues in Canberra about the deal given to pensioners, I should have thought that now they would set an example and lower the driver's licence fee for pensioners. We have heard plenty from members opposite about pensioners.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You had better change the subject because you are getting into really deep water.

Mr. RODDA: No, I am not; I am just making an observation. However, I will not achieve much by pursuing that line of argument. I shall be interested to hear what the Minister has to say in reply to the points I have put. I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I, too, support the general provisions of the Bill, one or two aspects of which relating to pensioners the member for Victoria has highlighted. I find it difficult to understand why all pensioners have

not been included in the list of those exempted from payment of the extra fee. I fully appreciate that many people are excluded but, if it is intended to help those people who are at an age when they are in need of some assistance, I think the list could well have been extended. I refer here to clause 3, under which a fee shall apply regarding all persons seeking a licence for the first time or persons seeking a licence who have not held one for the preceding three years.

A fee of \$1 a test shall be applied and, on the figures that I have been able to obtain from various sources, I point out that for people in this group the average number of tests in order to gain a licence is about 1.8 or 1.9, so that most of the people concerned may well be paying \$2 for a licence. I question whether a fee should be required of those people, who must submit themselves annually for a test, although I know that this matter is not included in the Bill at this time. We could have the situation where, instead of gaining a concession, a pensioner may be paying more for a licence than is paid at present by, say, beginners. Referring to this fee of \$1 for practical testing in his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

... the revenue from this impost will not find its way into the Highways Fund but will flow to general revenue and will to some extent offset the very heavy expenditure of the Police Department in this area.

I believe I am correct in saying that the Police Department conducts all these tests on behalf of the Motor Vehicles Department, and I see no reason why a charge for services actually rendered by the Police Department cannot be specifically directed to that department, although after being paid into general revenue it may well find its way back there. It will be possible in due course to take the provisions of this Bill a step further when we discuss the Highways Act Amendment Bill, and I shall have more to say then about the distribution of the sums to be applied under this measure.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Earlier this session in this House I moved a motion on road safety, and the Minister opposed the motion and, as Governments always do when they have a good majority (as his Government has) introduced a measure that completely altered the sense of the motion; and there it remained on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Burdon: Don't be too hard.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not being hard; I am merely stating facts. However, I think

there is one matter on which we are agreed, and that is the ghastly situation that is occurring all the time on our roads. In his second reading explanation, the Minister has actually used some of the language that I used when I was speaking to that motion. I suggest that the House should not be carried away by this when considering the Bill because, whatever may be said about this measure and the Government's intentions, the fact remains that this is merely an increase in taxation for South Australia. So far as I can tell from the Bill itself and from the related Bill (the amendment to the Highways Act), as well as from the Minister's explanation, no obligation is imposed by either measure on the Government to spend 1c more on road safety. I hope it will, and that is the expressed intention of the Minister, but if one looks at his speech one sees that, in fact, it does not take us far, because all he says is this:

Accordingly, the Government is at present considering a massive and far-reaching programme of driver-improvement proposed by the Road Safety Council of this State.

We do not know whether the consideration will conclude in favour of the scheme or whether it will be knocked back altogether, but whatever happens the fee for drivers' licences will be increased and the Government will have, I think on the Minister's estimate, up to another \$250,000 a year that can be used, as I understand it at the moment, for any purpose. Therefore, as I say, we want to be careful not to be starry-eyed about this. This is merely the impost of heavier taxes, and I only hope that it will be used for a good purpose.

One point in addition, which I should like to make and which I think was touched on by the member for Light a moment ago, is that for the first time we are imposing a charge for a driving test. Until now, no charge has been made for the services of the police in imposing a driving test, but there is now to be a charge of \$1. This may be justified; in fact, I think that in some ways, looked at from certain angles, it is probably a good thing: it means that a person will be deterred to some extent from going for driving tests until he or she is tolerably certain of passing the test; otherwise, the cost will increase. However, I think something rather more should have been said about this in the Minister's explanation than, in fact, he said about this aspect, because it is a new form of impost on the people in this State. I think several things should be said about the scheme of the

legislation, that is, this Bill and the amendment to the Highways Act. The Minister touched on the other amendment in his explanation of this Bill and said, at page 1950 of *Hansard*:

Accordingly, provision is being made by amendment to that Act—

that is, the Highways Act—

to ensure that not more than 50c of each dollar of the increase proposed by this Bill will be paid to the Treasurer where it will be available by appropriation of Parliament for road safety purposes.

That sounds all right until we have a closer look at it, and then we find that there is no obligation to pay any of this. It simply says "not more than 50c", but it may be no cents at all. These are traps in the legislation which I think all members should be alert to see and to avoid, and I hope that the Minister, when he replies to the debate, will deal with the points I have made.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The matter of doing something about the road accident situation is one that obviously has the attention and support of every member. I should like the Minister to amplify one or two aspects of the Bill relating to the revenue to be raised (and we must frankly admit that this is motor taxation: there is no point in pretending that it is anything else), and how it is to be spent. The Minister said he intended to support strongly a plan to improve drivers. I support that proposal. It was obvious in the motion moved by the member for Mitcham that the Opposition believed that this programme should be extended.

The Minister said that the extra money would also be used to make rail crossings safer. Improvement must be made to these crossings quickly. Much money is already spent on them, so I wonder whether the money now provided will be added in the next few years to what is already spent. It is not good enough to continue to spend what we are spending already. Obviously expenditures made in this way should be increased as a result of increased motor taxation. Few details are given about this in the Minister's second reading explanation; we know nothing of the break-up of this money. The Auditor-General's Report shows that motor taxation goes to the State Treasury and thence to the Highways Fund. Will a special line be provided showing clearly where this money is spent? If that is the case, I think the situation will be satisfactory. However, if no such line is set out, money to be spent for this worthy

objective may or may not be in addition to what is already spent. It will be entirely up to the Minister how much should be spent. Will the Minister make clear not only that this money will be in addition to previous expenditures for this purpose but also that the provision will be itemized clearly in future showing what is being done with the money? With those reservations, I support the second reading.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I support the Bill. With most other people in the State, I have been perturbed for many years at the accident rate on South Australian and Australian roads. I commend the Minister and the Government for introducing the Bill. I agree with the members for Mitcham and Alexandra that a Government cannot raise money other than by taxation. However, I believe that the people of South Australia will generally support the aims of the Government in endeavouring, through this Bill, to make some impact with regard to reducing the number of tragedies that occur on South Australian roads. The increase of \$1 in the driver's licence fee will go to the Road Safety Council, as the member for Mitcham said. It is estimated that the driver improvement programme contemplated by the Bill will cost about \$77,000 in the first year and \$60,000 a year thereafter. Most members could do with some improvement in their driving.

This programme is an endeavour to impress on people that there is a greater need for care on the roads. The provisions of the Bill will make available \$250,000 to be spent on facilities for road safety. For some time, I have sought in this House to have warning lights erected in my district at several railway crossings at which several accidents have occurred over the years. Fortunately no fatal accidents have occurred recently, and I hope that that state of affairs will continue. However, with other members, I look forward to seeing this additional money spent wisely in providing extra safety facilities.

Human nature demands that steps be taken to protect people from themselves, and there are no exceptions to this rule. A fee of \$1 will be imposed for the practical driving test. I do not think this fee will cause much hardship, but it could mean that, to avoid paying another fee of \$1, when they do their test people may pay a little more attention now, and this could mean that they will be better drivers when they secure their licence. The member for Alexandra said that a separate line should be inserted in the Budget with

regard to payments for these safety measures and that the sum being spent at present should not be reduced. I look forward to seeing no reduction in the sum now spent on road safety in the State; indeed, I hope to see extra money allocated for this purpose. As this Bill is in the interest of people who use the roads, I think they will agree that the extra money should be raised for road safety.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I believe that I should make a few comments, although I think that most of the matters that have been raised can and should be raised in Committee. I will not deal with the matters raised by the member for Alexandra, because obviously he was not sincere in making them as he has not even stayed in the Chamber to hear my reply.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a completely unwarranted thing to say, as you well know.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry if I have upset the member for Mitcham, but the plain fact is that the member for Alexandra is not in the Chamber and the member for Victoria, who also has criticized the matters contained in this Bill, is not here. If my saying that upsets the member for Mitcham, it is just too bad. Apparently, this is all members opposite think of the important question of road safety.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be so absurd.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the hard cold fact that the honourable member cannot run away from. The member for Mitcham spoke about the fact that, in the second reading explanation, I said we were considering a massive scheme, and he said that I had not gone into detail. Apparently, it has not dawned on him that we cannot go into detail until this Bill is passed.

Mr. Coumbe: Could you give us some indication of what you have in mind?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course I can. I can spell out the whole thing. The whole plan was there before we started. I announced our intentions in this House. We intend to conduct a massive driver education scheme, which was proposed by the Road Safety Council. If the member for Torrens cares to read my speech in the debate on the motion moved by the member for Mitcham, he will find complete details of the scheme for which we are now determining the financial aspect. I regret that the member for Mitcham and other members have followed the line that this represents an increase in taxation. Unfortunately, that is the line that the press of South Australia has also

followed, and I regret that both the members to whom I have referred and the press consider that the increase in licence fees is far more important than the objective of providing safer conditions on our roads.

Mr. Clark: How much is this increase?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is \$1 a year. The member for Light is in the Chamber, so I can deal with the matters that he raised regarding concessions for pensioners. The member for Victoria, I think, also raised this matter, and I welcome him back to the Chamber. I suggest than the member for Victoria, who is in a better position than the member for Light, refer his colleague to the debate in this House in November and December of 1968 on the Bill to amend the Stamp Duties Act. That Bill, which was introduced by the former Government and which provided a concession to pensioners, was supported by members of this Party who, at that time, were in Opposition. It provided an exemption for pensioners who owned a motor vehicle, were in receipt of a pension paid or payable under any Act or law of the Commonwealth, and who were, by virtue of being in receipt of such a pension, entitled to travel in any public transport in South Australia at concession fares under any Act, regulation or by-law for the time being in force. A provision in the Bill we are now debating is similar to that in the Bill introduced by the former Government and supported by the then Opposition. I am at a loss to understand why Opposition members suddenly are saying that we are not doing enough for the pensioners. We are doing precisely what the former Government did for them, so any criticism (although I do not agree with it) is against the former Premier, who is now the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rodda: I don't think we were criticizing: we were asking—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased the member for Victoria has decided that members opposite are not criticizing, because now I can go a little further. The position we are taking regarding increased licence fees is that these increases shall not apply to pensioners. Section 76 of the Motor Vehicles Act provides that the fee for a licence issued to a person who, as a result of his service in a naval, military or air force, is totally and permanently incapacitated, etc., shall be one-half the fee otherwise payable. At present, the fee is \$1. We are not increasing the fee for that person, so we are not permitting the provision regarding the payment of one-half to continue. The fee should go to \$1.50, if the terms of the present

Act and the attitude of the former Government were applied. However, I think the former Government could support our attitude in saying that the fee will remain unchanged for pensioners. We have done better than the previous Government did.

Mr. Rodda: I thought you might have—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would be delighted to be able to cut out the licence fees for pensioners, if that were possible.

Mr. Coumbe: You would find complications in that, I think.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I agree. Whilst we are trying to give concessions to pensioners wherever we can, in recognition of the poor deal they are getting, I personally would like the pensioners to receive no concessions whatsoever but to be given a pension on which they could live without needing concessions. They should not be put into the category of being second-class citizens, being given a concession here and one there and being labelled as the poverty-stricken class.

Mr. Clark: They will have to wait a while for this, though.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am afraid they will. I shall now deal with the matters raised by the member for Alexandra, because he is here and because they are important.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you think I am sincere again now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased the honourable member is here again in the House.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about the sincerity part of it?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Roads and Transport is replying to the debate, and interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member looks at the Highways Act Amendment Bill (and, unfortunately, we are not dealing with it) he will see that it contains a clause in it that adequately covers the point he has raised. That Bill is the next to be debated. However, the important point is that we have made a specific provision that the moneys must be appropriated by Parliament and, if they are to be so appropriated, they must be itemized separately and so shown. I consider that this Bill is a forerunner to one of the most important aspects of road safety we have known in South Australia for many years. I am expecting big things from it, and I commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Licence and learner's permit fee."

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister say whether a licence expiring during the year, rather than at the end of the year, would still require the payment of \$3?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): The Bill provides that the fees will operate from January 1, 1971, and they are to be paid in advance. If a licence expires on December 28 or 29, the fee will be at the old rate, but, if it expires on January 2, the fee charged will be \$3.

Mr. RODDA: As it is suggested that a sum of \$77,000 will be available for road safety provisions, can the Minister say how this figure has been calculated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This scheme was suggested by the Road Safety Council: the Chairman (Mr. Bruce Boykett) and the Secretary (Mr. Brian Plew), after discussions with me, suggested that this scheme be implemented, at a cost of about \$77,000. I think that they were conservative and that it will probably cost nearer \$100,000. It contemplates the expansion of the staff from two to six instructors; additional motor vehicles; film units; and additional clerical staff. The council costed it out at \$77,000 and suggested that if we could raise that amount for a reasonable scheme it would do the work. I have no doubt that the council will achieve its objectives.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say whether the result of the Bill will be a continued net increase in the sum spent on automatic railway crossings and grade separations; and whether details will be published in the Treasurer's statement or in the Auditor-General's Report so that Parliament can see how the money has been spent? Also, will the Minister refrain from reflecting on my sincerity when I am temporarily absent from the Chamber?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! The Minister must not deal with the last point in discussing this clause.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In answer to the first question, the increases will be automatic, because there is an automatic scale or graph of licences each year. The more licences that are issued, the more money will be collected, and more money will be available for this scheme. I do not know how the Auditor-General will present his report, but this point would be more appropriately dealt with under the amendment to the Highways Act, which provides for moneys to be appropriated by

Parliament. Parliament will do it, not the Minister.

Mr. RODDA: An amount of \$250,000 is to be raised by this scheme and appropriations will be necessary. Can the Minister say whether this will be used to provide additional police highway patrols? I am sure that additional patrols would be a valuable contribution to road safety.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The provision of additional police patrols on main highways is not within my province but is within that of the Chief Secretary. I am not aware whether he will decide to do anything in this regard. The Committee will realize that, although \$250,000 will be collected in a year, the provisions will not apply for this full financial year, and that sum will not be collected this year. The money will be used for driver-improvement programmes, grade separations, and automatic crossing warning devices. In addition, I hope that soon I shall be able to tell the Chamber of another desirable and ambitious action that the Road Safety Council will take to promote road safety. The finance necessary for these improvements will be provided by this Bill. It may seem to be a large sum, but when it has to be used for so many items there may not be much left.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Practical driving tests."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister's explanation referred to the heavy cost to the Police Department of carrying out driving tests. He then went on to say that the money was to be paid into general revenue. Is it proposed that any extra allocation will be made to the Police Department as a result of the money collected in this way? In any case, how much is it estimated will be brought in annually by the imposition of this fee for driving tests?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To deal with the honourable member's last question first, I cannot give him the actual figure for this. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles did at one stage give me a rough idea of the average number of new licences issued annually, but that figure escapes me for the moment. If the honourable member is really interested, I can get it for him, but it would not necessarily be accurate. First, it is always uncertain how many people will apply for licences. Secondly, this legislation requires that the applicant shall pay \$1 for each practical test involved, which means that, if a person takes three tests before he passes, it will cost him

\$3. Therefore, any figures in that regard would be only approximate.

Mr. Millhouse: Will any of it be given to the police?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not a matter of giving the police anything. As the honourable member knows, the finance necessary to run the Police Force is voted by Parliament. Expenses are increasing year by year, and increased votes are made each year to the Police Department. There would be little point, as the honourable member readily appreciates, in taking this money and saying to the Police Department, "Here is X thousand dollars; when we next vote you some money, we will take away that X thousand dollars." It would go into the general revenue pot, from which the Police Department and every other department receive the finance necessary to run their organizations.

Mr. COURCEL: I am interested in the reply given to the member for Mitcham and am intrigued, too, by the phrasing of this clause, which provides that before a person can take a driving test the police officer must be "satisfied that that fee has been paid". I take it that the procedure would be that a new applicant would have to go to the Motor Vehicles Department, make an application, pay the fee and then go along to the police station, or wherever he was to be tested, and say, "Here is my permit and here is my receipt for the fee." I take it that is right, although I am in some doubt about it. Is the fee paid at the Motor Vehicles Department or at the police station? If a person fails, he will have some documentation to that effect so that, when he returns, he must pay again. Can the Minister enlighten the Committee on this point? As I understood it, the fee would be paid to the Motor Vehicles Department, where an applicant would normally go to get his licence.

I want to get this matter cleared up because, when a person renews his licence, he does not send his money to the police station: he sends it to the Motor Vehicles Department. When somebody is applying for a new licence, as I have always understood it, he pays the money to the Motor Vehicles Department, not the Police Department. When a person goes to get his first licence (that is, to have his test) will he pay the money to the Police Department or to the Motor Vehicles Department? That brings up the point raised by the member for Mitcham: how will the Police Department be reimbursed by the Motor Vehicles Department? What about the people who

are retested, and what about the people over 70 years of age or those with some physical disability? To whom do they pay their fee?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It will help if honourable members will read section 79a of the Motor Vehicles Act and then the clause amending it. The first thing that becomes plain is that there is no reference in this clause to the testing of people over the age of 70 years. So there is no charge and it is not intended that there should be any charge for people who, by virtue of age or disability, require to be tested. Section 79a refers to the issue of a licence or a learner's permit to an applicant who has not previously held a licence. The procedure will be that a person will need to pass a written examination and will then be issued with a driving permit but, before he can obtain his licence, he must, as at present, have a practical examination by the police. He will go to the police station, as people do now, and make an appointment to take a driving test. When he takes his test, the first thing the police officer will say will be, "Right! Make a noise like a dollar bill and we can then do business." The fee will be paid to the police, not to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. COURCEL: And the police pay it where?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The money paid to the police goes into general revenue, as it would if the honourable member or I were unfortunate enough to be fined for an offence.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the clause about that.

Dr. EASTICK: Let us take this a little further. The Minister will recall that when we were dealing with the Estimates there was a particular line relating to police escorts, and he subsequently brought down an answer for me indicating that there was a physical payment from the Motor Vehicles Department to the Police Department; it was credited to the Police Department for services rendered. Therefore, I return to the question that has been asked two or three times on this: as it is the Police Department that will undertake the total function of the testing, why is it that the funds it is obtaining are not credited totally to it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am at a complete loss to understand the connection between this matter and the escort service that the police provide for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the clause.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The present position is that, from the general revenue of

the State, finance is allocated to the various departments for their operations. Included in this is a sum that is voted annually by this Parliament to the Police Department, and the honourable member took some part in that vote only a few weeks ago. The money being collected on this score must, of course, go into general revenue, from which it will be disbursed. I am at a loss to understand why there is such a problem about this matter when, in fact, members opposite permitted the police for years to go on testing people for nothing. Suddenly, when we are starting to put some revenue into the coffers, members opposite want it put into a specific coffer. It will go into the coffer where the need is greatest.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say what revenue he hopes to raise under this clause?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether the honourable member has been out of the Chamber, but the member for Mitcham asked an identical question, and I said that I would get the information.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 1951.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In indicating my support for the second reading, I consider it a pleasure to be able to highlight, at the outset, the work of the Commissioner of Highways, who carries out his function within the framework of the principal Act. We in South Australia are fortunate to have had the services of various Commissioners of Highways, particularly those services that have been carried out since March, 1969, by Mr. Johnke, who followed Mr. Yeates. As some members may be aware, Mr. Johnke has recently returned from an overseas trip, his prime reason for that trip, I am informed, being to attend the International Road Federation Conference in Montreal at which he delivered a paper on motor vehicle design. He subsequently attended a conference in New York of the American Society of Civil Engineering. The basis of that conference was environmental engineering. Mr. Johnke then travelled to Houston (Texas) and undertook a study of traffic engineering with particular reference to pollution, environment and ecology.

As a result of Mr. Johnke's obtaining first-hand knowledge of these subjects, which will play an ever-increasing part in the functioning

of his department, as well as in this State and in Australia generally, I believe that the expenditure involved in permitting Mr. Johnke to attend this conference was well justified. In some respects this measure may well be called the "pound of flesh" Bill, as it relates to sections 31 and 32 of the principal Act which apply to money entering and leaving the fund. The Bill gives effect to an increase of funds and authorizes the Commissioner to apply that money in certain areas in which it has not previously been possible for him to function. I believe that clause 2 is too far-reaching, new paragraph (d) providing:

for any purpose which in the opinion of the Commissioner is necessary or desirable to facilitate any scheme of road construction or development that may be undertaken by the Commissioner in the future.

If this provision is read in conjunction with paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of section 20a (1), I wonder whether the individual is receiving due consideration. Clause 3, which inserts a new section in the Act is, I believe, somewhat misleading. In explaining this provision, the Minister said:

It deals with the acquisition of land by the Commissioner in what are known as hardship cases.

Although I do not deny that the new section will do just that, I understand, from my reading of the Act and this amendment, that hardship can be considered only in respect of land that is immediately in line with or a part of the works to be undertaken. This matter was one on which there was major opposition in some quarters to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, the point made being that not only the area that was immediately in line with the proposed work but also adjacent properties would suffer as a result of roadworks being undertaken. I find nothing in new section 20ba that permits the Minister, in the case of hardship, to consider people whose property is adjacent to roadworks. By "adjacent", I would be prepared to leave it at "immediately adjacent" or, say, within 100yds. of the roadworks in question. Although I may be informed later that this is covered, I cannot determine that provision is made for the relief of hardship beyond the immediate area of the work. New section 20ba (1), and particularly new subsection (2), paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), provide that the Minister is answerable to himself alone. Part of new subsection (1) provides:

. . . the Minister may grant such a certificate but no proceedings shall be instituted or heard in any court or tribunal in respect of

the grant of such a certificate or the failure or refusal of the Minister to grant such a certificate.

Therefore, the Minister alone can accept or deny the right of a person to be considered under this hardship provision, whether the provision is as appears in the Bill or whether it is extended to consider people adjacent to the work. In the second reading explanation, the Minister said that there was a transposition of clauses 4 and 5. In new section 23 opportunity is given to the Commissioner to undertake research relating to materials and to different types of forward planning in relation to road transport. I believe this to be an excellent provision that follows one of the provisions made by the Commonwealth Act, to which I will refer a little later, whereby certain Commonwealth funds can be used for this research work. As excellent as I find this provision, I pose the question to the Minister whether it could not become a matter of empire building within the Highways Department.

Already we know that associated with the Highways Department there is a testing laboratory that has performed a worthwhile task. I have no doubt that, in future, the provisions of new section 23 would permit it to do even more than it has done in the past. However, will the Minister say whether this extra research work is necessary or whether there could not be a combination of the facilities that already exist in some other departments (not necessarily under Highways) whereby the research could be undertaken jointly by departments that would benefit from the findings, so reducing the individual cost to the departments involved? It might be suggested that, in the wrong hands (and I do not suggest this with regard to the present Commissioner or necessarily with regard to those who follow him), there could be empire building within the department and that, in due course, this would mean unnecessary expense to the State. The particular provisions in this respect permit the Commissioner to carry out research into materials and their suitability for road making, and into the various secondary considerations concerned with road building, particularly concrete work and other matters. New section 23 (2) suggests to me that the Commissioner will have the opportunity to undertake research into bubble cars and other futuristic means of public transport envisaged in statements made to the press, as this provision states:

The Commissioner may, subject to the approval of the Minister, engage in, or cause to be undertaken, road planning and research

including but without limiting the generality of expression—

- (a) the investigation of transport by road in relation to other means of transport; and
- (b) research into road safety, the design of vehicles and the behaviour of road users.

As this is all-embracing, it gives the Commissioner the opportunity to research these futuristic schemes. I believe this provision is worth while. We are not waiting until the time when to provide for necessary research requires an alteration to the Act but are providing for this now. New section 23 (3) provides:

The Commissioner shall make available for general information the results of research and experiments undertaken and made pursuant to this section in such manner and to such extent as the Minister directs.

In other words, the Commissioner cannot decide that he will make this information available; he is required first to get Ministerial approval. Similar provisions are not uncommon in many Bills that come before us and in many of the Acts on the Statute Book. However, can the Minister say whether, when this necessary research has been undertaken and a decision made and when information is obtained that would be generally available to other departments, it is expected that the money, which has been used to obtain this information, or a proportion of it, will be charged as a fee against the other departments that will benefit from the information? In debates earlier in the session, it has been said that this type of activity or cross-financing is a feature of Government undertakings. To highlight this, I point out that, when the House was considering a Bill dealing with insurance, members were given an assurance that, where officers were seconded from one department to another for any purpose of insurance, their salary for that period would be credited as a cross-accounting fee to the department from which they were seconded. Does the Minister intend in this case that the work undertaken by this research branch will be charged for as a fee, where the information made available by the Commissioner at the discretion of the Minister will be of tangible benefit to the recipient department?

As I said earlier, the whole crux of the Bill is in relation to amendments to sections 31 and 32 of the Act. Clause 6, which amends section 31, relates to income or the means whereby the Highways Fund can receive funds. Clause 7, which deals with section 32, relates to expenditure or, more particularly, to the application

of the Highways Fund. It is similar to the question of which came first, the chicken or the egg. Does a person put his money in before he spends it, or does he spend it and then find the means of reimbursing? Clause 7, which amends section 32 of the principal Act, is consequential on the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1969, which gives the Highways Department, through the Commissioner, additional powers and areas in which he can undertake work with Government funds.

Section 4 of that Commonwealth Act provides that the Highways Department can undertake work in relation to urban arterial roads and rural arterial roads, and that money can be expended on the construction and maintenance of rural roads. Also, provision is made for road planning and research. These additional areas were not previously covered in a way whereby the Commissioner could disburse his funds, and clause 7 makes this possible. The provisions of section 4 (5) of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act are interesting. It provides:

Where a State satisfies the Minister that—

- (a) the amount specified in the second schedule, third schedule or fourth schedule in relation to the State in respect of a year is greater than the amount that the State will be able to expend, in accordance with this Act, for the purpose applicable to the amount under subsection (1), subsection (2) or subsection (3) of this section, respectively; and
- (b) the inability of the State to so expend that amount is due to exceptional circumstances,

the Minister may direct that the amount so specified in that schedule in relation to that State in respect of that year shall be deemed to be reduced by such amount as is specified by the Minister and that the amount specified in relation to the State in respect of that year in such other of the second, third and fourth schedules as he specifies shall be increased by a corresponding amount and, upon the Minister giving such a direction, this Act has effect as if those amounts had been respectively reduced and increased in accordance with the Minister's direction.

This is an excellent example of the Commonwealth Government's bending over backwards to give to the States the opportunity to spend the money in the most beneficial and practical way. I highlight that aspect of the Commonwealth Government's practical attitude, because it is different from what Government members frequently fire at members on this side about the attitude of our colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think Dr. Breuning's report will have any effect on this?

Dr. EASTICK: Perhaps the report is bogged down in the Suez Canal, but it should be forthcoming soon. However, I wonder how soon after it arrives we will see it in this House.

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

Dr. EASTICK: Section 5 of the Commonwealth Act applies to the States of South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania in respect of supplementary grants, and section 6 indicates that the purpose for which the supplementary grants may be made is the construction and maintenance of roads. It is this provision of the Commonwealth Act, defining the construction and maintenance of roads, that has necessitated several of the minor alterations that the Minister has outlined in the Bill now before the House. The Highways Act previously did not permit the satisfactory use of these additional grants.

Under section 32 of the principal Act moneys may be spent on rehousing people who are affected by the alteration of roadways or who may be otherwise affected by road planning, and this section permits the granting of short-term loans. Here again, we find that the Minister must approve. The amendment to section 31 is important because it permits rentals or other funds made available and also the repayment of any loans to be made to the Highways Fund. These two amendments constitute the axis of the whole Act, and I believe they have been satisfactorily explained.

During the debate on another Bill this afternoon much discussion centred around the increased sum to be made available to the State under the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act. The present Bill's provisions refer to that money. I am a little surprised at the wording of this section wherein \$1 for each of the effective licences is to be made available to the State. The application of some of that money is strangely worded in new paragraph (1) of section 32 (1) which provides for payment to the Treasurer of an amount not exceeding 50c for each licence issued under section 75 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, as amended, in respect of which there has been paid a fee of \$3. I am in accord with accepting the additional payment only from those licences that have returned the greater sum of \$3, but the effect of the wording is that it is an amount not exceeding 50c. We could have the extreme situation of the application of 1c.

Mr. Rodda: Or. no cents.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Nonsense!

Dr. EASTICK: The Government may apply 1c or 2c. However, I find it difficult to understand why it limits itself to this "not exceeding 50c". It would be far more appropriate if it was indicated positively that a figure of \$X was to be made available; in those circumstances, there would be adequate opportunity formally to plan any undertaking required in this area.

But it may well be that other areas of Government finance were to be funded out of this area and that there would soon be a reduction of funds made available specifically for road safety or any other purpose the Minister might indicate. In the second reading debate, it was also freely stated that the sum would go towards expenditure on several other road uses. It was indicated, for instance, that it was expected that funds would be authorized for making available additional sums for warning devices on railway lines and for other purposes in aid of road safety and road promotion. If this is to be so and additional funds are to be made available for railway crossings, I am in full accord with this money being applied in that area, but there appears to be a grave need to make sure that the relative merits of the various railway crossings be considered before money is spent.

For instance, in recent weeks the Minister was able to tell the House that crossings in several country and city areas would receive warning devices. One would be a railway crossing device on the railway line between Riverton and Saddleworth, whereas previous applications in respect of the railway crossing between Manoora and Black Springs had received no consideration. It has been possible, with the Minister's help, to obtain some relative figures of the passage of traffic over these two lines. They show that on the Riverton-Spalding line there is no passenger traffic but there is a scheduled goods service comprising three return movements a week (two as far as Spalding and one as far as Clare) involving a total of six passages over that railway crossing in any one week. Only 10 miles north, on the same highway, the highway to Broken Hill, there is the Riverton-Peterborough line. As it passes over the Manoora crossing there is a passenger service of 13 down and 11 up trains a week, and a goods service of 15 down and 17 up trains a week. This balances out by some passenger trains becoming goods trains on the reverse move-

ment. So there are 56 movements of train traffic over this railway line in any one week. Earlier this session the Minister indicated the policy of his department in answer to a question on motion, where the aspects were considered, and he said:

Apart from the financial considerations, priorities for the installation of warning devices at level crossings are based on numerous factors. The principal considerations, however, are the relative volumes of rail and road traffic, speeds and local conditions such as visibility at any one particular location.

The matters outlined by the Minister in this regard apply more to the Manoora crossing than to the Riverton crossing and I should like the Minister's department to consider urgently all information obtained from individuals or district council officers concerning protection to be afforded at railway crossings. Undoubtedly, from my observations of the Manoora crossing, the potential danger there, particularly in respect of the up road track, is far greater than that at the Riverton crossing which, admittedly, is not an open crossing.

The Manoora crossing, which involves a slope or grade, is traversed by large petrol tankers, often with one trailer and occasionally two trailers. Traffic, including these tankers, is forced by a "stop" sign to stop at the crossing in order to ensure that nothing is coming. My comment applies particularly to down train traffic (in regard to up train traffic the train is only just leaving the railway station). By the time drivers of heavy transport vehicles go through the gears and are crossing the line, there is every chance that a train is approaching on the down track and may collide. The damage caused by a train's colliding with a motor car or truck would be serious but it would be many more times serious if it involved one of these fuel tankers, which frequently travel through the area to points north, including Broken Hill. It is this area, through local knowledge, that requires urgent consideration by the Minister's department before a final decision is made on any crossing.

In this regard, one might highlight the crossing on the road from Gawler to the Roseworthy Agricultural College, this road being the scene of an accident that has been discussed in this House previously. Although it has been suggested that this is a safe crossing, I suggest that the people concerned inspect it at various times of the evening, particularly when there is a background of the lights on the main highway to Nuriootpa, as well as the bright lights at the main intersection of the

Tarlee, Gawler and Nuriootpa roads. Many college students, including university students, travel over this crossing daily on their way to the Roseworthy Agricultural College. I hope that the Minister will consider the matters I have canvassed and comment on them in his reply, so that we can reduce the number of questions that would otherwise be necessary in Committee. I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): Generally, I support the Bill, but I am disappointed that the Minister commented on so little in his explanation; he produced a draftsman's report on the Bill, but he made no speech of his own. As Minister, he put forward no arguments.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I thought it was so simple that that wasn't necessary.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I would have thought that, having been appointed for nearly five months and having laboured mightily in that time, the Minister would at least bring forth more than a mouse, but he has not brought forward even that. At the election campaign, the Labor Party loudly criticized the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, making all sorts of statements about it. Since then, we have been allowed, if not encouraged, to forget that plan altogether until the Minister is ready to say something more about it. I should have thought that, when introducing a Bill to amend the Highways Act, the Minister would take the opportunity to make the biggest and most important statement he has made since taking over his portfolio, and would put forward the exact state of affairs in relation to the M.A.T.S. plan, saying what he intended in the future; at the same time he could have included the report of the draftsman.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This is making up for the omissions of your Government and that's all that it's doing.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If the Minister had taken the trouble to make the hypothetical speech which I have missed and which I think other members have missed, he might also have added a few words about what he thought were the omissions of the previous Government. Instead of having to stand that, however, we have had to stand nothing at all. No reference at all to the M.A.T.S. plan or anything like it was made in the Minister's explanation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why should there have been?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Bill refers to it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's to clean up the mess left by your Government.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister will have an opportunity to say something when he winds up the second reading debate. However, in the five months since the Minister took office, nothing has happened, there is no sign of anything happening, and Adelaide is getting gradually choked up with traffic. We understand that an important report was mailed some time ago from the United States. We do not know exactly when it was posted or how it was posted. I presume that, if it was important, it would have been posted "air mail", but it does not appear to have got on the right aircraft, and it may have finished up in Cuba or somewhere like that. So far we have not seen the report and we know nothing about it. *Hansard* appears to show that we have the Minister's assurance that he will make the report available to members. As that is the way it appears in *Hansard*, I should like the Minister to confirm what he said in reply to a question a few days ago: that he would make this report available for members of the House. In the meantime, we know nothing further at all and the traffic situation in Adelaide is getting worse. When I am speaking about transport in Adelaide, I am speaking not only of the people who live in the city but also of those who live in the near country and outer country areas. These people suffer from the bad transport conditions that are becoming worse each year. A farmer from the southern districts who wants to get produce to market must take it through Adelaide, from Darlington to Gepps Cross, over about 100 intersections and through many sets of traffic lights, and put up with many other inconveniences.

Mr. Harrison: Has all this happened in the last five months?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Traffic is building up by from 6 per cent to 8 per cent a year and the position is getting worse while the Government is not doing anything, and we know nothing about the future.

Mr. Payne: Don't you agree we should think before we move?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I point out that in 1962 this Parliament passed legislation that gave rise to this transport report, and there was no need for our Government to bring the matter back to Parliament in 1968, but we did bring it back.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You were forced to by public opinion and your own members in the Upper House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister is a great one for making a speech when he is sitting down, but he has not made a speech on his feet: he has read only the Parliamentary Draftsman's report. I suggest that he listen to me and prepare his speech, and then he will be able to reply soon. There was no requirement that our Government bring the matter back to Parliament, but we did that, and it was gummed up by some pretty poor political tactics and has remained gummed up ever since. The person who gummed it up probably as effectively as anyone else in this House is the present Minister, and he has refused to loosen it. What is more, he has refused to make any intelligent statement on it since he has been in office.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's only your opinion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Labor Party's policy before the last State election was that it would withdraw and revise the plan. When we asked the Government earlier this session about withdrawing the plan, the Government did not know whether it had withdrawn it or whether it had revised it. The Government has made some effort towards revision but has not got the report. That is still on the water, in Cuba, or somewhere else. We do not know where it is, but when it arrives it will be urgent.

There has been in the report a concentration on whether Adelaide should have freeways. The emphasis on freeways has distorted the whole position. The fact is that the M.A.T.S. plan has strong provision for public transport, far stronger than the provision, if any, in cities in the United States, to which Government members are so keen to refer. In its policy speech before the last State election, the Labor Party stated:

A Labor Government will withdraw and revise the Metropolitan Adelaide transport proposals.

As I have said, earlier in the session the Government did not know whether it had withdrawn them. The policy speech also stated:

Freeways from north south, to Tea Tree Gully, to Port Adelaide and Glenelg, will be necessary, but we do not believe that a massive concentration upon elevated freeways will produce eventually anything other than a city cut up and jammed up with private motor cars. We would be building problems American cities are now desperately trying to solve.

The Government talks about elevated freeways, but in fact under the M.A.T.S. plan only three

miles out of 60 miles of freeway would be elevated. About one-third of the total would be above the surface on embankments, 16 miles would be below ground level, and 10 miles in the hills would alternate between embankments and cuttings. Therefore, the Government's statement that it does not believe in a massive concentration on elevated freeways is an emotive statement containing very little fact or good sense.

However, the Government acknowledges in that statement that freeways must be built, and that was the idea behind the M.A.T.S. plan. However, the plan did not finish at that: it had a very big concentration also on the use of public transport, and that was consistently (and, I think, in some quarters deliberately) ignored by the critics. In fact, the American consultants who worked on this plan said that Adelaide was in a very fortunate position in having a network of public transport and a rail system that just did not exist in many cities in the United States, and that it would therefore be able to finance its plan considerably more cheaply than would cities in most countries having a comparable plan.

We have a fairly well-balanced plan. Of course, it is not perfect, and it would be subject to amendment as we went along. But what can we do worse for the metropolitan area of Adelaide in this matter of transport, and what can we do worse for the whole State, than do nothing at all? That is what has happened for the last five months. When members see the city of Adelaide and the suburbs during the week preceding Christmas they will see much stationary traffic for a large part of the day, conditions that one would not even find in London or New York. This will be caused not only because of the increased number of vehicles but also because cars will be filling the intersections; they follow each other through the green light, and when the light changes there is a big bank up of cars and there is no clear road for cross traffic. That is the sort of chaotic condition that occurs. Traffic congestion is bad now before long weekends, particularly before the Easter and Christmas breaks. It will be worse this year than it was last year, and last year it was worse than it was the year before. It will go on getting worse until something is done. It takes time to do anything, and that time is precious. In fact, that time is not being properly used now; if it is, there is absolutely no sign of it coming from the Government.

I think this is one of those situations in which the Government ought to get busy and, instead of the Minister answering questions in Parliament in an obscure way so that we do not know whether the plan has been withdrawn or revised, it is an opportunity for him to show some leadership and show that he will carry on with something that will solve the traffic problem. If we do not do this, Adelaide, which is not densely populated compared with other metropolitan areas and by most standards, will become an area that cannot be avoided and cannot be proceeded through. Is the House aware that, of the traffic expected to travel on these north-south freeways, not more than 44 per cent is expected to go into the city of Adelaide? Yet, at present a much higher percentage has to travel close to the city or into it to pass through it. It is costing people much money, whether they are in business or on the land. It is costing travellers and tourists and everyone else much money, yet there is no reason why we cannot get on and do something instead of having, as someone on the Government back bench has suggested, another look and then another look. I think it is time that we did something. These freeways, which everyone agrees should be built, are not being built: I say "everyone" because the Premier in his policy speech acknowledged that freeways would have to be built. I think we should get on with them. We know that freeways will not reduce values in these areas, as has often been suggested. We know from world experience—

Mr. Payne: Where do you live?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not reply to interjections.

Mr. Payne: You haven't anything to say.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not mention my personal business in this House: I never have, and I do not bother about anyone else's.

Mr. Payne: I know that: that is what we have been trying to tell you for a long time. The Labor Party does.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I know that the honourable member who has been doing all the talking will eat his words when he finds that values increase as a result of the construction of freeways. If they do not in Adelaide, it will be the first place in the world where this has happened.

Mr. Payne: I could introduce you to many land agents who are waiting on your advice.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If the honourable member would like to follow this up, I ask him—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot reply to interjections.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to ask this question, anyway. Is the Government frightened to go on with freeways because it thinks there will be a drop in values?

Mr. Payne: Bad luck.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is a good question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Question time has passed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister would find, if he made even a cursory study of the M.A.T.S. plan, that values would not decrease but increase. It is obvious (and this is what the honourable member is talking about) that there will be an immediate effect on values, and a bad effect, as a result of uncertainty. Obviously, there may be changes in the use of land around these freeways to achieve those values. There may be immediate embarrassment: we know that, and that is why we are trying in this Bill and in previous legislation to help people who are affected. However, do not think that in the long term there will be a lowering of values, because it would be a big mistake to think so. Values will rise. Also, the value of land in Adelaide and its surroundings will also be increased. Businesses that are able to get their products to markets and out of the city and get their materials in will benefit, and so will people in the businesses or on the farms concerned. So, everyone in the community stands to benefit from some action and to lose from inaction. Therefore, I suggest that the Minister make another speech and say a little more about what he intends to do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Minister will be pleased to know that I do not altogether agree with the member for Alexandra when he discusses the motivation of the Government. He has chided the Minister with not having made a speech on this matter and not having said what he intends to do about the M.A.T.S. plan. I agree that the Government should say what it will do about the M.A.T.S. plan.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But not in this debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This would have been as good a place as any to do that, but in the last few weeks the Government has burnt its

fingers so often since it started to tackle these matters that it is not surprising to find that it is avoiding burning them again. One has only to think of what happened when it leapt in over trading hours to have some sympathy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What have trading hours to do with this Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nothing whatever, but it is one of the foolish things that this Government has done and I am saying that I am not surprised that it is mum about this, to avoid doing something else foolish. It has done so many foolish things since it has come into office that it is obviously trying to avoid doing anything else foolish, and the way to do that is to say nothing about the M.A.T.S. plan; but sooner or later, as the member for Alexandra has implied, it will have to make up its mind and say something. All it can do is to do as we proposed to do when we were in office.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't you kid yourself!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why does the Minister then not jump in and tell us what he will do?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I cannot because you are on your feet; I am not allowed to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would be prepared to sit down. I cannot believe that the Minister will commit himself in this debate when I resume my seat. He cannot kid anybody but himself if he says he will do that, because he will not. Eventually, however, the Government will have to do what we were going to do, more or less, but it will put off the evil day as long as it can in the hope that the people of this State will digest some of the other silly things it has done so far and it will be able to get out of the mess it has created. I see the member for Mawson looking at me sympathetically.

Mr. Clark: We are all looking at you sympathetically.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members opposite are all in trouble. I strike a responsive chord in them all by what I have said. The report that the Minister read out as an apology for a speech does not cover many things in the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Such as?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One of the things in the Bill is a point raised by the member for Alexandra—the bestowal of power on the Commissioner to acquire land and pay for it if it could possibly be affected by future plans. There is no doubt that this power is required. We required it, but why did we?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why did you not do anything about it? That is a better question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We were cut off in our prime.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What a lame excuse!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have no doubt that we would have introduced this this year if we had been the Government. We would not have tried to conceal the purpose for which we were introducing it. It is necessary for the Highways Department to be able to acquire properties along the routes of possible freeways. At the present time that power does not exist, but it is rather amusing that the Minister who says that it can have nothing to do with M.A.T.S. (that M.A.T.S. was a terrible plan; it would ruin Adelaide, and so on—I need not go through it all; he is much better at hyperbole than I am) nevertheless brings into the House the very measure that is necessary if M.A.T.S. is to be proceeded with, and we have it here in this Bill in clause 2. That is the first point to which I draw attention.

Mr. Coumbe: Clause 2 hinges on it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is the whole point of the thing. I have said several times in this House, and I think I will go on saying it over the whole of this Parliament, because the Labor Party never learns, that we cannot rely on anything said by this Government; it will say one thing and do another, and here we have another classic example of that. M.A.T.S. is out, it says, but nevertheless it brings in a provision to give effect to planning for M.A.T.S. What is the new placitum to be added to section 20a? I have a copy here of the Highways Act, which will read in this way:

Without limiting the general powers of the Commissioner under the last preceding section the Commissioner may, subject to the approval of the Minister, acquire any land or interest in land by agreement or compulsory process for any of the following purposes—

We propose to add the following:

for any purpose which in the opinion of the Commissioner is necessary or desirable to facilitate any scheme of road construction or development that may be undertaken by the Commissioner in the future.

It gives him *carte blanche*, in fact, to acquire in the circumstances I have outlined.

Mr. Coumbe: An absolute blank cheque!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the first point I make. The second point, which worries me greatly and which I canvassed in the debate on the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill,

is the transfer from the Highways Fund to the Treasurer of moneys for the purposes of road safety. In view of the experience we have had of this Government's saying one thing and meaning another (in other words, in view of its unreliability), I am unwilling to accept what the Minister says is the Government's intention—that part of the money (not all of it but only part of it; at the most, up to half of the extra money that will purportedly be raised by the additional \$1 in licence fees) will be used for road safety purposes. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

The prime object of this Bill, therefore, is to create a source of revenue for this important work.

That was his driver-improvement programme.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which you do not support!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do support it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You don't support road safety.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do, but I do not trust the Minister to spend the money in the way he says he will, unless it is written into the Act.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Parliament is spending it; not I.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We shall see about that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Read the Act, and you will find out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but what body is it that introduces the Estimates into Parliament? It is the Government and, unless the Government introduces Estimates that provide for the spending of money on road safety, Parliament cannot do a thing about it, because only a Minister can do that. The Minister knows that. He hoped that I would not pick him up on it and that he would be able to bluff his way through; but this provision hinges on the actions of the Government, and Parliament can do nothing about it if the Government does not act. The Government intends to add to section 32 a number of extra powers or extra ways in which moneys in the Highways Fund can be spent. Section 32 provides:

The moneys standing to the credit of the Highways Fund shall be used by the Commissioner—

Then it lists the powers, and we are to add new paragraphs (i), (j), (k) and (l). New paragraph (l) is the one to which I refer, and it is as follows:

In paying to the Treasurer an amount not exceeding 50c for each licence issued under section 75 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, as amended, in respect of which there has been paid a fee of \$3.

So far as Parliament is concerned, none of that extra money need necessarily be spent, because this is permissive and not mandatory. The Government need not spend a cent of this extra money on road safety if it does not want to and, if it does not want to, Parliament can do nothing about it. Earlier this afternoon we heard the Minister say that \$75,000 would probably not be enough and that it probably would cost more than that. If that is right and if we are prepared to accept what the Minister said this afternoon, I believe we should write something more definite into the Bill so that we know that this money is to be spent for road safety purposes; we should not leave it to the Minister to make a decision later about what will happen. In any case, even if the Minister is as good as his word on this occasion, at the most one-half of the extra sum that is being put on motorists for their licence fees is to be spent on road safety; the rest will simply go into the Highways Fund for the purposes of that fund. Yet, in his second reading explanation the Minister said (and I had better make sure of this: I must not misquote him)—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You wouldn't do that, would you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not. I always know when I have the Minister rattled: he makes little interjections; not big ones, but a running fire of interjections *sotto voce*. I always know when I have him. He is reacting in that way now. When he is either quiet or yelling one knows that one has not really disturbed him, but when he is making this little running current of interjections one knows that one has worried him, and that is how he is reacting at present.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One of his henchmen, who is always silent except by way of interjection, tries to say that I have contributed nothing to the debate. I am sorry that he thinks that, for I had thought that I had made a couple of points well. The point I am making now is that the Minister says in one breath that the prime object of the Bill is to provide money for road safety, and in the next breath he proposes that, at the very most, one-half of the extra money to be collected from licences will go for this purpose, and maybe less: maybe nothing will go for this purpose. To me that is just not good enough, and I believe we should take some action on this. There are other matters in the Bill on which I do not intend to comment. I have made two points: first, I have referred to the

unreliability of the Government in saying that the M.A.T.S. plan is out and then introducing the very amendment that we intended to introduce so that M.A.T.S. could proceed; and, secondly, although it has used road safety as a pretext for increasing licence fees, I doubt its good intentions.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I congratulate the member for Light on the thorough way in which he spoke to the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: At least he spoke to the Bill, which is more than your other two members have done.

Mr. McANANEY: I will follow suit, and I hope I can make a monologue instead of taking part in a duet with the Minister. Although as a rule I do not like to see additional powers given to any part of the Administration or to a Minister, they are necessary in this case with respect to necessary works such as the South-Eastern Freeway and the M.A.T.S. plan, which is inevitable and which was always intended to be a flexible plan. It was to be a scheme that would change as circumstances changed but, ultimately, the plan would not have been much different from what was originally intended by Sir Thomas Playford in 1962, when he commenced something that was necessary for the State.

Dr. Tonkin: If you called it by a different name, it would be all right.

Mr. McANANEY: Perhaps the Government would like that and perhaps that would satisfy its ego, if nothing else. I congratulate the Highways Department on the way it has acquired land in the Hills area to the general satisfaction of most people. In some cases, it is essential to buy the whole of a person's property so as not to do him an injustice, although in the past we have known isolated cases where people were not allowed to sell originally and, by the time the Highways Department came in, they were then at a disadvantage. In my new electoral district, the officers of the department have been as fair and just as is humanly possible, so I do not object to the granting of this extended power. Authority is given to the Commissioner, subject to the Minister's approval. Although I think the reverse should apply, I think this Minister takes the Commissioner's advice.

Dr. Tonkin: I'm pleased he does.

Mr. McANANEY: Sometimes he makes a mistake, such as he did in relation to Glen-side Road in the hills.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who made that mistake?

Mr. McANANEY: I think the Highways Department admitted that it was wrong in the original planning, but it did not see fit, in the interests of common sense, to make an adjustment accordingly, and that failure penalized many people. I have said many times that I have never complained about or disagreed with the Highways Department about the way it builds a road, because the officers of the department are the experts. However, I do complain when they do not know local conditions yet do not accept the advice of local people about those conditions, because then they make some terrific mistakes. Although, technically speaking, as engineers they are doing a theoretically perfect job, the end result is flooded roads and general dissatisfaction amongst the people who have to use them, merely because the officers follow an engineering principle without considering local conditions.

The Commissioner is given power to investigate road transport in relation to other means of transport, and I think this is necessary in the general interests of the State. We need more liaison between the Transport Control Board, the Highways Department and the Railways Department to give us what is best for the general public. The member for Mitchell made a silly remark about what was in the interests of saving costs in industry when he said, "What about the workers?" Saving costs in industry and doing something in a more economic, more efficient and cheaper way will determine the living standard of the workers. Some wise-cracking individuals like the member for Mitchell or the trade unions think that they achieve something when they increase costs in this State to the general detriment of everyone. This does not improve living standards.

What intrigued me was a statement made by Dr. Siegfried Breuning in Melbourne, when he was going home. He said that we should turn all the transport over to private enterprise because only private enterprise could handle the situation. In fact, he said he did not know why this had not been done. I suppose that, to the glory of the Socialist Party opposite and perhaps to the shame of the Liberal Party in the past, he did not find out that whenever a bus service around Adelaide began to show a profit it was compulsorily taken over by the Municipal Tramways Trust which, despite a heavy Government subsidy, finds it extremely difficult to pay its way.

Dr. Breuning went on to say that the Government, which was paying him \$12,000,

would best be left out of the transport picture or at least no further inside than business wanted it to be. He went on to say that private enterprise had mostly left the transport field because businessmen did not consider it a paying proposition. However, he believed that that attitude was foolish, because one-quarter of the national economy must be a potential gold mine. His message is to get companies forming consortiums to build the future transport systems, with advice from Australian academics. What did this Government do when it had some of the leading experts of the world in South Australia, and one university professor had made a world-wide study of transport? That university professor was completely ignored by this Government, which got someone from America. Why? Well, the answer is that the Premier (the then Leader of the Opposition) was in America at the time and thought that this chap would come up with something that he would agree with. Of course, nothing is any good unless our Premier agrees with it. Everyone who disagrees with him is stubborn, obstinate and stupid.

Dr. Tonkin: Even members of his own Party.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. Dr. Breuning went on to say that Governments would inevitably have some control of transport because of their function, but only business had the "creative manpower" to do the job properly. He added that it was not as though they had much choice, since so many enterprises would be affected by the coming changes in transport. Therefore, he thinks that Governments should have some control over transport, but not very much. Certainly, this Government has indicated that it is not very capable in this particular way. Dr. Breuning went on to say that petrol firms would have to look for new markets as combustion-engine cars were replaced by electric vehicles or something else. However, he does not say how these electric-power controlled vehicles are to travel other than on freeways. He then said that every industry in transport was apathetic, and that "There hasn't been a new idea in car making since the invention of the automatic starter, and that was many years ago." He is still not saying that motor cars will be replaced, but rather that it is time they were made a bit more efficient. He went on to say:

People enjoy weekend drives down country roads but city traffic is wasting precious resources, as parking areas are reserved and ever more highways built.

Dr. Breuning asked why this had happened, and he asked those present how many had got there by public transport. He discovered that they had all got there by means of private motor cars. He said that not many people wanted to use transport systems that were worse today than they were 40 or 50 years ago. Transport systems have become worse because no-one is willing to use them, and unless people are compelled, they will not use these systems. Dr. Breuning cannot understand why additional taxes have been placed on cars and petrol, because this action is impeding the use of a system that has become a necessity. Motor cars are there but roads are necessary for their use. I think Dr. Breuning's report will coincide with what he said in Melbourne, and it will be a most interesting document. I think the Minister of Roads and Transport will sit on it for a long time (if he is not sitting on it already) before we see this report, because I am sure it will be a strange document.

Dr. Breuning suggests, from his experience in America, that South Australia could not possibly do worse than adopt a Government transport system. His speech indicates that he thinks there must be public transport and that motor cars must be modern, but there must be good roads on which motor cars can be used. The Opposition deplores the fact that the Government has taken no action to implement what the Premier said in his policy speech (and has said since then), that we must have a north-south freeway and must have some connection with the South-Eastern Freeway through Adelaide to Port Adelaide, otherwise there will be a slowing down of traffic.

Mr. Langley: That couldn't be the north-south freeway.

Mr. McANANEY: If the honourable member wants to be accurate, then it is south-east to north-west. No-one deliberately makes a mistake like this Government has made in regard to slowing down the construction of freeways and the development of the M.A.T.S. plan. Freeways are necessary and the South-Eastern Freeway should be constructed within three years. What will happen when this additional traffic comes on the roads?

Mr. Langley: All right then, what will happen: tell us?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Unley will have to bring Dr. Breuning back, and he will say that providing public transport is the best way of handling it and that modern cars will be needed. The Commissioner of Highways, on his return from America, said that

freeways were by no means dead but that they are still being built, they are the only method so far known of shifting large groups of people quickly, and they are still needed. I support most of the clauses of the Bill, but strongly condemn the Minister of Roads and Transport. I must be hurting him because he is not chirping like a magpie as he did when other members were speaking.

Mr. COURCEL (Torrens): I support the second reading. Some clauses I support wholeheartedly, especially those which deal with the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act and which give effect to the implementation of the provisions of that Act, and other clauses that will provide greater safety for the travelling public. I have no doubt that many places in the State, particularly in the metropolitan area, and in the city of Adelaide, require extensive improvements. Some of the clauses in the Bill will enable the Highways Department, and particularly the Commissioner, to take action to improve these situations. I could enumerate a number of intersections, as every member could in his own district; he could name various dangerous intersections that could be greatly improved. As previous speakers have said, it is not what the Minister said in his second reading speech that matters—it is what he did not say. That is not a bad one when I am referring to the Minister in charge of this Bill, because he was one of the most vocal members when he was in Opposition. Nobody could deny that—least of all the Minister himself. The member for Unley would concur with me, as he usually does.

Having said that many of these amendments are necessary and that I support them, I come to the point that the Minister in his speech outlined the bare bones of the Bill, and what he did not say was more important than what he did say because, after all, what he did not say and what the Bill does say is preparing the way for some type of M.A.T.S. plan, whether it is called a M.A.T.S. plan or has some other name. There is no doubt that this is the thin end of the wedge. I will start from the beginning of the Bill and quote clause 2, which states:

... for any purpose—
taken in conjunction with the principal Act—
which in the opinion of the Commissioner is necessary or desirable to facilitate any scheme of road construction or development that may be undertaken by the Commissioner in the future.

If we look at several other clauses of the Bill, we see the same type of terminology. This is,

of course, the first step to a revised M.A.T.S. plan, a re-revised M.A.T.S. plan, or whatever one likes to call it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are not really serious?

Mr. COURCEL: I am serious. When the Minister was the member for Edwardstown and was sitting behind where I am now standing—

Mr. Langley: He will never sit there again.

Mr. COURCEL: That is so—he may be kicked out altogether. I remember that, of all the members of the then Opposition, he was the one who was the most vocal and vitriolic about the M.A.T.S. plan. On every possible occasion, he got up and condemned that plan. I agree that that was his right and his privilege. It appears from the policy speech that the member for Alexandra so kindly read out to help the memories of some honourable members that the Government said it was going to review and redraw the M.A.T.S. plan and that, in doing that, it would still have freeways for the Tea Tree Gully and Glenelg areas; they would still be necessary, but the plan would be redrawn.

This Bill provides the first step towards that. It is significant what the Minister said, after Dr. Breuning had been brought out here by the present Government to report upon the M.A.T.S. plan, the M.A.T.S. plan which it took so long to prepare during the Walsh-Dunstan Government and which most conveniently did not see the light of day, for various reasons, until the previous Liberal Government took office. It was most convenient that it did not turn up in time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who started the investigation?

Mr. COURCEL: And who carried it on?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We did.

Mr. COURCEL: Who put it on our plate the moment we got into office? The moment that it was put on our plate, the member for Edwardstown damned the thing right, left and centre and got into all sorts of trouble in his own district. Some people wanted the 1962 plan, some wanted the 1968 plan, and some wanted a different plan altogether. The Minister even enlisted the help of the member for Glenelg to try to get him out of his trouble, by suggesting a route along the Sturt River. We all remember these things, and how we remember them! The present Government then said, "We're going to get out of this fix somehow. Seeing the trouble we're in, we'll get Dr. Breuning out." Dr. Breuning came out, and I vividly recall the present Premier's talking about Dr. Breuning and referring to

dial-a-bus schemes and wonderful automotive ideas and up-to-date plans, but we have heard nothing about it since. I think it would be about two months or 2½ months since Dr. Breuning left.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's right.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister was courteous enough to say that he would release that report as soon as possible, but we have not heard a word about it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you sure?

Mr. COUMBE: We have not.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you sure?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'd better read *Hansard*.

Mr. COUMBE: What are we going to get?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Read *Hansard*!

Mr. COUMBE: I see; I have to read *Hansard*. The Minister cannot recall what Dr. Breuning said, so he is inviting me to read *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can't recall what your own members have said; that's what it is!

Mr. COUMBE: I can see that the Minister is taking a few liberties here. Are we going to get a dial-a-bus system? Are we going to get these moving footpaths?

Mr. Langley: Get out of fantasy land!

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member may have been in Disneyland; I have been past it but never inside. Referring to the congestion in American cities, I recall that the case is often cited (I have cited it, too) of Los Angeles, where the horrible mistake has been made of bringing most of the traffic into one part of the city, and there is this horrible concrete mess (three or four tiers of freeways coming into the one point). However, the original American report said that Adelaide was ideally situated, because of radial and cross transport. I remind those members who have been to Los Angeles that it suffers from one great disability, apart from the smog, the huge number of people living there and some of the Hollywood stars; there is only one railway, namely, the old Santa Fe railway that runs down to Mexico. There are no radial lines at all.

The first thing that one sees in Los Angeles is the huge stream of motor cars (the biggest cars possible; there is none of the mini cars that we have here), and nearly all of the cars have only one person in them. Here, we have a Bill, which I am supporting, because I believe it will introduce some measures that

will provide greater safety facilities. However, it also provides a first step for a revised type of M.A.T.S. plan, because what did the Minister say? He is going to provide for hardship cases. Of course, that immediately conjures up those people who will be moved from their houses or dispossessed of their land because of the development of freeways. The Bill provides that the Commissioner may buy land to build new roads, and so on. For all the criticism that has been levelled at the M.A.T.S. plan, it has one great virtue, which is that people travelling from north to south, say from Tea Tree Gully to the district of the member for Mawson, do not have to go through the city of Adelaide. Members who have studied the plan will have seen that there are detours, such as the North Adelaide by-pass and the Hindmarsh crossover, north and south of Adelaide. This important aspect is missing in much of the planning of American cities, which have the disability that their roads radiate to the centre of or to a particular point in a city. The M.A.T.S. plan provides for by-passing the city of Adelaide.

Also, it provides for someone to travel directly from Tea Tree Gully, for example, to the city on a freeway. In addition, it provides for the rail rapid transit system and places much emphasis on public transport. Critics of the scheme have misconstrued this, saying that not enough emphasis was placed on public transport. Apart from the rail rapid transit system, which is important, great provision is made for other forms of public transport. As well as freeways and expressways, the plan provides for the upgrading of subsidiary roads, and that is most important, particularly from the point of view of local government. Great improvements are proposed to be made to some of the subsidiary roads in the area of the member for Price. Also, there is reference to a freeway to serve his district, and he and the member for Semaphore represent districts where there is an interest in getting goods to factories and from factories to these districts for shipping. A mistake made in originally interpreting the plan was to think that it dealt only with the motor car. Certainly there are too many cars for the roads today, and unfortunately that number is growing.

An important aspect of the plan is the provision for conveyance of goods to and from factories. In this respect we must consider articles carried by the ordinary carter, heavy haulage, refrigerated vans, containers,

mail waggons, and so on. Possibly the member for Peake will remember my saying in the House previously that last year I was able to travel from Scotland to Liverpool, simply because of the freeway, more quickly than I was able to travel from Liverpool to Manchester, and I travelled on one of the safest roads I have ever used.

Besides making provisions for road safety, which I thoroughly support, other parts of the Bill prepare the way for some future plan similar to the M.A.T.S. plan. That is because they provide for the hardship cases, for the acquisition of land (all of which is necessary), for the transfer of people, and so on. We on this side look forward eagerly to the Minister's telling the House in due course what Dr. Breuning has said. I cannot comment on his report, because I have not seen it, and I doubt whether Cabinet or the Minister has seen it. As the member for Alexandra has said, the report is on the way, but we do not know whether it has gone to Cuba by mistake. As the Government has been in office for more than five months and Dr. Breuning has been gone for about 2½ months, it is time we resolved this matter. Planning could have commenced by now to overcome the terrible problem of overcrowding on our roads, particularly in the suburbs.

Not only those who live in the city are involved in this overcrowding. My district takes in part of the city, and everyone travelling to Adelaide from the north, the north-east, Eyre Peninsula, or Yorke Peninsula must go through my district. My council or the Highways Department must maintain those roads. Unfortunately, at times pedestrians in my district cannot cross the roads. It is impossible for me to drive my car out of most of the side streets in my district on to the Main North Road, which is the main arterial road to the north-east or to the peninsulas. The only way I can get out to travel to Prospect or Nailsworth is to turn left and go north with the traffic for about a mile or half a mile, until I get a chance to return to the right.

Mr. Crimes: You must be a poor driver.

Mr. Langley: You're exaggerating slightly.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not exaggerating and I invite the honourable member to come with me on a busy day and experience the difficulty.

Mr. Langley: You said that every time you travelled there, you couldn't get across.

Mr. COUMBE: I am sorry if I said that. I meant that it happens at most times when I travel there. Certainly, at 3 a.m. or on a Sunday morning I could get across. A par-

ticularly bad corner, which is at the end of my street and which the member for Unley knows well, is the Windmill corner.

Mr. Clark: Why would he know that particularly?

Mr. COUMBE: Pedestrians cannot cross the North-East Road in the Tea Tree Gully area in my district.

Mr. Langley: I don't know anything about the Windmill corner.

Mr. COUMBE: Some scheme must be evolved without delay in the interests of safety and in the interests of controlling the transit of motor vehicles on our roads, whether they be motor cycles, motor cars or heavy or light lorries. Every day we delay, this problem is getting worse. Whilst the Bill provides for safety purposes, it also gives the green light to a M.A.T.S. plan in whatever form it may eventually evolve, whether it be a revised or modified plan or something else. I do not know how we are going to work a dial-a-bus system in my area. However, that is by the way.

I am quite prepared to support the second reading of this Bill because I believe it contains very necessary measures. At the same time, it will grant the Commissioner powers to provide for those persons who may be displaced. One thing that concerns me is that some people are worried because of the lack of an announcement by this Government about its plans. As a result, some people do not know whether they will lose their homes. I believe that in their interests, quite apart from any other consideration, a decision must be made and this matter resolved.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I think most aspects of the Government's policy or lack of policy have been highlighted by members on this side of the House. However, I want to draw the attention of the House to the subject matter of a question in another place, a question that raises intriguing details about what I think all members of the House would like to know more. In answer to a question in that House, the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport gave an answer in relation to the payment of Dr. Breuning that was similar to the one given in this House to a similar inquiry. However, of more interest to me was the reply given in relation to the Highways Department's programme. The Minister said:

In the Highways Department's programme for 1969-70 an amount of \$12,583,981 was spent on declared urban arterial roads, which are part of the roads and routes shown in the M.A.T.S. Report.

Therefore, more than \$12,500,000 has already been spent on a programme that has been withdrawn! The next part of the answer is even more interesting, because it is as follows:

This figure included Commonwealth Funds totalling \$7,780,000. The corresponding expenditure for the 1970-71 financial year is estimated to be \$12,896,850, including Commonwealth funds of \$9,450,000.

So, this plan that has been withdrawn is going to have nearly \$13,000,000 spent on it under this Government's programme. Where on earth do we stand in relation to Government policy? Time after time during this session the Opposition has accused the Government of being leaderless, confused, and less than frank in relation to its programmes, and here again we find that even though the programme has supposedly been withdrawn it is having money spent on it by the very Government that says it has withdrawn it.

The confusion is added to further by the very strong inference and rumour circulating in this town that the Minister already has Dr. Breuning's report in his possession. I should like to hear from the Minister in Committee whether he has this report and whether he has approved of it. What is the Government trying to hoax the community with in this State? This is one thing in respect of which the Minister will not be able to impose his will on the community. It is a matter of real moment to the community that this city, at the proper time in its planning and development, should have a transportation programme leading into the future, a programme that will provide in proper stages the development that will complement its building programme, and not something that is to be withdrawn and the responsibility left to future generations, which will find it far more costly because of the present neglect and confusion.

Also, it is not a problem that is to be met by the Minister and his Leader saying that they will withdraw this programme for political reasons while continuing to implement it in practice. We want to know more about this Bill, which enables the department to be streamlined in order to meet the transport needs of the State. I should like to hear from the Minister something other than the confusion that he has introduced to the House, and something that will give the public a lead as to what he intends to do on their behalf.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): First, Mr. Speaker, I should seek your authority and permission to speak

to the Bill, about which we have heard nothing for the last hour and a half. If members had taken the interest in this Bill that they have tried to display, they would have read my second reading explanation. I do not intend to deal with the poppycock of the member for Alexandra or of his puppet (the member for Mitcham) when they said that this speech was prepared by a Parliamentary Draftsman. It was, but before presenting it to the House I approved of it, and I take the responsibility for it. I do not hide behind public servants as some members do, and I am proud of the contents of the Bill. It adequately covers the position, and if Opposition members had read my second reading explanation, as well as the Bill, they would have realized that 95 per cent of what has been said in this debate was completely off the track. If they want to filibuster, that is up to them. I do not care: the responsibility for wasting time is theirs and not mine. The Leader has allegedly been interested in Dr. Breuning's report. He asked why it was not here and whether I was hiding something. I think his hypocrisy has been adequately shown, because on October 22 he asked the following question:

Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he is aware that many weeks have passed since Dr. Breuning left South Australia and, if he is aware of that, will he tell the House when Dr. Breuning's report will be made available to members?

I replied to that question, and he has not seen fit to ask the question again since. That is how interested he is in it. It is sheer hypocrisy.

Mr. Hall: Do you have the report or don't you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reply is on page 2000 of *Hansard*, and the member for Torrens can read it.

Mr. Hall: Do you have the report now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I gave the answer then. If the Leader likes to ask a question at the appropriate time, I shall give him the appropriate answer. The Breuning report is not even mentioned in the Bill. If it was, I would feel obliged to give the honourable member the reply he seeks.

Mr. Hall: Why do you avoid giving the reply now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It has nothing to do with the Bill, and I am trying to talk to the Bill. I know it may be a little strange for a member to do this.

Mr. Coumbe: The Bill is quite elastic.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Torrens gave us a travelogue; he took us around the world.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The Minister is replying to the debate and the subject matter must be observed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Torrens even went as far as talking about Disneyland, and I think he tried to ridicule the Premier in his references to systems such as dial-a-bus.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is extraneous matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Probably, the member for Rocky River shares the view of the member for Torrens; so many of these stodgy people think the same. If, however, we could get in South Australia a venture only half as profitable as Disneyland, our public transport would be in a far better position than it is now.

Mr. Coumbe: That is done by private enterprise.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not care whether it is. The member opposite cannot deny my statement of fact.

Mr. Coumbe: I'm not trying to.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If members will concentrate on this Bill, I shall be happy to debate the M.A.T.S. plan at any time they desire but, out of deference to Parliamentary procedure, we should debate the M.A.T.S. plan at the right time.

Mrs. Steele: When will that be?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Davenport wants to debate—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am happy to debate it at any time but, if my memory serves me right, when the M.A.T.S. plan was last debated in this House I did not notice the member for Davenport rise to her feet; in fact, I noticed that the current Leader of the Opposition directed his members not to get to their feet, and they obeyed to a man.

Mr. Jennings: How about the woman—she obeyed, too!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Alexandra was good enough to tell the House what the Premier said when he delivered his policy speech, but he forgot to say that another character stood up and said that the Government would continue its open road policy; the public transport proposals in the M.A.T.S. would be vigorously pursued. Then

52 per cent of the people said they did not want such a policy.

Mr. Venning: Where did you get that from?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At least 52 per cent of the people rejected the policy of the Leader.

Mr. Rodda: You should try them now!

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What is this Bill trying to do?

Mr. Hall: You tell us.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the Leader had taken the trouble to read the second reading explanation he would not have had to strain himself for one minute, because he would have found out in the first four lines.

Mr. Hall: It's not what's in it but what isn't in it that I am worried about.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Even the Leader ought to know—that the things that are not written into a Bill do not go into an Act, and therefore they are not part of the law of this land.

Mr. Hall: They are probably part of a private directive.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This Bill, first, enlarges the purposes for which expenditure may be incurred against the Highways Fund and extends the power of the Commissioner in relation to road planning and research. Why are we extending the power of the Commissioner? None of the members opposite told us.

Mr. Coumbe: That's for you to tell us.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should have thought the member for Torrens would know, because he was a member of the Cabinet that used Treasury funds to buy land, because of the stupidity of his Government. The ex-Treasurer knows that to be a fact.

Mr. Hall: Following the programme outlined by the Labor Party!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following no programme outlined by the Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reason for this situation was that the former Government, in its endeavour to make a great big splash, trying to make a hero of itself, received the M.A.T.S. Report, to which the member for Torrens has referred, and could not give it to the public quickly enough. It did not take the trouble to read it or to find out what effect it would have on the people; it just gave it to them and said, "Look at us; we're the forward-planning Government. This is what will happen in 1986." But the ex-Minister gave the game away when he said, "This will

cut the city up, we know, but you must have it; but even in 1986 you will still be jammed up with traffic"—

Mr. Hall: Seeing you spent \$700,000—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Members of the former Government then realized that they had some political pressures put on them, and we suddenly found that the freeway that went through the former Districts of Burnside and Mitcham, which were held by Cabinet Ministers, was deferred.

Mr. Hall: What implication are you making?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not making any implications; I am stating a fact. The project was suddenly deferred and, by the Government's deferring it, the Commissioner of Highways was denied the right under the Highways Act to acquire properties by using Highways funds. How did the former Government get out of that hole? It used Treasury money to offset the hardships that it had created in respect of people who wanted to sell their properties. This Bill seeks to rectify the mismanagement of the former Government. No wonder Opposition members talk all this drivel about the M.A.T.S. plan: they have a guilty conscience.

Mr. Hall: Personalities again!

Mr. Coumbe: You're back to your old form.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not; I never left my old form. This Bill is seeking to rectify the mismanagement of the former Liberal Government.

Mr. Hall: The political attitude always! Hang the people!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Never mind about hanging the people.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader (as Premier), his colleague the former Minister of Roads and Transport, and the rest of his Cabinet thrust the M.A.T.S. plan on to the people without considering what effects it would have. They adequately displayed their contempt for the needs and the future of the people of this State.

Mr. Hall: Can you tell us why you're still building the M.A.T.S. plan?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader knows as well as I know that we are not building the M.A.T.S. plan and that we have taken no steps whatever to pursue that plan since we have been in office. However, we have required

a complete revision to be made. We have had two experts go fairly thoroughly, in a limited space of time, into the problems associated with transport in this State.

Mr. Hall: And you'll spend over \$12,000,000 next year on it, your Ministerial colleague said.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As a result of that revision, I hope that soon we will announce to the House and the people, who are eagerly awaiting it, the solution to the mess the former Government created in this regard.

Mr. Coumbe: Come on now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member knows that is true. People are still living under a cloud of uncertainty because of the premature release of this plan. Unfortunately the member for Mitcham has left us.

Mr. Hall: I don't blame him.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think he should have left a long time ago. He complained that the Bill would give the Commissioner of Highways a blank cheque. This statement was made by a former Minister who presumably has no trust whatever in the Public Service. However, as I have complete confidence in the Commissioner, I am not afraid to give him an open cheque. If the honourable member had read the Bill correctly, he would have found that provision is made to give the Commissioner power to do certain things, subject to the authority of the Minister. Therefore, I can only assume that the former Attorney-General is afraid that, if his Party ever gets back into Government again, it will not be able to find a Minister it can trust. He has said he is not prepared to give the Commissioner a blank cheque, but the Bill is not doing that. If one continues to analyse the statements made by members opposite which were occasionally relevant to the Bill, one finds that in fact the members who made those statements have not even taken the trouble to read the Bill.

Mr. Coumbe: That's not true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not believe that some of the statements that have been made would have been made had members read the Bill. The member for Torrens said that clause 2 opened the way for a M.A.T.S. plan in some form or another, but I have already dealt with that. The clause does not do that: it merely provides the vehicle to rectify the failings of the previous Government. It will permit the Highways Department to continue to buy these properties, even

though the freeway routes have been abandoned. If this provision is read properly in its correct context (not read just as a clause in this Bill but read in conjunction with the Act), that will be found to be the situation. I do not think there is any need for me to reply to any of the other points raised, as most of them were irrelevant. I believe that the few which I had not touched on and which may be relevant can be dealt with in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Power to acquire land."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This clause widens the powers of acquisition of land and refers to any purpose which, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Highways, is necessary or desirable. I understand that in the principal Act the opinion of the Commissioner is not an operating factor in other provisions regarding acquisition. Although the Committee has confidence in the Commissioner, we should ensure that those to whom power is given are limited in some way and I ask the Minister what test will be applied to the opinion of the Commissioner and for what purpose he would need to acquire land other than the purposes referred to in the Act.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Section 20a of the Act provides:

Without limiting the general powers of the Commissioner under the last preceding section, the Commissioner may subject to the approval of the Minister acquire any land or interest in the land . . . for any of the following purposes:

Then three purposes are set out, and this clause merely adds a fourth purpose.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Is it still subject to the Minister's approval?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, that is already in the preamble to the new paragraph. With the new paragraph inserted, the section would read:

Without limiting the general powers of the Commissioner under the last preceding section, the Commissioner may subject to the approval of the Minister acquire any land or interest in the land . . . for any of the following purposes: . . .

(d) for any purpose which in the opinion of the Commissioner is necessary or desirable to facilitate any scheme of road construction or development that may be undertaken by the Commissioner in the future.

It will not be necessary to wait until a scheme is laid down and adopted before the Com-

missioner may act; he will be able to act in advance.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Any acquisition should be stated in a report ordered by Statute to be presented to Parliament. Acts administered by the Minister of Lands, for example, require such action and, if that is not required in this case, I draw the Minister's attention to the matter.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I take it that this is one clause that the Minister was referring to when he said that he would use certain aspects of this Bill to put right mistakes made by the previous Government in relation to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. If this is not one of those clauses, and as I understand that Dr. Breuning's report will guide the Government substantially about what it does in future, I now ask the Minister, following my question of October 22, whether he has now seen Dr. Breuning's report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Acquisition in case of hardship."

Dr. EASTICK: New section 20ba (1) gives the Minister over-powering authority, because there is no appeal to any court or tribunal. It states that the Minister may grant a certificate but that no proceedings shall be instituted or heard in any court or tribunal in respect of the grant of such a certificate or the failure or refusal of the Minister to grant such a certificate. In other words, the Minister makes a decision from which there is no appeal.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what there would be to appeal against. I am not sure whether the honourable member realizes what this clause is doing. When a person wishes to sell his property to the Highways Department, the Minister must grant a certificate to say that the land falls within certain limits. Subsection (2) sets out clearly and concisely the factors on which the Minister must be fully satisfied. If he was satisfied on those points, it seems a fairly reasonable assumption that he would grant a certificate for the land transaction to proceed. It would be wrong for any court or tribunal to override a decision of Government control in such a matter. If it could do so, a person could go to a court and say, "I want to sell my land to the Commissioner of Highways, but he won't buy it and the Minister won't buy it," and a court could order the Commissioner to buy the property. That would be an invidious position. Surely no member opposite would

accept that a court should be able to direct a land agent or any other person to buy a house or other property.

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Minister subscribe to the opinion that a Minister can never be wrong?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, I do not. I think that is a silly question. Of course a Minister can be wrong. In fact, we have had plenty of examples of that in this House over the last two years. However, surely there is sufficient area here for common sense to prevail. Some form of discussion would take place, and the Commissioner of Highways and his staff would investigate the various aspects. The honourable member would surely realize that the Minister would not physically do all these things himself: they would be done for him. A report would be brought forward and, while it is true that the Minister could be wrong, I think the chances of that are so remote that it is not worth considering.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree with what the Minister said on the question of the approach by the owner. However, I have a query on compensation payable in cases of hardship. Can the Minister say whether new section 20ba (2) (c) deals with the question of compensation? The new section provides that the owner may apply to the Minister if he is not satisfied with the price that the Highways Department is offering for the land, but he has no appeal.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This has nothing to do with the price that the Commissioner would offer. The person has to satisfy the Minister that the whole or part of the land may be required, that the value of the land has been depressed because of the likelihood of a road being constructed, and that the value of the land is adversely affected so that the owner may suffer substantial hardship. Many cases have been dealt with where, for one of a hundred reasons, a person has to sell his house, and establishes hardship. It is a combination of all the factors.

Mr. Coumbe: You say he would not suffer as a result of this?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No. It is on the certificate being granted that the Commissioner starts the machinery of negotiating about the price.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. RODDA (Victoria) 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 appeals.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2176.)

Clause 2—"Powers of inspector."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have an amendment on file to strike out "and" after paragraph (a).

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): That is only a clerical error that can be corrected after the amendment of the member for Alexandra has been dealt with.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As long as it needs only a clerical correction and is made consequently, I am satisfied.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

In paragraph (b) after "may" first occurring to insert ", with the specific approval in writing of the Minister,".

The powers of the inspector under the Act, which are to be widened by the Bill, will be slightly altered as a result of this amendment. It has been pointed out that most of the matters with which an inspector has to deal under this Act concern safety and things for which a person can easily be trained to reach the requisite degree of skill to operate as an inspector. The present provision in the Bill, including the Premier's amendment, creates such a wide power that it would probably apply to Leigh Creek (I am not sure of that), and it would probably apply to the operations at Iron Knob. It can apply, as I presume it is meant to apply, in the Coober Pedy area. If I am wrong in that respect, it is certainly meant to apply to the Adelaide hills face zone.

An inspector is not a person whose training necessarily authorizes him to give an opinion on the undue impairment of an amenity. I do not know what training is required or who is qualified in this respect, but it seems reasonable to me to amend the existing provision so that the inspector shall be at least limited in carrying out these duties to the extent that he must have the approval in writing of the Minister. After all, no sudden decision has to be taken: this is the sort of matter than can and should be discussed at the highest levels within the department, and I think the Minister should know when the inspector intends to operate under this provision. I believe the Committee will agree

with me that a strong case exists for having Ministerial control over these decisions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that I cannot agree to the amendment. I point out that in the amendments which I have on file and which will be discussed later by the Committee (they have been proposed after lengthy discussion with the Director of Planning, the State Planning Authority, the Mines Department, and quarrying interests) it is proposed that an appeal may be made, in effect, to the Minister, advised by a board. It would really be quite inappropriate for the Minister to authorize something directly to which there would later be an appeal administratively to him, because that would be like going from Caesar to Caesar. The honourable member has suggested that in this matter the inspectors do not have to take sudden decisions, but in some cases they do. Indeed, during the life of the former Government complaints were made to the department (and they are on file) that the topsoil was taken off areas in the Adelaide hills face zone for the specific purpose of preventing decisions by the State Planning Authority and founding a basis for saying that there was an existing user before regulations recommended by the Extractive Industries Committee had been brought into effect. What could have happened if this power had been there was that an inspector could have gone out and said, "Hey, stop!" I can remember raising a matter in this House and producing to the Government photographs of an extraordinary increase in quarrying activity of the most unsightly nature in the Adelaide Hills which, if this power had existed, could have been stopped and examined. The Government admitted that there had been a breach of the Planning and Development Act in what had been done. However, before any action could be taken by the State Planning Authority it was far too late and the damage had been done. In these circumstances, there are occasions when a complaint comes in and an inspector should be able to go there and say, "Halt; let us have a look at this."

The question then raised was as to the inspector's powers in relation to decisions on the amenity of an area, and it was said that an inspector was not necessarily one who was trained in planning. I point out to the honourable member that there are, as he knows, administrative provisions now operating through the Extractive Industries Committee which keep the Mines Department in close touch with the State Planning Authority as to an effective and co-ordinated effort to plan for the amenity of

any area in which mining or extractive industry takes place that is within the terms of the State Planning Authority's authority; that is, it is in an area for which a plan has been adopted. In these circumstances it is quite proper for an inspector to be able to make some decision about amenity. In fact, the Mines Department is kept in touch with the decisions and views of the State Planning Authority through the working of the Extractive Industries Committee. The whole of this measure has been worked out with the co-operation of the State Planning Authority, which is satisfied (and the Director is satisfied) that the measure proposed will in fact meet the basic planning needs within this particular area.

What is more, it has been made clear to the quarrying interests that what is intended here is that each of the quarries in a planning area will be asked to prepare a long-term plan for its development and for the restoration of the area so that we know what is the plan for taking the material out of that quarry, what is ultimately proposed in the area, how it is to be restored and how, in the meantime, overburden is to be disposed of so that the amenity (the general aspect of the area from the town planning point of view) is not impaired further than is absolutely necessary by the quarrying operations. Honourable members opposite know that once an agreement is made with the Government as to a proposal of that kind it is an agreement on which subsequent Governments act, and that is the intention here. What is proposed (and this has been made clear to the quarrying interests, a number of whom have said that they are satisfied on this score) is that we will be able to work out long-term plans in relation to quarrying, particularly in relation to quarrying in the Adelaide Hills area, which is the quarrying about which there has been a great deal of worry and upset, and that we will know just where these places are going; and the quarry owners will know that, too.

If those plans are adhered to there will not be any question of an inspector's going out and making some direction or order that will interfere with the operation of the quarry. The progress and purpose of the activity have been agreed on a long-term basis. In those circumstances, the proposals we have are designed to obtain the most satisfactory and easily administered method of control available to us. The amendment requires that approval must be given by the Minister beforehand of an order which, of course, he may not

be able to approve quickly when something is very urgent, and I do not think that that is a sensible course.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that the Minister will not accept this amendment, and I also say that I do not think much of the amendments that he has on the file. Whether the Committee accepts those amendments or not, I cannot accept what he has said about this amendment. All that the member for Alexandra is asking is that, before an inspector acts, he should consult the Minister and get his approval in writing. I cannot believe that the urgency would be such as to preclude an inspector from discussing a matter with the Minister. If it is urgent and obvious that action should be taken, the Minister, in a matter of minutes, will direct the inspector in writing or approve in writing of the inspector's stopping the work. What the Minister has said will not wash, and he gave it away in the second part of his statement, because he said that this was to be worked out in co-operation with quarry owners, having regard to long-term plans, and so on. In that case, there would not be much urgency.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There would be urgency if there was a breach.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but I cannot accept that the time taken to consult the Minister and get his approval in writing would be so long as to allow irreparable damage to be done, and that is what the Minister's objection to the amendment boils down to. The honourable member has moved the amendment because we do not consider that we should give the inspector such enormous powers. These powers are very much at large. They are matters of opinion, yet they can mean much financially to those operating quarries and to their customers. None of us is so naive as to think that any additional costs of this kind will be or should be borne by quarry operators: the community will have to bear them.

In the long time that I have been here, I have often heard members on my side say (and I have also heard the Minister say this many times), that we need Ministerial responsibility. This amendment would entail Ministerial responsibility. A Minister is answerable in Parliament for what goes on in his department and a Minister should have the earliest opportunity to make up his mind about what is being done by his officers when the powers and consequences are so great. The amendment will not delay matters to the extent the Premier has stated and it will act as a safe-

guard against ill-considered action. Parliament will be able to sheet home to the Minister responsibility for actions taken.

Mr. RODDA: I, too, regret that the Premier has indicated that he cannot accept the amendment. He was rather nebulous regarding the instance he gave of topsoil being removed on a site to show that a quarry had in fact been started. This casts aspersions on all quarry operators or owners in the metropolitan area. I think that in this industry we have honourable and upstanding people making a very far-reaching and valuable contribution to our economy, and I rather deprecate the Premier's remarks in this matter. Although he gave what he called a specific instance, he did not name any particular person, although he says that the particulars are on file. This casts the general aspersion on all quarry owners that they do these wilful things and that as a consequence these powers must be vested in his inspector. I suggest that this power could be vested in the Minister.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are not suggesting that any of the other powers are being restricted; they are enormously wide.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: They are safety standards.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are not; they refer to things such as nuisances.

Mr. RODDA: We are talking about a specific power to control quarrying in this State. It is aimed at controlling a specific industry.

Mrs. STEELE: I, too, support my colleagues on this side in this matter. The concern of members on this side all along has been the very wide and sweeping powers given to an inspector under this Bill. Most of us dwelt at some length on the question of those powers. We have all conceded that the inspector in his own field is a person whose opinion is to be respected, and I believe that his opinion is respected. What we are concerned about is that an inspector is being given power to decide whether or not the amenity of a district is being debased. I point out that in the development of a quarry vast sums are expended on forward planning. If, for instance, this has to be referred under appeal to an appeal committee, those funds are tied up and also work is prevented from going on.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is one of the reasons for proposing the time for appeal rather than the very lengthy procedures that would otherwise be involved.

Mrs. STEELE: The Premier has declined to accept the amendment of the member for Alexandra which would ensure that if there were any danger of this amenity being destroyed the inspector could confer with his Minister at very short notice and, I believe, quite satisfactorily, and this would not entail holding up work which is imperative to the development of a quarry under a long-term plan. I am sorry that the Minister cannot accept this because I believe it is a situation which could be quite easily expedited and one which, I believe, would have the co-operation of the mining authorities. I hope the Minister will reconsider this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry that I cannot reconsider the position. I believe that the Act has worked satisfactorily in the past, and there is no question that the inspectors have abused their powers. The administrative arrangements I have outlined make it highly improbable that there would be abuse of powers by inspectors, or anything of the kind that Opposition members fear. I point out that, at present, powers of inspectors (and they are wide powers indeed) do not require prior Ministerial approval and are not confined to matters of safety. These powers are there now without any further prior Ministerial approval and, indeed, at present without any appeal provision either.

Under section 10 (1) III (e) of the Act the inspector may examine and make inquiry respecting many things, including any mining operations which are creating or are likely to create a nuisance, or are damaging or are likely to damage property. Also, he may order to be discontinued in or about any mine any mining operations or practices which are likely to create a nuisance or damage property. There does not even have to be an existing nuisance. They are the powers the inspector has now without prior Ministerial approval and they were written into the Act a considerable time ago; in fact, they were taken over from the English Act. In these circumstances the exercise of the authority by the inspector is proper. The only thing added here is that we are talking (apart from a specific nuisance) of some damage to the general amenity of the area in a planning sense. Through the operation of the Extractive Industries Committee the view of the State Planning Authority as to what is the proper amenity of the area is communicated to the inspector.

I think Opposition members are seeing something sinister here that does not exist, and I think the operation of this Act has

worked well. The member for Brighton (now the Minister for Education) has raised many times the question of quarrying operations in his district and has protested that inspectors have not been tough about them. I have seen these reports. The necessity of keeping the industry in a viable form is something that is obvious indeed to the Mines Department, and that has been the history of the operation of this Act. I see no reason why that should alter in these circumstances. We are being careful in these proposals to be much more considerate of mining interests than is the present Act.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter is of such wide importance that it justifies pressing further. First, there is no criticism of inspectors or their past activities. I am pleased that they have acted in the way that most inspectors working under State Acts have acted, that is, responsibly and with moderation. The widest power in the past to which the Premier has referred was that relating to creating a nuisance. There is a long list of other powers, too; but now we are embarking on this matter of undue impairment of an amenity, which is so much a matter of opinion that the Minister should be brought into it. I do not believe that out and out urgency is required in a case like this. Every Minister of Development and Mines is available enough to be able to operate this power satisfactorily.

The Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, said there could be an appeal to a Minister from his own decision. My colleague the member for Victoria has an amendment on file which, if carried, could completely alter the position, because it would provide for a proper appeal board. The Minister has also said that the proposal will be to ask the quarrying interests to produce master plans of what they intend to do, what their programme will be and how they intend to rehabilitate the area. We know they cannot rehabilitate the area to any great extent, if at all, while they are operating a quarry. Whilst there is no doubt that the plan will be carried out, I do not know of anything in this legislation to enforce the rehabilitation of an area. But surely we in this Committee can know a little more of what it is intended to do with the hills face zone.

I have been speaking on this legislation on the assumption that the Government is not seriously thinking of stopping quarrying activity in the hills face zone, but we should have a general statement of what the Government

intends to do; otherwise, we are handing over a power to an inspector who is perfectly entitled to stop all quarrying in the hills face zone if, in his opinion, the amenity of the area is being impaired unduly. That is the opinion of many citizens of the State but not, I hope, of the inspectors. The very extent of these powers demands that a policy statement be made of what the future will hold. We know that the quarries at present are being worked, for the most part, away from the city of Adelaide and they should not be extended considerably in the plans. Those interests will be able to show, when they produce their plans for the Minister, that the breadth of their quarrying operations as seen from Adelaide will not be greatly increased, but they certainly intend to dig further into the hills. I am sure that will be in their plans. It would help me in my thinking if the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, would give us a statement of what is intended to be done with the hills face zone.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is intended is that there should be no spread of existing quarrying but that there should be long-term plans for the eventual phasing out of the quarrying and the restoration of the area. We do not intend to close down quarrying activity where there has obviously been a marked investment in the area and where people have bought land for an existing use pre-existing the Planning and Development Act. But what we do not want is the spread of quarrying of the kind to which the honourable member refers, that is, a marked widening of the quarry face which completely impairs the aspect either towards Adelaide or in the immediately surrounding area. We want to ensure in the plans concerned that the quarrying proceeds in a reasonable manner without a spread further of scarring of the zone. We believe, after consultation with the quarrying interests, that this can be achieved, but we wish to see that it is achieved in an orderly manner and that we are not faced suddenly with some wide new strip of topsoil taken off and quarrying and blasting operations taking place without there having been a proper plan, confining the development of the quarries to what the people themselves say that regard as the way to proceed in future. I refer to the sort of thing that occurred here two years ago when I raised the matter in the House, the then Minister in charge of planning in South Australia eventually agreeing that there had been a breach of the Planning and Development Act.

We want to see that the sort of thing which, in the Greenhill area, completely transformed the aspect of the place and scarred it extremely badly does not take place.

Mr. Rodda: Is this the specific instance you referred to?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is one specific instance; it is not the only one, but it was the one that was raised in this Chamber, and the Minister admitted, through his Minister representing him in this place, that there had been a breach of the Act. Unfortunately, however, it had taken place, and under the Planning and Development Act the then Government had no means of taking swift action at all until the matter had gone far beyond the bounds of what had been previously notified to the Government or to the State Planning Authority concerning the plans for quarrying the area. In these circumstances, we must have the possibility of ensuring that plans are developed which are kept to, so that we maintain the beauty of the hills face zone as an essential part of the plan and so that there is not this widening of the scarring in the area.

Mr. RODDA: The Premier said that there was to be no spread and that no topsoil would be taken off: do I understand him to mean that an existing quarry would be able to work only on its present face? Obviously, these quarries, which are important to the State, will want to open up a new face. Do I understand that that is prohibited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; where an existing quarry is being worked out, we want from that quarry an effective plan as to how it is to be worked out, so that we may minimize the scarring in the area and ensure its rehabilitation. We do not intend to close down a quarrying operation that existed prior to the Planning and Development Act, but we would certainly be opposed to opening new areas acquired after the passing of the Planning and Development Act and the adoption of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan and to scarring in those new areas. In relation to the existing quarrying, we want to see how quarries can be worked out and the area rehabilitated.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): There has been much publicity specifically in the opal-mining industry, and questions have been asked about the Government's intention regarding the back-filling of bulldozer cuts in particular. Will the Premier say what is the Government's intention in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On that matter, the specific provision for the back filling of bulldozer cuts will be introduced as a piece of legislation in the comprehensive revision of the Mining Act. It is not intended that action be taken under the Mines and Works Inspection Act in relation to that matter. I point out that the opal-mining areas are not within planning areas. Although the Mines and Works Inspection Act applies to the whole State and not only to the planning areas, it is intended that the opal-mining situation be specifically legislated for rather than that there be an administrative provision.

Mr. Hall: And no action will be taken under this Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not intend to take action under this Act in relation to that matter.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, and Virgo.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

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

In new paragraph IVa, after "has" to insert "impaired unduly".

The amendment softens the provision somewhat and I think the effect of inserting the words is obvious.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not certain what this amendment does.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The amendment ought to be explained to the Committee. I take it that it has nothing to do with the advisory committee that the Minister is intending to provide for but simply adds the words "impaired unduly". As such, it is worth while but, obviously, my colleague did not hear what the Minister said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amendment inserts "impaired unduly" after "has", so that new paragraph IVa will read:

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 impaired unduly or is likely to impair unduly the amenity of any area . . .

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(c) by inserting in subsection (3) after the passage "for an offence under this section" the passage "(except an offence arising from contravention of, or failure to comply with, an order or direction that is appealable under section 10a of this Act)".

Section 10 of the Act relates to the powers of an inspector. Subsection (3) refers to acts in contravention of any order or direction given by an inspector and provides for the appropriate penalty. I think the amendment is self-explanatory.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

New clause 1a—"Interpretation."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

1a. Section 4 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the definition of "owner" the following definition:

"the advisory committee" means the Mines and Works Advisory Committee established under section 10a of this Act.

This is the first amendment which relates to the proposed—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Acting Chairman, I rise on a point of order. As I see it, there are two amendments to go in at this stage, for the member for Victoria also has a new clause to be moved. May I ask why you have called on the Premier rather than on the member for Victoria.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by the Premier was placed on the file on September 21, 1970, whereas the amendment of the member for Victoria was placed on the file on October 29, 1970. The new clauses to be moved by the Premier would appear in the principal Act prior to the amendment to be moved by the member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: I rise on a further point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. What the Premier is moving and what I intend to move are not the same. I ask for your guidance on whether argument can be taken consecutively on the two. I think in the first instance they do principally the same thing, although perhaps one goes further than the other. The Premier probably would not agree, but I ask for your ruling on this, Sir.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I intend to let discussion take place by referring to both amendments, at this stage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is the first amendment dealing with the principle of

setting up a committee to advise the Minister on appeals against orders of inspectors. We examined two methods of proceeding: one was to provide that there should be an appeal to the Planning Appeal Board, since that board deals with matters of State planning. On the other hand, it is also the case that the Planning and Development Act has effect in those areas of the State where a regional plan or an accepted plan is in force. There seemed to be difficulties here and, what is more, it has been the experience under the Planning and Development Act that matters before the Planning Appeal Board became lengthy and complex and were not easy to deal with shortly.

In fact, we have now appointed the Chairman of the Planning Appeal Board the judge and full-time Chairman and have provided him with alternative other persons to sit on the board so that appeals may be effectively disposed of. To go through a lengthy judicial procedure in a matter of this kind is likely to hold proceedings up for some time, and our experience with appeals under the Underground Waters Preservation Act has been similarly unhappy. We have not been able to dispose of appeals within a reasonable time, because what we have done is to set up a somewhat complicated procedure. The alternative was to proceed as another section of the industry had requested us to proceed previously, as under the Mining (Petroleum) Act. Under that Act there is an advisory committee to the Minister on appeals of the kind proposed here. That was set up at the request of the industry, and we have not had the problems under that Act that we have had in the other areas to which I referred.

Given the administrative arrangements that I have outlined and the fact that there will be representation of the industry on the advisory committee to the Minister, it seemed to the Government that this was a much more swift and effective method to deal with any appeal from an inspector's order, if there ever is one. I doubt whether there will be one, and to set up a grand judicial tribunal for no purpose seemed to be pointless. I think this can work as the Committee has accepted that such an arrangement will work, because the same circumstances existed when we passed the Mining (Petroleum) Act in almost exactly the same form as this amendment, and the experience there has not been unhappy. Consequently, we think that this is a much more satisfactory method of proceeding than by setting up a separate judicial tribunal, as there are problems

about doing that. An appeal to a Mines and Works Appeal Board instead of to the Minister would be to a board consisting of four members, three with a mining and quarrying background and one required to assess aesthetic effects. So the board would be fairly heavily loaded in favour of a quarrying and mining background and not heavily loaded in favour of aesthetic effects.

Mr. Coumbe: It would be impracticable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what we have been told about many things that have happened in the past about which there is a great outcry at the moment. Practical men in some areas of the world have produced the greatest pollution. I have no doubt that the industrialists of Japan have proved very practical men but they have also blanketed Japan from Tokyo to Osaka in the most ghastly envelope of smog.

Mr. Coumbe: Then they are not very practical men.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not agree with the honourable member. It is understood that the amendments that we have put forward are designed to meet the wishes of quarrying interests for some right of appeal, and the amendments that will provide for a separate judicial board are disadvantageous in that they would establish a board with procedures and responsibilities similar to those of the Planning Appeal Board, in some instances stretching into the same area as the Planning Appeal Board's jurisdiction. The proposed board gives the appearance of being quite heavily weighted in favour of mining interests, and a difficulty can arise from the fact that the new powers for inspectors would, in some cases, parallel those of the State Planning Authority under planning regulations. It was quite a difficult exercise to work out the administrative fields of these two bodies.

One reason why we are proceeding in this way is that honourable members opposite will know the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the Leverington case in working the Planning and Development Act at the moment in relation to this industry. If we are to have parallel powers and there are two appeal tribunals, both of which have provision for appeal to the Supreme Court, we are likely to get a considerable judicial conundrum as a result. I do not think that is a sensible way of proceeding. The Government considered this for a long time; this matter was not dealt with overnight. One member opposite has suggested that here we have brought in a measure and have left it for some time and now we have

come along with amendments. I do not apologize for that. We brought in a measure that had been considered at great length and that we thought was sensible. It has been discussed with all the interests involved and, as a result of the publicity given to it, the debate that has taken place here previously and the representations of interested parties, we have said that we think there are certain additional things that should be included to safeguard the rights of parties; that seems to me to be a perfectly proper Parliamentary process. I think the course the Government has finally taken will be the most practical, effective and sensible for the industry.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In calling on the member for Victoria I refer to my previous remark when I said that I intended to allow discussion on both the amendment of the Premier and the amendment of the member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: After listening to the Minister, I do not think that we on this side of the Committee share his thoughts that there may not be an appeal from the decision of an inspector, that everybody will be a good boy and that everything in the garden will be rosy because, by his Bill, he brings the quarrying industry into the ambit of the mining industry. It is to this end that we have moved the amendments, in order to give the quarrying industry a voice in any arguments that may arise. Under the Bill at present, the inspector has certain rights, notwithstanding the Premier's assurance. This could put a quarry owner in the hot spot, and he might have to stop his operations on the say-so of the inspector.

The advisory committee will, according to the Premier's amendments, consist of certain personnel, although I think specifically debarred are people who have anything to do with the industry, and there is perhaps a good and valid reason for that. We wish to amend the provision in the interests of the quarrying industry, because of our great concern for that industry. Many people in this community would close down the quarries tomorrow if they could. Anyone interested in the progress of this State must be disturbed at the leader in today's *Advertiser* which must be extremely upsetting to the people who have a big investment in the quarrying industry.

Mr. Jennings: Many people have an investment in the Hills.

Mr. RODDA: I do not.

Mr. Jennings: You should have if you're a South Australian.

Mr. RODDA: I have an extremely big investment in South Australia, and we on this side will not give up the fight easily to see that controls are not placed on an industry that is contributing so much to South Australia as a State of low cost.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My objection to the Minister's amendments, of which this is the first part, is that the appeal is illusory: there is no appeal at all in the provisions he is putting forward. Although he has been careful not to say so, he knows that these provisions do not satisfy many of the interests that he says he has consulted in the time since the Bill was put on the file. He gave us an exposition on the democratic process to which I agree, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating and the fact is that these people are not satisfied with his amendments, because they recognize that these amendments will not safeguard the position at all. New section 10a provides that a person can appeal against the order or direction to which he is subject. Then the Minister shall refer that appeal to the advisory committee. However, the important point is that the Minister may, after consideration of the advice of the advisory committee, vary or revoke the order or direction subject to appeal. The Minister does not have to take the slightest notice of the advisory committee. That is all the appeal the Minister intends to write into the Bill and it means nothing at all. If he wishes, he can take some notice of the appeal; if he does not wish to, he wipes it altogether and things go on as if there has been no appeal at all. As the board merely advises the Minister and has no powers of arbitration or adjudication it is an illusion.

The Minister says that the amendments of the member for Victoria are cumbersome and that we may find ourselves in a legal conundrum. We do not want that to happen, but at least the proposals put forward by the honourable member have some force in them and would do something to safeguard those concerned. I can see nothing wrong with the body proposed by the honourable member, but if that is something to which the Minister objects we can easily put that right and redress the balance of membership on the board. It is far better that we have a body with some real power that can adjudicate and make sure that justice is done, and that we do not leave all this to an administrative discretion, which is what we are doing if we accept the provisions proposed by the Minister. It is far better to have the honourable member's provisions than

to have nothing at all, as we have now, although there may be a risk of complications and lengthy proceedings. We are dealing with a lot of money and assets, not only the assets of quarry owners and those interested in that industry but indirectly also the assets of the whole community.

Mr. Coumbe: And the employees.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the whole community is concerned in this. Surely it is worth while going to some trouble to safeguard those interests and that is what the member for Victoria proposes. However, the Minister will put up something which, on the surface, may look all right but which he knows has no substance in it whatever.

Mrs. STEELE: I support my colleagues on this side in their appeal to the Minister to consider favourably the amendment moved by the member for Victoria. I repeat that one of the other aspects of this Bill that concerned the people in the extractive ore industry and the members who had discussions with them was the lack of proper appeal provisions. Provision for appeal is covered much better in the amendment moved by the member for Victoria than it is in the Minister's amendment, which deals with it in a fairly scant way.

The Minister has said that the honourable member's amendment gives to the people in the mining industry almost greater scope than it gives to a person who would be nominated on the planning and development side to look after the aesthetic part of the appeal. The appeal board's considerations, in terms of the honourable member's amendment, will be far more to the advantage of the community than the considerations given in terms of the Minister's amendment. I repeat that we are speaking of an amenity in fairly general terms, and I ask the Minister to reconsider the matters that have been submitted most advantageously by members on this side.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am surprised at the Minister's suggestion that this matter is not big enough to warrant the establishment of such a complicated board as that envisaged in the amendment moved by the member for Victoria. This matter is important and the principal Act will have added to it a vast new factor that rightly is of much public interest.

Administrative action will be taken and all members agree that, in general, it should be taken, but that action will have a big influence on the whole industry, which has many millions of dollars invested already and spends much

money annually. I suppose that, in the crushed stone field, this industry has the Government as its biggest client. This is an industry that undoubtedly will be a vital factor in any future road-making operations in the metropolitan area. With all that is involved, surely it is not good enough to have a mere advisory committee and the Minister coming in only at the last stage. Under the Minister's amendment, he is under no obligation to take any notice of it at all.

In view of what I have said, surely some proper kind of appeal board is warranted. The board suggested by the member for Victoria would have practical men on it and would be a good one. I do not say that we should not have on it other people who would be highly qualified to decide on aesthetic aspects. In fact, no-one wishes to be inflexible regarding the composition of it. The member for Victoria has suggested an appeal board that would certainly be able to hear appeals and make good judgments on them. Furthermore, he has provided for an avenue to the Supreme Court. For those reasons, I think it is very much in the public interest that we should accept his amendment and not that of the Premier.

Mr. RODDA: I just cannot accept the Premier's assurance in this matter, for undoubtedly arguments will arise. He quoted the example of a quarry owner removing topsoil to show that a quarry had been started. Under his amendment, the quarry owner would appeal to the Minister and the Minister would refer the appeal to the advisory committee for advice. That was the basis of his argument that the Minister should not be involved with the inspector. His proposed new section 10c (2) states:

The Minister shall consider any advice of the advisory committee but shall not be bound thereby.

Undoubtedly, the sting is in the tail. Will the Premier tell the Committee his intention in this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The function of the committee is to advise the Minister after taking all the necessary evidence, but the Minister will have the overall responsibility to this Parliament. That is the situation that occurs in a much more heavily invested section of the mining industry. The largest investment in this State in that industry is in petroleum exploration. I seem to remember that we could easily get considerations of aesthetics about the territorial sea, and I point

out that, recently, there has been a great outcry concerning petroleum exploration on the Barrier Reef. To say that we will not have this sort of thing in South Australia is not to face facts. We might well do so.

Mr. Millhouse: We might well do so, but there is no immediate prospect of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but the petroleum industry requested the provision contained in the Mining (Petroleum) Act, which was passed since the honourable member came into Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: Why are we bound by what we did then? Haven't you a better argument?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Simply because it was sensible. It has worked well in the mining industry, but Opposition members cannot suggest how we can resolve this problem.

Mr. Millhouse: Has it been worked at all?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but there has been no trouble under the Mining (Petroleum) Act.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet you say it is working perfectly well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under the Mining (Petroleum) Act there has been no trouble.

Mr. Millhouse: Therefore, it has not been necessary to use these provisions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but they are there.

Mr. Millhouse: Then don't say that they have worked well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have worked to the extent that they are contained in the Act for those who need to use them. We have had no trouble in relation to them, and we are not likely to have trouble in relation to this Bill, particularly given the administrative provisions which I have outlined and which members know exist through the Extractive Industries Committee. In these circumstances we are not likely to face the trouble that Opposition members are speaking of. If we did have to face this trouble, how do Opposition members suggest that the conflicting jurisdictions, such as the Planning Appeal Board and the new judicial authority, could work out what the jurisdictions were? I do not know. The fact that the question of whether there should be appeals on the basis of a judicial tribunal and the difficulties where we have a Planning and Development Act as well as a Mines and Works Inspection Act applying to the quarrying industry have caused the Government to conclude, after lengthy discussions,

that using what is already provided in mining legislation in relation to appeals of this kind is the most sensible way to proceed.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

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

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

New clause thus inserted.

New clause 2a.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

2a. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 10 thereof:

10a. (1) A person who is required to comply with an order or direction under paragraph IVa of section 10 of this Act, may, by notice in writing addressed to the Minister, appeal against the order or direction.

(2) The Minister shall refer any such appeal to the advisory committee for advice.

(3) The Minister may, after consideration of the advice of the advisory committee, vary or revoke the order or direction subject to appeal.

10b. (1) There shall be a committee entitled the "Mines and Works Advisory Committee".

(2) The advisory committee shall consist of three members appointed by the Governor of whom—

(a) one shall be a person who is in the opinion of the Governor qualified and experienced in mining engineering;

(b) one shall be a person who has had, in the opinion of the Governor, extensive experience in the conduct of mining operations;

and

(c) one shall be a person who is in the opinion of the Governor qualified to assess the aesthetic effect of mining operations and practices upon the environment in which they are carried out.

(3) The Governor may appoint one of the members of the advisory committee to be chairman of the committee.

(4) A person who holds office in the Department of Mines, or who has any direct or indirect financial interest in the

conduct of mining operations in this State shall not be a member of the advisory committee.

(5) The members of the advisory committee shall hold office for such term and upon such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Governor and shall be entitled to such remuneration, allowances and expenses as may be determined by the Governor.

(6) The Governor may make such appointments as are necessary to fill any vacancy occurring in the membership of the advisory committee and may appoint a person to be a deputy of a member if the member is unable to perform his duties as a member because of illness or any other cause, or if it is otherwise expedient so to do, and a person so appointed to be a deputy of the chairman shall be deemed to be the chairman while so appointed.

(7) The Public Service Act, 1967, as amended, shall not apply to or in relation to the appointment of a member of the advisory committee and a member shall not, as such, be subject to that Act.

(8) The office of a member of the advisory committee may be held in conjunction with any office in the public service of the State.

10c. (1) The advisory committee shall advise the Minister on any appeal referred by the Minister to the committee under this Act and upon any matter connected with the administration of this Act referred by the Minister to the committee.

(2) The Minister shall consider any advice of the advisory committee but shall not be bound thereby.

As I have already explained this clause, members will be familiar with it.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2224.)

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): This measure includes a clause that was the subject of a Bill introduced by the member for Bragg. The previous measure sought to widen the relevant definition in the Act to include all parts of the plant known as *cannabis sativa L.*, in order to cover a loophole discovered in the Act. However, although the Government opposed that measure one wonders whether its appearance hastened the introduction of this Bill. Although I do not wish to dwell on this point, I simply point out that the member for Bragg introduced his Bill on October 14 and that this Bill was apparently printed on October 21.

This measure goes further than the previous one, and in that respect it is a good thing: it amends many provisions in the original Act that need amending. Few alterations have been made to the Act, which came into operation in 1934. It is also gratifying to see that, in drafting this measure, the Government has followed the recommendations of the National Standing Committee on Drugs of Dependence. I doubt whether any of us five years ago would have believed how the use (or abuse) of drugs could grow in our country to the extent that such use (or abuse) now represents a real threat to our society. It is no good any of us burying our heads in the sand regarding this matter: any of us with children must accept the fact that our children will more than likely come into contact with drugs of dependence. Indeed, we now have the situation of responsible people who advocate legalizing marihuana.

When speaking on a previous Bill a fortnight ago, I read out to members a description of the effects of *cannabis* on those who use it either by smoking or eating it. As I said then, that description is not a description of a safe drug. People who advocate the legalization of marihuana say that it is no worse than alcohol and some say it is not nearly as bad as alcohol. I do not intend to argue that point: I do not know about that. Even if it is no worse than alcohol, I cannot see how that has anything to do with the matter. As the member for Bragg said, why add another social evil to those that we know exist already? People who advocate the legalization of marihuana point to the appalling road toll as a result of alcohol. I do not deny this, but these people also say that marihuana is safer.

Previously I read to the House a statement that people who use marihuana suffer a loss of ability to estimate time and space. In view of that, it is ridiculous to say that marihuana is less dangerous than alcohol. I contend that it is more dangerous because a person under the influence of alcohol is fairly readily detectable and consequently can be stopped from driving a motor vehicle. A person under the influence of marihuana is entirely undetectable, so there could be people under the influence of marihuana able to drive a car and no-one would realize that they were under the influence. Marihuana users, while they are under the influence of the drug, are in a dream world where wonderful paintings are planned but never executed,

where great thoughts are thought but never put on to paper, where colours are brighter, and where sounds are clearer, and these are the reasons why people continue to smoke marihuana. It is a door through which they can escape from reality at least for a while, but this escape is paid for at a high price.

Drug users lead a euphoric existence. There is a gradual growing of lethargy. The British Pharmaceutical Codex made a statement (which is now refuted) that *cannabis* is a habit-forming drug. It is now readily accepted that marihuana is not addictive in the physical sense but that people do become psychologically dependent on it. This escaping from reality is more likely to lead to the use of other drugs and from these other drugs there is no escape. To the advocates of the legalization of marihuana I reiterate what the member for Bragg said, that not enough is known about the long-term effects of this drug. We know the effects of alcohol from years of study. I am not saying that those effects are good—far from it. However, at least they are known and some control can be exercised over them. Much research is going on into the effects of marihuana at present and this has shown some evidence of genetic effects. Admittedly this is not yet definite but at least it is enough to suggest that we should continue the ban on this drug.

As I said earlier, it is good to see that the Government has followed the recommendations of the National Standing Committee on Drugs of Dependence. The principal Act deals only with narcotics such as opium, Indian hemp and morphine and its salts and derivatives. In the original Act, the definition of these narcotic drugs covers almost a full page and this has been tidied up in the Bill, which specifies any derivative of morphine or cocaine or of any salts of morphine or cocaine or any other alkaloid of opium. This states in two or three lines what it took a page to do before, and it therefore tidies up the Act. The Bill makes an important addition by inserting in section 4 the new subsection (c), which states:

any psychotropic drug or substance.

This is designed to bring amphetamines under control, but I point out that this term "psychotropic drug or substance" has extremely broad application and covers more than the amphetamines. Under this heading can come what are commonly called tranquillizers such as amitryptaline, nortryptaline chlorpromazone, and barbiturates, which include amytal. As I am sure that the Health Department does not intend that these be

covered, I ask for an assurance that, when this Bill becomes law, the drugs that the department intends to control will be spelt out in more detail instead of being shown under the broader heading of "any psychotropic drug", which could cover many matters. In the past broad headings such as this have proved to be not the best way of covering what it is intended to cover.

The Bill changes the penalties and differentiates between a drug pusher and a drug user. This change is long overdue. Drug pushers, who sell drugs to the community but are not drug users, are parasites and must be punished to the full extent of the law. An addict at times also needs punishment but, in the long term, what he needs more is help. The provision adding dentists to the lists that previously included a medical practitioner and a veterinary surgeon is a good provision. The provisions enabling a policeman below the rank of sergeant to act with authority, and so on, are good additions to the Act and I have no quarrel with them, because they all help tidy up the legislation. I am not completely pleased about clause 11, which allows proceedings for an offence that carries a punishment of a fine of up to \$2,000 to be dealt with summarily, and I will say more about this in Committee. On the whole, this revision of the Act is long overdue and I support the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): About three years or four years ago, when we were previously in Opposition most of the members of my Party spoke on an urgency motion to try to persuade the Government of the day to do something about lysergic acid diethylamide. This was when L.S.D. was first rearing its ugly head and its dreadful effects were being recorded in books, pamphlets, and reports. These publications were read at length in this House. The then member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) was one of the members who was most anxious that something be done about this problem. We considered that the Government was treating the matter too lightly. It said, I think, that it was waiting for confirmation from the National Medical Council regarding the effects of the drug.

It seems ironic that it has taken such a long time (it was in either 1966 or 1967) for us in South Australia to realize the dangers of such drugs. I wholeheartedly support the Bill, which I believe was inspired by the Bill introduced into this House by the member for Bragg, a person who spoke with great authority and who has obviously made a very great

study not only here in South Australia of the dangers inherent in this whole drug problem but who at considerable length studied the subject when he was in the United States of America. I noticed particularly that while he was speaking every member on both sides listened with rapt attention because all of us, whether parents of children or not, realized that this was a menace to the whole moral and social life of the community. Therefore, I believe that no member could do other than support the Bill.

In fact, I was so impressed by the speech the member for Bragg made that when I spoke to many of my friends who have teenage children and even younger children (the member for Bragg pointed out that it was alarming the tender age at which children were confronted with and exposed to the dangers of drugs) I promised that I would send them a copy of the honourable member's speech so that they could read the remarks of someone who really knew about this terrible scourge and the dangers inherent in it. I was somewhat alarmed the other night on one of the rare occasions that I have been home and able to watch television to see the programme *Contrabandits*, a very fine programme that deals amongst other things with the question of drug introduction by illegal means into Australia. This episode showed at some length the dreadful effects that follow the addiction to drug taking and the terrible conditions under which some of these people live. While I believe that the aim of these programmes is perhaps to make people aware of the dangers of drug taking, at the same time it is impossible to stop young and impressionable people from seeing some of them, and I just wonder whether the very effect which the promoters set out to attain (which is perhaps to acquaint people or put them off the idea of taking drugs) is lost, and whether in fact such programmes do not

rather encourage youngsters to try the drug for themselves.

For those reasons, I was appalled when I read that a South Australian Labor politician advocated legalizing marihuana. We had only to listen to the member for Bragg the other evening to know that, although this is perhaps what one might call one of the minor drugs, it can lead to greater and more serious drug addiction. There is always the danger that the drug can be spiked with a more serious drug that can lead a person to addiction. It seems to me that no punishment is too great for the drug peddler or pusher, whom the member for Bragg considers to be a murderer who commits one of the most dreadful crimes possible. To suggest that we legalize the distribution of marihuana is to me most appalling. Although this suggestion no doubt stemmed from the belief of a Commonwealth member in the safety of the legalization of marihuana, I believe that members on both sides of the Chamber, after listening to the member for Bragg, would not support such a suggestion.

I commend the introduction of the Bill. I believe it is long overdue, because the attention of the Government of the day was drawn to these dangers as far back as 1966 or 1967. Now, we are finding in Australia that the things we thought could not happen here are happening here. This is only one of those great moral dangers with which I believe the community is faced today and in which it is following tragically and sadly the footsteps of countries overseas. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 4, at 2 p.m.