HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 4, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

STOBIE POLES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about stobie poles at Bellevue Heights?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been informed by the General Manager of the Electricity Trust that the poles erected near Bellevue Drive are part of the construction of a new 66,000-volt transmission line from the Happy Valley substation to the Panorama substation on Goodwood Road. This is an important new line, which must be in service before next winter in order to provide for growing demands for electricity in the southern metropolitan area. The board of the trust gave close personal attention to the route of this line and the method of construction and decided that, despite the extra cost involved, the line would be placed underground from the Panorama substation to the end of Bellevue Drive, Bellevue Heights. At this point the terrain becomes very rugged and it is technically difficult and abnormally expensive to use underground cable. Consequently, the end of Bellevue Drive, where two poles have at present been erected, is the point at which the overhead line from Happy Valley will terminate and the underground cables start. The trust has already agreed to absorb the high cost of over 2½ miles of underground cable along the more closely built-up portion of the route. It would cost at least an additional $50,000 to carry the cable the extra one-third of a mile mentioned. This would be an additional expenditure of almost $10,000 for each 100yds., and the trust could not justify this expenditure. The present stage of construction is that the cable has been ordered from overseas in exact lengths to provide for the chosen route. Apart from any expense involved, it would not be possible at this stage to obtain additional cable in time to allow the line to be in service by next winter.

WATERHOLES

Mr. BROWN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to obtain information about the legal position with regard to the poisoning of waterholes at stations in the North? I have received from the Northern Naturalists Society correspondence stating the society's grave concern at the poisoning of waterholes on some station properties. Apparently this practice is causing the wanton destruction of our native animals and birds.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up with my colleague the matter raised by the honourable member and to bring down a report as soon as possible.

ABATTOIRS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about the report of the committee that inquired into matters relating to abattoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The committee appointed to inquire into the meat industry was appointed by Cabinet to report to the Minister of Agriculture. Its report is not a public document, and the Minister does not intend to release it at this stage. At the first opportunity, the Minister intends to visit the Eastern States to observe the operation and organization of metropolitan abattoirs, following which a further examination of the committee's recommendations and their implications will be made with a view to formulating plans for the reorganization of the industry in this State.

D.D.T.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the use of D.D.T.?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In my reply on October 21 to the honourable member's question concerning the use of D.D.T., I indicated that the human health aspects of the matter had been taken up with the Public Health Department. The Director-General of Public Health states that the use of D.D.T. for mosquito control in septic tanks is not now recommended by the Public Health Department. Although publications and notices issued before 1970 included this chemical with others as a suggested means of mosquito control, the department has not recommended the use of D.D.T. for this purpose for some considerable time. The insecticides recommended are fenthion, diazinon or similar substances that do not have the persistence of D.D.T.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, on whether the Premier has observed reasonable standards of courtesy in relation to amendments to the Succession Duties Act. This morning's newspaper contains a report in which the Premier gives details of the amendments to this Act that he intends to introduce, and there is a long report on what the Bill includes. I notice that the Premier has taken the trouble to give notice that tomorrow he will move that he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act. As he has given what are called details of the amendments in a press statement that was issued at least 24 hours and probably 48 hours before moving that motion, I ask whether reasonable standards of courtesy to this House have been observed.

The SPEAKER: I think the House has considered this matter many times, and I understand that for several years it has been the practice to make statements to the press regarding policy matters before making announcements in the House. I recall that, since I have been a member, many questions have been asked about that matter, but to my knowledge nothing has been set down regarding it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, say whether the rebate of duty in respect of land used for primary production is to be affected by the Bill? In his press statement, the Premier said that it was intended to reduce by 40 per cent the value, for succession duty purposes, of primary-producing land passing to the immediate family of the deceased, instead of 30 per cent for properties having a net value up to $40,000. It does not say anything about the duty itself. As the Premier could give details of this to the press, I believe that the Deputy Premier is aware of the provisions of the Bill and, in the absence of the Premier, would be prepared to answer this question.

The SPEAKER: Irrespective of what the honourable member has read in the newspaper, the Deputy Premier does not have to answer the question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am happy to reply to the question. The answer is "Yes".

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the rebate of duty in respect of land used for primary production is intended to be reduced, eliminated or affected in any way by the Bill to be introduced tomorrow? I am sure that the Minister did not intend to cloud the issue by giving the answer he gave to my previous question whether this rebate would be affected. However, because of the situation whereby a member must ask his question first and then explain it, the meaning of the answer of "Yes", which the Minister gave, was naturally rather obscure, as I think the Minister will appreciate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am afraid that I did misunderstand the honourable member's question. The proposal is to reduce by 40 per cent the value of primary-producing properties which have a net value up to $40,000 (I think this is consistent with the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill presently before the House) and which pass to the immediate family of the deceased, instead of reducing it by 30 per cent as applies now. As a result of this, the duty will be reduced. Less will be paid, but the duty will not be removed entirely. If the honourable member is asking whether or not this duty will be removed entirely from primary-producing property, the answer is "No", but the amount of duty will be reduced because this concession is greater than that which presently obtains and greater than that which was proposed in the 1966 Bill. The Premier will give the final details when he introduces the Bill tomorrow.

MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Social Welfare examine the method of processing maintenance moneys that have been lodged, under the terms of court orders, with the Social Welfare Division of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department? I have been told that sometimes delay can occur in the payment of these maintenance moneys, particularly when originally the money has been paid into the department by cheque.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter has exercised my mind often since becoming the Minister. True, the department cannot underwrite, so to speak, the obligations of a husband who is subject to a court order, and that means that, if the funds are not available to pay the wife, the department cannot undertake the responsibility of doing so. In those circumstances the wife, unfortunately, has to fall back on whatever social service benefits are available from the Commonwealth, and, pending this, on relief payments from the State. What has troubled me is that in many cases husbands do pay but do not pay punctually on the day required under the order. The result is that, although the department is actually in funds,

looked at in the long term, the wife is in a constant state of uncertainty whether she will receive her money on the day when she is expecting it. Consequently, her budgeting arrangements are dislocated, and she is under constant anxiety and stress, wondering whether she will get the money with which to purchase the weekend food supplies. It seems strange, but there is a formidable number of accounting problems to be surmounted. I gave a direction to the department some weeks ago to examine the accounting system with a view to making a recommendation to give effect to this idea, and the accounting procedures are in the course of being examined. I conferred with the Director of the department last week on this topic, and I am hopeful that a system can be devised soon that will enable us to tell deserted wives that they can expect to receive their money on a certain day in each week. Of course, we would have to put some ceiling on the amount of arrears that could be allowed to accumulate, so that the department did not find itself in the position of underwriting the husband's obligation, because otherwise it would be beyond our financial resources at present. I hope that I shall be able to give some further information to the honourable member soon and that I shall be able to tell him then that new accounting procedures have been devised that will remove this anxiety from the minds of many women.

MARGINAL LANDS INQUIRY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I recently asked about the sum that the Lands Department may consider necessary to implement the Marginal Lands Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Commonwealth is investigating farm reconstruction in primary industries, and the State is awaiting further information. Any reconstruction scheme would require a detailed investigation to determine the form of reconstruction. Implementation would depend on provision of the necessary funds. It seems premature to embark upon a full inquiry to reimplement the Marginal Lands Act, or any State rural reconstruction scheme, until the intentions of the Commonwealth are known.

MODBURY DEATH

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Premier, a reply to the question I asked last week about the shortcomings of the Building Act as it applies to ventilation and about the safety regulations as they apply to gas heaters? I asked that question as a result of the City Coroner's report on the death of a young girl at Modbury North.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Chairman of the Building Act Advisory Committee has supplied the Premier with the following information:

Regulation 244 under the Building Act sets a standard for ventilation of rooms requiring the total effective area of ventilator surface in square inches for each room to be derived from the formula:

$$\frac{\text{capacity of the room in cubic feet.}}{120}$$

There is, however, no specific requirement for upper vents in the outside leaf of a cavity wall, although they might be thought advisable: there is no statutory prohibition of ceiling boards covering cavity walls. Where gas or electric cooking appliances, or coal or coke furnaces, are installed in rooms, the local government building surveyor must be satisfied with additional ventilation provided. In practice, however, heating units are often installed in chimneys of existing houses without reference to local government authorities.

The Interstate Standing Committee on Building Regulations has considered ventilation requirements in view of the usual practice of using ventilators with small holes or backing larger-holed ventilators with flywire. Such ventilators soon become ineffective due to blockage by fluff. Regular cleaning should therefore be undertaken. In some older homes, ventilators with larger holes not backed with flywire are effective for long periods, but blowflies and other insects can readily gain admission to these houses, and instances have been noted where effective ventilators have been covered by wallpaper to exclude insects and draughts. The Commonwealth Experimental Building Station sees no point in installing ventilators which shortly become ineffective. A possible safeguard with an unflued appliance is to open a window slightly whenever a heating unit is operating. The South Australian Gas Act Regulations require all gas appliances to be installed by an employee of the South Australian Gas Company or by a licensed gas fitter but this is not always observed. In the Clovercrest case, the heater was secondhand and was not installed by a registered gas fitter.

Because of wall staining and ineffective heating, the Gas Company discontinued the installation of flueless gas heaters in 1969. Following the recent fatality, the company now proposes each autumn to service all the flueless gas heaters disclosed by the recent conversion to natural gas. Owners will be encouraged to install flues. The Builders Licensing Act contains no specific standards of construction, as does the Building Act, but if a licensee infringes the statutory requirements of any kind or if his workmanship is shoddy, his licence will be in jeopardy and it is

expected that observation of building standards and practices will increase because of this. But this is not to say that every detail of every building erected will be inspected: a horde of inspectors would be required to do this. Although some matters will be discovered by random checks by Builders Licensing Board inspectors, it is expected that most instances requiring action will come to the attention of the board's inspectors by way of complaint from house owners. In cases of inadequate ventilation, the owner may unfortunately be quite unaware of the defect. The Building Act is shortly to be revised and consideration will be given to the possibility of amendments designed to prevent the recurrence of the circumstances that led to this tragedy.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr. WELLS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding the Government's intention to close the printing section now operating at the Yatala Labour Prison?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the Prison Industry Committee, which has the responsibility for examining prison industries and making recommendations regarding their feasibility, recommended that the print shop at Yatala Labour Prison be discontinued and that a more productive and up-to-date industry be substituted. To the department's knowledge, only one prisoner has ever been placed in the printing industry, and this was as an assistant compositor on a paper in the Northern Territory. The installation of more modern equipment was opposed by both the Printing and Allied Trades Employers Association and the Printing Industry Employees Union on the grounds that prisoners were not undertaking formal apprenticeships and were therefore not acceptable to the trade. Training on out-of-date equipment is obviously useless. As it is the department's policy to train prisoners in good production methods and in up-to-date techniques, it was felt that retention of the print shop would achieve no purpose, and for this reason the described action was taken.

BOARDING ALLOWANCES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently regarding boarding allowances payable to country students?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As from the beginning of 1970, boarding allowances for secondary school children were increased from $150 to $180 for those in the first to fourth years, and from $200 to $230 for fifth-year students. Prior to this the last increase was in 1962. While I appreciate the difficulties of parents who have to send their children away from home to attend school, the Government is not in a financial position at present to make a further increase, bearing in mind that the allowances were raised as recently as the beginning of this year.

CHELTENHAM INTERSECTION

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport seek a report from the Highways Department as to when it is expected that traffic lights will be installed at the intersection of Torrens Road with Cheltenham Parade and Addison Road? Many of my constituents have sought this information because at certain times of the day this is one of the busiest intersections in the metropolitan area. When people employed in the area are going home from work in the evening and on days when races are held at Cheltenham, the traffic congestion at that intersection is so bad that a police officer has to direct the traffic.

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

QUORN SCHOOL RESIDENCE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about the residence at the Quorn Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The residence recently completed at Quorn will be occupied by the senior master at the school. It is a replacement for one formerly occupied by the Headmaster of the now disestablished Quorn High School. It is intended to provide an additional residence at Quorn, but it is unlikely to be available before the end of 1971. This residence will replace one now occupied by the Headmaster which is attached to the former primary school building. No requests other than these have been made for residences at Quorn.

ASCOT PARK CROSSING

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what is the present position with regard to the projected reconstruction of the road and rail crossing at the Marion Road, Daws Road and Adelaide Terrace intersection at Ascot Park?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although I am interested in all matters relating to crossings, perhaps I have a greater personal interest in the intersection to which the honourable member has referred, because I know the heavy traffic it carries and the dangers associated with

it. As a result, on taking over my portfolio, I had discussions almost immediately with officers of the Highways Department in an endeavour to expedite the provision of grade separation at this intersection. A few weeks ago, officers of the Mines Department took soil tests in the district. I understand that recently an officer of the Highways Department had discussions with representatives of the Marion council and the broad outline of the proposal was placed before the council which, I understand, unanimously endorsed the recommendation, expressing its gratitude that the Highways Department was expediting the provision of this grade separation. I understand that broad details of the matter have now been forwarded to the Railways Commissioner to enable him to consider this proposition, as he must consider it in view of the railway work involved. Following this, further detailed design work will be undertaken. Therefore, I hope that yet another crossing that previously claimed lives will soon provide safe conditions for the travelling public.

CHILD-MINDING CENTRES

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether the Government intends to inspect and license suburban child-minding centres? The fact that in some areas child-minding centres seem to be mushrooming shows that many young married mothers are working to add to the weekly income, so that it is important that their children are properly cared for and supervised.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Experience has shown that the present system under which the supervision and control of child-minding centres is in the hands of councils has produced difficulties in ensuring the maintenance of uniform welfare standards, mainly because many councils are lacking in the machinery and officers trained in welfare work who are able to supervise the maintenance of such standards. The Government intends to introduce legislation to vest the control and supervision of child-minding centres in the Minister so that the resources of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department can be used to ensure the observance of uniformly high standards in such centres.

COUNTRY HOUSING

Mr. CURREN: In the absence of the Premier, can the Minister of Works give me information about the supply of houses under the rental grant homes scheme operated by the Housing Trust? Many people in my district have asked me to get this information and also to find out whether the scheme is to be expanded by the construction of additional houses.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me that he would ask this question, I can say that during 1958 the trust received $736,038 under the Country Housing Act for the purpose of building houses in country towns for rental to tenants on very low incomes, such as widows and pensioners, to enable such tenants to remain in the communities where they had previously lived. This money was provided (free of interest and repayments) by the South Australian Treasurer, and in 1960 a further $200,000 was paid to the trust to further the scheme. The excess of income over expenditure is also added to the fund to enable further houses to be built under the scheme. The trust had built and let 193 single-unit houses under this Act to September 30, 1970, for a total expenditure of about $1,140,500, and the fund stood at about $1,142,900 as at that date. Therefore, the honourable member can see that little balance is left over.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Chief Secretary an up-to-date report on proposals for expanding the Port Pirie Hospital?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: My question is to the Minister of Education and it concerns the sketch plans for the Gladstone High School going to the Public Works Committee.

The SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's question?

Mr. VENNING: The question relates to the sketch plans of the Gladstone High School going to the Public Works Committee. With your concurrence and that of the House, Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's question?

Mr. VENNING: They can't understand the King's English.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MURRAY RIVER STORAGES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): On behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, who is temporarily absent from the Chamber, I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should put aside its present political attitudes and, in the terms of its own election slogan "for South Australia's sake", immediately ratify the Dartmouth agreement.

I expect that the Leader will soon be here to speak to this motion, and he will do so more eloquently than I can. However, I assure the House that I am speaking with the support of every member of the Opposition, which has been horrified at the time wasting and play acting by the Government on this extremely important issue.

Mr. Clark: That's exactly what the Opposition is doing now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When the infamous vote was taken in this House last session and the then Leader of the Opposition switched the Opposition's vote from its stated policy to support of a two-dam policy, we were told that the Dartmouth agreement could be renegotiated easily within a few months. However, in the meantime nothing has been done: no renegotiation has taken place. In reply to questions in this House in the last few months, the Government has had to fall back on the excuse that it has not received replies to letters. For a long time neither the Premier nor the Minister of Works visited the Eastern States on this matter: they merely said that they had not received replies to their letters.

Under a little more pressure, they recently called a conference and this conference, quite predictably, was a failure. The Premier and the Minister of Works were trying to negotiate with the representatives of three Parliaments that had signed an agreement with South Australia and had passed legislation in their own Parliaments. That agreement would give us more water than we had ever asked for previously, but the Premier and the Minister of Works were still asking for more and, in doing so, were publicly insulting the other Governments. That is no way to negotiate, as I think the Government has found. I think the people of the State have been observing this conduct with some distaste.

We badly need to supplement the Murray River system through the Dartmouth dam before the end of this decade and we badly need to get on with constructing the dam. The Government led by the present Leader of the Opposition had negotiated an agreement whereby we would get more water than we had got before and this agreement was on our table, waiting for us to ratify it. That was all that was needed, yet the present Government, because of its obstinacy, has refused to take up that offer.

About a year ago I said in this Parliament that the Labor Party one day would come to accept the Dartmouth dam. That is almost true in the Government's thinking now, but not in fact. The present Government would like to accept it but will not ratify that agreement and soon we will be short of water because of the Government's failure to take up the offer that I have mentioned. This is a disgrace, and the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly entitled to ask the Government to put aside its political attitudes.

Nothing the Government has done has improved the water situation one bit. Everything that it has done has worked against it. As I have said, the Government has offered public insults to the Leaders of the other Governments involved. Before our representatives went to the conference, they said that these other fellows must come to heel, and they made all sorts of other statements. Then they complained that they were not treated properly. The people of South Australia have received a better offer than they have ever had before. South Australia is the only State that has a specified quota under the River Murray Waters Agreement, and that quota would have been increased to 1,500,000 acre feet if we had ratified the agreement.

Mr. McKee: You hope!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It seems at times that the honourable member does not hope. The district of the member for Pirie will depend as much as any other district on the outcome of this matter. But what has the Government done in the meantime? Yesterday, I asked the Premier to comment on Mr. Whitlam's suggestion that the River Murray Commission ought to be abolished and replaced by Commonwealth control, and I received one of the most senseless and garbled replies that one could imagine. However, among the few clear statements contained in the reply was the remark that the Premier fully supported Mr. Whitlam.

It is perfectly all right for Mr. Whitlam, coming from the Eastern States, to pin his faith on Commonwealth control, but it is not all right for our Premier to go along with the

idea of abolishing the River Murray Commission, of which South Australia is one of the four partners and in respect of which it has legal rights. It is not suitable for our Premier to go trotting along in this matter with the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Whitlam may be able to speak with the voice of Labor, particularly that voice which originates in the Eastern States, but our Premier should not subscribe to that. I have heard suggestions that if there were Labor Governments in the Eastern States this matter would be fixed up: that we would get all sorts of change that the Premier wanted. However, there has not been even one sign in the attitude of any Labor member in any Parliament, Commonwealth or State, to justify that. On the contrary, the opposition of Labor members in the Eastern States to South Australia's case has been as vehement as that of any other member of Parliament in those States.

How can they say that we should write off the River Murray Commission and the agreement with it, and replace it with some sort of Commonwealth control? That is a shameful attitude and one that I actually had not expected would arise. It came out yesterday that the Premier fully supported the statement made by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, but the Premier should not fully support it; he ought to stand up for South Australia, for he well knows that we have an agreement ratified by all the other Parliaments concerned, which are waiting for us to accept it.

Mr. McKee: Ratified to their advantage!

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Under this agreement 1,500,000 acre feet of water has been offered to us, but if we do not sign the agreement we shall not have any more than 1,250,000 acre feet. The member for Pirie should try to reason how that is to the Eastern States' advantage. We were offered 1,500,000 acre feet, because the present Leader of the Opposition was a good negotiator; he did not trot along with the Eastern States but demanded it and got the allocation by negotiating. Now, the Premier has said he will be a better negotiator, but he has been able to do absolutely nothing, except insult the other Parliaments and their Leaders when he has appeared on television. When he met them he could do nothing. It is time the Premier stopped being political and silly about this matter and accepted the offer that we have. We had a wonderful offer, and we are frittering away the State's future by not accepting it. I have moved this motion on behalf of the Leader, who I am glad to say is now here.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. HALL seconded the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I should have thought that at least the person who had originally decided to move the motion standing in his name would have something to say about the matter, but evidently he was a little flustered about something that occurred on his side of the House, possibly in relation to questions, for he went out of the House in a little fit of temper and left it to the member for Alexandra to carry the baby for him. I think that is indicative of the Opposition's real attitude to this matter; it shows to the Government and to the people of South Australia just how seriously the Opposition is treating this motion. So seriously is it treating the motion that the Leader was not even here to move it. Although he was in the precincts, he missed out and left it to the member for Alexandra who, in spite of short notice, applied himself reasonably well to the subject but was obviously not prepared for such short notice.

First, I question the sincerity behind the Leader's motion. We have been told to put aside our present political attitudes to this matter, but I think the Opposition is playing politics here as hard as it can. It is not willing to improve South Australia's position in this matter, because it gave the game away some time ago.

Mr. Venning: No!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The honourable member doth protest too much, methinks.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes; in fact, it is obvious from the way he over-emphasizes his protest that the member for Rocky River is not genuine or sincere, either. Because the Opposition gave itself away some time ago regarding Chowilla, it is now saying that we should do exactly the same thing, but I remind members opposite that on at least two occasions of which I am aware this House unanimously carried a motion defending South Australia's rights to Chowilla. This Parliament did that (not the Government or the Opposition) but, in spite of those motions, the Leader went away and negotiated a new deal, as he called it, concerning Dartmouth, and he came back and tried to tell Parliament that he had done

this State a favour. I do not think that a comparison between Dartmouth and Chowilla is at stake at present, because the Government has clearly said that it is willing to allow Dartmouth to proceed immediately, on the basis that we can have some reinstatement of our rights to Chowilla in the previous agreement. The proposition put to the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria was, in my view, completely reasonable. The proposition, really, was to remove the words which stand in the present agreement (I think in clause 13) and which sought to amend the agreement that was ratified to build Chowilla. The words sought to be added by the other parties were these:

Completion of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir shall be deferred until the contracting Governments agree that work will proceed.

South Australia sought to have those words removed because, as we explained previously, they gave the power of veto to the two State Governments and the Commonwealth Government at any time over the future construction of Chowilla. South Australia wanted the situation reinstated whereby, if Chowilla or some other storage were being compared in the future, the other States would not have that power of veto and we would retain the right to create a dispute and to go to arbitration, as we can now in relation to Chowilla.

As well as asking that those words be removed, we asked that any money that might have to be made available for improvements to the inlet and outlet works at Lake Victoria (which were estimated to cost between $3,000,000 and $7,000,000) as a result of proceeding with Dartmouth be disregarded in estimating costs in any future comparison of costs of possible storages. If any money spent on those improvements were not excluded, it would place Chowilla at a considerable disadvantage in comparison with any other possible storage site. For this reason South Australia submitted that these costs should, if incurred, be ignored. That suggestion was accepted by the Commonwealth Government as reasonable, but New South Wales and Victoria would not accept it in any circumstances.

After arguing on the first point alone for one hour and five minutes, it was apparent to me that Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth Governments would not return to their Parliaments and alter in any shape or form the agreement that they had already ratified. When I put this question to them I received the answer I expected: that they would not do so. I do not believe they are being reasonable, as the Commonwealth Government says it is anxious to proceed with the construction of the Dartmouth dam as, indeed, are Victoria and New South Wales. However, I doubt this at times because had they been anxious to get on with it as we think they are, they should have been sufficiently reasonable to agree to amend the agreement their Parliaments had already ratified. Surely it is not too much to ask that they ignore the $3,000,000 to $7,000,000 that might be spent on the inlet and outlet channels at Lake Victoria. I have been told that the present Leader of the Opposition insisted that this provision be included in the agreement. I do not know why he did this because he must surely have seen then, if he believed that Chowilla was a possibility in the future, that it would have the expected adverse effect that we claimed it would have on any future comparisons between Chowilla and any other storage.

True, there is a strong possibility that the money to which I have referred may not have to be spent on Lake Victoria, as the works there may not have to be carried out and, even if they are proceeded with, they may not involve expenditure of that magnitude. Be that as it may, we considered that if there was a possibility of this work being proceeded with, we should be given the protection that we sought at the conference I attended about two weeks ago. We believed, as did the Commonwealth Government, that our request was reasonable. I also asked that any increase in the whole system as a result of the construction of future storages should be shared equally between the States. I do not think that was an unreasonable request, either. Indeed, in this regard I do not think we are asking for anything that we would not have been able to obtain in future negotiations. However, that request was not acceded to, either.

Regarding future studies for the next major storage on the Murray River, it was pointed out (and I accepted it because I could do nothing else) that letters had been exchanged between the various Governments and that studies were proceeding. This is indeed so, as the basic data is being collected now. Sir Henry Bolte, who speaks for Victoria, has bluntly said that South Australia will get nowhere. I suppose we in this State are supposed to sit down and knuckle under just because Sir Henry Bolte speaks in this tone. I do not think Sir Henry has helped his State's position. I know he is as anxious as we are (if not more so) to have

the Dartmouth dam. Although he may have been able in the past to bluff his way through crises will all sorts of high-sounding statements, South Australia is certainly not going to be frightened by what he says. Sir Henry said that Victoria would no longer be a partner to the River Murray Commission or River Murray Waters Agreement, or words to that effect. I should like to ask him how he intends to get out of it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you in favour of abolishing the River Murray Commission?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I am not and, until we can find a suitable replacement, it will not be replaced, either!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It would be ridiculous to suggest that the commission is the be-all and end-all of everything. If it can be proved that there is a better system by which the waters of the Murray River can be regulated, and if all State Governments and the Commonwealth Government agree, why should we not replace it? However, the commission is at present doing the best it can in difficult circumstances, as it will no doubt continue to do for a long time. I have never suggested (nor has anyone else to my knowledge) that the commission should be disbanded, unless we can arrange for something better to take its place.

I believe the time will come when the commission (or whatever may replace it in the future) will have to control not only the Murray River but also the tributaries running into it. There is a need for a total control of the quality of water which, to my mind, is becoming as important as, if not more important than, the quantity aspect. This matter was also raised at the conference, at which it was, I am pleased to say, generally agreed that this matter needed urgent attention. The Gutteridge report was therefore referred back for investigation by the various Governments. I sincerely hope that something will evolve from any recommendations made, because the quality of the water is important, particularly to South Australia because it is on the end of the system.

Mr. Coumbe: When will we get that report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I hope it will be available soon. I believe the honourable member has a summary of the report now. The only reason it is not in the Parliamentary Library now is that New South Wales failed to submit its list, and it did not indicate to the Commonwealth Minister for National Development until the day of the conference that the list had been submitted. It has been decided that until it has been completely distributed, no part of the report should be published.

Mr. Coumbe: I have not read the report.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thought the honourable member had a copy of it. As I indicated earlier, I should be happy for him, if he so desires, to examine it. I understand, however, that its contents are not to be made public until the Commonwealth Government distributes the report to those on the lists that have been submitted. As well as expressing concern about the overall control of the quality of water, on the Monday following the conference I arranged for the Premier to send a telegram to the Prime Minister informing him that this State would apply for a grant from the Commonwealth Government to undertake further salinity control measures within this State. This was to be on the same basis as applied to Victoria, which had been granted $3,600,000 by the Commonwealth Government to undertake quality control works on the Barr Creek system. We know that this will benefit us. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done within our own State on this sort of control because the salinity in the water from the time it enters our State until it reaches Waikerie doubles, so we are vitally concerned about this matter. If we get the additional water the Leader of the Opposition has referred to when the agreement to build Dartmouth is ratified, it is still questionable how we will use that water. We have to look closely at any future permanent irrigation development and the effect that has on quality of water. I think all members will realize what problems we have in that regard.

We firmly believe that this is the time for us to stand firm in relation to ratifying the agreement to proceed with Dartmouth in the hope that in the future we may see Chowilla, by the grace of God and the generosity of the other States. We are convinced that if we cannot do it now and we are eventually forced to ratify the agreement to build Dartmouth, we can safely say we will never see Chowilla built. We have to have this added protection inserted in the present agreement if we are to have any hope at all. That is why the Government is taking its present stand. It is a last-ditch stand because the

Leader of the Opposition, when he negotiated the agreement that the other two States and the Commonwealth have ratified, could see added advantages in the form of the additional water South Australia was going to get out of the sharing arrangements in times of restriction. No doubt these were attractive but I think the Leader of the Opposition in his anxiety to get these things could not see that he was endangering the future of Chowilla. I believe he cannot honestly say he believes that, if we ratify this agreement, we have any hope of getting Chowilla.

Surely we should be striving to get an assurance on Chowilla, because not only has this Parliament in the past unanimously supported Chowilla and the people in this State expect us to do something about it, but a former Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) fought a hard battle to get Chowilla in the first place. We were given Chowilla because it was replacing something we can rightly say was taken away from us. There were special concessions given us: we had a legal right as well as a moral right to Chowilla and we are not going to give away that right easily. We do not want to give it away at all. If we do, we are convinced, if we let this agreement go as it stands at present, that we will never see Chowilla. South Australia does not want that and I do not think the Leader of the Opposition or any other member of the Opposition would want it. They want to see that storage constructed in the future. The Commissioner for Victoria (Mr. Horsfall) has stated clearly that an upper river storage would be better for a total system than a down river storage. Unless we get some sort of protection in respect of the future of Chowilla, such people as he will see that we do not get it. That is why the Government is trying to renegotiate the agreement. The honourable member for Alexandra said that a delay took place in the holding of the conference, but he knows as well as I that the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister on July 8, stating:

In order that agreement may be achieved I request a meeting of yourself, the Premier of New South Wales and the Premier of Victoria with me during the next month.

He summarized the matters that would be discussed, and I have already mentioned these. I do not know why the delay occurred but it seems that the Prime Minister thought he was to arrange the conference and, on the other hand, the Premier thought he had made it perfectly clear that he was arranging the conference. In accordance with that view the Premier had sent an identical letter to the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria. It seems that it got pushed and shoved around and it was not replied to by the Prime Minister or the two Premiers for some time. Consequently, no conference was agreed to between the Prime Minister and the Premiers as the Premier of Victoria said he did not see any need for it because the Ministers involved could handle the situation as far as he was concerned.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Someone should have got on an aeroplane long before.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Be that as it may, once one has written one can expect at least the courtesy of a reply from the other State Governments and the Commonwealth Government on a matter so vital to South Australia. The issue was so wrapped up with the State election that the Prime Minister and other Premiers must have been aware of the political situation prior to and during the last State election on May 30. The honourable member has asked why we did not get on an aeroplane, but obviously the other Governments were not playing the game with us, so we did not get on an aeroplane.

Once it was proposed that the Ministers meet, the meeting was not long delayed. We met and the results of that conference are now known. I have not given up hope and, as for the honourable member suggesting that he has not heard from the Commonwealth Parliament or from any Parliamentarians in the States of New South Wales or Victoria, be they Labor, Liberal or Country Party, I can tell him that the Labor Party in New South Wales is willing to back our stand in this matter and I am certain that the Opposition Party in Victoria will back it too. I shall be asked, "So what?" The member for Alexandra said that no-one was making a row about this but we have people on our side in New South Wales and Victoria and I hope they can help us get this agreement renegotiated.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have you read the Victorian *Hansard*?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I read the statement the honourable member has alluded to, but that is not the general attitude of the Parliamentary Labor Party at all. When we explain to these people the amendments we are seeking to the agreement they will see that those amendments are completely reasonable and they will not be critical of the moves of the Parliaments of the other two States and of the Commonwealth if those Parliaments see fit to put these amendments

into the agreement we are being asked to ratify. We should alter our agreement accordingly and the whole thing could then proceed. To say that we should put aside our political attitude in this matter is not a reasonable stand on the part of Opposition members, and they are taking such a stand simply in the hope that they can get some limelight as a result of what they are saying.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That's complete rot.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not. I am entitled to my beliefs and the honourable member is perfectly entitled to state his beliefs. I do not believe that the Opposition is genuine in this. How can I believe that it is genuine when I have seen what happened when this motion was first moved? The Leader of the Opposition was not here to move the motion. Opposition members know as well as I know that this gives the impression, rightly or wrongly, that they are not sincere about this. Maybe I am wrong, and members opposite will have the opportunity to prove that. South Australia will eventually have Dartmouth, and I hope that we will eventually have Chowilla, too. But I give the warning that, unless we can press the other two States and the Commonwealth to see that reason prevails and unless they accept the amendments we are proposing, Chowilla is a dead duck forever. We do not want to see that happen, and we will not see it happen without a fight.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Since the Government came to office, the standard of its administration has been tested with regard to several items. Nothing has tested it more than the attention it has had to give to South Australia's water supply. If there needed to be one additional reason why the Minister of Works was unable to renegotiate this agreement, it would be the type of political gibberish that he has just given the House—a mixture of excuses that do not relate to each other. He criticized the other States' representatives for adopting an attitude that he said no other thinking person could adopt, and he insisted that the other States should agree to commit themselves to the future construction of a dam without knowing its worth in relation to the total concept of the Murray River water supply. The Premier and the Minister have asked the other States to agree to an impossible situation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn honourable members that I will not repeatedly stand up and call for order. Honourable members will observe the Chair.

Mr. HALL: Yesterday in the House the Premier said that ratification of the Dartmouth agreement as it stands would be the end for all time of the Chowilla dam, and that is a blatant untruth.

Mr. Curren: It's not.

Mr. HALL: Members of this House know that, before the agreement was presented to the House, I got a letter of committal from the heads of the other Governments that a study of Chowilla must be included in the subsequent study of where the next dam would be. Although all members know that, the Premier stated that blatant untruth yesterday. Today the Minister of Works has dealt with snide little personality items when these great resources for all of south-east Australia stand obstructed by him and his Leader. If members are not aware of the clause in the agreement to which I refer, perhaps I should read it out to them. The Minister of Education, in his devious approach to these matters, knows this clause well. It is clause 2 (*d*) of the Bill that was brought into this House on April 28, 1970, and it provides:

> That the Government of the Commonwealth and the Governments of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed with the Government of this State to request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the River Murray system including the proposed Chowilla reservoir with a view to ascertaining where the next River Murray Commission storage is to be situated to meet the needs of persons using the waters of the river.

Yet, in the stupid arguments that members opposite bring to the people of this and other States, they deny that this agreement exists. They expect other Governments to go further, committing themselves to Chowilla without knowing its worth in relation to another storage. This Government's attitude is such that it demands Chowilla as the next storage, even though that dam might provide this State with only one-third of the water that an alternative storage might provide. Knowing this, members opposite stand convicted of a dual standard and approach to this matter.

Mr. Curren: I know who's convicted.

Mr. HALL: This matter stands with other issues on which the Government is ashamed to face the people today: issues such as the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, on which we learnt yesterday that, although the Government has said it has withdrawn this scheme, money is being spent at the rate of

almost $13,000,000 this financial year on it. Industry has not been expanding in this State as it expanded under the previous Administration. I challenge the Government to produce announcements during its term of office with regard to industrial expansion. The shopping hours fiasco demonstrates the dictatorial attitude of the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the motion about shopping hours. The honourable Leader must confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. HALL: I was alluding to these matters only to illustrate that the water issue stands among other important issues. I will complete the list by saying that it stands with rural issues and others, such as compulsory unionism. Today from the Government we had much drama, but it did not face its responsibility. Its latest failure is its failure to accept the advice of all the experts (not isolated experts, or a factional group of experts) of the four Governments in relation to the Dartmouth issue.

Although this issue stands among the others to which I have referred, it also stands above them. The three States that contain most of Australia's population are being held to ransom by this Government's attitude. One last step is all that is needed to get this huge construction moving, and that is for the Government to bring ratification legislation into this Parliament; the other three Parliaments concerned have approved it. I wonder whether the blockage is my signature on the agreement. Is it too much of a bitter pill for the Premier to swallow to have to introduce an agreement that bears my signature? I wonder whether the real blockage in Government thinking is that it does not like to see my signature, as a previous Premier, on a successful agreement. Added to this is the fact that the agreement provides for 37 per cent more usable water than this Government asked for when last in office. I believe these are the real reasons why the Government finds it impossible to present this matter to the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a debate in which all members will have an opportunity to speak on the issue. Interjections must stop.

Mr. HALL: The Government is proceeding with a cruel hoax. We are all to be sacrificed to the god of Labor politics who is a cruel beast who devours the freedom of the people that he pretends to represent, always using one of his many faces to misrepresent himself as the advocate of democracy. This is entirely lacking in public morality. So much did the Premier think of his promise before the last election to renegotiate the Dartmouth agreement and so important did he think this confrontation with the other States to be that he went overseas and sent his Deputy to the conference. However, I think the Premier came back before the conference was held.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What conference are you talking about?

Mr. HALL: The Minister is out of order again.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will determine when honourable members are out of order. Interjections are out of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The conference to which the Leader of the Opposition is referring has nothing to do with the topic of discussion under this motion. The Leader's discussion of the conference and when the Premier was overseas is irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. If any honourable member, in debate, makes a mistake, I am willing to listen to any honourable member who wants to correct that, but I cannot uphold that point of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HALL: The Premier thought so much of the renegotiations that he sent his Deputy to the conference! The Minister of Works came back, not having been able to influence the other members of the River Murray Commission (thank goodness) one iota, and then the Premier said, "We have not gained anything and we have not lost anything." All he did was send the Minister to another State. The Government ignores the lesson of 1967, when this State did not get its present entitlement of 1,250,000 acre feet of water. It then got about 900,000 acre feet, which members know was a reduction of many hundreds of thousands of acre feet. In fact, the water was running back instead of up at that time. The Government ignores that lesson. It does not regard it as something to conjecture and work upon in the future: it casts that lesson aside and excuses its recklessness, because it says that Chowilla is in jeopardy if the Dartmouth agreement is signed.

That is the Government's excuse (there is no other), yet it ignores the special clause that I had introduced into the agreement. The Government will dishonestly lead the public to believe that the Labor Party in other States supports it. If it can, it will lead the people to infer that the Labor Party in the other States will say, "We want Chowilla, too, after Dartmouth, and we agree to delay the building of Dartmouth until the Labor Party in South Australia gets that promise." That contention is false and hollow because all members would have read the debates in the Victorian Parliament on this matter and they would know what the spokesman for the Labor Party in that Parliament said. Mr. Floyd was one of the chief speakers for that Party, and his speech is recorded at page 3384 of *Hansard* of the Victorian Parliament. He said:

> I intend to deal exclusively with the Bill and to explain that Chowilla was a fake.

These are the people that the Premier and his Deputy say are in their pockets.

Mr. Coumbe: He was speaking on behalf of the A.L.P., wasn't he?

Mr. HALL: Yes. He also said:

> Although the Minister of Water Supply states that the Opposition was previously enraptured with the Chowilla reservoir proposal, I remind the House that we expressed certain doubts concerning it, as did many other people. In fact, any person with a knowledge of water would have done so, because it is not sound policy to build a water storage at the mouth of a river.

These are the people who are coming to the rescue of the beleaguered Labor Party that is confused and leaderless in South Australia. Mr. Floyd also said:

> The Opposition has come down on the side of what is logical. The rejection of this Bill would not mean that the Chowilla project would proceed. We are not faced with a comparison between storages; the purpose of the Bill is to ratify an agreement. If the Bill is not accepted by Parliament, the Dartmouth reservoir will not be built.

Of course, that Parliament, with the approval of every member of it, accepted the agreement which I have here and which the Government has on its files with my signature on it, as well as the signatures of Sir Henry Bolte, Mr. Askin and John Gorton. I understand that the only opponent to any part of the Bill was one of the members representing Broken Hill in the New South Wales Parliament, who was concerned about including the Menindee Lakes in the River Murray Waters Agreement, which inclusion was an advantage to us. Any move in support of Chowilla was opposed in the Labor Party, yet members opposite claim that those members are their magnificent supporters in other States and that, if they win elections, they will come to South Australia and say, "Here you are, you can have Dartmouth, and then we promise you Chowilla." That is an unmistakable fraud.

The position would not be quite so bad, perhaps, if this is where the A.L.P. in South Australia rested—if it just took up this stupid and foolish position, whether for pride or lack of common sense. However, the A.L.P. here has joined with the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament in advocating the removal of the River Murray Commission and the destruction of that commission. The Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, that disaster ready to happen to Australia, is reported in the following press article as making a statement on this matter when he was in South Australia:

> A national authority to replace the "archaic and inefficient" River Murray Commission, and to incorporate the Snowy Mountains Authority was urged today by the Federal Opposition Leader, Mr. Whitlam. The authority could deal with conservation and construction works throughout Australia, Mr. Whitlam said.

Remember, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, that he said "throughout Australia". The report continues:

> Mr. Whitlam said A.L.P. policy was that at least two dams were needed on the Murray to ensure a supply of water of quality and quantity. Whether the present Dartmouth and Chowilla dam sites were the answer was another matter.

The Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition spoke as much gibberish as the Minister has spoken today and as the Premier spoke yesterday when he was challenged by the member for Alexandra about his opinion regarding the removal of the River Murray Commission. On being asked whether he supported Mr. Whitlam's proposal the Premier replied:

> 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, and 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.

That is simply gibberish and it is unintelligible, as members opposite know, except that we get the drift, which is that the Premier agrees with the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition that membership of the River Murray Commission is too narow. That is the main contention: that membership comprising representatives from the Commonwealth Government and the Victorian, New South Wales and South Australian Governments is not wide enough for the Premier or his Deputy. The Premier and his Deputy, as well as the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, advocate incorporating all the functions of the River Murray Commission in a national body. That national body will obviously be guided by all of the representatives of this nation. In other words, we will go back to the type of representation that we have had in the House of Representatives. We will face Victoria and New South Wales with 12 members against 79. This is what the Premier, his Deputy and the Commonwealth Leader are advocating.

Mr. Coumbe: Compulsorily!

Mr. HALL: They are advocating that we give up a position of equity, regarding control of our water supplies from the Murray River, over which we have the power of veto. We are to give up this unparalleled position of power within the commission and hand it over to the National Parliament. Why does the Premier not make himself plain and say that we should hand it over to Melbourne and Sydney? It makes one wonder what motives are behind this obstructive attitude. It is a coalition of exhibitionists that we have under the Dunstan-Whitlam axis, and they are using considerable acting talents, not to lead but to pretend to lead. According to them, someone else is always at the root of the trouble, and it is a wellknown anarchist ploy to create trouble and blame someone else for it, at the same time destroying the body that is being attacked.

Let members opposite give a reason for the destruction or replacement of the River Murray Commission! If they cannot give a reason, they stand purely destructive in their motives. Mr. Whitlam has never been consistent; he has always been erratic in looking at the political market and in adjusting his attitudes to it.

Mrs. Steele: A political opportunist!

Mr. HALL: He is the complete political opportunist. Why his actions in the Commonwealth Parliament have not been fully exposed to the Australian public remains to me a mystery on a national scale. I challenge him to explain to the South Australian electors and to the Victorian and New South Wales electors why he agrees, with the lame Government that we have in South Australia, to the deferment of Dartmouth, when Dartmouth would increase South Australia's usable water supply by 37 per cent, when it would substantially increase the water resources of New South Wales and Victoria, and when already in the agreement there is an undertaking subscribed to by the other three Governments that Chowilla must be included in the next group of dam sites to be investigated. Why does Mr. Whitlam maintain this apparent agreement with the Government here that Dartmouth must be stopped until something else occurs (we know not what)? Let him explain not merely on the parochial scene for local consumption: let him barnstorm Australia and tell the people why he personally favours holding up one of the greatest developments of national resources in south-eastern Australia!

Mr. Whitlam is, of course, a political obstructionist, one of the worst type that Australians have to suffer under, and I hope the people see him for what he is in this regard. South Australia has had the only increase offered to it since the River Murray Commission was formed (a substantial increase of 37 per cent of usable water), and my political opponents never even requested that increase. The need is well established, and what occurred in 1967 is a lesson in recent history that shows why we must not wait one more season than is necessary to approve the construction of such a valuable project. The agreement has been approved by the other three Parliaments concerned without any person in those Parliaments agreeing to the present viewpoint of the South Australian Government. Chowilla is safeguarded as the subject of a future investigation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order!

Mr. HALL: I have already told the Minister many times in this House that no Government can commit itself to a Chowilla of the future, and he knows it. If he is going to advocate the committal of Chowilla before its alternatives have been investigated, I believe he is culpably negligent, as a Minister, and irresponsible.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, there is a limit to the amount of abuse and garbage that the Leader can hand out in this House. I have to take a point of order. I object to the remarks made by the Leader in relation to me, pointing vigorously, as he did, and saying "irresponsible", etc.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister has objected to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Will the Leader withdraw those remarks?

Mr. HALL: I should like to see those remarks in writing.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the Leader to withdraw. The Minister has objected to the terms used by him. Is the Leader going to withdraw?

Mr. HALL: Could I ask what—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has objected to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McAnaney: What are they?

Mr. HALL: I withdraw, although I do not know what I am withdrawing.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I asked for the withdrawal of the remarks that the Leader made in relation to me, namely, that I was culpably negligent and irresponsible.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister has objected to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader has withdrawn those remarks. The Leader of the Opposition!

Mr. HALL: I can say plenty of other things about the Minister without, I hope, insulting his tender sensibilities. I hope he can take political criticism, because he is a political animal. I hope he does not object to that term, because I am sure that he has used far worse in relation to other people. The Minister seems to advocate the committal of Chowilla before the Dartmouth agreement is signed, and I say that, if he is advocating that, it is an irresponsible advocacy. Let him object to that, and I will go out of this House before I will withdraw it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Your first assumption was wrong.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Minister sits in his seat, disobeying the rules of this House by interjecting and disturbing members as they speak.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: That is what I am saying: they are out of order, and the Minister breaks the rules of debate continually. However, never mind him; let us forget him, shall we? The Chowilla safeguard is included in the agreement that has been signed by the four parties to the agreement. It is impossible for any responsible Minister of a Government in Australia to advocate the committal of any Government to Chowilla in the terms in which the present Government is doing so. It would be irresponsible of him (indeed, he would be culpably negligent) to do so. I wonder whether there is some impediment in Government thinking when it asks us to throw away the water (indeed, much more water than was ever requested) that was obtained pursuant to the agreement I signed. We have a coalition, not for the good of this State but for political purposes, between Mr. Whitlam and the Premier. It has been advocated that the River Murray Commission should be replaced by a national water conservation body. Therefore, this magnificent advocacy of South Australia's interests will result, if this Government continues to influence its friends in other States, in the complete sell-out of South Australia's water rights.

There is an old saying that we will never know the worth of water until the river runs dry. As I said earlier, we have had examples of that in recent history. Indeed, if the member for Mitchell cared to go up river, where he could examine the situation and interview some of the growers whose properties were ruined by the last drought in South Australia when we got only 900,000 acre feet of water, he would find evidence of the need for a water supply in this State.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: If the honourable member were to visit the river areas, he would see evidence of the need for water. I have, particularly during the first few months that this Government was in office, deliberately not mentioned this matter to my colleagues in other States. True, I spoke to the Prime Minister at the Party conference in Canberra, but I did not refer to State Government administration. I want to make that clear to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We did not suggest you did.

Mr. HALL: The Deputy Premier is very sensitive today. I am trying to tell other members, not just the Deputy Premier, that I have not mentioned this matter to my colleagues in other Parliaments. However, the time has come to ascertain just what damage the attitudes of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, both of whom have returned to this State and are going to sit tight while the river runs dry, have done to South Australia's interests. I am going to interview the other Parliamentary Leaders in an attempt to see what damage has been done to South Australia's magnificent case. Tomorrow I will ask Sir Henry Bolte, Mr. Askin and Mr. Swartz not to take any precipitate action that could affect South Australia even more adversely than it has been affected by the stupid attitude this Government has adopted. Every expert who has studied this matter has put forward a case for the acceptance of the motion now before the House. South Australia has only to get 24 members of this House to say, "Yes, we want all that water." Yet the people are being led to believe in this great deception that it is against their interests to accept the water that has been offered. I would never have believed that a Party could maintain its ascendancy in politics without having a reasonable degree of public morality, and that is why I believe this Government will never retain its present temporary ascendancy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): This afternoon I feel very sad because we have listened to a performance by the Leader of the Opposition that has involved every possible distortion that he could dream up, every conceivable fiction that he could express, any farrago that he could throw at the Government, and even the use of untruths. I believe the Leader this afternoon, losing his temper at missing the opportunity of moving this motion because he had gone out of the House in a huff, has overstepped the mark as a consequence, and has degraded the standards of this House and of politics in South Australia.

Let me give honourable members one immediate example of the Leader's untruths. The Leader said that the Premier cared so little about this matter that he would not go to the conference but sent the Deputy Premier instead. The Leader knows full well that the Premier suggested a meeting of the Premiers and the Prime Minister, and that the other State Premiers refused to agree to such a meeting, insisting on a meeting only of the relevant Ministers. For the benefit of the puerile mind of the Leader of the Opposition, let me read from a letter that was sent to the Premier by the Premier of New South Wales, part of which states:

> I have received your letter of September 16, concerning your request for a meeting to discuss certain matters affecting the River Murray Waters Agreement. I have since received from the Prime Minister a copy of his letter to you of September 17 in this matter in which he has agreed with my suggestion that at least in the first instance discussions be held between the Ministers whose administrations are directly concerned with the agreement.

In other words, the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria and the Prime Minister insisted that a meeting of the relevant Ministers be held and, knowing that to be the case, the Leader of the Opposition has stooped to telling an untruth by saying that the Premier refused to go and sent the Deputy Premier instead. However, the truth of the matter is that he sent the Minister of Works, the person responsible for the administration of the department directly concerned with the agreement. That is typical of the low level to which the Leader descended in the debate this afternoon: an appallingly low standard that degrades not only the politics of this State but also the level of debate in this House. The Government has said that the form of the agreement that we are asked to ratify, which was presented by the previous Government and which is now temporarily being insisted on by the other States, will mean the loss of Chowilla for all time. The Leader of the Opposition denies this. Let me ask a simple question: if it does not mean the loss of Chowilla for all time, why are the other States refusing even to consider amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement which would ensure that Dartmouth would be undertaken first, that Chowilla would not be unfairly judged in the future, and that all existing rights to Chowilla would not be tampered with?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That does not prove that Chowilla is lost for all time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the other States were really concerned to see that Dartmouth went ahead, they would be willing to consider the amendments that we asked to be made to the River Murray Waters Agreement. The member for Alexandra has had his say: he knows very well that the amendments that we asked for were not world-shattering amendments. If the other States had come to the conference willing to compromise we would

have an agreement now. Instead of this, we have to put up with a farrago of untruths from the Leader of the Opposition, from the Minister for National Development, and from Sir Henry Bolte, suggesting that it was this State that was completely and utterly intransigent. It was clear from the conference the Minister of Works attended that it was the other States that refused to contemplate any alteration whatsoever, and the member for Torrens is not even prepared to consider our proposed amendments.

Mr. Coumbe: They're all out of step, but not you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We asked first for the elimination of the following words in the agreement that was signed by the previous Government:

Completion of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir shall be deferred until the contracting Governments agree that the work shall proceed.

Those words in the agreement negotiated by the previous Government gave a permanent veto over Chowilla; they removed all possible rights of arbitration that this State had in relation to Chowilla, and we asked for the removal of those words. Why should the other States be completely intransigent and refuse to consider in any circumstances the removal of those words from the agreement unless they wanted to be sure that they had the power to prevent the construction of Chowilla? No matter what happens they could be sure that they would never be committed in any way to Chowilla again. That is the only possible basis for their refusal to contemplate the removal of those words.

Mr. Coumbe: You're saying everyone is wrong except you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not saying that at all. I am saying that, for Party-political reasons known best to the members of the Liberal and Country League, the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin thought that it would be inappropriate prior to the Senate election to consider any possible compromise with the people of South Australia (despite the vote of the people of South Australia) and that South Australia should be taught a lesson by the big strong Liberals; yet we are told in relation to this meeting that we are being intransigent. In other words, lies are being peddled in this House. No attempt at all was made by any other Government to reach any sort of agreement with South Australia in relation to this.

Mr. Coumbe: What are these lies you are talking about?

The Hon HUGH HUDSON: I have instanced one told by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, and another developed by the Minister for National Development, namely, that the Minister of Works in this State had agreed not to comment in any way on the meeting of Ministers. The Minister for National Development said that in the Commonwealth Parliament: that was untrue and the member for Torrens knows that it was untrue. He knows that the Minister of Works is a man of his word and that what was said was completely untrue, again.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day (Other Business) to be postponed until Notices of Motion (Other Business) have been disposed of.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the House for the suspension of Standing Orders. The first amendment that we asked for at this conference was for the removal of certain words that gave the Commonwealth and the other States permanent right of veto over Chowilla, no matter what future studies might show. There was to be a permanent right of veto for Mr. Gorton, Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin written into the River Murray Waters Agreement, an agreement negotiated by the previous Government. The removal of those words would be agreed to by anyone who believed that Chowilla should be given a chance to be the next storage. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the agreement he proposed meant the end of Chowilla and that the proposed amendment to the Bill (not to the agreement), providing for further studies, was just window dressing to keep people quiet for a while.

The second point is even more damaging to the claim made by members opposite that it is we who are intransigent. We asked that in relation to any studies to determine the location of the next storage, and in the comparison of Chowilla with some other proposal, no account should be taken of the cost of

any works carried out, as a consequence of the construction of Dartmouth, on improvements of the inlet and outlet channels of Lake Victoria. It would be unfair in our opinion for further studies to take into account as an added cost to Chowilla the costs of those works at Lake Victoria. The Commonwealth Government (and this was the one point where any sign of possible co-operation was shown) agreed with our contention in this matter and was willing to give a letter of intent that, so far as it was concerned, the cost of works on Lake Victoria would not be added to the cost of Chowilla in making a comparison with some other proposed storage. However, New South Wales and Victoria refused. That refusal indicated to us that they intended to use their veto against Chowilla and to see to it that the studies to be undertaken should be as prejudicial as possible to the future construction of Chowilla.

In whose interests are the members opposite acting—the interests of the people of South Australia or the interests of Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin? Are members opposite trying to protect the people of this State or their fellow Liberal Party colleagues in other States? The amendments proposed by the Government at the meeting of Ministers were perfectly reasonable amendments. I challenge members of the Opposition to say they were not. If they agree that they were reasonable requests, who is being intransigent—South Australia, making reasonable requests, or New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth, colluding to slap South Australia down?

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think even you believe that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In other words, the honourable member considers that they were unreasonable requests.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't say that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, what is the honourable member saying? He has a great habit of taking one sentence or a part of a sentence and saying something about it. What is he saying?

Mr. Millhouse: Wait and see.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will wait. As we know, the honourable member claims some repute in debating tactics. I ask him to consider, when he joins the debate, the actual proposition put to the meeting of Ministers and not to stick to the ridiculous story put around that South Australia went to the conference of Ministers insisting on Chowilla at the complete cost of Dartmouth, and insisting on Chowilla as the next storage no matter what the study showed. That is not what South Australia did at that conference. Why is it impossible for the Liberals in the other State Parliaments and in the Commonwealth Parliament to consider any reasonable requests that South Australia makes in this matter? Is it because their Liberal colleagues in South Australia lost an election on the issue? I wish members opposite could tell us what possible basis in logic or fact determined the attitude of New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth at that recent conference of Ministers. Why is it necessary for the other States and the Commonwealth to retain a veto? Why is it necessary, in any future studies, to add to the cost of Chowilla the cost of any works undertaken on the inlet and outlet channels of Lake Victoria?

No Opposition member has given any reason why the other States and the Commonwealth should have refused South Australia's requests. Giving no reason for the refusal, they say that South Australia, in trying to protect any future rights it may have, although those rights are tenuous enough, is being intransigent and that the other States, in apparently trying to see that Chowilla is a dead duck for all time, are not being intransigent. I think that Opposition members, their colleagues in the other States, and the Prime Minister and the Minister for National Development have some explaining to do on this matter. They should be willing to tell the people of their States why South Australia's reasonable requests on this matter cannot be acceded to in any circumstances. We are accused of playing politics: I suggest that the politics is being played by members opposite, who are fully aware anyway that the basis on which any studies are undertaken is already prejudicial to South Australia, because the commission undertakes studies on the basis of what storage will maximize the yield not to South Australia and not to the whole system but to the up-river States of New South Wales and Victoria. The studies are designed to determine what storage will give the greatest possible yield to New South Wales and Victoria whilst just giving South Australia its entitlement. That puts a bias in favour of the storages up-river for the Victorian irrigation settlement and so on and against Chowilla.

I was interested in the information supplied in this House on the relevant flows that have occurred at various points along the river

during the recent winter months. We were told yesterday that the flow of the Mitta Mitta River during the months of August, September and October contributed an average of about 24 per cent or 25 per cent of the water flowing into the Hume dam: that is the entire flow of the Mitta Mitta River, not the quantity of water that actually flowed past the Dartmouth dam site. That percentage would have been lower.

Mr. Coumbe: Is that for more than three months?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is for three months. From the way honourable members talked about the Mitta Mitta River in the past, one would have thought that it would be up around the 40 per cent or 50 per cent mark. As one of the three main branches, in fact, it contributed barely a quarter of the total flow into the Hume dam. In addition, the quantity of water that flowed past the Dartmouth dam site during those three months would have been significantly less than one-quarter of the water that flowed into the Hume dam. At best the flow past the Dartmouth dam site could not at any stage have been greater than about 10,000 cusecs.

Only last Wednesday details were given in this House of the flow of the various tributaries of the Murray River during recent months, and I repeat this information for honourable members. The flow at Albury has been as low as 3,000 cusecs and as high as 51,000 cusecs. Of course, that flow is made up of flows contributed from three branches, of which the Mitta Mitta River is one. The peak flow of the Kiewa River reached 7,500 cusecs. In other words, the flow of that river would probably have been as great at any stage during that period of three months as the flow past the Dartmouth dam site. The Ovens River had a peak flow of 24,000 cusecs at the end of August, reducing to the present flow of 2,500 cusecs, and that is probably up to three times greater than the flow past the Dartmouth dam site. The Goulbourn River had a peak flow in early August of 6,000 cusecs, rising in September to 16,000 cusecs, and reducing to the present flows of about 4,000 cusecs. Again, that is greater than the flow past the Dartmouth dam site. The Murrumbidgee River had low flows of 1,000 cusecs in August and September, rising to an expected peak of between 7,500 cusecs and 8,000 cusecs at the end of October. The flows of the Darling River were negligible.

Honourable members will be aware that the total yield of the Murray River under any studies results in increased entitlements to South Australia simply because South Australia is the only State that may make fully effective use of all the tributary inflows. Honourable members also know that studies that require one to work out which storage maximizes yields to New South Wales and Victoria as against maximizing a yield to the whole system put a premium on an up-river storage, because only an up-river storage can serve fully all those parts of New South Wales and Victoria along the Murray River that are taken into account in the exercise. Many of the tributaries do not effectively serve large parts of the irrigation settlements along the banks of the Murray in New South Wales and Victoria, and much of the tributary inflow can be used effectively only in South Australia. That has always been held to be an argument in favour of Chowilla and why it would be in the interests of this State. However, we are prepared to agree to studies going ahead on the old basis, which is, as I have explained to honourable members, partly prejudicial to Chowilla as against an up-river storage.

Why is it, then, if we are prepared to agree to this, that Victoria and New South Wales insist that any costs associated with inlet and outlet works at Lake Victoria must be added to the costs of Chowilla for a comparison to be made between Chowilla and an up-river storage? Why do they want to prejudice Chowilla still further, unless they are saying, "Chowilla is a dead duck now; let us keep it that way"? I believe that the opinion of the Liberal Party in other States is simply in line with that: "Chowilla is a dead duck and, as long as we stick together, we can keep it that way." The Leader of the Opposition has continually tried to deny in this House that Chowilla would be a dead duck if the agreement, as he presented it to the House, was signed and ratified by South Australia. However, we believe that to be the case. If it is not, there must be some other extraordinary reasons why New South Wales and Victoria are not willing to consider even the alteration of one word relating to their veto power or one word relating to adding Lake Victoria costs to the costs of Chowilla in any further studies.

I think I have said enough to show that the insincerity in relation to this matter has come from the Liberal Party in other States and to show that this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition has had no respect for the truth.

Mr. Coumbe: Oh, come on!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Torrens knows quite well what I am talking about. He knows the kind of attitude that the Leader will adopt in debate in this House, and he knows the extent to which he will make irresponsible statements and lower the standard of debates in this House.

Mr. Coumbe: You can talk!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is one of those patriotic bits of garbage that we have heard before and, doubtless, will hear again. I consider that the questions that should be asked in the daily press, both here and in other States, have not yet been asked. Sir Henry Bolte, Mr. Askin and the Prime Minister should be explaining to the people of Australia why, if the present agreement that they support does not mean the end of Chowilla, they will not even consider the most minor amendment to it. I should like to hear an answer, even from an honourable member opposite, on that point. I think our newspapers and other news media have been failing in their duty in not requiring, from the other Governments involved in this matter, an answer to that question.

We heard much from the Leader of the Opposition, again distorting the position stated by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, about the future of the River Murray Commission. We on this side have said that there is a case for a national water authority. I should think that one feature of the River Murray Waters Agreement that would stick in the gullet of honourable members opposite would be that the Commonwealth Government contributes only 25 per cent of the cost of any water storage work. I should have thought honourable members would be upset about that, when the Commonwealth contributes 50 per cent in relation to storages on the Murrumbidgee River and in Queensland, and more than 50 per cent in relation to storages in Western Australia.

I should have thought that, under our current financial arrangements with the Commonwealth, it was an anachronism that the River Murray Commission required each party to contribute equally; that is, to contribute 25 per cent, while the Commonwealth Government contributed only 25 per cent. I should have thought that any member who believed in a national conservation policy would expect the Commonwealth Government to contribute to the cost of that policy to a greater extent than our present Commonwealth Government has done. In my opinion, it ill behoves the Leader of the Opposition to say that the purpose of the Labor Party and that of Mr. Whitlam and the Premier is to destroy the River Murray Commission.

Surely the Leader of the Opposition is capable of contemplating another proposal that would ultimately substitute a new organization for the River Murray Commission if that new organization could do a better job in the overall interests of Australia. Surely we can contemplate such a new organization being established without adding the puerile charges of the Leader that we are out to destroy the River Murray Commission. Surely it is time that the people of this State did not have to put up with that sort of puerile argument, yet great slabs of the Leader's speech were directed at distorting what Mr. Whitlam and the Premier had said and at accusing both of them falsely of trying to destroy the River Murray Commission, trying to be purely destructive and not wanting to do anything constructive for the future of Australia.

Honourable members know that that sort of attack is, first, false and, secondly, one that does no credit to the Leader, to this House, or to the politics of this State. I consider that we have reached the stage where members opposite should give us some answers about why they are not willing to contemplate any amendment to the agreement that is demonstrably in the interests of South Australia. Even if it is shown, as I have shown, that it is in our interests that these amendments to the agreement be made, members opposite will not accept the amendments and support us. Why will they not support us? What is the answer to that, if it is not that they feel that they must justify their previous stand, no matter what? Are not members opposite willing to admit that they may have been mistaken in the stand they took when they were in Government? Are they not willing to admit that they may have been wrong to allow in the River Murray Waters Agreement a provision that gave New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth a permanent right of veto? Are they not willing to admit that they may have been wrong in not seeing that future works at Lake Victoria were not to be to the discredit of future works at Chowilla?

If members opposite concede that we have a case on these amendments, why will they not support us? Why do they support their colleagues in New South Wales and Victoria

and in the Commonwealth Parliament? Is their only reason for supporting those colleagues that they are members of the same Party? Members opposite persist in saying that the agreement is there and we must sign it. I suppose they say that it is wrong to assume that people in other States are reasonable men and capable of discussion and of coming to an agreement, and I suppose they say that, if one puts up a reasonable argument, one will get knocked over. Is that what members opposite are saying? Is their argument that these people in other States and in the Commonwealth Government are so incapable of reason that we must accept what they give us? Surely it is about time we heard some argument from the Opposition on this matter, not the kind of abuse to which we have been subjected by the Leader this afternoon.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The simple reason why the Opposition is moving this motion is that it wants the Government to get on with the Dartmouth project, on behalf of everyone in South Australia. The two Ministers who have spoken this afternoon in reply to previous speakers were full of apologies and said nothing constructive. The Minister of Education did an economic and academic exercise and posed some obvious questions to which everyone knew the answers and to which he, of course, knew the answers before he even posed the questions. What the two Ministers did was simply to prop up a weak case of inactivity by the present Government and of specious promises made earlier which have not been kept.

The Opposition is seeking on behalf of everyone in South Australia a way of solving the water problem that we are facing as individuals, as a State as a whole, as divertees of water from the Murray River, and as city and country dwellers. The member for Whyalla represents a district that gets water from the Murray River, and most of the industries in this State rely on water from this system. I wish to ensure that in the years to come we will get the water we need. The Government's action in recent months, particularly in the last few weeks, has done the very opposite of achieving a solution to this problem, because what it has done (and what the Premier in particular has said in this House and publicly) has put the backs up of the very people whom one naturally would have assumed the Premier wanted to co-operate with him.

Mr. Keneally: You've got to be nice to them, I suppose.

Mr. COUMBE: No, but when one is doing a deal with three other parties one does not immediately put the backs up of those parties. I have had some experience of this, as the honourable member may know, being the Minister who, together with the then Premier, brought this agreement to fruition. The Australian Labor Party has put the Party before the State, and the Government is culpable in having delayed this matter and in having denied South Australia an extra quota of water for all its citizens. The Government has deliberately delayed this matter through the action its members took in the debate that occurred last April, and those who were not here can read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Keneally: We already have.

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased to hear it. On that occasion, South Australia had the opportunity to get the first great increase in water since 1915, when the River Murray Waters Agreement came into effect.

Mr. Keneally: Who denied that increase?

Mr. COUMBE: The A.L.P. did; that is true. As a result of the negotiations in which the present Leader and I, as members of the previous Government, took part, we were able to reach agreement at the meeting held at which I and other Ministers of Works were present, and this agreement represented about 20 per cent extra water for South Australia. I remember vividly, as you would also remember, Mr. Speaker, that on the last night of the previous Parliament the member for Ridley, who was the then Speaker, moved an amendment that was defeated by the then Government and the Opposition. However, he then moved another amendment, which was snapped up by the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier. Why did he support that amendment? It was not for South Australia; he put the Party before South Australia, so that he could have an election.

Mr. Keneally: And he won.

Mr. COUMBE: I charge the Government with delaying the development of South Australia, as well as the whole of south-eastern Australia, in regard to its water supply, and I say again that the A.L.P. is the guilty one as a result of the action taken on that occasion. If on that occasion the A.L.P. had agreed to ratify the agreement that the then Liberal Government had brought into the House, the planning could have commenced straight away.

Mr. Keneally: Planning will not have been delayed, as you have been told.

Mr. COUMBE: I heard that statement the other day, and I thank the member for Stuart for reminding me of it, for I will come back to it. I remember the present Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, saying, "You elect us to Government and within a few months I can renegotiate this agreement." I remember in April twice saying in this House, in the debate that took place, "You haven't got a hope in hell. You have got as much chance as a snowflake in hell of getting this agreement renegotiated," and I said that from experience.

Mr. Venning: What has the Premier done?

Mr. COUMBE: Although six months has passed, nothing has been achieved. Certainly, there has been a meeting of Ministers, and the Minister of Works came back and, to give him due credit, kept his word. But when the statement was released, what did it amount to? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. Clark: Do you remember when you promised as an election plank to build Chowilla?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and I remember sitting on the other side of the House and saying that since that time we had received other advice. I was the first to admit that I was wrong, and I had the honesty to get up and say it. No-one can accuse me of not being honest in making that statement.

Mr. Hall: Your altered opinion also depended on getting additional water.

Mr. COUMBE: Exactly. At the meeting of Ministers that I attended last February, the only condition under which we agreed to this situation was that South Australia would receive an extra allocation, for which the Labor Party had never asked in its negotiations. The New South Wales and Victorian Parliaments passed the relevant Bills ratifying the agreement, and it had the concurrence of both sides. Indeed, I think that in one Parliament it was passed by three Parties. The A.L.P. in the other States did not oppose it; it was in favour of Dartmouth, and it was in favour of the same agreement that we as a Government brought into this House last April. I vividly recall saying to the then Leader of the Opposition that if he voted for the amendment proposed by the then member for Ridley it would not be long before he himself would be over there seeking the same ratification, and for all practical purposes that is happening today, because nothing has been done since. The A.L.P. on that occasion put the Party before the State, and it is now facing the moment of truth.

Mr. Clark: The State gave its answer too.

Mr. COUMBE: The A.L.P. has found that what we said on that occasion was true: the other three Parliaments have passed the measure and have ratified the agreement, and it now remains only for this Parliament to ratify it. The member for Stuart reminded me of the time aspect. When Minister of Works, I was told by officers of the Commonwealth Department of National Development that planning could be started immediately the agreement was ratified by all four Parliaments. That statement was made by responsible officers for whom I have the greatest respect—indeed, a greater respect than I have for some members opposite. Also, I got the Engineer-in-Chief in South Australia—

Mr. Keneally: Which one: Mr. Dridan or Mr. Beaney?

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member should not live in the past. I am speaking not of Mr. Dridan, a man for whom I have the greatest respect, but of the present Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Beaney), the head of one of the departments for which I, as Minister, was responsible. He said that if the agreement were ratified planning could proceed and tenders could be called in about the middle of 1971. Any member who has the slightest knowledge of engineering or of buildings of any description, or who knows the first thing about dam construction (and there is plenty of information in the library in this respect, and one has only to read some of the River Murray Commission reports) will realize the long time it takes to plan these schemes. I was told by these officers that planning could proceed immediately the agreement was ratified. The member for Stuart is trying to make some moment of this matter and he is trying to divert me. However, every moment that this ratification is delayed means that the southern part of Australia, and South Australia particularly, will be denied the advantage of the extra quantity of water.

Mr. Keneally: What extra quantity? You say that, but the experts don't.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member says—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not reply to interjections.

Mr. COUMBE: I shall be happy to explain this matter to the honourable member later.

What is this quantity of water of which we are speaking? The temporary member for Chaffey would be most interested in this matter, because, had Chowilla been built, South Australia would have got 1,250,000 acre feet of water a year. Yet its entitlement, had the Bill that the Liberal Government introduced to ratify the agreement been passed, would have been 1,500,000 acre feet—an increase of 20 per cent.

Another important aspect is the quantity of diversion water to be allocated to us. The temporary member for Chaffey would again be interested in this aspect because of the number of divertees in the irrigation settlements in his district. At present 690,000 acre feet is available, but this volume would rise by 35 per cent to 930,000 acre feet. How can the member for Chaffey, whether he is temporary or not, say to his constituents, "I am opposing a 35 per cent increase in our divertible water for you"?

Mr. Curren: We'd be getting something better for South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE: Do you think it would mean more water for them?

Mr. Curren: For South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE: I am talking about the volume that would be available not to the other States but to South Australia and to the people who live and work here—people of whom the honourable member should be thinking. The Labor Party has always said that it stands for the people, but it is not doing so now. The Leader's motion would, if passed, give the people of this State an advantage. The volume of diversion water that the honourable member and other members along the Murray River (of whom there are many) can use is 564,000 acre feet. When one examines the present allocation, however, one finds that at present the Minister of Works cannot issue more licences because South Australia is already over-committed in a dry year by about 85,000 acre feet. If Dartmouth were built, an additional 161,000 acre feet of water would be available after covering the over-commitment, some of which (perhaps 100,000 or 120,000 acre feet) could be used to improve the quality control of the river.

Members opposite talk about evaporation but, in his eagerness to get Chowilla, the member for Chaffey has obviously forgotten about evaporation. I admit that I have not yet had an opportunity to read the salinity report that the Minister was courteous enough to make available to me. Members were told earlier that the evaporation at the Dartmouth dam would total about 15,000 acre feet annually, but how much evaporation would occur at Chowilla?

Mr. Venning: A significant amount.

Mr. COUMBE: It would be about 1,050,000 acre feet a year, compared with 15,000 acre feet for Dartmouth. What in God's name is the use of storing water when it will evaporate during the year? It must be remembered, too, that this water will get more and more salty and, when it is let out, the people down the river will get all that salt. Where is the logic in that? What is the position regarding the issuing of licences to the people on the river, a matter that concerns all members, particularly those representing river districts? There is a complete ban on the issue of licences to more divertees on the river. Indeed, in a dry year there is a danger of the number of licences being reduced. If Dartmouth were built, however, we could increase the number of licences. As the Minister knows, investigations are proceeding to ascertain by how many that number could be increased.

One can also ask about the years of restriction, which is indeed a vexed question. Between 1905 and 1960 there were three restriction periods, compared with only one in the area in which the Dartmouth dam would be built. Chowilla could even have emptied once during that period.. The Government is now saying that, as the saviour of South Australia, it wants to retain Chowilla and to get it into the agreement. When the previous Premier and I, as well as other members of the Liberal Government, prepared this schedule, which was ratified by the other three Parliaments, we made sure that certain aspects regarding Chowilla were still retained in the schedule. We could have had the whole thing worked out, but we made sure that certain provisions were retained.

Mr. Keneally: Tell us about the veto.

Mr. COUMBE: If the honourable member wants to read about the veto and if he doubts the figures I have given, I suggest that he read in the library one of the most learned papers which I have seen on this subject and which was succinctly prepared by the Executive Engineer of the River Murray Commission, who is one of the most highly qualified engineers in the country. That paper should be

compulsory reading for all members interested in this subject. When he was member for Glenelg (and I do not want to reflect on the present member for Glenelg, who stands alone), the Minister of Education asked question after question (and I was happy to provide the information to him) about this subject designed to frustrate the building of the Dartmouth dam. One only has to read last year's *Hansard* to see this. The honourable member made all sorts of excuses then, as he did today. Recently the Premier referred to certain votes on this issue in the House, and about how the House had carried certain motions. I remember that, in 1967, the present Minister of Labor and Industry, who was then the Opposition Whip following the unfortunate accident to the then member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), moved the following motion, which was eventually carried:

Assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the dam, South Australia will be supplied in dry years with the volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure.

That motion, which was sponsored by the Labor Party, asked for only the water proposed by the present agreement. Our Government asked for more than that and we got it. At the Ministerial conference I attended as Minister (and it was equivalent to the conference attended last week by the present Minister), South Australia got more than we hoped and expected to get. We achieved the first major advance for South Australia in this matter since 1915. Not only did we get the extra quantity of water but we also got the Menindee Lakes agreement put into perpetuity, and that was no mean achievement. That agreement was previously designed to expire in 1970 but, with the consent of New South Wales and Victoria, we got it into perpetuity. We agreed that certain investigations should be made. We got for South Australia an equal 5: 5: 5 share instead of the 5: 5: 3 share that previously applied. Then we came to the matter of the financial agreement that has been raised by the Minister of Education. Members can contradict me if I am wrong, but I distinctly heard the Minister say that the Commonwealth would contribute only 25 per cent.

Mr. Millhouse: He said that.

Mr. COUMBE: Under the agreement as it stands at present, the cost of capital works will be borne equally by the four parties, each party paying one-quarter. The cost of maintenance works will be borne by the three States. However, under the financial agreement for the construction of Dartmouth, not only will the Commonwealth pay its one-quarter share but it will also advance to the three States one-half of their quarter share as a loan repayable over 15 years, the first repayment to be 10 years after the money is borrowed. That is a moratorium in the true sense and it means that South Australia and the other States will each have to find from their own resources only one-eighth of the total cost of the whole project.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They have to pay it back.

Mr. Keneally: That's a misrepresentation.

Mr. COUMBE: It is not. Perhaps the honourable member can recall the difficulties in which my predecessor as Minister (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) became involved in regard to the financing of the Chowilla agreement at that time. This agreement gives a moratorium. The Minister of Works will be the first to agree that other works in the States can go on while work on the dam takes place: nothing will have to stop for this work to be done. Therefore, we were able to achieve a most important agreement. The purpose of the Opposition in bringing forward this motion is to suggest to the Government that it forgets for once its political considerations and thinks of all the people who are working towards the future development of the State. The Government should get on with the job of ratifying the Dartmouth agreement. At the moment, the Government is putting everyone else's back up, and I sincerely regret that this will delay for years to come the implementation of a scheme that will provide, through the Murray River system, an increased quantity of water for the people of the State, whether the water will be supplied through mains or through direct pumping, or whether it will serve to improve the quality of the river.

Before the election the Premier blithely said that he could renegotiate this agreement within a few months, but six months has passed and nothing has happened. In fact, from the tenor of the remarks of both the Ministers who have spoken today it looks as though another six months will pass before we get even a glimmer of hope. The other day, the Premier said (and he was not referring to Mr. Whitlam's comments) that some time in 1971 the Askin Liberal Government in New South Wales will

fall, Labor will get in, and then we will have an amendment to the agreement. He is throwing the whole of this wonderful opportunity into the lap of the gods. Who says that the Askin Government will fall anyway? Even if it did, I remind members that Labor members of the New South Wales Parliament supported the schedule that we are seeking to ratify. Also, the Victorian and Commonwealth Governments are concerned, and there has just been an election in Victoria. The Premier has a faint hope indeed of using this ploy. I say sincerely to the Government that the Opposition is interested in getting more water for South Australia: for God's sake forget politics and get this thing ratified.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I oppose the motion.

Mr. Venning: What—

Mr. CURREN: If the member for Rocky River takes the barley grass and cockie chaff out of his ears and listens, he will hear what I have to say. As the Minister of Works has said, the Leader of the Opposition has again shown that this is a political issue for which the Opposition has not much support. The Leader showed that by his absence from the Chamber when the motion was moved and his reluctance to stand up and second the motion when he did return after the stopgap—

Mr. Gunn: Where are all your members now?

Mr. CURREN: Where are all the Opposition members? It is an Opposition motion, so it would be desirable for Opposition members to be present.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey has the call and I ask that interjections cease. I have been persistent in asking this, and interjections must cease forthwith.

Mr. CURREN: Once again the Opposition has made clear that it regards this as a political question, just as it made that clear during the election campaigns in 1968 and earlier this year. I have explained that the Opposition does not regard the matter highly, but after the election on May 30, it should be careful about how it regards the matter.

Mr. Gunn: How is it that—

Mr. CURREN: The pop gun from Eyre will have an opportunity to put his views. The member for Torrens made some points that were valid and some that were not. Regarding irrigation expansion with this 35,000 acre feet of water extra that will be made available in South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition said during the last State election campaign that very little of this would be available for irrigation expansion. There is no denial from the other side on that point. Members opposite are merely mumbling in their beards. The original concept of Chowilla was to store for later use the water that flowed down the river during the winter and spring months. That is when irrigators do not need much water: considerable quantities of water of good quality are needed in summer.

This year, during the past few months, the figures showing the quantity of water flowing to waste over the barrages at Goolwa are interesting. I asked the Engineering and Water Supply Department for an estimate of the total quantity of water that has flowed over the Murray River mouth barrages during the past six months, and the department told me that the estimated figure was about 3,040,000 acre feet. I also asked the department for an estimate of flows over the barrages during the next three months, based on projected flows down the river that are well-known. I was told in reply that the estimated volume through the barrages for the next three months was 1,900,000 acre feet. Those figures total 4,940,000 acre feet, which is a little less than the total quanitty that would be stored in the Chowilla dam if it was there now. That is one reason why this Government is still saying that Chowilla is a good thing for South Australia.

In reply to a further inquiry, the department told me that the monthly average salinity levels in parts a million at Murray Bridge during the period from June 1 to October 31 this year were: June, 267; July, 275; August, 258; September, 263; and October, 197. I, as the member for the District of Chaffey (and my representation will not be temporary as members opposite hope) realize that it is good not only for the irrigators of South Australia but also for the whole State to have this large body of water stored where it is most necessary and useful. Members opposite have tried to create the impression that the people of the river districts do not want the Chowilla dam. For the benefit of those members, I will read the editorial in the *Murray Pioneer,* which circulates widely in the Upper Murray districts, of October 29. That editorial states:

S.A. Stand on Dams: Predictably, the efforts of the Premier to obtain recognition for Chowilla as the next Murray dam to be built after Dartmouth have not gained a sympathetic

reception from the other partners to the River Murray Waters Agreement. The greatest obstacle to persuading New South Wales and Victoria to agree to Chowilla is doubtless the conviction that this dam would give much greater benefits to South Australia than to the Eastern States, whereas with a headwaters dam such as Dartmouth the situation is the other way round. The Victorian Premier has conceded that South Australia is in more desperate need of water than the other States. To be consistent he could well agree that Chowilla should come immediately after Dartmouth and so give the positive control of the surplus waters that could mean so much in meeting our irrigation, domestic and industrial needs. Our Premier, in his stand for "Chowilla next", is doing no more than carrying out both the expressed wish of Parliament and the declared policy of his Party when it successfully contested the election precipitated by the dam issue earlier this year. No serious argument has been advanced against Chowilla except on the score of cost—and Dartmouth is expected to cost just as much. The South Australian stand need not therefore be construed as holding up progress any more than that of the Eastern States and the Commonwealth in refusing to recognize our right ultimately to what had previously been agreed upon.

Mr. Gunn: Did you send that in?

Mr. CURREN: I fully support those views but, as other honourable members will realize, I did not have anything to do with compiling that editorial. From a South Australian point of view, it is a good editorial.

Mr. Wardle: Why don't—

Mr. CURREN: It also would be beneficial for South Australia if the member for Murray did something to look after the long-term interests of the State rather than deride a Government that is trying to do something in that direction. The Leader of the Opposition has performed gymnastics on the Chowilla issue and he has tried to justify his changes of attitude. Just after he was elected Premier, he went on one of his famous interstate trips, trying to carry out his function as chief negotiator for South Australia, and a report of that trip was headed "Premier to Sell Chowilla". I have said previously that he did not sell Chowilla: he gave it away, much to the detriment of the future security of South Australia's water needs.

I fully support the stand taken by the Government on this issue. The establishment of an overall authority that can control the waters of the Murray-Darling system has been thoroughly discussed in many quarters other than in Labor Party circles. Industrial organizations of a national character, which are interested in irrigation, have supported the establishment of a national authority in order to have an assured water supply, which is so vital for the development of national projects. For the Opposition to deny this is merely wishful thinking. I know that ours is the correct attitude, because I have been connected with the Federal Council of the Australian Dried Fruits Association, which carried a resolution supporting and advocating development of the water supply under this concept. I believe that this authority must eventually be established. To that end, I support the stand taken by the Government on this issue, and I oppose the motion most heartily.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The subject matter of this motion is one of many time bombs which are steadily ticking away and which eventually will mean the destruction of the present Government. I do not believe that any one issue will destroy the Government: there are several issues which will show the people of South Australia that they cannot trust this Government or rely on anything it says. Perhaps, of all of the issues, this issue illustrates better than any other does the lack of capacity to be relied on. Immediately this matter arose in the House in April, the present Premier said that he would renegotiate the agreement within a couple of months. He said that in a television interview, which I have quoted in the House, I think when the matter was before the previous Parliament in April. He has been in office now for five months, he has done very little, and he has achieved absolutely nothing. As the member for Torrens has said, there is no doubt that this issue was used by the Labor Party quite cynically, without any idea of merit on the part of that Party, in order to force an election in this State so that it could get back into office, and that is as far as it has gone.

This matter is dragging on and will continue to drag on, and it will drag the Government down until it is resolved. We have asked in this House from time to time that the Government tell us what it is doing. I have asked the Premier to table the correspondence that he has had with the other States, so that the people of South Australia will know what arguments the present Government is putting forward in its claim for a renegotiation of the agreement. That has been refused, and one suspects that it is because there are no arguments that the present Government can put forward in favour of renegotiating and altering the agreement. Now, of course, the Minister of Education and others are accusing every

other party to the River Murray Waters Agreement of intransigence: why will they not accept, we are asked, reasonable amendments which the Government of South Australia wants to move? The vice of the present Government's position is this: we cannot please ourselves in this matter and decide what we want. We happen to be only one of four parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. It stands to reason that, as we are one of four, before there can be any agreement there must be an agreement by four parties, and no one party can dictate to the others. I do not know whether the new members in this House realize that the agreement which we should like to ratify, and which we tried to have ratified in this House, to have the Dartmouth dam built was the culmination of years of negotiation. Some of their colleagues and some of our colleagues in the Parliaments of New South Wales and Victoria pointed this out. We are one party to an agreement, and if we are to have renegotiation of that agreement there must be some grounds for renegotiation, but we have none, and we have no cards in our hand to force a renegotiation of that agreement.

Mr. Keneally: Wouldn't the amendments suggested be reasonable?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I don't care two hoots about the amendments. Under the agreement negotiated by the previous Government we have a very good deal, because I remind the honourable member—

Mr. Keneally: But you didn't—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me remind the member for Stuart of the whole aim of the River Murray Waters Agreement: it is to provide more water to the parties that have entered into the agreement. The essence and the aim of the agreement are that we should get more water and that Victoria and New South Wales also should get more water. We were able to negotiate an agreement which gave us 250,000 acre feet more water than we are entitled to get at present. I remember warning the people of South Australia before the last election, as did many members on this side, that unless we got that extra water speedily there would be restrictions in this State in one year in three and, so far as I am aware, that forecast or estimate, given to us by our officers in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, still stands. Yet five months has passed and nothing has been done to get us more water, and our entitlement at present stands, as it has stood since the agreement came into operation, at 1,250,000 acre feet.

Let us face this issue squarely: South Australia does not have the power to renegotiate this agreement (to shape it to suit its own needs), and the sooner the Government acknowledges that the better. How long, I ask, must we wait until the other parties come to heel? We have heard this week that there is to be an election in New South Wales next year. Is that going to get us anywhere? What about Victoria? Victoria had an election on the same day as ours, and, if we follow that line of argument, I suppose Sir Henry Bolte is just as much entitled as our Premier to say that the people of Victoria voted in a certain way at the election and that he was not going to change the stand on which he was endorsed on May 30. However, he has gone rather further than that, and I remind honourable members of this, because by not doing anything we run the risk of losing Dartmouth as well.

Sir Henry Bolte has said that, unless there is some agreement soon, at any rate, the money for Dartmouth will be used for other purposes. The member for Stuart wags his head at me, but that is what Sir Henry Bolte said. If the honourable member is prepared to believe that Sir Henry Bolte does not mean it, I think he is a foolish man to take that risk. We in South Australia would be foolish to take that risk. These are the facts of life, and the sooner the Government realizes it the better. We cannot force our partners in the agreement to renegotiate it, but we already have an excellent deal under the agreement. If we lose that deal it will be to the prejudice of this State. I hope that honourable members opposite, even if they defeat the motion (as undoubtedly they will: to save their political faces, they could not do anything else), will accept our arguments, and that, in some way or other in the next few weeks, they will be willing to ratify the agreement for the benefit of this State and of every person in it, because, as I have said, it is one of the time bombs ticking away and it will continue to tick away until it explodes in their faces.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McAnaney and Mathwin. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan and Lawn.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-1964. Read a first time.

Mr. JENNINGS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a simple and, I hope, non-controversial measure designed to prohibit a form of cruelty that is of a completely unnecessary nature existing in this State. The Bill seeks to make the use of what is commonly known as a gin trap illegal in municipal areas throughout the State. Clause 2 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting immediately after the definition of "ill-treat" the following definition:

"trap" means any device equipped with spring-loaded jaws for seizing an animal by its leg, tail or snout, but does not include a rat trap or a mouse trap:

Clause 3 enacts and inserts in the principal Act immediately after section 5b thereof the offence and the penalty, and subclause (2) restricts the provisions of the Act to any municipality. During the past 10 months, 23 cases have been investigated where cats have been caught in gin traps set by suburban householders. The reasons for setting these traps are mainly: (*a*) for the protection of valuable birds (that is, racing pigeons); and (*b*) for the protection of the householder's garden surrounds.

The reason that is usually given is that the householder is attempting to rid his property of rats. The most efficient way of doing this is by use of poison, which can be procured from the local council. The poison used, which is issued by the council free, is a compound that affects the blood and has a cumulative effect resulting in death. It is a reasonably humane process. Furthermore, there can be no objection to the use of rat traps, which break the back of the rat when trapped, although these should be placed so that they will not accidentally trap children and domestic pets. A piece of chicken wire over them is usually sufficient. There is no doubt that an aviary or pigeon loft can be made cat-proof with the exercise of a little imagination.

The injuries caused by an animal being trapped by the leg in a gin trap initially are severe and cause intense pain. Extensive bruising, broken bones and severed tendons and nerves are found on the leg where the jaws of the trap close around it. Additional injuries are caused through the animal, particularly a cat, having been caught by the leg, going berserk in its struggles to free itself, and tearing the flesh, sinews and tendons of the leg. Within four hours of damaging the leg, the wound often becomes flyblown and gangrenous. If the animal is released within 24 hours of being caught, the leg can be amputated, depending on the extent of gangrene found. If the animal is not released, it dies in agony.

Details of 23 cases were reported to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and investigated between January 1, 1970, and October 31, 1970. More often than not cases are not reported to the society as the owners of the traps do not publicize the fact when they catch any animal, and many animals drag the trap into the bush and cannot be found. The Animal Welfare League reports that it has knowledge of 40 cases of domestic pets being caught in gin traps over the past 10 months. It would be reasonable to assume that the actual number of cases that occur runs into hundreds. The legal position on the use of these traps is that, at present, they can be used by any person in all areas. Legal action can be taken only if it can be proven that the setter of the trap was aware that an animal had been caught in it and made no attempt to put the animal out of its suffering within a reasonable length of time. This is extremely difficult to prove in court, although in a large number of cases traps are set and then ignored by the setter.

There is no intention of depriving any householder of the right to protect his property, but it is considered that the use of the gin trap is inefficient and cruel. The householder can protect his property in many more efficient ways, and there is no justification for the setting of traps in urban areas. I have a purely statistical table showing the number of animals caught in gin traps between January 1, 1970, and October 31, 1970. I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Animals Caught in Gin Traps

Serial	Animal	Date caught	Area	Time estimated spent alive in trap	Injuries	Disposal of animal
1.	Cat	January 5, 1970	Sefton Park	Overnight	No apparent injuries	Cat released
2.	Cat	January 23, 1970	Pennington	2 days	Severed leg	Destroyed and buried on premises
3.	Cat	January 30, 1970	Edwardstown	Overnight	Paw bruised and swollen	Veterinary treatment, retained by owner
4.	Cat	February 3, 1970	Prospect	2 days	Paw bruised and lacerated	Veterinary treatment, returned to owner
5.	Cat	February 3, 1970	Glandore	7 days	Hind leg stripped of flesh	Destroyed
6.	2 Cats	March 18, 1970	Northfield	?	Person setting traps caught cats and then killed them	
7.	Cat	April 6, 1970	Forestville	?	?	Released and returned to owner by person setting trap
8.	Cat	May 7, 1970	Unley Park	2-3 days	Severe leg injury, gangrene	Destroyed—Subject letter 28/8
9.	Lamb	May 8, 1970	Christies Downs	?	Minor leg injuries	Kept by Honorary Inspector, Southern Branch, R.S.P.C.A.
10.	Cat	May 10, 1970	Findon	24 hours	No severe injuries	Cat rescued from trap. Returned to owner
11.	Dog	May 17, 1970	Cheltenham	2 hours	No severe injuries	Dog released and taken to veterinary by owner
12.	Cat	June 5, 1970	Plympton	2 days	Severe leg injuries	Cat destroyed
13.	Cat	May 22, 1970	Riverton	2 days	Severe leg injuries	Veterinary amputated leg
14.	Cat	June 4, 1970	Gawler	? days	Severe	Veterinary destroyed cat
15.	Cat	June 10, 1970	Pooraka	? days	Flesh torn, leg bone exposed	Cat destroyed
16.	Cat	June 15, 1970	Clearview	2 days	Badly injured front leg	Cat destroyed
17.	Dog	July 1, 1970	Kilkenny	15 minutes	No severe injuries	Returned to owner, received veterinary treatment
18.	Cat	July 2, 1970	Kingswood	?	No apparent injuries	Released
19.	Cat	August 17, 1970	Seaton	?	?	Unable to locate cat
20.	Cat	August 19, 1970	Magill	?	Severe laceration of leg	Cat taken to veterinary by owner, destroyed
21.	Cat	August 20, 1970	Fullarton	3 days	Severe	Cat killed in trap
22.	Cat	September 18, 1970	Enfield	3 days	Front leg severely injured	Cat destroyed
23.	Crow	October 5, 1970	Tea Tree Gully	?	?	Person setting traps destroyed bird after trapping it

Mr. JENNINGS: This simple Bill relates only to *municipalities*. It could not possibly be argued that we are interfering with people in rural areas who may need to use these kinds of trap for destruction of vermin. I do not think that such traps would be used very much these days, even in the destruction of rabbits. Perhaps they would be so used on properties that were well netted and where neighbours were not very careful about destroying rabbits on their properties. Nevertheless, we have provided that this Bill relates not to rural areas but only to municipalities. I cannot see that any member would have any objection to it. I therefore ask that it have a speedy passage through this House.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. It provides for a practical method of dealing with a difficult problem. I fully appreciate that some members of the community will suggest that it is not far-reaching enough. Any Bill that comes before this House mut be realistic, and this Bill is such a measure. If traps were banned throughout the State it would deprive country people of the opportunity of using the gin trap in their programmes of vermin destruction.

The cat is a vagrant animal and one whose movements cannot be controlled. Consequently, the owner of any cat cannot be held responsible for any mischief or damage that the cat may cause. In the course of its vagrant habits, a cat may interfere with pigeon coops and bird aviaries. Unfortunately, many cats are caught by people who seek to protect their birds. However, as the member for Ross Smith has said, there are other means of protection. Because this Bill is relevant to the immediate needs of the community, I shall not delay its passage.

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

BOOK ALLOWANCE

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

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

which Mr. Simmons had moved to amend by leaving out all words after "That" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "this House supports the fulfilment of the Government's election pledge on secondary book allowances through three successive increases of $2 per student per annum."

(Continued from October 28. Page 2148.)

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): When this debate was adjourned, I was discussing the problem of assigning priorities to various items of expenditure on education. The Minister of Education has pointed out the need this year to appoint teacher aides and additional guidance officers and to expand the department's research and planning office, which I agree has been grossly understaffed for years. Never has so much public money been spent with so little research to guide the expenditure. The Minister pointed to the need for additional caretakers to be appointed this year. He spoke at length about the need for even more teachers to be appointed and for greater expansion in teacher training.

To these deficiencies I can add many others, to some of which I have earlier in the session drawn attention. There is an urgent need for more clerical staff, bursars and groundsmen. There is a serious lack of specialist teachers, speech therapists, librarians and so on. Schools with migrant children badly need grants for special books. There is an urgent need for a replacement of the present subsidy scheme for current expenditure by a system of unmatched grants. There is also a shocking inequity in the provision of kindergarten facilities in our community. We have a chronic shortage of funds for our tertiary institutions of education resulting in the curtailment of courses, the restriction of intakes, and the imposition of increases in fees. There is a shortage of funds for public libraries and many other desirable educational activities. In the face of these deficiencies, what right has the Opposition to claim that the whole $6 promised by the Government for this three-year term of office should have been provided immediately? Does the Opposition insist that an extra $4 for books next year for the parents of each child not receiving free books is more important than all the other avenues of improvement in the quality of education that I have listed? It is obviously not. Therefore, we are forced to the conclusion that the Opposition is merely trying to stir up discontent against the Government. I suppose that this is standard political practice but, in my opinion, it is culpably irresponsible, and I appeal to the House to reject the motion and to support my amendment.

The Hon. L. J. KING seconded the amendment.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL INDUSTRIES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

(For wording of motion, see page 1408.)

(Continued from October 28. Page 2155.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Persons in the rural industry must meet and put a co-ordinated and cohesive case to the Commonwealth Government for assistance. At present, their disjointed and fragmented efforts can only meet with failure. For instance, in Queensland there is the Institute of Economic Democracy, in New South Wales the Rural Action Movement and the Rural Survival Committee, and in Victoria the Edenhope Agricultural Bureau and the Organized Purchasing Power (which also features in South Australia). In Tasmania, the progressive farmers have formed a union and have applied to be affiliated to the Trades Hall. I point this out to members opposite as being a wise move.

Of course, this action in Tasmania is not surprising, because farmers are notorious for their policy of capitalizing their gains and socializing their losses. All this talk of Government research and assistance, stabilized prices, and subsidizing is pure Socialism and whenever the rural industry gets into difficulties those engaged in it become rabid Socialists. I suggest to them that they allow the rest of the community the right to the Socialist policies that they claim to be their right. Other Government members will answer the hysterical misrepresentation of the Labor Party's rural policy expressed by the member for Rocky River and will point out that the Liberal and Country League lacks a rural policy.

Members on this side will also comment on the request by rural industries to the Arbitration Court that wages be not increased. Whilst claiming justice for themselves, they seek to deny it to others. Members on this side may also wish to mention the impost on the wine industry. What assistance do Governments give to the rural industry? In subsidies or bounties in 1970-71, estimated assistance is $207,650,000; in research, $26,023,200; in extension services, $4,900,000; in loans, $900,000; in grants, $40,412,000; in miscellaneous items, $25,405,000; and, in devaluation compensation, $21,000,000. Other forms of assistance that cannot be measured in money terms include: the home price schemes for wheat, canned fruit, butter, cheese and sugar; the statutory percentage system for tobacco leaf; import embargoes on sugar and butter; taxation concessions (about which I will speak later); and subsidized postal and telephone services.

In addition, various types of assistance to the rural industry are financed by the States. These include provision of extension services, agricultural research stations, and freight concessions. Rural producers also benefit from local government or semi-government concessions in the form of subsidized electricity charges and reduced council rates. I should like to speak a little longer about taxation concessions. They have special depreciation allowances and the investment allowance. Everyone knows that most farm machinery can be written off by 120 per cent of the purchase price, because the depreciation allowance available is 40 per cent in the first year and 20 per cent for each of the next four years. Capital expenditure on land development is deductable against income.

At present, those in the rural industry are getting taxation deductions for clearing land to sow crops, which perhaps they should not be doing. However, they are encouraged to do this because the cost is a taxation deduction. Over a five-year period the cost to the Commonwealth Government will be $110,000,000, and the total for this year will be $30,000,000. If I had time, I would expand on that matter. Persons in rural industry also receive a zone allowance for remote areas. They also have a drought bond scheme.

Structural improvements (and this is a good one) are amongst the items for which the man on the land can receive a taxation deduction, and we know what can happen within that framework. Estate duty is another taxation deduction. One of the main areas of taxation deductions available to the man on the land is a tax that normally is a direct charge to the man living in the city. For the city man, the cost of running a motor car is regarded as part of his ordinary living costs. However, I understand that, for the man on the land, car registration and insurance costs, as well as the costs of petrol, oil, tyres, etc., can be claimed as a taxation deduction. The man in the city pays a direct charge.

Further, whilst building improvements are also a direct charge to persons living in towns, the cost paid by the farmer can be shown in his tax return.

Mr. McAnaney: You'd better get your facts right.

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

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Sir. Capital subsidies are also available in respect of water supply and fencing. Members opposite have said that some farmers have an annual taxable income of only about $2,000: that may well be so, but I suggest that that is a misrepresentation of the facts. Why do not these people come out and say what is their gross income? As I said earlier, the taxable deductions are extraordinary, so that if the person concerned had a taxable income of $2,000 his gross income would be much more. I suggest that there are hundreds of thousands of citizens in this country whose net income is less than $2,000; in fact, there are many thousands whose gross income is only $2,000. I suggest that the man on the land remember this because, if he wishes to argue that his taxable income is about $2,000, he is not contributing greatly to the Commonwealth Treasury, so that, when he asks for subsidies, those subsidies must come out of the moneys contributed by people who work not on the land but in the cities.

Therefore, he is asking the city dweller to support the rural industry. If the Commonwealth Government considers this to be necessary, I do not complain, but I criticize members of the rural industry for not stating the facts plainly and for not stating that they do receive assistance. If they need more assistance, let them first admit that they receive assistance, and then ask for more. If the primary producers are serious in their complaints that they do not receive the assistance they need, let them show that they are serious by going to the ballot box and voting the Commonwealth Government out, because it is that Government that has got them into their present situation, and it is no good suggesting that the State Government can solve the problem. Members in this House who are in that category have secured a suitable alternative source of income so that they do not find themselves in the depressed state that other members of their industry are in today. As such, I suggest that they show good faith in their industry by voting for a Government that will plan to assist the rural industry. Members opposite say that planning is Socialism, but they accept Socialism when it assists them, and I repeat that in times of plenty when the seasons are good they are thorough capitalists because they tend to capitalize their gains and socialize their losses.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute to go.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. If members opposite intend to comment on some of the criticisms I have made, they will probably jump on to the criticism I made when I said that we should grow maize in South Australia. They may criticize an uneducated remark if they wish, but I suggest that they forget that remark and criticize the other points I have made. If the people concerned rationalize and diversify their industry, they will not require assistance, for obviously they will be on the right track. However, if they refuse to do this, they are inefficient and do not deserve help. As the State Government cannot help primary industry in this matter and as it is the Commonwealth Government that must help, I oppose the motion.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 3. Page 2306.)

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Drugs to which Act applies."

Mr. CARNIE: I point out that any psychotropic drug or substance could cover many preparations, which I am sure the Health Department does not intend to control any more than they are controlled at present. Although I am sure that it is meant to cover amphetamines, can the Attorney-General indicate what drugs will be specified in the regulations?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The only class of drugs which, as far as I am aware, is being brought within the regulations is the amphetamines under this heading. I have no further information on any others that are intended to be covered. However, this matter would have to be considered by the authorities when the regulations were being framed, and I should think it was desirable that the power existed. Of course, any regulations that are made are obviously open to review by either House of Parliament when they are, in fact, made.

Clause passed.

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

Clause 5—"Prohibition of manufacture, administration, etc., of drugs."

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

In new section 5 (1) (*c*), after "pipes" to insert ", syringes"; and after "utensils" to insert "or any appliance or thing".

One of the few things about the Bill that does not bring it into line with modern practice is the continued reference to "pipes". However, knowing the abilities of some drug dependents who, if all else were banned, would use the old-fashioned method of pipes, we should cover every method of the administration of drugs by including the words I have suggested.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I realize the validity of what the honourable member has said and, as the amendments improve the Bill, the Government accepts them.

Amendments carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have discussed my foreshadowed amendments with the Attorney-General who has an amendment on the file and, because of that amendment, I do not intend to continue with mine, the effect of which would be to make every offence triable by indictment. The effect of the Attorney's amendment is to provide that a person charged may, at any stage up to the close of the prosecution case, request that he be indicted. I am happy to accept that amendment, if the Attorney confirms that he intends to move it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do. A problem exists concerning offences created by this Act. There is a class of offence relating to trafficking that is clearly serious and punishable by severe punishment, and clearly such offences must be regarded as indictable offences. The other offences under the Act could cover a wide range—some less and some more serious. I am reluctant to treat them all as necessarily indictable offences triable by jury.

On the other hand, there may well be some offences which are serious in their character and in respect of which there should be a right to trial by jury. It seems to me that the appropriate way to deal with the situation is to give a defendant who is prosecuted in a way which would normally be disposed of before a magistrate an opportunity to elect to be tried by jury. I intend to move an amendment designed to give the defendant the right to elect to be tried by jury.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Regulations."

Dr. EASTICK: As this clause relates to regulations and as the definitions of "medical practitioner" and "veterinary practitioner" are controlled by regulations, it may well be, with the greater sophistication of drugs now applying, that urgent consideration could be given to defining a veterinary surgeon as a person who has graduated from a university. In many of these old Acts "veterinary surgeon" includes a veterinary practitioner, who is a non-qualified person but who, for a period of time before the Veterinary Surgeons Act was passed in 1935, had been undertaking veterinary activities. The numbers still existent under this qualification would, at the most, be only three or four. Because of the very nature of the drugs now applying in this area, I think it is time we considered deleting "veterinary practitioners" as persons who could be regarded as veterinary surgeons for the purposes of such an Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Proceedings."

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

To strike out new subsection (8) and to insert the following new subsections:

(8) Subject to subsection (9) of this section, proceedings in respect of an offence against this Act shall be heard and determined in all respects as if the offence were a minor indictable offence as defined in the Justices Act, 1921, as amended.

(9) At any time in the course of proceedings in respect of an offence against this Act up to and including the completion of the case for the prosecution, the defendant may elect to be tried upon indictment and upon the making of that election, the court shall not proceed to convict the defendant but may commit him for trial upon indictment.

The effect of the amendment is to give a defendant charged with an offence the right to be tried by a jury if he so desires. He will have the opportunity to be dealt with by a magistrate if he so wishes but, if he wishes to be tried by a jury, that will be possible.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 12—"Court to impose suspended sentence in appropriate cases."

Dr. TONKIN: I move to insert the following new clause:

12. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 14 thereof:—

14a. Where a person is convicted of an offence under this Act and the court is satisfied that it is expedient in the interests of the rehabilitation of the convicted person so to do, it shall, pursuant to the provisions of the Offenders Probation Act, 1913, as amended, impose a sentence of imprisonment upon the convicted person and suspend the sentence on condition that the convicted person undergoes such treatment as the court thinks appropriate to alleviate or control the convicted person's addiction to, or propensity towards the use of, drugs of dependence.

It is obvious to anyone who has had anything at all to do with people dependent on hard drugs that they are not acting on their own volition in many cases. They have to depend for their supply of drugs on the suppliers, who may threaten to withhold supplies unless they do what is requested. Consequently, many people who are drug suppliers and peddlers are acting because of their dependence on drugs. I strongly support giving these people the opportunity of receiving treatment and having a sentence passed on them that can be suspended provided they undertake to remain under treatment. The new clause will make that possible. I realize that there is already provision for this action to be taken under the Offenders Probation Act, but I should very much like to see that provision incorporated in this Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think the view of those who drafted the Bill was that sufficient power was present in the ability of the court to release a defendant upon a bond and to impose conditions that would require him to undertake treatment. However, I appreciate the honourable member's concern and I agree with his viewpoint that the emphasis in legislation of this kind should be upon treatment for people who have become addicted to drugs. I think we have to maintain and keep in mind a clear distinction between people who are endeavouring to exploit the weaknesses of others for profit and those who have unfortunately succumbed to a weakness and become addicted. The Government has no objection to making it explicit in the Bill that the court has power to do these things. The Government accepts the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

D. & J. FOWLER (TRANSFER OF INCORPORATION) BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and ordered to be printed.

BUILDING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2179.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): During the debate on the builders licensing legislation, I mentioned that structural defects in buildings, particularly in houses, would not be eliminated unless the Building Act was revised. Therefore, I am pleased that this Bill is now before the House. The present Act came into force in 1923 and, although it has been amended, it certainly needed updating because of the different methods adopted in the building industry and the different building materials used. In 1964 a committee was appointed, and this Bill is a result of the work of that committee. The Bill is flexible. The details of requirements and standards to which buildings and building work must conform will be established by regulation, because regulations can be altered more easily.

In recent years, there have been great changes in the building industry. The Bill also gives powers for administration of the Act by local government and provides for the adjudication of building disputes. It lays down minimum standards in structure, safety and health, in building construction. These are all necessary provisions in the Bill. I do not intend to refer to all 61 clauses in the Bill, but I point out that the nine Parts into which the Bill is divided deal with the following matters: preliminary; approval of proposed building work and classification of buildings; building surveyors; Building Act referees; dangerous and defective excavations, buildings and structures; party walls; miscellaneous; by-laws and regulations; and the Building Advisory Committee.

It is obvious that in some ways the regulations will be more important than the Act. I have spoken about defects in houses, and many of these defects, rightly or wrongly, have been attributed to the provisions of the Building Act. The Act and regulations lay down minimum standards and some builders have claimed that they have carried out work to the standard laid down in the Act. This could be to the detriment of the person acquiring a house. I referred recently in the House to an unfortunate death that took place at Modbury North, and the shortcomings of the Building Act were the subject of a question which I asked regarding this matter and to which I was pleased to receive a reply only today, stating that, as the Act was to be revised, consideration would be given to the possibility of amendments designed to prevent a recurrence of the circumstances that led to this tragedy.

It seems that defects of a type that could lead to such a tragedy as this would not exist if the Act had been revised earlier, and I think that Acts are often revised long after they should be. However, under clause 61

of the Bill, I am pleased to see that the advisory committee is to recommend to the Minister any alterations that may be necessary and, as a result, amendments may be considered by the House when they should be and not too long afterwards, as seems to have been the case frequently in the past. I have here a booklet given to me only last week by a builder in my area, entitled *Standards of Building Construction* and, under the heading "Building Act and Regulations", it states that the building must be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the Building Act, including all subsequent amendments and all Government and municipal regulations, and must be completed to the satisfaction of the lending authority. It lists the names of the lending authorities and the acceptable standards.

I was referred to page 6 of the booklet, dealing with damp proof mortar, and the builder concerned took me to show me houses in my area which were showing early signs of salt damp. He told me that this was because the present damp proof method, even though it met the acceptable standards, could be improved. This builder intended to give me some material that I hoped to include in my comments on the Bill but, unfortunately as it has not come to hand, I will later pass it on either to the committee or to the Minister. I thank the builder concerned for drawing my attention to this matter, because it is only through people such as builders coming to us as members of Parliament that we can become aware of the shortcomings in Acts such as this one and in the relevant regulations.

Clause 50 provides that all buildings and structures, property of the Crown, shall be exempt. The member for Torrens said that this provision was acceptable to him and, of course, a similar provision is contained in other Acts. However, I personally have yet to be convinced that such a provision is justified, although I know that it is in the Act. I stand to be corrected on this matter, and some other member may be able to convince me that the Crown should be exempt. I presume that the provision applies to projects undertaken by the State Government, such as hospitals, school buildings and police stations. Perhaps the Minister can convince me, when he replies to the debate, of the necessity for this provision.

I realize that this legislation will do a great deal to protect the industry. In fact, it will protect the house owners, the builders and, of course, the council employees who have to administer the Act and who have the responsibility in this regard. I trust that the Bill will pass through all stages in this House and the other place quickly so that the Act can come into force as soon as possibl.e

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the general principles of this Bill. Although it had been foreshadowed by my Party when it was in Government, I congratulate this Government on seeking to reduce the bulk of the existing Act which it has become almost impossible to work under. The number of alterations that had been effected and the intricate detail involved in the Act made the working of local government in this particular sphere of activity extremely difficult. Before dealing with the Bill in detail, I should like to refer to an activity of the Minister in respect of the management of his department. He saw fit to advise local government throughout the State, by means of a four-leaf brochure, details of the new building legislation for South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who did that?

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister, as Minister of Local Government, did that. This was very well received by local government, because as well as advising it of the Bill that was to come before Parliament it set out the history of the committee's activities leading up to the recommendations contained in this Bill, and it also pointed out to local government authorities how they could proceed to be heard or how they could approach members of Parliament on any point about which they were worried. Unfortunately, the same document was not made available to members of this House. I have previously asked the Minister to consider making available to members of the House, as does his colleague the Minister of Agriculture, press statements on vital issues. I consider that if the Minister had been courteous enough to supply this document to members of Parliament, it would have been to the advantage of members.

Whilst I agree that many aspects of this Bill are of tremendous advantage, I am worried about the change with regard to the areas in which the Act is to apply. Previously, many local government areas could decide for themselves whether they wished the Act to apply to the whole or any part of their area. However, I find that the general impression now is that all local government areas will be affected by the ramifications of the legislation. It would be a catastrophe if the legislation applied in respect of every fowlhouse, pigsty, and storage shed in rural areas away from the towns. I am not suggesting that any authority should condone the construction of poor quality or

inferior buildings, but the provisions of the Bill that require the retaining of a building surveyor and subsequent employment or use of a building inspector would be physically impossible to comply with in many rural areas. Also, councils would have to pay heavy costs that they could not recoup from the fees applying to these structures, and it would be a physical impossibility for an inspector to travel over the areas that are involved.

Clause 5 provides that the Governor, by proclamation, can declare that certain provisions of this Act apply in relation to this matter, and this means that there would be no decision of Parliament: it would be an executive decision followed by a proclamation, and members would have no chance to discuss the matter. Although the Bill is simple and has been reduced in size, I wonder whether some features are not too simple or that there have been some notable deletions from the Bill. A definition of a building surveyor is included but not one for a building inspector. This matter is extremely important because, generally, the building inspector is the one who has physical inspectorial control of building activities in council areas, and this definition should be explicit so that the authorities would know when and how to deal with the appointment.

The word "clerk" appears in several different places: in some cases it refers to the town or district clerk but in others, although it does not state it specifically, it refers to the clerk of the court. A clearer and more definite description of "clerk" would be an advantage. Councils experience difficulties where the State Government or the Commonwealth Government is permitted to undertake building programmes without first contacting the council or submitting plans and specifications to the council. Many times this action leads to a grave subsequent difficulty. To illustrate this point, the Housing Trust has purchased land in my district that is in a depression. This land was cheap, but the trust then proceeded to build houses without any apparent consideration of the manner in which the area would be drained. It gave little thought to the height of the foundations relative to the adjacent roadway, and I have been told by inspectors with long experience that in some cases the cracking that follows the sinking of a foundation and other construction problems are the direct result of these buildings being constructed in areas that the local people know are subject to flooding or other hazards. Therefore, I suggest it is important that the council be made well aware of the Crown's activities in the area it controls. In this regard, to take the matter further, quite apart from the building aspects and the construction, with the normal inspections that would follow, the submission of a site plan would be of great advantage to the council before there was any consideration of actual physical building. Here again, local knowledge and experience could indicate to the authority submitting the site plan certain features that could be expected to cause a building hazard or some other difficulty.

We can go one step further and highlight the fact that in this Bill consideration is given to the effect on environment and to the fact that buildings may be refused by a council because they do not conform to other buildings or other plans, either current or future, for the area. The council, being aware of this fact, can advise a person submitting any details of his project that in due course—possibly in one year, two years or whatever period of time may be involved—this could conflict with the future development of that area. As the Crown is not responsible for making known its intentions in respect of these projects, the plans of the council and the decisions it has taken to ensure that the environment and the area would be of a particular value or class for the people it represented (the ratepayers) would be lost, because the Crown would be able to proceed to put its project where, to all intents and purposes, it would best not be put.

There are several other features of this nature that I know other honourable members will wish to discuss. I note that already the Government has seen fit to give notice of some amendments to the Bill. I support the amendments that have already been indicated in the name of the member for Torrens, which are the result of discussions by a number of people interested in local government. In due course, we shall give them the consideration they deserve.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I am pleased that the Government has introduced the Bill, because, as some speakers have said earlier in this debate, the Building Act has been with us since 1923. While certain amendments have been made to it, there have been tremendous changes and progress over the years in the building field. It is fairly obvious that the changes in the legislation have not kept pace with changes in building materials, structures, people's attitudes, and the administration of the legislation. In past years I was engaged, partly at least, in carrying out the work of a

building inspector for local government. Consequently, I believe that the viewpoint of the inspector in the field is very important, and I hope that consideration will be given to that viewpoint during the Committee stage when the question of the membership of the advisory committee is being considered.

The member for Tea Tree Gully said that, whilst the Bill represented an exciting reappraisal of the legislation, the important thing would be the introduction of new regulations. I believe that it will be in the regulations that we will see the greatest amount of change. Since building legislation was first enacted in this State the Planning and Development Act has come into its own and now assumes much of the importance that the building legislation earlier assumed.

I add my hope that the Crown will be required to conform to this Act to some degree. It is not very encouraging for a building inspector to go on his rounds of buildings (in respect of which applications have been made, approvals have been given, and fees have been paid) and to find that in certain streets in his town, municipality or district, buildings are being erected about which he knows very little. He knows perfectly well that he has no authority or control in this regard, because the Crown is erecting those buildings.

If I recall correctly, I believe that, whilst the Housing Trust has made a very great contribution in respect of housing people, it was that trust that first adopted the practice of lowering ceilings. Ceiling heights were reduced by 6in. at a time on two occasions. Local government suddenly found that a recommendation came through its advisory committee that the ceiling height be lowered by 6in., and we discovered that the Housing Trust had been following this practice for some months. I realize that credit must be given to the trust for informing local government of its plans and specifications, at least to the degree in respect of which the trust's specifications were specified broadly in particular types of certain houses. The ground plan of a given subdivision is sent to local government and on that ground plan is specified the particular type, R.D.4 for instance, or the particular type of house that is to be built. Councils would have records of the basic specifications of all Housing Trust buildings in their records.

It is important that the Crown should give councils a copy of ground plans of buildings, showing what part of an area will be built upon, where the building will be situated, and its distance from the boundaries of the block of land. The Crown also ought to contribute, in terms of the regulations, in the form of a building fee. Many small councils find it difficult to employ a building surveyor or a building inspector and, if the Crown accepts responsibility and contributes towards building fees, this will assist councils to meet the cost of employing such officers. I am pleased that the Bill permits regulations to be made prescribing standards for building inspectors, because it is important to encourage persons engaged in this work to qualify so that they can do the work on a full-time basis.

I ask the Minister to clarify the reference in the early part of the Bill to "building" and "structure". I suggest that, if there is no adequate explanation of the difference between a structure and a building, the word "structure" ought to be deleted. I understand that the Australian Building Code Committee at present is having difficulty in finding a suitable definition of what is a structure and I do not understand why the word "building" cannot cover all buildings, from a fernhouse to a 20-storey building.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have a dictionary over there that you can look up, or else you can come over here and see one.

Mr. WARDLE: If the Minister looks at the 16 volumes of the *Oxford Dictionary* and *Webster's Dictionary*, in the Parliamentary Library, he will see how difficult it is to find the difference between the two words. The member for Light has mentioned total local government areas. Whilst at present many small councils declare the small townships in their areas to be under the Building Act, it is obvious that expense is involved in sending a building inspector a distance of three miles to inspect a hay shed or some other building that a farmer may want to erect.

I believe that the Bill is designed basically not only to protect the person who is building but also to ensure that the materials employed are good and sound and are used in a workmanlike manner. In addition, the Bill seeks to ensure that the building in question will be protected in regard to fire, as also will adjoining properties. Finally, the measure is designed to cover the aesthetics of the building in question and to ensure that the standard of the area is maintained and not adversely affected by poor construction.

Obviously, none of these issues would apply to a building three or four miles out in the country, say, on an isolated farm. I hope that

the Government will consider this aspect because, as I see it, the councils that are really anxious to supervise building work undertaken in their areas are those which have already incorporated all their towns under the Building Act and which supervise all of the buildings erected in the townships in their area. Clause 9 (9) provides that "where any proposed building work does not conform with this Act, but the council is of the opinion that it fails so to conform only in minor respects, the council may approve the building work notwithstanding that it does not conform . . ." I should like the Minister later to explain why this provision has been included, for it seems to me that it would create a risky precedent to accept applications in regard to work that does not conform to the Building Act. Also, I should like the Minister to explain the reason for the provision contained in clause 10 (4), relating to penalties. This provision seems to be completely out of place because it deals with a building area.

Although I know that members of the Building Act Advisory Committee are to be nominated, I point out that no details of the personnel are given, except that the committee "shall consist of six members appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister". I make the plea that at least one of these members be a representative of the Australian Institute of Building Surveyors. Although such a person is at present a member of the Building Act Advisory Committee his appointment to the committee referred to in the Bill does not necessarily follow. Alternatively, I suggest that it be a representative of the Local Government Building Inspectors Committee. I am delighted to see this new legislation, and I support the second reading.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I believe this Bill is a step in the right direction. However, as I see it, the measure is too wide in some respects and is in great need of amending. I understand that the committee that was set up to handle this legislation has been, as recently as last week, working on new amendments to it. As most of us know, there are always people looking for loopholes in any law. Therefore, we must be particularly careful with this legislation. I think that councils and their officers should have had the opportunity of perusing this Bill, for they would then have had the chance to put forward their views.

The revision of the legislation is most welcome, because the existing Act is hopelessly out of date. With modern techniques of building, the Act certainly needs revision. When I was on a visit to the United Kingdom recently I was able to see for myself the new structures that are being erected in Europe. One such building is a cathedral that is made of prestressed concrete, under a new method using a lighter type of concrete. This is a colossal building, the centre hall of which holds 2,000 people. There are many different methods of doing this type of work. Sometimes the concrete is formed with rough wood, with the result that the grain of the wood shows up on the concrete and gives a very decorative effect.

Most councils at present are being swamped with applications for the building of flats or units or tenements, if one can call them that and, even if they want to, many councils are not able to resist the erection of these types of building. I know that at present many councils are considering imposing zoning regulations to assist them in this matter. However, even if these regulations were accepted, it could be many months before the councils were able to put some form of restriction on the type of buildings they want. I wonder whether some temporary powers can be given to councils to enable them to withhold some of these applications for these high density areas.

I am most concerned about this. I have spent much of my life under high density conditions, and I submit that we do not know how fortunate we are here in Australia that we have so much land available. I cannot see why the land has to be spoilt by these high density areas. Although councils can control such things as ventilation and windows and other features, they have little control over the size of these buildings. I have seen instances where a person living alone with probably just a cat and a canary would be overcrowded. I am most perturbed about this. I fully appreciate that it would no doubt be desirable to have high density areas in certain parts. However, I consider that this must be controlled. This is the reason, of course, why we are bringing in the new districts.

Clause 38 of the Bill deals with unhealthy and unsightly buildings and structures and refers to the "local environment". The word "environment" has a very wide definition. I submit that it would suffice if we put it into the right clause. The point I make is that people are entitled to protection by local government, for many of those people have put their life's savings into whatever they are

buying. People live in certain districts, whether by choice or necessity, for various reasons. Having decided where they will live, they are entitled to a happy family life. In this great country of ours part of that life is outdoor living, such as barbecues and swimming pools. However, people who buy houses in the more pleasant areas suddenly find themselves hemmed in by two or three sets of three-storey flats, which overlook their properties and affect their privacy.

The best they can wish for from these structures is that the flats face the front, but even then they would be faced by rows of balconies. The worst is that they can see lines of waste pipes from bathrooms and stench pipes from the toilets if they face the other way. I believe that in many cases these areas will become slum areas within a few years. The people who are building these flats in a hurry today (and all councils are faced with this situation) want only married couples without children or aged people as tenants. However, if these properties cannot be let to these people, the builders will let them to anyone who wishes to live in them, so that large families will be housed in small units. As this matter is urgent, I suggest that some powers should be given to councils. In his second reading explanation the Minister, when referring to amenities, said:

> The Bill does, however, retain certain effectual powers that enable a council to prevent the amenity of an area from being destroyed by building work in instances where the nature of the building work and its effect on its environment is closely interrelated.

Later he said:

> If, however, the council is of the opinion that the proposed building work will adversely affect the local environment within which the building work proposed . . .

The word "environment" has a wide meaning, but its use is important in this context. In some cases people, after submitting their plans to the council and placing the foundations, have not continued building until many years have passed. In this time many council by-laws may have changed, but at present councils cannot do anything about this matter. However, the Minister in his second reading explanation said that the Bill provided that building work would become void if it were not commenced within 12 months after the day on which approval to build had been given. I welcome this provision.

I suggest that a clear definition of "clerk" should be included; the Bill should indicate whether it refers to a town or to a district clerk. Although the Minister has said that we can always get a definition of "structure" from the dictionary, I still find it needs clarification. It is a hard word to define and I agree with the member for Murray that, if it cannot be defined adequately, it will be wiser to leave it out. Clause 50 provides:

> All buildings and structures, the property of the Crown, shall be exempt from the operation of this Act.

I presume that this would exclude organizations like the Housing Trust. Clause 49 provides:

> A person shall not, without a licence granted by the council, erect any building or structure that may encroach or project upon, over or under any public place.

This is, strictly speaking, referring to a verandah, which would mean that a shopkeeper or anyone else would not be able to put up a verandah unless it was cantilevered, but the Government or the Housing Trust would operate under a different power: they could put up a verandah post on the pavement. This is an important matter that should be looked at.

The Building Advisory Committee has been mentioned by other members, but the qualifications of its members are not mentioned in the Bill. I think that either a building inspector or someone closely related to local government should be on that committee. I support the Bill, which is a very good one, and I will speak to the amendments in Committee.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): It appears from the definition of "area" that the Bill will apply to all areas, but I notice that certain areas can, by proclamation, be excluded. In country areas, where the man on the land constructs sheds and other such buildings, he does a job that has been deemed satisfactory over the years. Will the Minister, when he replies to this debate, say whether it is intended that the farming areas shall be excluded from the provisions of clause 5? I should not like to see building surveyors coming on to every farm in the State to inspect, for instance, a duck house, a ram shed, or even a hay shed being erected. These buildings are constantly being constructed on our farm lands, and we all know that the farming community has enough expense to bear as it is. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): This Bill, as has been stated by members opposite, is primarily a Committee Bill. During the Committee stage I

shall be only too delighted to deal with the various points raised during the second reading debate. The important point is that this Bill is designed to bring conditions associated with building into line with circumstances that prevail at present and will prevail in future years. As the member for Torrens said, the Bill's provisions are fairly broad in their general context, and the real strength of the legislation will lie within the regulations. As members opposite know, it is far simpler to deal with changing circumstances through regulations than through amendments to an Act. It was with this thought in mind that the Building Act Advisory Committee, which did a tremendous amount of work and to which I paid due respect in my second reading explanation, approached this question in such a way that the greatest possible flexibility could be attained. It appears that members opposite think that local government should have been consulted on this matter and that the Bill should have been circulated to local government, I think before the Bill was presented to Parliament. That suggestion was put to me and I flatly rejected it. I shall take a similar attitude to all suggestions of that kind. Parliament is the place where legislation should be introduced. The first people who ought to be told of proposed legislation are the elected members of this House.

Mr. McAnaney: What about succession duties?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can understand the concern of the member for Heysen.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying to the debate, and he is not permitted to digress as a result of interjections.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A request was made to me that a draft copy of this Bill be circulated to building interests, building firms and others associated with the building trade before its presentation to this Parliament. I rejected that request out of hand, and I shall continue to do so in respect of similar types of request. I gave my second reading explanation on September 1. So, there have been almost nine weeks for the Bill to be considered by people concerned about its effect from the building viewpoint, the architectural viewpoint, the inspection viewpoint or any other viewpoint. In fact, in that time we received several comments in response to the invitations that were sent out. These have been analysed, the good ones having been incorporated in the amendments on the file, and the others rejected.

If some people in the community have found that the Government has provided adequate time for a full and proper consideration of the Bill, I seriously suggest that all sections could have found exactly the same time to study carefully the importance, intention and effect of the Bill if they wished to do so. Therefore, I reject out of hand the weak criticism that local government ought to have been consulted specifically. Local government has had the same opportunity as have all other interests and, in fact, received a precis of the contents of the Bill after it had been explained, in the same way as other persons received it. Let us not get ourselves in a knot by suggesting that local government has not had the opportunity to give to the Bill the consideration it deserves. This is primarily a Committee measure, and I think that the remaining matters that have been raised can be dealt with adequately in the Committee stage. I suggest that members raise any matters they desire to raise then, and I shall be happy to deal with them.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1820.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): This is a short Bill, and it is a simple measure from outward appearances. However, I believe that it is far-reaching and important regarding people engaged in the pastoral industry. At present it is permissible for a mining lease to be pegged over any part of a pastoral lease except in an area within 200yds. of certain structures and improvements. This Bill seeks to extend the area of protection so that a mining lease cannot be pegged within 440yds. of structures and improvements, such as a well, water bore, reservoir, dam, water tank, aeroplane landing strip, or any dwellinghouse, factory or building of the value of $200 or more.

Of course, that value relates to the property of a lessee, and I understand the point has been raised in another place that it does not permit a mining lessee to erect a structure and to use that as the basis for determining the boundaries of the mining lease. I also understand that certain vast areas of pastoral lease have been

mined over. I am informed advisedly that a station known as "Mount Clarence" comprises about 300 square miles of opal-bearing soils, and that this area is being progressively mined over. While this is occurring, the grazing or pastoral lessee has little protection, except in regard to his improvements.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There cannot be any stock grazing in the area.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My information confirms what the Minister has said: that the lessee is concerned about his stock and about the fact that his watering points and improvements are being used by mining prospectors. The point raised by the member for Alexandra, who previously secured the adjournment of this debate, relates to the rights of a lessee with a 42-year pastoral lease after the mining lease has expired or the area has been worked over. I should like to have an assurance that the pastoral lessee retains the lease after the mining lease has expired or after the land has been completely worked out. It may be completely worthless, but there is this aspect of legal ownership.

Clauses 2 and 3 are purely machinery clauses, removing certain sections of the Act that are redundant because the matters are now covered by other Acts. These relate to the appointment, terms of appointment and personnel of the board. Clause 4 repeals section 45, which relates to the manner in which an agreement is reached between the lessee and the Crown with respect to improvements on property within nine months prior to the expiration of a lease. This section is being repealed, because the Land and Valuation Court now has the function of determining the value of these improvements, and the appointment of an arbitrator to make a decision in this matter is no longer necessary.

Clauses 5 and 6 contain the most important provisions, particularly clause 5, to which I have already referred and which seeks to protect the improvements of the pastoral lessee from any inroads made under the mining lease and to protect specifically the improvements I have outlined. It also provides that operations in pursuance of the Mining Act shall not be carried out upon land comprised in a lease and so situated that such operations will prevent the access of stock to any watering place. I believe that there have been instances where the watering point has been completely dozed around, thus preventing stock from having access to it. It is quite important that mining operations should not so encircle a watering point or improvement that it is no further value or use.

The other important aspect of this is the question of establishing the boundaries of a lease. Section 137 enables the Minister to realign boundaries of leases by agreement with all parties concerned and also to make adjustments of rentals and to apportion between the parties the costs of making these adjustments. New section 137a takes the matter a little further, because it now gives the Minister authority to use an existing boundary or fence and to have the lease corrected so that the boundary of the lease corresponds to the existing improvement or the existing known and accepted boundary of the property. Here again, if any costs are incurred, or if the area of land that is to be transferred from one lease to another is such as to warrant some adjustment of the lease, the Minister has the power to take appropriate action.

It appears that in all these instances the Minister still has overriding control. Whilst I have said that the Act prevents certain mining development (within 25 yards of a fence, within 440 yards of certain improvements, or within close proximity of a watering point), it also permits the Minister to give approval for an expansion of work closer to these improvements. This has to be a written approval, and I think that it would have to be subject to agreement between the Crown and the lessee with respect to this further extension of development work.

For the first time, a penalty is provided. This penalty is not excessive. However, if there is an infringement of these particular provisions, a penalty of up to $500 can be imposed. As I have said, I believe that this Act has been amended basically to give greater protection to pastoralists in the areas now being exploited by mineral and mining development. On behalf of my Party, I can say that we on this side support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Boundary may be altered to correspond with actual occupation."

Mr. NANKIVELL: During the period of a 42-year lease a mining lease may be pegged over the pastoral lease. Not all of the 42 years has been used in the exploitation of the area for mineral exploration, but at the time the mining lease is vacated what happens to the pastoral lease? Can the Minister say whether it belongs to the pastoral lessee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I cannot give an unqualified assurance to the honourable member, but I should imagine that once the mining operation ceased the area that had been pegged or claimed initially and was being worked would revert automatically to the pastoralist. However, I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BETTING)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2218.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support most of the provisions of the Bill and I will deal later with those I do not support. It is a good thing that people interested in dog-racing in South Australia, who have been enthusiastic and done much work in preparing tracks ready for the day when they can have the same privileges as those who own race horses, are now to be given those privileges. I do not agree with the provision for allowing bookmakers to operate on dog-racing because the National Coursing Association did not ask for them. Apart from horse-racing, the trend throughout the world is for the number of bookmakers to decrease. Because bookmakers take an additional share out of racing, apart from the share to racing clubs and the Government, many countries find that these operations are much more successful without bookmakers. Sir Henry Bolte recently pointed out that he has no plans to legislate to stop bookmaking, because he considers that it is only a matter of time before they fade away.

Racing clubs, themselves, control the destiny of the bookmakers and, with a simple committee ruling, they can put them on the sidelines—forever. Bookmakers, for a century, have waxed fat on Australian racing and it is time clubs made a concerted effort to phase them out of racing—rather than wait for a "long-term trend." Racing in Victoria, and Australia for that matter, is not yet ready for all-totalisator betting. The facilities are not available to offer the betting public a complete service which would compare more than favourably with the "bets friends". But administrators should work to this aim, particularly as, with few exceptions, they agree with Sir Henry's views.

So in starting up and allowing betting on greyhounds, I think it is a mistake that bookmakers should be allowed to operate right from the beginning. One of the heads of the Sandown Greyhound Racing Company in Victoria, returning from an oversea trip, said:

> One of the most impressive features of the report is a comparison of the control of greyhound-racing in the different countries. Mr. McKenna found it strikingly apparent that greyhound-racing was much easier to control at meetings where bookmakers did not operate.

It will be a big mistake if we bring bookmakers into greyhound-racing. Great Britain was once one of the leading racing countries but it is now slipping back and cannot get enough prize money to make the industry prosperous because, compared with France, America and New Zealand, which all have totalizator betting, Britain is nowhere near as successful. It is a great pity that the Government has seen fit to allow bookmakers to operate on greyhound-racing, because the greyhound people did not ask for it.

There is a provision in the Bill for bookmakers to sue and to be sued. At first glance, we may think they should have this power, that, if somebody owes them money, they should have the right to sue; but with the Totalizator Agency Board system, all bets must be in cash, and a person cannot get his money back until the end of the day. I cannot see why, in these circumstances, the bookmaker should have the right to sue because, if the other types of betting are on a cash basis, all betting should be on a cash basis, and the temptation for somebody to over-extend his credit and thus get into trouble should not be encouraged by a Government. I strongly oppose that provision.

There is also provision for jackpot totalizators. Although I am not opposed to betting, I am perhaps a little against the extension of betting facilities. However, this idea may be gaining in popularity. Therefore, although I am not over keen on this provision, I see no reason why I should vote against it.

The provision for the six extra mid-week meetings a year on metropolitan racecourses is to be regretted. Already, action has been taken so that some of the smaller racecourses will be eliminated. I do not necessarily like this, but some of it is inevitable and we must accept it, whether or not this is a step by the racing authorities, who are governed by a certain Adelaide club. Possibly, that matter should be investigated. There is also the fact that we are setting up the same sort of control

for dog-racing as we have for horse-racing. In Victoria there is a Dog Racing Control Board whose membership provision is as follows:

The board shall consist of seven members appointed by the Governor in Council of whom—

(*a*) one (who shall be chairman) shall be a person who has no financial interest in any dog-racing course or in any racing dog;

(*b*) one shall be appointed from a panel of three names submitted by the executive committee of the National Coursing Association of Victoria;

(*c*) one shall be appointed from a panel of three names submitted by dog-racing clubs which conduct speed coursing outside the metropolis;

(*d*) one shall be appointed from a panel of three names submitted by dog racing clubs which conduct field or plumpton coursing beyond a radius of forty miles from the post office at the corner of Bourke and Elizabeth Streets, Melbourne, and shall be a person residing beyond the said radius; and

(*e*) one shall be appointed from a panel of three names submitted by the executive committee of the Greyhound Owners', Trainers' and Breeders' Association of Victoria;

(*f*) one shall be appointed from a panel of three names submitted by the executive committee of the Melbourne Greyhound Racing Association; and

(*g*) one shall be appointed from a panel of three names submitted by the executive committee of the National Coursing Association.

I think that that is a better method of controlling the sport than the method adopted in this State in regard to dog-racing and horse-racing. We must remember that differences of opinion occur between the two organizations connected with the administration of trotting. Perhaps a good case could be advanced that having six extra mid-week racing meetings a year in the metropolitan area would assist the racing industry. On the other hand, it is regrettable that the racing clubs that have spent so much money in preparing very good courses at Balaklava, Murray Bridge and Strathalbyn will have their activities curtailed. The additional commission that will be made available to the racing clubs will enable them to provide better course facilities and better totalizator arrangements. If in the future we have only totalizator betting, the clubs will need this extra commission so that modern totalizator equipment can be installed on racecourses.

For the first three months of this year the amount of money held by the off-course and on-course totalizators increased considerably, whereas bookmakers' turnover decreased. This shows that, in the long term, bookmakers will cease to exist. The sum the Government receives from bookmakers is much less than the sum it receives from other forms of betting. How can anyone say that this is just, fair and equitable? The only reason I have heard advanced why bookmakers should not pay to the Government the same proportion of commission as the totalizator pays is that bookmakers would go underground if they had to do so and the Government would then be unable to catch up with them. However, this is a very poor argument indeed in support of the claim that bookmakers should have this unfair advantage over the totalizator. I shall oppose some provisions strongly but I think that, overall, it is a good Bill, in the interests of the racing industry. Therefore I support the measure in general.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, support parts of the Bill. Last year, I supported a motion about allowing totalizators to operate at dog-racing meetings, and I still have the same attitude to dog-racing. I do not know why horse-racing should have that privilege but dog-racing should not have it. Therefore, I support that part of the Bill. However, like the member for Heysen, I will not support clause 42, which relates entirely to giving a bookmaker the right to sue and giving a gambler who is laying bets with the bookmaker the right to sue the bookmaker. I do not think we should make it lawful to sue or be sued in respect of a gambling debt. I do not think it has ever been intended that this should be the case, except that the present Government may intend it. Some people argue that horse-racing is an industry, and I consider that it can be so described today, because much money is turned over in horse-racing now, and big money is paid for race horses and, to a certain extent, in prize money. Much money is invested in the sport or, if one prefers to use the word, the industry. It is the gambling, not the horse-racing, that increases attendances at race meetings. If we did not have gambling, attendances would be much smaller than they are at present.

Mr. Jennings: Most people who go wouldn't know one end of a horse from the other.

Mr. EVANS: A few persons who attend horse-racing are horse lovers who go to see the horses, whether they are trotters, gallopers

or pacers. Those people would watch a race regardless of whether gambling was allowed. We know that, with dog-racing, when gambling is allowed with totalizators and the mechanical lure is used, attendances will increase. Why should they not have it, if it is gambling that takes the people there? We know that that is the main reason why people attend our race meetings throughout the country, so let persons who speak about the horse-racing industry be honest enough to say it is so big because we allow gambling in it.

I consider that allowing a bookmaker to sue or be sued in an action involving up to $5,000 brings about a wrong principle and allows horse-racing to be conducted in the wrong way. I visualize people, including bookmakers, taking big risks without making an immediate cash settlement. If a bookmaker knows that a person has some equity in a house, he may gamble that that person will be able to meet the commitment. If he does gamble and within six months wishes to bring an action for repayment of losses, members of Parliament will have people approaching them saying that these people are likely to lose their houses or items in the house that are so necessary today. I consider it wrong for any member of Parliament to regard these provisions for legal action as being necessary. We know that at present if a bookmaker wants to accept a bet from an individual, he must be sure that that person can meet the commitment with ready cash. If not, he takes the risk of not being paid. The same thing may be said to apply to a person betting with a bookmaker, but the bookmaker must lodge a security to ensure that he will meet his obligations. If a person is prepared to keep betting with a bookmaker but does not receive his winnings from those bets, simply continuing in this way until it is outside the bond kept by the bookmaker, that is that person's risk, and he deserves to lose. Gambling was never meant, in my opinion, to be an industry or a business, yet that is the way we are starting to consider it.

Gambling was meant for people who wished to spend the ready cash they had or to invest it, if that is the term to be used (but I do not use it), in order to see whether they won or lost, and that is the way it should stay. In fact, the original intention of the mover and seconder of the motion to which I have referred was that in the case of dog-racing there should be only a totalizator; it was never the intention that bookmakers would come into this field. Members may say that I am adopting double standards and that dog-racing and horse-racing should be considered as being the same in relation to allowing gambling. However, If I had my way, there would be no bookmakers connected with horse-racing. Some members opposite may believe that that is a poor attitude; perhaps they received some sort of contribution from the bookmakers' association towards their Party funds at the last election.

Mr. Wells: That's untrue.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: Members opposite may interject and say that it is untrue, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to discuss matters not confined to the Bill, and I will not permit such remarks.

Mr. EVANS: I accept your ruling, and I know that throughout the debate you will be as strict on all other matters that may not relate to the Bill. If you are not, I shall be disappointed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given a ruling in relation to this matter. The honourable member is entirely out of order in anticipating what I will do concerning other matters.

Mr. EVANS: There is some doubt in my mind about bookmakers' being allowed to enter the field of dog-racing, when the people specifically interested in this field never asked for bookmakers to operate here. People can form their own opinions on why this has occurred, but I for one have my own idea; indeed, it is possibly an earlier approach made to me that has given me that idea. I do not accept the fact that the metropolitan clubs should be allowed to operate on six more week days during the year, for I do not believe that it is necessary. We are merely allowing more gambling to take place.

Mr. McAnaney: And absenteeism!

Mr. EVANS: Yes, whether it be the manager or the person swinging the pick and shovel. If this is to be allowed, why not allow football and cricket matches to be held mid-week and permit gambling in respect of those matches? As no gambling is allowed on that type of sport, why should it be allowed on horse-racing?

Mr. McKee: Don't they gamble on football?

Mr. EVANS: People gamble on all sports to a certain extent but, if that is the attitude, why not make it legal? If it is all right to gamble on other sports, stand up and say that it should be made legal for the rest! Let us not have these double standards and be two-faced, as

we are being here. If we allow gambling on one sport, it should be allowed on others. If a footballer kicks 10 goals in a match or 100 goals in a season, why should not we be allowed to gamble on that? If bookmakers are brought into dog-racing, we bring in another human element, as a result of which there is sometimes doubt, distrust and dishonesty. Of course, this does not apply in all cases, because the average bookmaker is as honest as is any other member of the community. With greyhound-racing we eliminate the jockey for a start, so that is one human element eliminated. If we left the bookmaker out, that would be a second human element eliminated, and we would then have only the owners and trainers to contend with. Perhaps in those circumstances people who wished to bet on a particular sport to try to gain something would have a better chance.

Mr. Payne: You could put monkeys on dogs and use them as jockeys.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the part of the Bill that gives the right to dog-racing groups to use the totalizator at their meetings. I have some reservations about supporting that section that gives the right to bookmakers to operate at meetings where the mechanical lure is used. However, I will not under any conditions support the clause that gives the bookmaker the opportunity to sue a bettor and the bettor an opportunity to sue the bookmaker for any winning bets. It is possibly a good move ruined by some bad clauses to try to promote a particular field of interest. I will say no more about it, because I think enough members know what I mean.

Mr. McKEE (Pirie): I want to say briefly that I support the Bill. This is social legislation, and members can use their own discretion.

Mr. Hall: That's a bit of a change, isn't it?

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The only thing in the Bill that concerns me is the question of a bookmaker having the right to sue a punter and a punter having the right to sue a bookmaker. I do not disagree with bookmakers betting on greyhounds. I think the House supports me on this matter, because when the motion was moved the Parliament of the day supported the right for bookmakers to field at dog meetings, and I have no axe to grind in that respect. As the majority of the House was of the opinion that bookmakers should be allowed to field at dog meetings, we must accept that.

With regard to this question of bookmakers having the right to sue, some members opposite have said that betting should be a cash transaction. I support that opinion. I think it would be wrong to make it too easy for people to be able to indulge in what is known as nod betting, for this could cause a great deal of trouble to certain irresponsible people. The bookmaker should be able to select from his clientele of punters people that he considers are able to pay. I know that fairly substantial nod betting takes place at every race meeting throughout Australia. However, I do not think there are many occasions on which a punter welches on the bookmaker, because he knows that if he does not pay he will not be able to place another bet. Also, the bookmakers will only accept nod bets from people they know are able to pay.

If we gave to a bookmaker the right to sue, he might be tempted to accept bets from a person whom he knows has no cash but has a house or a motor car that is freehold; he could let that person bet, and if he lost his bet the bookmaker could take legal action against him and probably take his house from him. This could even happen to a woman, because many women like betting, too. The house may be in the wife's name or in joint names. We may make the situation too easy for people to be able to bet on credit, and I do not think that people should be given the opportunity to do this too easily. This is the only provision I oppose, and I think we should seriously consider deleting this clause. I fully support the remainder of the Bill. Having had much to do with the Bill dealing with mechanical lures, I am pleased that this Government has seen fit to give people the privileges that have been enjoyed by others throughout Australia by allowing people to bet at dog-racing meetings.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the Bill, I foreshadow three amendments that I shall move in Committee. I understand that this Bill is similar to one prepared by the Chief Secretary in the former Government and, for that reason, I sincerely hope my colleagues on this side will support it. When introducing the Bill, the Attorney-General said that once it had been dealt with the Act would be completely reprinted. I hope this will be done soon, because at present it is most inconvenient to try to refer to the present Act with its many amendments.

My first amendment, which is to clause 7, will allow racing clubs to open either the grand stand and flat or the grand stand and Derby stand at mid-week race meetings. I believe that racing clubs should be allowed to decide whether they open either one or other of these facilities or all of them. Eventually, racing in South Australia will reach a standard in which the facilities will be situated on one side of the ground and there will be no flat. The facilities will be similar to those provided overseas, where patrons are able to watch the races in absolute comfort and to be waited on by waiters and attendants, who take bets and serve drinks whilst the patrons are watching the races. At this stage, while we are considering alterations to the Act, we should make this clause as flexible as possible. My next amendment, which is to clause 16, deletes reference to Bolivar and adds "situated within a radius of 15 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide".

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a second reading debate; the Bill is not yet in Committee. The honourable member cannot deal with his amendments, which must be dealt with in Committee. The honourable member must speak to the Bill without referring to his amendments.

Mr. BECKER: I thought I would give my reason for moving the amendments.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in doing so.

Mr. BECKER: I want to explain the reason for moving the amendments, because I think members should take some interest in the Bill. There does not seem to be very much interest in it at present and, therefore, it may pass expeditiously.

The Bill refers to the minimum size of bets on the T.A.B. as 50c. In New South Wales the lowest betting unit is 25c. Some years ago in South Australia at trotting meetings betting was in units of 20c. This was a great advantage to the trotting club, and particularly to the aged persons who formed a large percentage of the attendance at those trotting meetings. When the size of the bet was increased from 20c to 50c, it interfered with the opportunity of those aged persons to have bets at trotting meetings, and the attendances declined over a period simply because the aged people were denied a 20c bet.

Mention has already been made of the provision enabling bookmakers to sue or be sued. The bookmaker is in business. If he conducts his book properly, he makes a percentage profit on his turnover. Any bookmaker who gambles against the favourite or creates his own favourite would be a fool, because eventually he must go broke. The proper way for a bookmaker to run a book is to keep tabs on what he is holding on various horses in the race, and to adjust the prices accordingly. There are professional punters in the community, and it is nothing for a professional punter to place bets of $500 or $1,000. I do not think it is fair to expect such a person to go around a racecourse with $10,000 or $20,000 in his pocket. They are professional punters. We cannot stop them. We are led to believe that "two-up" is a national pastime. There will always be a game of "two-up" in Adelaide for a person who wants it. Deleting reference to nod betting will not stop it. Therefore, the bookmaker should have the right to sue and be sued, and to have established clients.

I recall my experience in the bank when bookmakers came to us saying, "So-and-so desires to open an account with us. Will you check his references with his bank?" We would write to the bank and ask whether the person in question would be good for $1,000 on demand. If the reply was "Yes", we would advise the bookmaker accordingly and tell him, "This chap is good for $1,000." That person would then go on the bookmaker's list. So, although the Bill may appear generous in setting $5,000 as a limit, to the professional punter $5,000 is nothing. I do not think anything would be achieved by eliminating this provision. The bookmaker should have the right to sue an established client and, on the other hand, I believe a client should have the right to sue the bookmaker. Bookmakers must put up a guarantee with the Betting Control Board, and this guarantees all bets made with them. I can see no harm in this clause, and I do not agree with the previous speakers in this respect.

Possibly the most significant part of the Bill is that which provides for totalizator betting and bookmakers to operate at greyhound race meetings in South Australia. Greyhound-racing has come a long way since the mechanical lure was agreed to by this House some months ago. I think the best example of that is what has been done by the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club at Bolivar. If members have not bothered to go out there and look at a meeting in operation, I extend to them on behalf of the club an invitation to do so. Some weeks ago, when I was the guest of the club, I was extremely surprised at the facilities

it has provided and the sum it has spent in establishing the track. I was particularly surprised by the very strict security precautions; these are an important part of dog-racing in South Australia.

There will be no fairer sport for the punter than betting on greyhound dogs. It was most difficult for the President of the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club to show me through certain sections of the course because they were under the supervision of the various stewards, and this is how it should be. When the dogs are taken to the course they are locked away for at least 1½ hours prior to their race and they are detained after the race so that there is no chance for anyone to interfere with them. So, greyhound racing will be conducted very fairly and the punters will have nothing to fear. In dog-racing in other States 55 per cent of all favourites win. This is a considerably higher proportion than that which applies to horse-racing or trotting. It is not a bad percentage when one considers that dog-racing is a sport that can be followed by all sections of the community. The average working man can afford to own, train and race a dog. I think this provision has everything to commend it.

The Bill increases by 0.5 per cent the commission payable to horse-racing clubs. This will be a welcome addition to their finances, because racing in South Australia has struggled over the last two or three years. It has been subject to all sorts of taxation and to intense competition from other States. Consequently, it is the Government's responsibility to assist horse-racing clubs in South Australia. I believe that eventually one of the metropolitan horse-racing clubs will disappear. The immense amount of capital needed to maintain the three racecourses in the metropolitan area and the relatively small number of meetings that each metropolitan club has (even with the mid-week meetings allocated through this Bill) may mean that it will be in the interests of horse-racing to eliminate one of the metropolitan racecourses and to split the assets of the club concerned between the other two clubs so that they can provide facilities that are better than those provided by horse-racing clubs in other States. I believe that this reform must come. The clubs have already looked at it and they should give further attention to it.

I think the South Australian Trotting Club is to be commended for building the new trotting complex at Bolivar, which will cost about $2,000,000 when it is fully established. Trotting, like horse-racing, and dog-racing in future, will attract many visitors from other States. The Government should assist these clubs because it will thereby be helping the tourist industry of this State. The Bill is a money measure, because the Government is looking for revenue. The Treasurer told us in his Budget speech this year that this was one area in which we lagged in comparison with the other States. The Government's share of commission from gambling in this State is lower than that in any other State, but I hope that the Government does not become greedy and bleed racing in South Australia, because the success or otherwise of racing and of the industry as a whole will be reflected in the breeding industry. Whether it is greyhound racing, trotting or horse-racing, with the breeding of thoroughbred race horses, trotters, and greyhound dogs, we will see developed a new industry that should be encouraged. Horse-racing studs have been established in country areas and many thousands of dollars have been spent in purchsing sires and establishing these studs. As I have said, I support the Bill wholeheartedly, and I will speak on my amendments in the Committee stage.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Many aspects of the Bill can be dealt with only in the Committee stage, and I should like to ask some questions then. One or two members on this side were horrified when the Minister said in his explanation that trotting and horse-racing would be grouped in one term, because there are suggestions that trotters are a breed apart from race horses. Of course, other people consider that both groups are donkeys and that people who follow them are a cross between the donkey and the horse. Earlier, when the Treasurer referred to his going to the Commonwealth Government for additional grants, he said that there were several areas in which the Government would be increasing its revenue, and he included revenue from betting. Certainly, the Bill contains many instances where the Government will gain. The Minister said in his explanation that he hoped that, by giving organizations, whether they are associated with trotting, greyhound-racing, or horse-racing, better opportunities, there would be a better return and the Government would benefit.

Some of the information that the Minister gave us about greyhound racing was, to say the least, a hope for the future. Some of the assurances that seem to have been given to the Minister or his department about the amount of money available or expended by

greyhound-racing clubs on facilities are, I suggest, open to question. Certainly, some of them have an extremely tangible asset and they are, as indicated at Bolivar and Strathalbyn, racing at present. However, some indicated a few years ago that they would move into the field of active racing to be able to give the Government a guarantee that they could look after all aspects of the industry, but they have failed to conduct even one race meeting. From my own experience, I do not deny that greyhound-racing is a booming industry in other States, whether it be at Wentworth Park or Harold Park in New South Wales or at Olympic Park or Sandown Park in Victoria.

It has been said that the greyhound is the working man's race horse; indeed, again speaking from my experience in Sydney areas, I fear that in some instances a person's interest is in his dogs and not to the correct degree, either economically or otherwise, in his family. Although I am not opposed to the industry going forward in this way, we must seriously examine the social aspects of the Bill. In the promotion of greyhound-racing, there has been considerable canvassing of the cruelty aspects, which I realize have been considered by a Select Committee of another place. Although this matter is largely covered by the provisions of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, I have yet to find, in that part of the Act dealing with the conduct of greyhound-racing, any evidence that provision will be made regarding the swabbing of dogs that participate in races. This provision may well be included in the National Coursing Association regulations, but I point out that, when we create a situation in which betting occurs, it is extremely important that there be a deterrent in relation to the untoward conduct of that activity.

Indeed, in horse-racing and trotting this deterrent exists. Although it does not necessarily apply to every race or winner any more than it applies to the horse that may have come last, the relevant provision is available to the stewards who conduct these meetings and who may decide that an animal should be swabbed in order to determine whether it has run on its own merits. I hope the Minister will ensure that adequate provision is made for swabbing once wholesale betting becomes legal.

Reference has been made to mid-week racing and, bearing in mind that there will be an increase of six meetings, I draw attention to the fact that only about 2½ to three years ago the metropolitan area gained a further eight meetings when the Gawler racecourse was deleted as a metropolitan course, and these eight meetings were divided between the metropolitan racing clubs. The Oakbank racecourse is regarded as a metropolitan course for the purpose of the two race meetings a year conducted there, and, if action were taken to close that course, yet another two meetings would be held in the metropolitan area. Certainly, we are getting close to centralization here and, while this has considerable advantages concerning the degree of turnover and, therefore, the amount that is fed back into the Government coffers, it is nevertheless depriving the rural community of access to race meetings.

The member for Hanson referred to the Minister's announcement that, although in 1969 there was to be a reduction in the extra amount retained by the clubs of the fractions from T.A.B. from 1¼ per cent to ¾ per cent, this Government had decided that the 1¼ per cent would continue. Whilst I agree that this is of considerable benefit to the clubs themselves and that it will undoubtedly be fed back into the industry either in stake money or in facilities for patrons, I think it indicates that the Government is trading benefits with the one hand for the greater gains it will get with the other. I support the second reading, and will have other questions to ask during Committee.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I shall not detain the House long. I announce my support for the second reading, and my attitude to certain clauses will be made clear as we pass through Committee. This is a new and unexplored territory for me, for I personally have never been on a racecourse in my life, although I hold no personal antipathy to those who are either regular or casual habituees of these performances. I think it is an axiom of debate that the least one knows about a topic the more authority with which one can speak.

However, it seems to me that we are here in an area of tension between our desire to protect people against themselves, which is sometimes necessary, and at the same time treating them as adults, which means giving them the freedom to go to the devil whatever way they wish. There are occasions when we have to be guided by one or other of these two principles. I think that perhaps resolving this dilemma is the central problem that faces any Legislature when it considers social legislation, whether it be in relation to liquor, betting or drugs.

It has often amazed me that there are those who, like myself, call themselves Socialists and who are very concerned for the effect of various industries on the worker and his pay packet yet are not always as concerned for the effect on the worker's pay packet of the various industries concerned with betting. Yet at the same time we also have to realize that betting is, in effect, the working man's form of investment, that he does not have the capital behind him to make the sort of investments which are more certain in their return but which provide less profit in the short run. So, if there is any area of investment which is open to the little man, then perhaps those sorts of investment that come under betting provide this.

My principal reason for speaking was to express my support for the point brought forward by the member for Pirie regarding clause 42, and I will go much further on this in Committee. I am opposed to the principal of betting on the nod. This is something which does not apply and is not recognized in any other State in the Commonwealth. There will be those with sufficiently long memory to recall the stories of Hollywood Joe (I believe his surname was Edser) who was warned off tracks in Australia because he owed more than $100,000 and who got a bookmaker into strife because the bookmaker was betting on the nod on his behalf with other bookmakers. This is not an isolated case; others could be referred to. However, I shall not do so, because they are rather closer to home and might bring embarrassment to people who are now regarded as respectable citizens in this community, and no doubt are.

I point out for the edification of the member for Hanson that if we delete the clause the situation will not be as unfair as he thinks it will be. Bookmakers may, whatever legislation provides, borrow to keep in business. If the punter burns his fingers what is the use of suing the bookmaker? What can he get out of him? I support the second reading, and my attitude to other clauses will be made clear in Committee.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I support the Bill, but I would not say that racing is a gigantic industry. Because of what the member for Fisher said, because it is an industry that encourages gambling. I could take members to other countries in the world where there is no gambling at race meetings but these meetings are some of the greatest that are conducted in the world.

Mr. Gunn: Where?

Mr. WELLS: In Egypt and Palestine. Let us analyze this industry. It is not the little fellow with his 50c each way on a horse who creates the evil in this industry. He is not the person who gains: it is the blue noses that the member for Fisher and his Party support who get the profit from it. These are the people who are able to pay fabulous prices for racehorses; these are the people who can take their horses to America to race; and these are the people who can afford enormous sums for yearlings in a gamble that may buy them a Melbourne Cup winner. It is not the 50c bettor of the working class who gains any benefits from the racing game, nor is he contaminated when he has his 50c each way or a dollar each way. That is his prerogative.

It is mealy mouthed hypocrisy for Opposition members to say that they are concerned about gambling, whether referring to trotters, gallopers or dogs. Let us consider some aspects of this industry. First, the horse-breeding industry. This is a gigantic money spinner for this State and a large industry in itself. What about the people from the country who moan and groan about this and ask what is 'n it for them? What about people in the country who grow fodder and grain to feed horses? What about the farriers who make a living shoeing horses? What about the jockeys, the little blokes up top, who have to earn a living? What about the stablehands who are now members of the Australian Workers Union, a good powerful union, who for the first time are now receiving a decent living wage and enjoying reasonable conditions? This is not compulsory unionism, either.

What about the veterinarians who jab the needle in and who bob up and look at a horse and say that he is fit to run, but it lets the punters down? The veterinarians get their chop out of it, but I think some veterinarians need to be swabbed. What about the staff who work on the racecourse? Are they entitled to consideration? When we discussed the legislation dealing with early closing hours, members opposite were concerned about the fact that people were deprived of work opportunities. What about these people? Thousands of them work on racecourses on race days. Also, what about the catering staff and the transport staff, the people who drive the buses to get people to the racecourses? Is all this to be jettisoned or is it worth some consideration?

I was shocked (and I am not easily shocked) to hear the member for Light say that he was concerned because he feared that the social

aspect of dog-racing would have to be considered because a man might pay more attention to his dog than to his family. What rubbish! I am sure the honourable member was not sincere when he said that. Just imagine a man ignoring his family and saying, "I am sorry, Mum—no pictures tonight; I have to go and walk the dog"! Then the member for Light spoke of swabbing a dog. He has probably been to Sydney and seen the spectacular dog meetings at Harold Park. I have been there, too, so I am not talking from hearsay: I have been a regular visitor there. If I do not put money into the pubs, I may as well put it on the horse's nose.

Swabbing is a matter of machinery. There are millions of little things that these people know about. It is easy to stop a dog if a person wants to, but I am confident that the people who will be responsible for the welfare and supervision of the dogs will ensure that they are in satisfactory racing condition and are not interfered with. We all know the old stunts years ago of giving a dog a drink of water or taping a pebble between its toss. These things were done, but people know all about it.

Then there is the bookmaker. Some people are horrified that bookmakers are to be allowed on the course. I have had something to do with bookmakers. Indeed, I should be in partnership with some of them because I have helped filled their bags, but bookmakers are a spectacular part of the racing scene, whether at dog races, trotting races or horse races. This is the reason. If a man goes to a racecourse and wants to put his 50c on Joe Blow, he looks at the board of a bookmaker, who offers 10 to 1; then he goes to another bookmaker, who offers 8 to 1; and then to another, who offers 12 to 1, which is the best he can get, so he puts his 50c on at 12 to 1. Then people move in, and many of them fancy a certain horse, so the price of that horse tumbles. Therefore, the early bettor gets the best price and the last people to bet get the worst price. However, if a punter is betting on the tote, it does not matter whether he buys the first ticket or the last ticket from the tote—his return is governed by the number of people who back that horse; so there is no advantage for some in using the tote: it is a dead sort of thing.

Mr. McKee: You mean there is no challenge?

Mr. WELLS: Yes. I know the member for Pirie enjoys a challenge. These things must be considered, and it should be remembered that the bookmakers do add a spectacular effect to race meetings.

I support the provision that enables six additional mid-week meetings to be held in the metropolitan area. I think it is awful that some people immediately scream that this provision will cause absenteeism. How many of us here (with the exception of the two ladies) have not taken a sicky and sneaked off somewhere when we should not have done so? The worker says to Mum, " I cannot go to work today." However, by lunchtime he has recovered and says, "A walk in the sun will do me good." So, he goes to a race meeting, and what harm is there in it? He recuperates there by getting exercise and, when he goes to work the next day, he is a better man. So, there are many advantages in having the six additional mid-week meetings in the metropolitan area. I believe that the day of the Adelaide Cup meeting should be declared a public holiday. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I could not follow why the member for Heysen and the member for Fisher said it was undesirable that we should have bookmakers at dog-racing meetings. The member for Heysen suggested that racing was conducted very prosperously in other parts of the world where there were no bookmakers. He said that, if we did not have bookmakers here, the horse-racing industry would be so much better off and that the dog-racing industry would be better off without bookmakers. The question I pose to the honourable member and to the House is this: is an industry such as racing conducted for the benefit of the clubs or for the benefit of the public? Is an entertainment industry (and that is what it is) there to cater for what the public wants by way of entertainment, or is it there to cater for what those supplying the entertainment want?

If members are in any doubt at all about what the public wants they need only to go to any horse-racing meeting and compare the number of people in the ring between races with the number of people in the totalizator queues. Because the bookmakers' ring at horse-racing meetings is the centre of activity between races (even the bar included), there can be no doubt that the public wants bookmakers at horse-racing and dog-racing meetings. If the public wants that form of service, why should it not have it? Why should it be that, just because a theoretical argument can be made out that the clubs may be financially better off without bookmakers, the law should

provide that bookmakers should not field at the meetings? If bookmakers are permitted at dog-racing meetings, the people who attend those meetings can please themselves whether they bet with the bookmakers or on the totalizator. I suggest that it should be no business of Parliament to put a restriction on what the public obviously wants.

Regarding the provision that enables a bookmaker to sue or be sued, whilst I would concede that there may be arguments that can be put by either side (indeed, they have been put), what surprised me very much was the observation made by the member for Fisher, who, I think, is, unfortunately, not in the House, in view of what I am about to say. However, I regret that this is the only opportunity I have to say it, so I shall say it now. The member for Fisher seems to be incapable of debating any issue before this House without making reflections on the integrity of those who disagree with him, and on this occasion he gratuitously made a serious reflection on those who propound the provisions of this Bill relating to bookmakers.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is he the only one who thinks so?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Well, apparently the member for Kavel agrees with what the member for Fisher said about the motives of those who propose these provisions.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You didn't hear what I said.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that I have a couple of files that were put on my table by the Chief Secretary when he was kind enough to invite me to introduce the Bill in this House, and one of those files contains a small minute, which states:

> To the Hon. the Attorney-General: Cabinet on 18th instant decided that provision should be made in the Lottery and Gaming Act for bookmakers to operate on dog-racing. Could this be referred to the Parliamentary Draftsman for inclusion in the draft Bill?

It is signed by the Chief Secretary and the date of the minute is March 23, 1970. The Chief Secretary's initials appear there and may be deciphered, one would think, as being those of the Chief Secretary of the day, Mr. DeGaris. It is then referred to the Parliamentary Draftsman under the initials "RM, Attorney-General." I also have here another little file, which is dated April 6, 1970. It is a recommendation signed by the Chief Secretary of the day, recommending to Cabinet (and approved, indeed) that bookmakers be authorized to sue and be sued in respect of amounts not exceeding $5,000. Mr. Speaker, I mention those matters—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Attorney-General is quoting from a Government docket and I ask whether it is in order for me to ask that that docket be tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General is replying to accusations that have been made by the member for Fisher.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, is it in order for me to ask that both dockets that the Attorney-General is quoting from be tabled?

The SPEAKER: Erskine May states:

> Another rule, or principle of debate, may be here added. A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the table. This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevents counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in. It has also been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interests. A Minister who summarizes a correspondence, but does not actually quote from it, is not bound to lay it upon the table.

In reply to the member for Alexandra, I suggest that the Minister can summarize from the docket rather than quote the docket itself.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; I heard the Minister quote directly from the document, and I believe that the *Hansard* record will show that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In fact, I think I quoted from the first one and summarized the second one, but I am happy to table both dockets.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister tables the dockets they become the property of the House.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is so; I do not want them, Mr. Speaker. However, I shall now proceed to read from the second docket, which I was summarizing. It is a minute from the Chief Secretary for Cabinet, and states:

> The South Australian Bookmakers' League had made representations to the previous Government for amendment to the Act to enable

bookmakers to sue in respect of credit betting. Inquiries revealed that in all States except Western Australia legislation enables a bookmaker to sue in respect of credit betting and also for the bookmaker to be sued in cases where he has not paid a winning bet. At the present time a punter can only recover money from a bookmaker by the Betting Control Board enforcing the bookmaker's bond. It is recommended that section 50 of the Lottery and Gaming Act be amended to enable a punter to sue a bookmaker for any amount owing, and for a bookmaker to be able to sue a punter for a debt not exceeding $5,000, and for the bookmaker's legal action to be only in respect of the six months period prior to instituting proceedings.

That docket was signed by the Chief Secretary of the day with the initial "D". One might suppose that perhaps it was the former Chief Secretary (Hon. Mr. DeGaris). Cabinet approved the drafting and the docket was signed, again for the Premier, by the same gentleman and forwarded to the Draftsman. I mention those matters not because I think they are relevant to the issue, as such, but because of the reflection that the member for Fisher saw fit to make on those who happened to differ from him on this subject. The member for Light referred to the swabbing of dogs: of course, the control of any sport, whether it is horse-racing, trotting or dog-racing, must be a matter for the controlling body of that sport, and the controlling body has the obvious motive that it must inspire public confidence in the conduct of the sport and in the integrity of those conducting it. These are obviously matters not for legislation but for the rules made by the controlling body.

Dr. Eastick: It was not suggested they weren't.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The other matter raised, I think also by the member for Light, referred to mid-week racing, and this was adverted to also by the member for Heysen. The suggestion was made that the provision of additional mid-week racing days might have an adverse effect on country clubs, and the member for Heysen, in particular, expressed regret at the fact that country racecourses were being closed and were not being used for racing. This is true, and I regret it also, but I think the honourable member recognizes that a club, if it is not in a sound financial position, must face the realities of the situation. The plain fact is that under modern conditions most horses that race at country courses are trained in the city and, indeed, a great many of the people who attend country race meetings travel from the city for that purpose.

It is in the interests of country racing that the racing in the city should receive the stimulus that will be received from some additional mid-week days. It may be thought that, with the stimulus of mid-week racing in the city, a pool of horses will be developed which will ultimately be to the benefit of country racing. It is certain that country racing cannot survive unless metropolitan racing is healthy, and these additional mid-week days will tend to promote the health of metropolitan racing as well as to provide amenities for those who might wish to attend the occasional mid-week racing in the city. I therefore commend the Bill to the House. It is obvious that some points will have to be dealt with in detail in Commttee.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That this Bill be now read a second time".

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to see those dockets that I understand are to be tabled. They have not yet reached the table of the House, although they are being passed around amongst Government members.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 5, at 2 p.m.