

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 11, 1971

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

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

QUESTIONS

UNIROYAL DISPUTE

Mr. HALL: Following his discussion with Cabinet today about the strike at Uniroyal, can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether there is any hope of settling the dispute this week?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: At this stage I can only report that a hearing is being held before the Arbitration Commission at 2.15 this afternoon: I do not think it is advisable to say anything, for the matter is now in the hands of the court. We will not know the outcome of this hearing until some time this afternoon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister say what has happened in the last few hours regarding the strike at Uniroyal? The last public information that I had on this matter was that the strikers, at a meeting this morning, had decided not to return to work. Therefore, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Minister's reply to the Leader, as I understood that there could be no return to work before a meeting that is to be held next Monday. I therefore ask the Minister what has transpired in the meantime.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Two separate cases will come on before the court this afternoon. One case, which deals with the dispute regarding the females employed at Uniroyal, is scheduled to start at 2.15 p.m., and the question of the men not returning to work will be dealt with at about 4 p.m. or 4.15 p.m.

Mr. Millhouse: Is this before Commissioner Lean?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes. The honourable member would appreciate that it is not my function to try to make statements on what the outcome of these conferences may be.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister say to what extent factories and other industries are now being affected by the continuance of the Uniroyal strike and whether any of these organizations have indicated that they may be forced to curtail or stop production? I think it is quite apparent to everyone that what is a relatively small strike is having far-reaching effects on other industries in this State, and certainly on the economy of the State as a whole, particularly at this fairly critical time, and I should be interested to hear whether the effects are spreading further as a result of the continuance of the strike.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I appreciate the honourable member's concern in this respect and, doubtless, the strike has had an effect on quite a few people who are not directly involved. At this stage it would be difficult for me to say how many people will be involved if the strike goes further but I can say that Chrysler Australia Limited would probably be the worst affected. As I have said, it is difficult for me to say how many people involved in other industries depending on supplies from Uniroyal would be affected.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister give details of the latest position concerning unemployment in this State and say whether any alternative employment is available for those who are affected directly or indirectly by the present industrial strike? I believe it would be of considerable value to those people who are stood down or affected directly by the strike if alternative work was available. If such work was available it would help if the Minister made a public statement, as some of these people may then be assured that they may receive some income in order to maintain their families during this present strife.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As the honourable member would probably realize, people who are stood down but not taking direct action in the dispute are entitled to receive social service benefits. I cannot say what the present situation is concerning the re-employment of so many people. However, as they are entitled to receive social service benefits, I think that the best thing I can say at this stage is that I shall have the situation studied and obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister say, as a result of the continuance of the regrettable Uniroyal strike, what is the position concerning the motor industry in South Australia, especially at Chrysler Australia Limited and General Motors-Holden's, in respect of the output of

vehicles and stand-downs? Also, as he has referred to social services, can he say how long a person must be stood down before qualifying for social services?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It is seven days before a person can apply for social services, as the honourable member well knows. As he probably also knows, Chrysler Australia Limited is probably the worst affected by the strike at this stage. I do not know the position regarding General Motors-Holden's, which has not communicated with me, although that organization would probably be the next most affected if it could not obtain supplies from the rubber company. I do not know how many people are involved but, as the situation continues each day, it can probably vary and no doubt worsen. I reiterate that Chrysler is the hardest hit company at this stage.

SCRUB CLEARANCE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister for Conservation again take up with the Commonwealth Government the urgent necessity for doing away with or drastically modifying the present taxation concessions available for scrub clearance? On August 7, under the heading "Tax Problems?", the following notice appeared in the newspaper:

Sixty acres of scrub, \$300 an acre. Near Verdun. Within 1½ miles of freeway at Verdun. This property represents good value to someone to clear and develop.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Soon after taking over this new portfolio I contacted the Prime Minister and suggested that a meeting of State Ministers responsible for conservation and the environment be arranged so that matters such as the one that the honourable member has raised could be considered. We now have an acknowledgment, and a meeting of State Ministers will be arranged soon. I assure the honourable member that at such conference I will press the matter that he has raised.

KINDERGARTEN SUBSIDY

Mr. WRIGHT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question regarding grants to the Lady Gowrie Kindergarten?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Lady Gowrie Kindergarten is conducted by the Commonwealth Department of Education and Science, through the Australian Pre-school Association, and was originally established for research purposes along with others in other States. The State Government does not make a direct grant to the Lady Gowrie

Kindergarten, but a grant is made to the Kindergarten Union of South Australia, which makes a contribution towards the salaries of the teaching staff of the Lady Gowrie Kindergarten. In the financial year 1970-71 the grant to the union was \$813,700 and, of this, \$5,800 was made available to the Lady Gowrie Kindergarten. The Commonwealth Department of Education and Science has stated that the Commonwealth grant to the Lady Gowrie Kindergarten in 1970-71 was \$25,000. The Lady Gowrie Kindergartens in each of the other capital cities of Australia are subsidized by the Commonwealth Government in the same way.

GARBAGE COLLECTION

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Local Government clarify the position concerning a recent press article in which it was stated that \$10 could be charged by councils for garbage collection under the provisions of the Local Government Act Amendment Bill now before the House? I have been approached by several constituents who have become confused by the press article and who would appreciate any clarification that could be given by the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is regrettable that the way the article was written in the press suggested to the public that the passing of this Bill would mean that councils would charge an additional \$10 for garbage collection. This is not the case, and I can only assume either that it was written in ignorance of the true facts or, alternatively, that it was a confused version of what was contained in the Bill. The present situation is that, under the Local Government Act as it now stands, any council may, if it so desires, levy a separate rate for collecting garbage. Some councils do this but, generally, councils absorb this cost in their general rate. The purpose of the proposal that the Government has placed before the House to consider is to enable those councils that have levied a separate rate for collecting garbage to be able to levy a rate on all people who live on the garbage collecting round, because it has been found from experience that where a separate rate is levied (and because it can be levied only on those who use the service) the provision of the service is uneconomical, and also that some people are regrettably so bereft of civic pride that, rather than pay the \$10, they take the garbage can and empty it in a back street or in a park, or do something of that nature. The whole purpose of part of the amending Bill is to enable those few councils that avail themselves of the existing provision to make a charge

on all persons who are enrolled in the area in which garbage is collected, irrespective of whether or not they avail themselves of the service. The suggestion in the newspaper report, that councils would be charging an additional \$10 a year as a result of the Government's action in introducing this Bill, is a completely false interpretation of what the Government intends to do.

WHYALLA POLLUTION

Mr. BROWN: Can the Minister of Marine say when the proposed conference will take place between the Government and officers of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited concerning the Broken Hill Proprietary Steel Indenture Act? Having previously expressed to the Minister deep concern about the pollution of Spencer Gulf near Whyalla, I am now most anxious that proper and adequate precautions be taken to ensure that certain things, including the killing of many fish, do not recur.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's efforts in this regard. The honourable member contacted me shortly after it had been reported that fish had been found dead in False Bay, near Whyalla, and he has been in touch with me constantly ever since. The honourable member may be aware that this morning I met the Manager of Iron and Steel Making Operations at the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla (Mr. Risby) with whom I had what I consider to be worthwhile discussions, which have led to the company's immediately removing the existing dump and treating the surrounding areas. The waste, which contains the cyanide and which is stored in drums in this dump, will be removed and alternative methods of treating this waste will be investigated and put into effect. In addition, the company has agreed that discussions should be held between its executives and the Government on clause 7 of the indenture which deals specifically with this problem. I hope that this conference may be arranged for early next week.

MIGRATION

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier is reported in the *China Mail*, as follows:

Mr. Dunstan said he hoped that Australia would drop its racist immigration policy and let in useful and capable people of any colour.

Will he say whether he is correctly reported? It is known (certainly to the Premier) that Australia allows 10,000 people of non-European descent into the country each year, mostly

from Asian countries. Knowing how easily misunderstood in Asia is the Australian policy on this matter, I ask whether it would not have been better for the Premier to point out this policy and to make it clear that it is not a racist one. Would it not have been better to try to spread goodwill and good news about this country in an accurate and informative way?

The SPEAKER: Order! My recollection is that this question has already been asked. However, if it has not been asked, I call on the Premier to reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My remarks, as reported in the *China Mail*, are entirely accurate. Although Australia allows in about 10,000 people of what are called non-European origin, only 3,000 of these are of non-Caucasian origin, the remainder being part Europeans. At present, people who are trained in Australia, who are well acquainted with the Australian community, who are able to live here and who have been accepted by the Australian community while they have been here, are excluded from Australia because of their racial background, whereas people who have no such qualifications for fitting into our community, who do not speak English, who have not trained to the same professional standard as has been provided within Australia are welcomed here on assisted passages from places such as Turkey. The qualification for the Turks is not that they can fit into the community but that their skin happens to be the colour of the honourable member's and my skin.

If this is not a racist policy, I do not know what it is. In respect of the Australian alumnae in Singapore (graduates of our own universities who have been excluded from Australia because of the colour of their skin) or students in Singapore or Hong Kong who have been excluded from Australia because of the colour of their skin, although they are far more easily able to fit into the community than some of the migrants who are sought by the Immigration Department, I can only tell the honourable member that, since preference is given to people with the colour of skin such as our own, there is a racist policy, and there is no other explanation for it. I do not in any way suggest that we should not take migrants from the areas from which the Commonwealth draws. I believe that the migration of people to Australia from Greece, Germany, Italy, Holland, Sweden, and Central European countries, has been of advantage to our community.

Simply to say, however, that one must exclude a Malaysian Chinese because of the colour of his skin, when he has been trained in this community, means that this country has a racist policy, and there is no other explanation for it. The admission of 3,000 people a year from the whole of Asia, compared with the numbers we seek in other parts of the world, when they are people who could fit into this community and who live at its standards, is unrealistic. However, I have never suggested that we should open the doors to unskilled migrants who would depress our standards of health, hygiene and working activity in the community. If we are to seek migrants from elsewhere, why should we provide different criteria for people who have a different colour of skin from that of our own as compared with those who have the same colour of skin?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: My question applied to Hong Kong.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that he should ask only one question at a time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was answering questions in Hong Kong where there are numbers of Chinese who live at a standard similar to that in this community, who are educated to our standard, who are migrating in numbers now to Canada without difficulty and fitting into that community, who are not unskilled, and whom we are refusing because of the colour of their skin and on no other basis. In those circumstances, there is no explanation other than that the policy is racist.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Did you say that we now allow 10,000 people such as these to migrate here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said that we allow in 10,000 people who are non-Caucasian in background. About 3,000 of these are Asians without any European blood, the remaining 7,000 being part-Europeans who are required to have a majority-European background. Apparently, the criterion is that they give the necessary reaction to a light meter. On any examination of the activity of the department or of statements of policy of the Commonwealth Minister, that is the only conclusion that one can come to. Not many of these people are coming in from Hong Kong. I am aware that members of the Party opposite have been proceeding to circulate material in this State that suggests that, if one wants a Pakistani for a neighbour, one should vote Labor.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Don't start that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member had better talk to Mr. Jessop about the material that gentleman has circulated in Whyalla on just that basis because, if the honourable member does not want to be tagged with a racist background, he had better talk to the Enoch Powells in his own Party.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether members are correct in believing that he seeks to substitute academic achievement for racial origin as a qualification for his migration policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

STUDENT LIAISON TEACHERS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department intends to extend the appointment of student liaison teachers to include all secondary and primary schools? At present, student liaison teachers have been appointed to schools that have special problems. My question is prompted by the outstanding success of the student liaison teacher at Port Augusta High School whose work is well known throughout the town and who is thought of very highly. Therefore, I wonder whether the department can extend this service to primary and secondary schools that do not already have such a teacher.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What the department has done in several schools this year is to appoint a special senior master or special senior mistress as student liaison officer within the school. When this is done, a teacher is thus taken out of the classroom and put on to student liaison work. As the honourable member has correctly stated, initially we concentrated on those secondary schools in which, for various reasons, we were likely to experience the greatest difficulty with regard to students. Although we plan to extend the provision of this service, at this stage we cannot say that we will be able to cover all secondary schools. I think that the honourable member will appreciate that it is partly a matter of the availability of suitable staff, this availability being judged in terms of the need to avoid any depletion of classroom teachers or senior teachers who spend a normal amount of time teaching in the classroom.

KEITH BY-PASS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Keith by-pass?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The designs of this junction and of the intersection of the Keith by-pass and Mount Charles road are currently being examined and preliminary plans are well advanced. These proposals should greatly improve the situation in this location. However, owing to prior commitment of the Highways Department funds, it is not expected that remedial action can be undertaken until 1972-73.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister for Conservation consider the fact that the Pegasus Pony Club continues to use or to lease about four acres of cleared land facing Perseverance Road, Tea Tree Gully, that is part of the property of the State Planning Authority, which last year purchased 181 acres from Mr. R. M. Ellis? On September 22 last year, in reply to my question, the Minister of Lands told me that the land referred to, which is bounded generally by Perseverance Road and the North-East Road at Tea Tree Gully, had been purchased by the authority for eventual development as public open space in terms of the Metropolitan Development Plan and the Planning and Development Act, is designated in the proposed Anstey Hill major district open space, and is in the north-west corner of the proposed reserve. I point out to the Minister that the club referred to has used this portion of land for about 10 years, and continues to do so, the land it uses having been cleared.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As I am not familiar with the situation referred to by the honourable member, I shall be pleased to have it examined to see whether anything can be done to comply with her request.

CROWN LEASE RENTALS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier consider reducing the rentals of Crown lessees in this State? About three or four years ago, in accordance with the general economy of the rural industry at that time, these rents were increased. Now that the situation has changed not only dramatically but critically, will the Premier consider reducing these rents, thereby giving some assistance to rural producers to solve their problems? I point out that Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, who has from time to time been ridiculed in this House, has recently reduced similar rents in Queensland by as much as \$2,400,000,

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the matter examined and bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to consider reviewing rentals on perpetual leasehold Crown land for which leases were issued between 1960 and the present time? I understand that the principle used in fixing Crown land rentals is to take a fair unimproved value of the land at the time the rental is fixed and to capitalize that at an agreed rate of interest, which I understand is usually a rate acceptable to the Treasury. This rental is fixed in perpetuity and, whilst we agree that many people have gained as a result of peppercorn rentals, there are many instances during the period to which I have referred of people having rentals capitalized on what is now proving to be an extremely high value of the land, and I think instances were raised in this House of leases being issued at a rate of 60c an acre. As there have been obvious changes in land values, resulting in the Government's recognition of these changes in its undertaking to review valuations for land tax purposes, and as many of these leases that have been issued in perpetuity were issued at rates that are obviously in excess of the capacity of the property to meet them, will the Government consider reviewing these leases to find out whether, in view of the circumstances that currently exist, a more equitable lease provision could be made in respect of those properties, in keeping with their capacity to pay?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure the honourable member appreciates a difficulty in this matter, because he has already said that the rents are set in perpetuity. A significant feature is that the rents can be reduced by the Government but can never be increased.

Mr. Nankivell: That is right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has already pointed out that anomalies exist in this system, and I agree with him. In fact, the Auditor-General has constantly emphasized these in his report. The honourable member would know, as well as I do, of many areas in this State where the annual rental is about 1c an acre for prime land, but it has never been suggested by people in good times that the rent should be increased. If any alteration is made to the rentals on the present representations of the honourable member, these rentals would be continued, irrespective of future circumstances. I suggest that it would be perfectly proper for any landholder to apply to the Minister at any time for a review of the rental. However, as the honourable member has raised this matter, I will ask my colleague what he has to say about it.

POLLUTION EXHIBIT

Mr. CRIMES: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether the Government has considered placing at the 1971 Royal Show an exhibit on the subject of conservation and pollution?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, it has been decided to exhibit at the show this year a project in relation to water, air and noise pollution. These activities will be the responsibility of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Public Health Department. I hope the exhibit will point to the developments taking place in these departments with regard to solving the problems of air, water and noise pollution in the State.

ANGASTON BRIDGE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report about the silting up that has occurred under the railway bridge or culvert on the Angaston railway line, and on the compensation payable for negligence? I have been approached by two of my constituents who live in this area, and I have details of one case. Apparently, there is a small bridge or, as it has been described, a culvert under the railway line between Nuriootpa and Angaston, and this became silted up. I am told that the railway workers, instead of cleaning it out, made a diversion, stating that this was only temporary until they had time to clean out the culvert. As a result of recent flooding occurring from this temporary diversion, one constituent had \$300 damage done to his driveway, which needs urgent repair, and damage amounting to more than \$1,000 occurred to his carrot crop. An area comprising three-quarters of an acre could not be harvested and an area of two acres was badly washed and eroded with gutters. I have been told by the same person that a Government assessor was in the district. I do not know to which department the assessor was attached, but he saw the situation and agreed that negligence had occurred. I ask the Minister whether he will get a report on the matter and, if negligence has occurred, I ask that compensation be considered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As first things come first, I will obtain a report and bring down the information for the honourable member.

OVAL RENTALS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me particulars of the number of schools at which money is paid for

the rent of private ovals and also particulars of the total amount spent in this way?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Oval moneys?

Mr. McANANEY: I am referring to the moneys spent for maintenance of private ovals at schools, the total amount paid, and the basis on which the rent is determined.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure what question the honourable member is asking. If he is asking about the grant made for grounds maintenance at various schools—

Mr. McAnaney: No, from the Education Department—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McAnaney: —to the controllers of the private ovals.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the *Hansard* proofs are available I will examine the exchange that has taken place and see what I can do about the matter.

EFFLUENT DISCHARGE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister for Conservation take action against the Minister of Works, as Minister in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, because the sewage treatment works at Glenelg North are discharging effluent into the sea to the detriment of the marine growth at Glenelg North and West Beach? In view of the statement in the press—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think a question asking one Minister to take action against another Minister is appropriate, so I rule it out of order.

Later:

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether effluent emanating from the treatment works at Glenelg North is polluting the sea and retarding marine growth at Glenelg North and West Beach? In view of the statement appearing in the weekend press that the Minister of Marine will sue the Streaky Bay council for polluting the sea, I appeal to the Minister to protect marine growth at Glenelg North and West Beach.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: When I entered Parliament about six years ago I, much like the member for Hanson, was quite raw and immature. At that stage, I had been misled on this issue by certain people, and I took the opportunity to ask a similar question of the then Minister of Works (the member for Torrens) who, in his usual way, went to much trouble to provide me with a complete

and detailed report that established that no damage was occurring to the marine growth. I suggest that the member for Hanson discuss this matter with the member for Torrens.

ADULT WAGE

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Flinders has the call, and he is entitled to ask his question of the appropriate Minister.

Members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I do not require the assistance of cheer squads in the back bench. They must contain themselves.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Premier say whether any unions have had discussions with the Government on the possibility of the adult wage being paid to 18-year-olds and, if they have, can he give any idea of what such a move would cost the State? The *Westralian Independent* of August 8 reports that two major unions will consider applying for payment of adult wages at the age of 18 years if the Western Australian State Government lowers the age of responsibility. The report goes on to state that the Shop Assistants Union and the Federated Clerks Union are in the initial stages of preparing their campaigns. I point out that this would certainly lead to an increase in costs and, with school-leaving ages rising, it is possible that in time junior wages in any award may be provided for only one year or two years. The age of responsibility has not yet been lowered in Western Australia but the unions are already making their moves and, as the age of majority in South Australia has been lowered already, I ask the Premier whether he knows of any similar moves being made in this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report.

DINGO SCALPS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to my question about payments for dingo scalps?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that, following the raising of the bonus payment for wild dog scalps from \$2 to \$6 a scalp as from September 1, 1969, there was a considerable increase in the number of dogs destroyed. For the previous 10 years scalps were submitted at an average rate of fewer than 4,000 a year. For the year 1969-70 this

figure rose to 19,382 and by June 30, 1970, the Wild Dog Fund was \$39,200 in debt, although it had been in a healthy position at the commencement of the year. In order to alleviate these financial problems, the bounty payment was reduced to \$4 for the scalp of a fully grown wild dog and \$1 for a dog not fully grown and the rate a square mile was increased from 10c to 15c. As it was not considered that these measures would be sufficient to restore the fund to solvency, amendments to the Wild Dogs Act were passed during the 1970 session of Parliament. These provided for (a) the maximum rate which can be charged to be raised from 15c to 25c a square mile; (b) the removal of the upper limit of \$8,000 on the Government subsidy to the fund on the basis of \$1 for every \$1 collected as rates; and (c) the raising of the maximum amount which can be loaned to the fund from \$8,000 to \$50,000. One result of the reduction in the bonus payment as from July 1, 1970, was that for the year 1970-71 the number of scalps paid for dropped to 6,325 from the previous year's figure of 19,382. However, at the present time the Wild Dog Fund is still in deficit and it is not intended at this juncture to alter the scalp bonus rate for either wild dogs or their pups. The Pastoral Board has not received any reports to the effect that dingoes are increasing at an "alarming rate" and my colleague would be pleased if the honourable member would advise him of specific areas where this is said to be happening.

VICTORIA SQUARE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HALL: Because of the statement by the Premier that he would offer land in Victoria Square to a development consortium for hotel purposes at a peppercorn rental, because of information I received this morning that more than just a vacant block purchased for future Government administration buildings may be involved, and because the Premier has spoken of a brochure that he had with him on his oversea trip, will the Premier make available a copy of that brochure to members and to me?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I, too, should like to ask a question of the Premier.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What is funny about that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call and he deserves the courtesy of members on the Government side. I insist that he should be given the opportunity uninterrupted to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether it is the policy of the Government to bolster its case in any matter by claiming the support of senior public servants or officials and, if it is not, will he ensure that Ministers do not make such claims? Yesterday I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he supported the Railways Commissioner in standing down railway workers last week or whether he supported the workers in the motion of no confidence they carried against the Commissioner. That was the substance of what I asked, as the Minister well understood. The Minister did not give a direct reply to the question but, in the course of his reply, he said:

The Commissioner has received support—it may be that that meant support from the Government, although it is not stated—and, furthermore, the Commissioner supports this Government.

That last phrase was not explained, but one could only assume (as I did, and I give this by way of explanation of my question) that the Minister was seeking to bolster his own position in this matter by saying that the Commissioner supported him, although he had not said whether he supported the Commissioner. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether it is the Government's policy to embroil senior public officers in politics in this way.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're being childish.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's question and his convoluted explanation give some reason for the rapturous hilarity with which his questions are at times welcomed on this side. The Minister did not involve the Railways Commissioner in politics in the statement he made.

Mr. Millhouse: What did he mean then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think he meant no more than the sort of thing that the honourable member's Leader meant in his citing of Mr. Beaney during the course of the Chowilla dispute.

NARACORTE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about

erecting change rooms at the Naracoorte High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The contract for the erection of change rooms at Naracoorte High School was let on February 12, 1971, with a completion time of 40 weeks, terminating in November this year. Progress to date has been slow, and it has been necessary to remind the contractor of his obligations to meet the scheduled time. Every effort will be made to have this work completed as soon as possible.

LINEAR ACCELERATOR

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from his colleague to my question of July 20 about the linear accelerator at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The condition of the linear accelerator, whilst held in store, is the responsibility of the agents who are the contractors to the Government for its supply and installation, until such time as it has been installed and accepted as satisfactory by the department. Contractual liability for costs associated with regular inspections and maintenance during storage by the agents is currently being negotiated.

NEWSWEEK

Mr. PAYNE: Is the Attorney-General aware that copies of the periodical *Newsweek* are being sent to people in South Australia without their requesting such copies, and that this is followed by an invoice for a subscription to this periodical?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am aware of this: it is an aspect of a wider problem related to the delivery of unsolicited goods, a matter that has caused me and Governments elsewhere in Australia considerable concern. This particularly applies to the delivery of books and magazines through the post. I have a special reason for being aware of the practice regarding the magazine *Newsweek*, because some weeks ago I was surprised to receive through the mail a copy of that magazine, not having ordered it, of course. This was followed on two successive weeks by further copies, arriving unsought and unsolicited through the mail. However, such amusement as I derived from that was removed when I received in the next mail an invoice requiring the payment of a subscription to *Newsweek*. Needless to say, this was not paid, but apparently the suppliers are undeterred by this,

because I continue to receive copies of *News-week*, which I have not ordered, for which I have not paid, for which I have no intention of paying—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you reading them?

The Hon. L. J. KING: —and which I am not reading. The importance of the matter is this: the mere fact that I did not order the magazine and have not paid for it does not relieve me entirely of any obligations regarding the magazines I have received and, without rendering myself liable for their value, I am not at liberty to destroy them. Therefore, the magazines must pile up in my study and occupy space that I could put to better use; or, if I destroyed them, I could render myself liable for their value. This seems to me to be an unsatisfactory state of the law. I have indicated previously, and I repeat now, that the Government intends to introduce legislation that will relieve recipients of unsolicited goods of this kind of the obligation that the law places on them.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Morphetville Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A request has been made to the Public Buildings Department for the following work to be carried out at Morphetville Park Primary School: first, conversion of the present staff room to an office for the clerical assistant; and secondly, conversion of a spare classroom for use as a staff room. This will include the installation of a sink and cupboards, a sink heater and additional power points. There are sufficient classrooms in the school for the accommodation of the children. The request was made only yesterday and it is therefore not possible at this stage to indicate when the work will be undertaken.

SEACLIFF PARK INTERSECTION

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport call for a report from the Road Traffic Board on the general efficacy of the islands at the intersection of Brighton Road and Ocean Boulevard, Seacliff Park? I ask this question, as there has been local anxiety concerning this intersection, situated, as it is, close to the local primary and infants schools, and some lay opinions suggest that the islands could be better sited.

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

MOUNT BARKER CROSSING

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have an investigation made into the railway crossing at Mount Barker, near the Catholic school, to see whether it can be made safer for children in the area who use this crossing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I assume that this is a non-sectarian question, I shall be pleased to follow it up for the honourable member.

BREAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to take action regarding baking hours? An article appearing in the press (I think today) states that a decision has been given on the reheating of bread and that this is not legally considered to be baking. Having been approached by someone in my district who is concerned about this matter, I know that a similar question was asked about it recently by the member for Torrens, the Minister indicating that no action was intended at present. However, in the light of this recent judgment, I ask whether the Minister has anything in mind.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Although Judge Bleby brought down, I think yesterday, a decision on the reheating of bread, I cannot see how that decision will affect the community in any way because, as the honourable member is aware, the reheating of bread has been taking place for some time. I believe that it is wrong for retailers to advertise bread as fresh bread when it has been reheated; it is wrong and misleading to the public. Legislation concerning five-day baking is at present being considered.

RURAL MARKET BULLETIN

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what will be the charge for and method of distributing the *Rural Market Outlook* bulletin, which is to be published quarterly and released shortly? In a press release (No. 44 of 1971, dated August 9), the Minister has indicated that the *Rural Market Outlook* bulletin will be made available quarterly and that initially it will be distributed free of charge in the August issue of the *Journal of Agriculture*. Subsequently, in the new year, it will be available at a charge. Because it is to be released in the *Journal of Agriculture*, which has a relatively limited distribution, and because of the very nature of the booklet, which is or could be of considerable benefit to the rural community, I think that

all the information that can be made available to the rural sector of the community should be made available as widely as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will find out for the honourable member.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education explain the Government's new proposal for assisting schools by grant instead of subsidy, indicating when the subsidy system will terminate, and particularly what the system will now be with respect to the building of amenities such as assembly halls, the cost of which in the past has been subsidized and towards which many schools have been working?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Briefly, the position is that subsidies for amenities such as swimming pools and canteens, which are paid out of Loan funds, will continue; no discontinuance of those subsidies is intended. In addition, there will be an extension of the subsidy arrangements so that a \$1 for \$1 subsidy will be available for schools establishing, say, an oval, a tennis court or a basketball court. Subsidies paid out of the current Budget are to be replaced by a system of grants. The grants scheme will be introduced on a calendar-year basis, payments being made biannually—in January and in July. It is hoped, however, that this year the first payment will be made in December, prior to January of next year. Some expenditure is already committed as a consequence of the carryover of the subsidy allocated but not paid from the last financial year. The sum involved in that carryover of subsidy from the last financial year, together with the first payment of the new grant, would involve an expenditure of Budget subsidies, as against Loan subsidies, of \$625,000, compared with an expenditure last year of \$550,000. It has been necessary to proceed in this way, first, because we wished to convert to a calendar-year basis and, secondly, because we did not want to reject those commitments on subsidies from the Budget which had been entered into but which had not been paid prior to this financial year.

T.A.B.

Mr. SLATER: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether consideration is likely to be given by the Totalizator Agency Board to the payment of winning dividends on the same day as the investment is made?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

COMMUNISM

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say what influence he considers Communism is having by means of infiltration into trade unions in this State? I had a letter recently from a constituent of mine expressing great concern about the influence that he considers Communism is having on our trade unions. He wants to know this:

Why don't Labor members ask the union bosses and Labor rebels if they are Commo. sympathizers? There have been, and will be, opportunities on television in particular, to show up these people and tell the general public some facts about Commo. subversion and infiltration of unions. Unfortunately, there are only a few men, such as Mr. McLeay, M.H.R., who have the intestinal fortitude to speak up and too many frightened—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. He must ask his question. Does the Premier have any control over this matter? If not, he can say so, but, if it comes within his department, he may reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not come within my department but, as the honourable member is interested in the question of Communist infiltration into the trade unions, I suggest that he acquaint himself somewhat better than he and his colleagues have so far shown themselves to be acquainted with the trade union movement in South Australia. There are very few people in that movement who are in any way involved with the various sections of the Communist Party in South Australia. I suggest that the honourable member point out to his constituent that the Communist Party in South Australia is almost as much fragmented as the Liberal Party is. It has so many different sectors not talking to each other that it seems to be taking an example from members opposite.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you answer the question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot interject while the Premier is replying. I ask honourable members to apply this rule to themselves as they would wish it to apply to others. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that his constituent seems to be as ill-informed about the situation as Mr. McLeay has consistently shown himself to be.

REFERENDUM VOTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General give the House an assurance that complaints have actually been laid against persons who failed to vote at the referendum last

September? This question is supplementary to the questions I asked the honourable gentleman on notice yesterday, about how many people had been prosecuted in South Australia. The surprising answers I got were as follows:

1. No person has yet been prosecuted for not voting at the referendum on September 19, 1970.

2. No complaints have yet been heard.

The Attorney-General will know, as probably other members know, that under the Justices Act complaints must be laid within six months. I can see nothing in the Act that provided for the referendum last year to extend that time.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not: I am explaining it.

The SPEAKER: I call on the Attorney-General to reply.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As regards my replies to the honourable member's questions seeking information yesterday, I shall certainly check to ensure whether or not complaints have actually been laid. I have not the answer before me, but it came from the Electoral Office and I think it said that complaints had actually been laid. On the question of the time in respect of this matter, the honourable member should realize that it is an important responsibility of the Returning Officer for the State to give persons who have not voted the opportunity of explaining why they have not voted and to evaluate properly the validity of explanations given.

Mr. Millhouse: Eleven months is a long time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am surprised at the honourable member's attitude in this matter because he seems to be pursuing a remarkably vindictive desire to have people prosecuted for not voting, apparently irrespective of the validity or otherwise of the explanation given. The duty of the Returning Officer for the State is to give proper consideration to the explanations offered. I have not the slightest doubt that he has done this and that, if he decides that there ought to be 197 prosecutions, he has done so in an honest and competent exercise of his discretion. I will obtain for the honourable member the factual information he now seeks.

EMERGENCY FIRE SERVICES

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister for Conservation a reply to my question of July 28 about Emergency Fire Services?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Section 52 of the Planning and Development Act provides that the Director of Planning may refuse approval to a plan of resubdivision if the plan does not provide 12½ per cent of the land as reserve or, alternatively, that \$100 (metropolitan) or \$40 (country) each allotment is paid into the Planning and Development Fund of the State Planning Authority. As members will be aware, the authority has embarked on a major land acquisition programme to provide new open spaces with this money. Since the Act came into operation on July 1, 1967, the Director has used his discretion to waive the reserve contribution only in those cases where an allotment is being created for transfer for drainage or road purposes or as a recreation reserve. In such cases, a note is attached to the plan. In cases where approval is sought for the creation of an allotment resulting in the issue of a freehold title that can then be transferred to any party, the Director is not prepared to exercise his discretion. The application within the area of the District Council of Cleve comes within this category. I am informed by the Director that any change in policy would result in similar requests from innumerable organizations and individuals. Payments have been made in other cases where the Director understands the allotment has been intended for use by Emergency Fire Services.

PASTORAL LEASES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When replying to a question by the member for Fisher about the possible closing for 20 years of some of the pastoral leases, the Minister for Conservation said that this matter was being considered. However, when a question was asked subsequently in the other place it seemed that the Minister of Lands did not know anything about the matter. As the Pastoral Board, under the terms of its Act, is virtually the landlord of all these areas, will the Minister for Conservation say whether he has consulted with the board? If he has not done that, with whom has he consulted? Will he also assure the House that nothing will be done before the board has been consulted and has approved, at least in principle, action to this effect?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No deep consideration has been given to this matter and I do not think the honourable member could infer from my reply that there had been any close and detailed examination. However, I believe I undertook such a course for the honourable member who asked the question.

This is one matter among many other matters that have been referred to me by various people interested in conservation, and I am considering it. Hitherto, no detailed consideration has been given, but I assure the honourable member, as I did his colleague, that when a decision has been made I shall be only too happy to tell him about it.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee and notified the selection of its representatives.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

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

That the Builders Licensing Board regulations, 1971, made under the Builders Licensing Act, 1971, on April 8, 1971, and laid on the table of this House on April 8, 1971, be disallowed.

I move that the regulations be disallowed because I believe they infringe personal freedom and spell the doom of the subcontracting industry, as we know it, in the house construction industry. The regulations have a rather busy history, as they were disallowed in another place during the last session of Parliament. New regulations to substantially replace those that had been disallowed were introduced in this House and in another place on the last day of sitting, so that no effective attempt could be made to debate them and to disallow them again before they had a chance to operate in the interim recess of Parliament.

The regulations, which are a poor way of instituting important controls in the community, are an attempt to frustrate the work of Parliament and the decision that it can make on them. They are an obvious attempt by the Government to show that, because they have been working for three or four months, they should not be disturbed. Honourable members know that the disallowance of regulations is different from the disallowance of by-laws, because regulations are effective when proclaimed. Of course, they may be disallowed during those days on which they lie on the table of the House but they are effective until disallowed.

Today, South Australia has the most iniquitous control of the building industry, and this control has been foisted on to it at the behest of those who form the union segment of the Labor

Party. The regulations are a deliberate attempt (as I said in the presence of the Premier at the Housing Industry Association's meeting at North Adelaide) to prevent not only the further development of the subcontracting system but to destroy it and to convert all work carried out on building sites to that of day labour. The regulations are an attempt to remove the incentive from the building trades and to replace it with a less efficient system. The Housing Trust's report, which was laid on the table of the House recently, shows the concern of the trust's management and board over the rents for houses which the trust builds at the lowest possible cost and how difficult it is for some families who occupy its houses to pay the full economic rent for them, even though they are built with money borrowed at a rate lower than the bond rate.

The regulations are most restrictive and repressive: if anyone wants to carry out any building work in his own right, he must comply with them in many ways. For instance, one has to obtain two testimonials to present to the board in order to beg for a licence. One cannot simply put up a board and say, "I am a builder; I have served my apprenticeship and complied with all the Acts." One has to submit to the jurisdiction of the board and give it a chance to say "No".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What has that got to do with the regulations?

Mr. HALL: The Premier knows very well what it has got to do with the regulations. Regulation 4 (2) states that one has to obtain two testimonials.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But you are attacking the licensing system, and that is in the Act.

Mr. HALL: I am quoting from the regulations, which I am moving to disallow. Perhaps the Premier has not heard the motion. The regulations are entitled "Regulations under the Builders Licensing Act, 1967-1971". Regulation 7 (1) provides for a fee of \$20 for a general builder's licence and \$8 for a restricted builder's licence. The section of the regulations dealing with classified trades forms the most obnoxious part of the control that is being foisted on the building industry. One can be a concrete path paviour, a master plumber, a plumber (sanitary)—unproclaimed areas, a sanitary drainlayer, a specialist in space heating, a water plumber (proclaimed areas), a water plumber (unproclaimed areas), or a roof sheeter (asbestos cement). We do get specialized in this! One can be a roof sheeter (metal

deck and ironworker) or a demountable partition fixer. There is a list of restricted trades in groups A, B, C, D, E, F and G. The list ends with miscellaneous trades, which include general repairs, insulation and caulking. In connection with this great attempt to institute strict demarcation in the building industry, regulation 9 (b) provides:

The holder of a restricted builder's licence for the classified trade of general repairs shall not, pursuant to paragraph (a) of this regulation, undertake painting and decorating work to a value exceeding \$100 including the value of material and labour.

Then, the regulations deal with the various requirements that licence holders must meet. Regulation 17 (1) provides:

The holder of a builder's licence shall furnish the board on demand with details of the names and addresses of all persons working on his or its behalf.

Under these regulations one has not only complete control over the licensees but also control over their ability to renew their licences. The licence must be renewed annually.

Mr. Mathwin: It is a dossier.

Mr. HALL: Yes. One has to reveal in the dossier his total business assets, his total personal assets, and his total liabilities. From these must be deducted total business liabilities, total personal liabilities and total liabilities. The result of the calculation is "net worth". Despite the disallowance of the previous regulations and the slight amendments that have been made to them, one still has to list any convictions for dishonesty, fraud or breaches of bankruptcy or company law, regardless of when the offences took place. Not only must one get two testimonials but also one must have known the people who furnished them for over three years. One has to apply for renewal of a licence and to restate annually the situation regarding assets and convictions in this running commentary on the details of thousands of South Australian citizens. In the schedules to the regulations there is a neat form entitled "Regulations pursuant to the Builders Licensing Act, 1967-1971. Summons to Witness". One can be summoned to produce evidence and all sorts of material at the behest of the Chairman of the board. The form states:

AND WHEREAS I, the undersigned, the Chairman (or Secretary) of the Builders Licensing Board of South Australia, am satisfied that you are able to give evidence (or and have in your possession or power certain documents or articles) which is or may be relevant to the said matter,

YOU ARE THEREFORE HEREBY SUMMONED to appear at _____ in the said State, on _____ the _____ day of _____ 19____, at the hour of _____

before such members of the said board as shall then be there, to testify what you shall know concerning the said matter and to produce all books, plans, papers, documents, articles, goods, and things likely to be material evidence on the hearing of said matter.

The regulation dealing with resignations illustrates the dictatorial methods that the Government has adopted in dealing with builders' licences. Regulation 15 provides:

The holder of a builder's licence may not resign the licence without written permission of the board.

So, one may not build or carry on a trade or enter a trade without the permission of this overriding authority and, once one has entered a trade, one shall not leave it without permission. So, one gets kicked at both ends when one touches this board. We have never heard anyone explain properly what the board is attempting to do. Government members have become emotional and tried to say that the regulations will prevent the building of substandard houses. I have been told (and I hope it cannot be substantiated) that the board is out to reduce the number of builders' licences by 25 per cent in a short time.

Mrs. Byrne: The figures do not prove that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is untrue.

Mr. HALL: In his short term of office the Premier has been noted for being dictatorial with the people of South Australia. He closed the shops north and south of the city. He cannot say that he has not shown what he can do in that way. He has been entirely dictatorial in his dealings with the people. As an indication of what will happen in the future, the board has already said what experience may be required of people who want to become general builders or restricted builders. This is entirely discriminatory. If people who have served their apprenticeship and completed their formal training can operate in other spheres, why is so much required of builders? No-one has yet explained why the driver of a bulldozer must have four years' experience before he can level a block. No member opposite who has had any practical experience can explain that to this House. No member opposite who has had any practical experience in the industry can explain the eight years' training that a tradesman must perform before he can enter a sphere of work as a subcontractor, whereas a person studying medicine can practise after seven years' study.

It is ridiculous for the Premier to say that the regulations are not restrictive, or that they are not aimed at reducing the number of people in the building trade. That is obviously the reason for doubling the term beyond the duration of the normal apprenticeship term. As I have done in previous debates on this subject, I could detail the ridiculous requirements people must satisfy and the length of time they must train before they can work in their own right as a restricted or general builder. Need I remind the Premier of what the board has indicated it will probably require of these people in the future?

I have dealt so far with the detestable parts of the regulations. What does the building industry itself believe? This is probably more important. Is this Parliament to ignore those who make up the industry and who compete properly against each other? We are not dealing with some cartel or restrictive trade: we are dealing with an industry that has hundreds, even thousands, of people who compete against one another for the jobs available. In South Australia these people have undeniably produced the best housing situation that this nation has seen, and no member in the House will deny that. In terms of value for money the building industry in South Australia has produced the best, and continues to produce it, and the Government has advanced no sustainable reason why it wants to impose the strictest controls on this industry.

Mr. Langley: It could be better.

Mr. HALL: If that is the flippant way in which the Government approaches a vast industry such as the building industry, one can understand why it is in trouble. What does the industry think about this?

Mr. Langley: What do the subcontractors think about it?

Mr. HALL: If the honourable member wants to know what the industry thinks, he should come with me and attend the general meetings.

Mr. Langley: I've been at some that you haven't attended.

Mr. HALL: It would have done the honourable member's heart good to attend the large meeting of the Housing Industry Association that the Premier and I attended at North Adelaide. I advise the honourable member to get in touch with that organization and with the other organizations that generally represent builders in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There are other organizations—

Mr. HALL: The Premier need not try to avoid the substance of the argument. He knows who represents most of the builders in the State. Let him go to the Housing Industry Association and ask its opinion. I can give that opinion, as it is set out in *Housing Australia*, which is the journal of the association. The cover of the journal states that it is "The Journal of Australia's National Housing Industry Association". Also on the front page appears the heading "Licensing Fight in South Australia", and in the section entitled "Viewpoint" there is an extensive article on the views of the association and its members about this restrictive measure. A short summary is given of the events leading up to my motion this afternoon, and I quote from this journal, as one of the most responsible journals that speaks for the housing industry; it speaks not idealistically on behalf of some Party or union organization but on behalf of the industry itself.

Mr. Payne: Who wrote the article?

Mr. HALL: For the benefit of the member for Mitchell, the article states:

Four years ago, South Australia's building industry benignly adopted a newborn and seemingly harmless legislative creature christened the Builders Licensing Act, 1967. The task of raising this infant cub was assigned to a Builders Licensing Board and an Advisory Committee. Then, with a change of Government that put Steele Hall's Liberal Country Party back in office, the whole thing was more or less forgotten. The reasons for this were obvious. During debate on the Bill, Steele Hall and other members of the L.C.P. had made it quite clear that they didn't like the smell arising from the implications of parts of the proposed Act.

We still do not like the smell. The article continues:

When Don Dunstan's Labor Party was returned to the Government benches last year, it instructed the board to finish its grooming of the legislative cub and let it loose on the industry. This the board did and, late last year, it revealed a full-grown tiger which, unless it can be tamed during the next session of Parliament, will surely savage the subcontracting system which has kept the housing industry a viable entity during the booms and slumps of the last ten years.

That is the consensus of opinion in every sector of the building and housing industries, and they have made their views known to the Premier through their various organizations, including the Housing Industry Association. His reaction has been rather surprising, to say the least. He accuses the industry of acting treacherously in that it has withdrawn its support for legislation which it had sought and approved a few years ago.

The industry retorts that it went along with the registration of builders, and that it is still willing to do so. It insists that it has had no argument with the Act itself, except perhaps in some of its detail, either when it was enacted, or now. It is with the implementing regulations, produced by the board under the umbrella of the enabling Act, that the industry is quarrelling.

The article is too long to read in full, but I intend to read other excerpts as follows:

It would be fair to say that the industry as a whole realized it had a tiger by the tail only when licence application forms and a booklet, "Guide to Applicants," were distributed late last year. The shocked dismay which followed has inspired industry-wide opposition to the regulations. Objection has also been taken to the fact that confidential information, normally privy to companies and individuals, must be placed in the hands of a board and its staff of clerks and officials. It is suggested that, no matter how trustworthy these people are, information which is open to a random number of individuals loses its confidential nature.

Another excerpt, which is headed "Big Brother", states:

The Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, also commented on this aspect of the regulations when moving for their disallowance in the council. "We are seeing the 1984 Big Brother appearing in 1971," he said. "When all this form-filling and invasion of privacy is operating, there will be no security in respect of the information obtained."

From his various involvements with political Parties and other organizations, the Premier would know that the larger a group is the more easily information leaks out to the general public or to those who have some specific reason for wanting to know about it. Another excerpt from the article states:

The questions about an applicant's place of origin have also raised the spectre of discrimination for the many migrants in the industry.

It has been made clear that if an applicant, either for a general builder's licence or the restricted builder's licence required by subcontractors, is judged by the board to be financially unstable, he will be refused a licence. Herein lies a danger that a builder or subcontractor who is running a small but sound business may be judged to have insufficient financial means to be granted a licence, with the result that the good may be thrown out with the bad.

In debating this issue previously in the House, I have said that many building companies have had ups and downs in their financial stability. The world of the building industry is full of companies which have pressed on and made good in the end. If the board strictly applies these rules, it will prevent the return to financial stability of many companies similar to those that previously returned to stability. Most

members would know of many instances in the past of companies returning to financial stability. The article goes on to say:

It is true that the Government, in response to a barrage of legitimate objections and criticism, has agreed to amend some of the offending items in the regulations, but the most controversial area, the licensing of subcontractors, still remains, and it is this section that the housing industry wants eliminated in its entirety. No less than 45 trade classifications have been listed by the board, and it seems certain that the conditions on which a subcontractor can obtain a restricted builder's licence will automatically reduce the number of subcontractors in the industry. Day labour would necessarily be substituted at considerably higher cost to the industry and the home buyer. Demarcation disputes would develop, and it is freely stated that the only sector that would benefit from this legislation would be the trade unions. In fact, it is contended, not without substance, that the sections of the Act dealing with subcontractors were union inspired.

The President of H.I.A.'s South Australian Division, Frank Wilkinson, told *Housing Australia* that the regulations, as they affect subcontractors, will arm the trade unions with an effective weapon that can be used to force the home-building industry back to the costly day-labour basis. He said that, once day-labour tradesmen are entrenched in the industry, they would undoubtedly re-introduce the old demarcation disputes. This would prevent a painter from patching plaster, a carpenter or plumber from touching up damaged paintwork or tiling, formworkers from concreting, and so on. This would not only add substantially to costs but contractors who infringed by crossing lines of demarcation could be reported to the board and their licence placed in jeopardy. "The Trades and Labor Council would like nothing better, and it is not difficult to see a link between the T.L.C. and the Labor Government in this respect," he said.

"Nothing at all is to be gained by the strictly detailed licensing of subcontractors. It will neither improve the quality of workmanship, nor will it protect the public. On the contrary, it will inflict a huge price penalty on the home-buying public," he said.

The article goes on as follows:

He also pointed out that the five-man licensing board is not representative of the industry, and that the 10-man advisory committee includes four representatives of trade unions and two Government appointees. As the sole representative of the housing industry on the advisory committee, he found himself continually outvoted, he said.

I would expect that he is likely to continue to be outvoted, because this great Act and these regulations to serve the building industry give the industry only one representative out of 10 on the Advisory Committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Master Builders have a representative, and there are two other employer representatives.

Mr. HALL: The article continues:

In the light of circumstances and current opinion, *Housing Australia* feels that perhaps the South Australian Government should destroy, as humanely as possible, the "tiger" it has sought to let loose on the industry and, making good use of the experience gained both by itself and the industry during the long debate on this issue, start all over again with its objective limited to the original purpose of the exercise—the registration of builders only. Or, better still, forget the whole thing.

Mr. Hopgood: That is where they give themselves away.

Mr. HALL: I do not give myself away. The honourable member knows where I stand on the issue. We therefore have an industry up in arms against an Act with which the Government intends to restrict it. Apparently the Government will not listen. It did remove one or two minor objections to the regulations when they were defeated, but the amendments do not in any effective way alter the implementation of the Act, and the regulations, if applied over a length of time, will mean all those things that the Housing Industry Association's spokesman forecast for South Australia.

It is typical of this Government that the main measures we have to consider are restrictive. We have restriction after restriction: it is evil to eat bread on Sundays, it is evil for a builder to build unless he has two testimonials from people he has known for three years and unless he has submitted personal and business details. So the list goes on as Big Brother comes to South Australia in the form of the Labor Party. Surely the Government has some electoral sense. If it has no business sense or administrative sense, can it not read the electoral scene? Does it want to antagonize the whole of the building industry? If I cannot successfully appeal on the score of principle to a Government that does not have any principle, at least I appeal on the lower level of electoral sensibility.

Mr. Jennings: You are a great authority on that, aren't you?

Mr. HALL: The member for Ross Smith has always been able to act in this House without any regard for the electors' susceptibilities because of his huge majority in the seat he represents. I suggest that members opposite should at least consider this aspect. I ask the Government to agree to the disallowance of these regulations.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion. The regulations as laid on the table of the House and the Act itself have had a rather chequered career in their passage through

the House. The Act was amended earlier this year, and the present set of regulations is not the first to come into the House. The only good thing to happen was the inclusion of the manager's licence and the deletion of the requirement to state the place of birth. It is some of the principles involved in these regulations to which I and others object.

I say without hesitation that, when this legislation was introduced in 1967, very few members realized that, upon its passage, regulations of this nature would eventually be brought in. These regulations are far-reaching and revealing, requiring all sorts of personal, private and confidential information to be disclosed. What is more important, very few members of the public and of the building industry which had promoted the Bill realized it, and in due course they received a terrific shock. I was one who also received a shock. When I got hold of the publication entitled *A Guide to Applicants* put out by the board, I read it with a great deal of interest. I obtained an application form, because I found a number of very worried constituents were coming to me and asking why the form had to be completed in such detail and how they should go about it. I made quite a few inquiries and I found, to my chagrin, that I, too, had to apply for a licence.

Mr. Jennings: Did you get it?

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. I paid my fee and I got it, but to do so I had to go to a great deal of trouble. My wife and I, who are directors of a small private company that has about eight or nine employees and is more than 100 years old, experienced much trouble. We had to get testimonials for each person. We also had to disclose every financial detail of our private company and of our private assets and liabilities, and I took great exception to doing that. One knows that one is obliged to give certain information to the Taxation Department and the Bureau of Census and Statistics, but the officers of those departments are sworn to secrecy. However, this is a different type of thing. I am an engineer, not a builder, and my company happens to make small parts that someone else puts together in a building. I paid the \$20, or whatever the amount was, but when the Act was amended I certainly applied quickly to have my position changed to that of manager.

What is required of an applicant? The requirements are so different from the requirements under the electricians licensing legislation that they are not in the same category.

We must realize that one object of the Act that is now in operation (and I am speaking also of the regulations under it) is to give some protection against the shady operator, the £2 company, as we used to call it: I suppose we would call it a \$4 company now. There is no indemnification given in these regulations. I invite members to look in detail at the regulations and the schedules attached. They can be summed up in the statement that a person is required to make sworn statements regarding any convictions that he has, and his status regarding bankruptcy, receivership, or similar legal restraints, and a statement of his own net worth and that of his business, including contingent liabilities. He must give full details of his education, training and experience, including contracts carried out or worked on as an employee during the previous five years. How would any person who wanted to get into the building industry qualify regarding the five-year period for which he has to have worked? However, I will deal with that matter later.

I come now to the licensing of a company, for which there is a form. A company must take out a licence separate from that of its licensed director or manager, must give particulars of contracts carried out during the five years prior to its application for a licence and the value of that work, and must give details of material changes since preparation of its last balance sheet. This information gives a department the financial details of the company, whether it is large or small. Everyone is human, and I do not know how far down the line this information goes. I do not want unduly to criticize anyone who has not the right to reply to me, but, in terms of the law under which the Taxation Department and the Bureau of Census and Statistics operate, officers are sworn to secrecy.

Some companies would hate to have their personal information bruited abroad: certainly, they would hate their competitors to get it. I am not suggesting that that would happen, but there is always the possibility. The objection that I am making is that the information sought under these regulations constitutes an unwarranted invasion of our valued privacy. As a consequence, we can expect a marked rise in—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notices of Motion, Other Business, to be proceeded with before Orders of the Day, Other Business, are called on.

Motion carried.

Mr. CUMBE: I thank the House for its courtesy. I was saying that these regulations imposed a bureaucratic and restrictive control over the building industry without conferring a commensurate benefit on the public as a whole, particularly the prospective house buyer or house builder. The matter goes further. The Leader has dealt with the matter of subcontractors, and I suggest that this is one of the most controversial areas in the regulations before us. I think 45 classifications are set out, with particulars of the requisite classifications.

I have no doubt that the most controversial section is that dealing with the licensing of subcontractors. Some people want subcontracting eliminated completely, and I have heard members of the present Government and the previous Labor Government say quite openly that they want subcontracting eliminated entirely from the building industry. They have said that the sooner that is done the better.

Let us consider the present housing position in South Australia. This State is noted for the high quality of Housing Trust building, if I may take an example, and its comparative cheapness compared to costs in other States. We can take the matter further, into the private house-building sector, and compare the prices of average houses of similar size in Adelaide and Sydney. Government officers prepared information on this for me only about two weeks ago in connection with another matter, and I was staggered to find that a house in Adelaide was so much cheaper than a similar house in Sydney situated a comparable distance from the city.

There is no doubt that in South Australia housebuilding is usually done much more cheaply for houses of comparable size and quality. Also, in South Australia some of the best materials produced are going into our housing. For instance, our bricks are of excellent quality and compare more than favourably with bricks produced in other States. I have no doubt that the regulations that we are considering greatly restrict entry into the building trade and, if they come into force, they will lead eventually to almost the complete elimination of the subcontracting system, if the Government wants to eliminate it.

I wish now to point out one or two anomalies. How does one obtain a restricted builder's licence? To obtain this licence, in order to continue his business as a subcontractor or to start a business, a bricklayer

must have had eight years' experience, including two years in a position of responsibility. The same conditions apply to a carpenter, a steelworker, a solid plasterer, a fibrous plasterer, a plumber, or a glazier, and these periods are prescribed by law.

It takes a doctor seven years to complete his medical course (and I am not reflecting on the member for Bragg), but under these regulations before one can become a glazier one must have had eight years' experience, at least two years of which must have been in a position of responsibility. We should get things in their correct perspective. A wall and floor tiler and a concrete path pavior or a welder must have had five years' experience. I cannot understand why a glazier must have had eight years' experience when a welder needs only five years' experience. It should be reversed, because the welder is working on structures that take more stress than a pane of glass in a window (and that is no reflection on the member for Mitchell). A roof or wall cladder or a roof tiler must have had three years' experience; even a bulldozer owner must have had four years' experience. Unless the member for Fisher has had this experience he could not obtain a licence.

Can we afford to sacrifice the subcontractor system in the present circumstances of the housing industry? In another debate last evening members praised the Government and welcomed the activities of the Housing Trust in their districts. However, houses will cost much more if we sacrifice the subcontractor system. The report of the Housing Trust warned that before long (and, in fact, we are experiencing these conditions now) many people would find it difficult to meet the rental costs for an ordinary trust house, let alone being able to purchase a house. I suggest that these regulations do not provide for the indemnification that so many people sought from the building industry in the original Act when it was introduced into this House. I should like to point out one or two other odd requirements under these regulations. Regulation 17 (1) provides:

The holder of a builder's licence shall furnish the board on demand with details of the names and address of all persons working on his or its behalf.

Why is that information required? A person holding a builder's licence engages men to work for him and, as they are tradesmen, they must have a licence, too. Why must the holder of a builder's licence furnish the board with these details? Must he provide details relating to

the typist, the accountant, or the man who drives the delivery truck? Regulation 17 (2), which refers to local government authorities, provides:

The Town Clerk or District Clerk shall, upon request signed by the Secretary to the board, supply in writing to the board a list of approvals granted by the council employing him pursuant to the provisions of the Building Act, 1923-1965—

incidentally, that Act has been repealed and a new one introduced—

together with such particulars and covering such period (not being earlier than one year prior to the day of the request) as the board requests.

We have the silly situation that the board is now to request a town clerk or a district clerk in any area to furnish it with a list of approvals. I do not recall any reference to this aspect in the Bill when it was introduced in 1967, and I am sure that everyone has had a very rude awakening. When the Bill was introduced few members of this House or members of the public and, more importantly, few people associated with the building industry realized the impact and the savageness of the regulations that would operate under the enabling section of the Act. These regulations do not provide some of the safeguards that the member for Tea Tree Gully and other members spoke about so vehemently.

I respect the views of these members, but a quick perusal of these regulations shows that they go much too far and do not catch the old £2 company, as we used to know it. I suggest that people in the building industry, who are those who are mostly concerned with these regulations, have now received a shock, are up in arms, and are determined to oppose this move. In South Australia we rely for our development of cottage dwelling buildings, industrial buildings, and Government buildings of all types on this industry's being vigorous and prosperous, because it employs so many people, with many subcontractors in other fields and suppliers of materials also employing many people in this State. We want a far more realistic and workable set of regulations if this Act is to continue to operate: they must be based on a real knowledge of the industry and of the real objects of the Act.

As the member for Tea Tree Gully and other members have said, the object of the Act was to protect against the shady operator certain people who were building houses, but I cannot understand how these regulations (and the member for Tea Tree Gully as Chairman,

and the members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee have considered them carefully) will protect people from shady operators. In my view, the legislation, especially these regulations, makes no provision for the indemnification of people who buy houses and other buildings and who suffer monetary loss because of the bankruptcy, death or deregistration of the builder or because of the depredations of the shady operator whose application for registration might get through the Builders Licensing Board.

Are these regulations achieving the main purpose of the Act as it stands? I submit that they are not and that they should be withdrawn and replaced by a more realistic set of regulations. These regulations represent an intrusion on the privacy of many people engaged in this important industry, and they are repressive in that they can, if fully implemented, restrict the entry into the industry of many worthy tradesmen in our country, including migrants from other countries, including the United Kingdom, who have served their time in the industry. Furthermore, if implemented and carried to their full extent, these regulations could lead to the complete destruction and banishment of the subcontracting system as we know it in South Australia, this system having been responsible for the building of houses of a high standard at a reasonable cost.

If the subcontractors go, what replaces them? It can only be day labour, which immediately brings into force all sorts of complication, such as labour disputes, demarcation and added costs. Do we want added costs in this industry? I suggest that, if we want added costs and if we want the industry to falter, we pass these regulations. If, however, we want to foster the industry and to make it prosper and ensure a fair deal for all, we will disallow these regulations, in the hope that more reasonable and workable regulations will be introduced, if the Act is to be implemented at all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH-EAST RENTALS

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

That, in view of the judgment given by His Honour Mr. Justice Bright on September 8, 1970, in which he made a declaration in favour of a petitioner concerning a zone 5 war service land settlement property rental, the Government should proceed forthwith to meet the claims of zone 5 settlers under the three points (a), (b) and (c) of the declaration.

Here, I am doing something quite opposite from what I did a short while ago: in relation to this motion I am asking the Government to do something, whereas in relation to the preceding motion I was asking it to stop doing something. This subject is one more illustration of the present Government's passing the buck. We have recently seen the Minister of Roads and Transport enlisting the aid of the Commissioner of Highways as a supporter of Government, trying to spread his responsibilities. We have seen the Minister of Education continually blaming the Commonwealth Government for his own shortcomings in relation to the school-building programme, and so on.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Oh! You're wet.

Mr. HALL: Much to the annoyance, of course, of Ministers, we have had to expose Government action for what it is. In this case, the Government continues to ignore an important judgment brought down on September 8, 1970, in respect of an irritating and difficult position in the South-East, concerning zone 5 rentals applying to war service settlement areas. In this case, rentals are not finally fixed in respect of properties connected with the land settlement scheme that was established following the last war. What is worse, the soldier settlers who took up the properties in question are growing older and there will soon be instances where properties will be handed on to the succeeding generation or sold to other people. It is most disturbing, and the source of much continuing discontent among the soldier settlers concerned, that after all these years, during which the people concerned have continually presented a case to the Government (originally the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford's Government, then my own Government, and now this Government), no action is being taken and the present Administration continues to ignore an important judgment on this matter delivered by Mr. Justice Bright. When my own Government came into office the situation was far from being remedied. The case had been the subject of court proceedings for some years. At a Cabinet meeting at which I presided, it was agreed that our Government would try finally to bring this matter to an end by agreeing to expedite the hearing before Mr. Justice Bright. Our Government made every relevant article in its possession freely available in order to assist the learned judge's investigation of the case. We believed that this was the only way in which the situation could be speedily settled, and the Government would have the advice of an impartial investigator, including his recommendation on what should be done. The

judgment with which the present Government was confronted in September, 1970, is actually the result of the assistance we had given counsel representing the soldier settlers concerned. I will read the declarations which the judge made, indicating the obligations of the present Government in this matter. At the end of his judgment, Mr. Justice Bright said:

I propose to make declarations as to the petitioner's rights, leaving it to the authorities to act justly in accordance therewith.

I declare:

- (a) The petitioner is entitled to a lease from the Crown in right of South Australia of section 167 hundred of Bowaka upon and subject to the terms and conditions (other than rent) contained in the lease submitted for his signature.
- (b) The petitioner is obliged to pay an annual rental, calculated from April 1, 1954. The amount of the annual rental is to be fixed in accordance with the War Service Land Settlement Agreement between the Commonwealth and the State of South Australia dated November 2, 1945, as amended by the conditions annexed to the letter dated July 30, 1953, from the Commonwealth Minister for the Interior to the State Minister of Lands.
- (c) It has not been established on the evidence that the annual rental has been so fixed and in particular it has not been established that any fixation has been made within a period of 12 months after date of allotment (April 1, 1953) or that any subsequent fixation has been made which would have been a proper fixation if it had been made within that period.

The petitioner has been substantially successful in these proceedings and ought to be paid his costs by the defendant.

That is a most significant declaration made on this matter and, indeed, a most successful one for the petitioner. It is the only relevant public document that defines the present situation.

Mr. Burdon: What part did the Commonwealth Government play in this?

Mr. HALL: I have said publicly, and I will repeat it if necessary, that my Party and I believe that the Government should act according to the judge's declaration. I have given the settlers an undertaking, which I reiterate now, that, if this matter is not dealt with soon, it will be dealt with when the Liberal Government resumes office. That is a responsible statement made after much consideration of the judge's declaration and in the full knowledge that, if this Government does not do something about the matter soon, it may be the province

of the Liberal Government to do so. That is my Party's policy on the matter and this is the way in which we intend to pursue it.

Mr. Burdon: Your Party did nothing for 15 years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The member for Mount Gambier can talk long and loud in this House if he likes. However, let him try to justify the giving of over \$1,000,000 worth of public funds to oversea millionaires in relation to a certain project in Victoria Square.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has moved a motion, and I ask him to confine his remarks to that motion.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Sir. I was led off the trail by the inane interjection of the member for Mount Gambier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: This subject was dealt with exhaustively in the judge's declaration. I do not intend to burden the House or to lengthen the number of pages in *Hansard* by detailing this matter to any extent. However, I should refer to some relevant matters in the judgment to support my contentions. The learned judge set out the history of this case, which showed that in 1945 the war service land settlement agreement was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament and that complementary legislation was passed in the State Parliament to make it effective. This petitioner, who represents the other petitioners in the case because of the similarity of their cases, was selected in August, 1949, as a successful applicant for a block. In 1950 he was requested by the department to enter full employment, and in 1951 he stated his order of preference after inspecting the blocks in company with an officer of the Lands Department. In 1951 he was granted occupation of the land, and in April, 1953, he was granted an allotment. He received his provisional rental in 1954, to which he objected, and then, in 1963, he received notice of his final rental, which is the subject of contention. The rental then was \$962, compared to the \$200 provisional rental which he was charged and which he is still paying. His perpetual leasehold was offered in 1966. However, he declined to sign therefor on the basis of the final rental, to which he objected. After detailing the case, the judge said:

I shall come back to these possibilities later. But first I must mention the State and Commonwealth agreement. No point is taken that the State has acted merely as agent for the Commonwealth, although originally that appears to have been so. The State in this case asserts its right and denies the petitioner's rights in the character of a principal. The agreements made between the State and the Commonwealth are not agreements to which the petitioner is a party or with which he is concerned save in so far as the provisions contained in those agreements may have been imported into the arrangements (to use a neutral word) subsisting between the State and the petitioner.

His Honour later continued:

It seems to me that the Crown, having purported to quantify the rent, and so as to render certain the only matter which was uncertain, ought not to be allowed to assert that there is no agreement. For again it is not a matter of the Crown making an offer to accept rent at a certain sum, but of the Crown having set in motion machinery for the computation of the annual rental, and having rightly or wrongly applied the resulting figure to the holding already held by the petitioner, as the Crown recognized, as tenant of the Crown. In my view therefore the evidence enables me to find, and I do find, that the petitioner has a right to a lease of which all the terms save annual rental are contained in the lease submitted for his signature.

I draw the attention of the member for Mount Gambier to the judge's comments in the earlier excerpt, as follows:

The State in this case asserts its right and denies the petitioner's rights in the character of a principal.

Mr. Burdon: We support their right.

Mr. HALL: The member for Mount Gambier denies these petitioners their rights.

Mr. Burdon: No, we support their rights.

Mr. HALL: I refer the honourable member to that declaration made by the judge, because this Government will not accept its responsibility but continues to blame the Commonwealth Government, when it has every legal right to settle this matter.

Mr. Burdon: This Government always has accepted and still is accepting its responsibility.

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

Mr. HALL: His Honour later continued:

In my opinion the true position emerging from the evidence is that a leasehold tenure came into existence on April 1, 1953, and that the Crown had a duty to fix a rental according to principles and procedures that were sufficiently precise to constitute a prescribed method. The petitioner was not aware of the full details of the method when he became lessee but he then knew that a method would be agreed to allow the Crown, following the method, to fix his rent.

Later, His Honour said:

In the 1945 agreement the State acted as agent for the Commonwealth and not as a principal. But in *Magennis' Case* (1949) 80 C.L.R. 382 the High Court pointed out that the Commonwealth could acquire land only on just terms, and that this requirement had not been observed. So the basis of the scheme was changed and the scheme turned into one in which the State became a principal instead of an agent.

That is the crux of the matter and, indeed, the crux of the declaration in the judgment given by Mr. Justice Bright. The judge went on to say in another excerpt:

But it is not at all clear that the valuations are proper, and I am justified in directing the attention of the Crown to this matter . . . I am, therefore, left quite uncertain whether the rent has ever been properly fixed and I am clear that it has never been properly notified.

He went on to make the declaration that I have already read to the House. I will repeat his footnote at the end of the declaration:

The petitioner has been subsequently successful in these proceedings . . .

The judge has said clearly that the State is a principal, and not an agent. He has said that the rent has never been properly fixed and that it should be fixed on the conditions applying at the time the perpetual lease was offered. What does the Government do in the face of this quite clear declaration made by the judge? Here, we have the situation I have detailed to the House: at the beginning, in 1949, this applicant was selected as a successful one to become a member of the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. He was granted occupation in 1951. There were then those long years of paying a provisional rental; then there was notification of a rental to which he objected, and it was contended in legal proceedings that this rental was not proper. My Government decided that this issue must be settled. I see that the Minister of Education in his usual way attempts to deride someone who tries to do something for others. All the Minister tries to do is make political capital out of other people. He only destroys people's freedom—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You did nothing at all.

Mr. HALL: When he cannot destroy people's freedom, he focuses attention on the Commonwealth Government. He is the Leader of a cargo cult of power in South Australia. People are derided by the Minister of Education.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader must link up his remarks with the matter under discussion.

Mr. HALL: It is clear, therefore, that this is a long dispute which is causing hardship to all the settlers now and which will cause hardship when they need to be involved in the disposal of their property. As a matter of fact, there have been remarkably few changes in the ownership of property, simply as a matter of circumstance. If my information is correct, I think that only about four or eight people are involved in that way; but we know that this number will increase and blocks will be placed on the market or pass into the hands of successors who will not know what the rent is, which is an absurd situation for them to be involved in. It is a situation of hardship.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Your Party did nothing about it for years.

Mr. HALL: Again, the Minister of Education blames someone else. I will give a party when the Minister decides to accept some responsibility himself. He never accepts responsibility for his own actions or his own Government. He should be directing his attention to these cases of hardship for the 100 people and their families rather than looking to restrictive measures for other sections of the community or giving State money away to rich people overseas. He should look to his own community because, on top of this situation, the country areas generally are passing through very hard economic times. On top of this problem of uncertainty and dissension we have the general problem of unprofitability. This doubles the hardship that these people are suffering. It brings little credit to the Government to perpetuate this state of affairs after it has had a clear indication of what it should do. I know the Government will say, "We have not the money", but that is not so. The Government, apparently, has plenty of money; it has money to give away.

Mr. Clark: You are back on your obsession now.

Mr. HALL: Obsession or not the Government cannot deny it. It has enough money to put \$800,000 into an unplanned cultural addition to the festival hall.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is relevant to the situation. We are dealing with a sum of money that could amount to between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 if the State is left without assistance from the Commonwealth

Government to remedy this position. Then it becomes a matter of priority. The Government has clearly established priorities, and these people are at the lowest end of the priority scale, because cultural activities come before the righting of this wrong that the judge has so clearly outlined.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader cannot allude to a subject matter now under discussion by the House. I ask him to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Sir; I shall soon finish. I should have thought that I would receive greater sympathy from members opposite in this matter.

Mr. Keneally: You get back what you hand out.

Mr. HALL: I only hope that the Government will face up to this problem. We know that it will say, "We cannot act." It will say it has not the money, and possibly it will also say, "We are waiting for the Commonwealth Government to assist us." It seems obvious to me that, once the State Government accepts the responsibility and sets the path, the Commonwealth will assuredly come in with some assistance in this case. Whether or not it does, I do not believe that this Government will act in this matter. It should take the action outlined by the judge, and it should, on that basis, hope to get some Commonwealth assistance. Apparently, so far, it has been unsuccessful. The Government has been involved with the Commonwealth Government in this matter but cannot shift it, and it is using the Commonwealth Government as a front for not acting.

A few weeks ago, when this matter was brought up by me, the Premier said that Mr. Kneebone had informed him that he had made further arrangements to meet Mr. Sinclair in Melbourne on Thursday and he hoped that, as a result of discussions, the matter would be resolved. That type of thing is not satisfactory. It is not satisfactory to the settlers, for reasons that have been outlined; it is not satisfactory because of the judge's declaration; it is not satisfactory because the State is a principal, as outlined in the judgment; and it is not satisfactory because of the attitude of this Government towards accepting responsibility. It is totally unacceptable to the Opposition, and I reaffirm the Opposition's policy. I inform the Minister of Education that, when we are returned to office, if this Government has not solved this problem, we will; and we will use as the basis for our action the judge's declaration.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support this motion. This is a long and sad dispute. At least half of these people are constituents of mine and the remainder are represented by the Minister of Works. One would have had to live with these people and see the anguish and frustration they have suffered over the years to appreciate the problem they now face. Virtually all of the original settlers are still on their properties, although four have died and perhaps half a dozen of them have sold their properties. Honourable members should bear in mind that these 100-odd settlers have no equity in their property and that for some of them over 20 years of hard and devoted work is tied up in the property. Some Government members have said that this was the result of a Liberal Administration. The Minister of Education knows that in 1964 these settlers took out a Supreme Court writ.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How long had the problem been going on before 1964?

Mr. RODDA: The leases, which were issued in 1963, became a point of argument between the settlers and the Government of the day.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which Government?

Mr. RODDA: It ill behoves the Minister to suggest that this problem had been going on for 10 years. It was a period of development, and some of the settlers went on their properties as early as 1950.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How long did it take your Government to do anything?

Mr. RODDA: The final leases were issued in 1963, at which time the settlers contested their rents. Prior to 1963, they had paid provisional rents. The then Minister of Lands (Hon. P. H. Quirke) appointed a committee known as the Eastick committee, whose report was never made public. The report is reputed to contain the answer to the very unsatisfactory situation the settlers are now suffering. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the side effects the settlers are suffering as a result of the harassing times that rural industry is facing. As these settlers lack collateral they are unable to obtain finance from banks or finance institutions against the value of their property. Many of them are taking contracting work to keep their property in tact. The soldier settlers in other zones have a valuable collateral with which to raise funds to keep themselves solvent. As many of the settlers in zone 5 are over 60 years of age, their families have grown up, and the settlers have put in years of hard work on the property.

There is a real need to resolve the settlers' problem. I could go on for hours debating the methods of assessing values, but that would be so much water under the bridge. The Leader has quoted from the judgment brought down on September 8 last year. Regarding the question of whether it is an argument between the settlers and the State Government or whether the Commonwealth is involved, the Leader has conclusively proved that it has now become an argument between the State Government and the settlers. In his judgment His Honour Mr. Justice Bright said:

I regard the State as having demonstrated an intention that a legal relationship should subsist between the State and the petitioner, viz., the relationship of Crown as owner and petitioner as War Service Lessee in Perpetuity with right of purchase. The lease, it will be noted, was not submitted in 1966 as an offer but as a document expressing in formal terms the arrangement which was, in the view of the State, already in existence. It dated back to 1953 and therefore purported to refer to a legal relationship which had already been in existence for 13 years. All the letters issuing from servants of the Crown to the petitioner support the same view.

That extract underlines the point that the argument is between the settlers and the State Government. Any dealings concerning the Commonwealth are between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government under the War Service Land Settlement Agreement, but it has been demonstrated that the 100 settlers have a right to a lease, and it is incumbent on the Minister and the Government to make a settlement forthwith. The Leader has clearly stated what he will do if he again becomes Premier in the event of the present Government not settling the matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What the Leader said would be absolutely worthless.

Mr. RODDA: Our word is our bond, and the South-East settlers can write what I have said in their notebooks. I am sorry that we have had to move this motion. We are worried because the 100 people have had to suffer at the hands of the Government for far too long. It will cost the State Government a large sum, as the Leader has said. We are surely not going to ask these 100 settlers to bear these excessive rents. The judge has clearly spelt out what he believes the settlers' just entitlement is. The settlers have had to look to the Opposition for a solution to this unsatisfactory arrangement, under which they are the losers. Their lifetime's work is bound

up in extremely valuable properties. I emphasize that it is an argument not between the settlers and the Commonwealth Government but between the settlers and the State Government. I hope that, as a result of this motion, the Government will give the settlers their just dues. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOSPITALS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Dr. Tonkin:

(For wording of motion, see page 550.)

(Continued from August 4. Page 552.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I have studied the speeches of the mover (the member for Bragg) and the seconder (the member for Flinders), and I thank them for their interest in this matter. I am sure their motives in moving the motion were sincere. As they said, for many years church-administered hospitals have received \$1 for \$1 subsidies in respect of approved capital works, whereas subsidized hospitals and community hospitals have received \$2 for \$1 subsidies. The member for Bragg said that he had been unable to discover the reason for the different bases of the subsidies. I, too, have tried to discover the reason, and I have concluded that it is purely historical.

The only church-administered hospitals with recognized nurse-training schools are St. Andrews Presbyterian Hospital Incorporated, Memorial Hospital Incorporated (which is administered by the Methodist Church) and Calvary Hospital (which is administered by the Roman Catholic Church). The McBride Maternity Hospital, which is administered by the Salvation Army, is not a fully recognized nurse-training school. I have visited two of those four hospitals (St. Andrews Hospital and Calvary Hospital), and I have been a patient at Memorial Hospital. I have not visited the McBride Hospital although, as a result of the assistance it has given to single mothers, its reputation is well known to me; I hope to visit it in the future.

In respect of the cost to the State, the difference between a \$1 for \$1 subsidy and a \$2 for \$1 subsidy is \$167 for each \$1,000 of capital cost. The member for Flinders said that non-profit church-administered hospitals in the past received only one-half of the subsidy given to community hospitals but, if he gives further thought to the matter, he will find that his statement was inaccurate; he probably made

it on the spur of the moment. A \$2 for \$1 subsidy is not double a \$1 for \$1 subsidy: in the first case, the hospital meets one-third of the cost, whereas in the latter case the hospital meets one-half of the cost. On a capital cost of \$1,000, in the case of a \$2 for \$1 subsidy the Government will pay an additional \$167 (a total of \$667), with the hospital paying \$333. However, in the case of a \$1 for \$1 subsidy each party pays \$500 on a capital cost of \$1,000.

As all members know, on August 2 the Government announced that church-administered non-profit hospitals would in future receive \$2 for \$1 subsidies on approved capital works. The member for Bragg said that the Government, in making this announcement, was trying to stop the Opposition from getting credit for its motion. Nevertheless, he said that the Government's announcement was appreciated. I point out to the honourable member that this is not the first occasion when that sort of thing has occurred. He will find that it occurred when the Labor Party was in Opposition, too. So, the purpose of this well-intentioned motion has been already achieved.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I very much appreciate the way in which the Government received this motion at the initial stage and also its action in providing for it to be dealt with in the House, and I appreciate, too, the remarks of the member for Tea Tree Gully. Since the Government took this action on subsidies, in my rounds of these hospitals in the last week I have heard nothing but praise for the Government in taking this step. If I had known this action would be taken, I wonder whether I should have amended my motion so that it would provide that the subsidy be at least \$2 for \$1, because there are special occasions when a \$2 for \$1 subsidy is not sufficient. However, I am sure that everyone will be pleased with the subsidy. The member for Tea Tree Gully referred to the matter of credit: I do not mind who gets the credit as long as the thing is done. All I can say is that I am pleased indeed that this action has now been taken.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 4. Page 553.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I want to make only a few remarks now, and then I intend to seek leave to continue my remarks for a reason I will

explain. I am sure the member for Light will agree with my reason for wanting to adjourn this matter. However, in view of some of the things he said in the House last Wednesday, I am forced to reply to him immediately. I have again read his second reading explanation, in which he states:

With the presentation yesterday by the Minister of Local Government of a speeded-up Local Government Act Amendment Bill, it was necessary to prepare a redraft of the Bill of which I gave notice last Wednesday 24 hours before the then stimulated Minister gave notice of a similar intention.

I do not think the honourable member was being very kind in saying that, but obviously he did not intend to be kind. I do not ask him necessarily to be kind, but I do ask him to be a little more factual.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member listens he will learn something. I draw the attention of the member for Light to page 222 of *Hansard* of July 21 on which there appears a question asked of me by the member for Tea Tree Gully about the Government's intentions with regard to the Local Government Act. In general terms, I said that the Government would reintroduce a Bill. One week later, on July 28, the member for Light gave notice in the House that he would introduce his Bill. Let us be serious about this: the Bill has been reintroduced by the Government at the first opportunity, so it ill behoves the member for Light or other Opposition members to suggest that the Government has been tardy in this regard. In fact, the tardiness came from the Party of which the member for Light is a member. The honourable member admits this in his second reading explanation, as follows:

In the presentation of the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, 1970, many desirable features were included.

Why were they not adopted in 1970?

Mr. Venning: That Bill was full of trash.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reason they were not adopted then was that the member for Light and his colleagues were too lazy to do their own homework. That homework has now been done, because it is obvious from what the member for Light said in his explanation that he has looked at the 1970 Bill. Actually, he has now made the amendment, as it were, that could have been made in 1970. The Government Bill has been arrived at similarly, although the member for Light has found that two or three matters had been

omitted; he thinks they have been forgotten, but they have not been. I am sure he will be delighted to know that I intend to support most of his proposals, but not for the reason that he has put them forward. I will support them because they go towards our objective of adult franchise; that is why we did not include them in our Bill. I am pleased that the member for Light has fallen for the pea and thimble trick. I hope that the honourable member will be a little more charitable and careful in future when he makes allegations of the type he made last week.

I will briefly tell the member for Light the attitude the Government intends to adopt in relation to the matters he has raised. He has suggested that section 54 of the Act should be deleted, but I will not support that proposal. First, I do not accept the kind of argument that the honourable member has put forward. He claims rates are not payable in many country council areas up to February 28; that is not true as the honourable member, who is a mayor of a council, would know. Rates are due and payable 21 days after the notice, as the member for Murray can verify.

Mr. Mathwin: You're wrong.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The authority from Brighton can contradict me if he wishes: I am only quoting the Act. There is no case at all to alter the present situation; if councillors are not the people to set an example to the public, I do not know who should set that example. In this regard no more restriction is placed on a person holding office as a councillor than is placed on him with regard to many other restrictions. If an ordinary ratepayer who is not a member of a council contravenes any of the other clauses that debar a person from continuing in office, he is not exempt from paying his rates, and this is just one of the qualifications that a councillor is required to abide by, and it is not unreasonable.

The other point that I think I should mention briefly is contained in clause 3, which takes away one of the precious rights that candidates for local government now possess, and I am sure that, if the honourable member conferred with his colleague, the member for Mitcham, he would not get his support for what he is proposing. At present a candidate may test, in a civil court, the decision of a returning officer, and the member for Mitcham will know of cases where this has occurred, yet the Bill introduced by the member for Light seeks to take away this right. I am sorry, but I would not be a party to that. If

it may help the honourable member when he replies, as he undoubtedly will, to some of my comments, let me say that the difference between what he is doing now and what we tried to do in the Bill that we introduced is like the difference between chalk and cheese, because in our Bill the right of appeal to a civil court from the decision of a returning officer in a district was vested in the Returning Officer for the State, so there was an area of appeal. The honourable member has not read the Bill properly if he does not accept that.

The suggestion in the present Bill is that a returning officer could rule, improperly, that a nomination was out of order and the candidate concerned would have no right of appeal. That is only setting up a Czarist State, and I know the member for Light would not contribute to that kind of thing. I suggest that he may care to look again at that provision.

As I have said, the Government intends to accept the remaining points, because they were omitted from our Bill for the reason that they impinged on the question of adult franchise. However, if the honourable member is prepared to come here, presumably with the support of his Party, and say what we said, namely, that adult franchise was desired by local government, we are more than willing to accept that. That is what the honourable member is saying: no longer will we take into account the memorial based on the value of the rates, or the multiplicity of voting, and we will regard people as being people. That is the principle of adult franchise contained in this Bill, and I congratulate the honourable member on introducing it.

I draw the attention of the House to a request that I have previously received from the Local Government Association that, when local government legislation is being introduced in this House, the association should be given the opportunity and time to study it and give its opinion on it. I am led to believe that the association has had neither the opportunity nor the time to study this Bill.

Dr. Eastick: That's a lie.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If it is a lie, I hope the honourable member will direct that statement to the President of the association (Mr. Netherton), the Vice-President (Mr. Spencer), and the Secretary (Mr. Smith), all of whom told me in my office last Friday that they had not seen the Bill.

Dr. Eastick: I'll take that up later.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope that the honourable member will. In the meantime, I ask leave to continue my remarks after the Local Government Association has commented on the Bill.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEAT BELTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 4. Page 559.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I am pleased that the Opposition in general, and the member for Mitcham in particular, have taken steps that I consider can be described as acting responsibly and constructively in a field in which I have much interest. This is in direct contrast (which makes me all the more pleased) to the attitude that the member for Mitcham adopted in this House last year when he moved a motion in relation to road safety. However, I do not intend to pursue that particular matter.

I say at the outset that, if the Opposition pursued a line of a constructive nature, it would always find that the Government was more than pleased to accept any legislation that it might care to introduce. That may be in direct contrast to the attitude adopted by the Hall Government. During the term of office of that Government, there seemed to be a race to make sure that the Government always got something in ahead of the Opposition, and it was considered that the Opposition, even if it had some worthwhile legislation, should never be given the kudos for having it passed through the House. However, that is now history and I do not suppose that for many years to come we will have to worry about that sort of attitude again. After all, the Leader, not I, said that his Party would be in Opposition for at least 12 years.

Perhaps, without being unkind to the member for Mitcham (because I have already adequately thanked him, I hope, for bringing this matter before the House), I should say that I would have preferred to see this Bill in such a form that it could be passed without amendment. However, if an honourable member takes a Bill from another State, makes one or two minor alterations, and thinks that that adapts the measure to this State, the obvious way to get over this is by amendment and, of course, we will have to do this. These amendments have been placed on the file and I hope honourable members will be able to consider the Bill further and pass it in its amended

form. Then, if the Bill receives the concurrence of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, I consider that much good will have been done for the community. Therefore, I appeal for co-operation by all members, particularly those in the other House, in the same way as we have co-operated with the member for Mitcham, who presumably has the support of his own Party. Like other members, I have received a few letters, but I thought I would quote from one only. I am pleased that the Leader has now returned to the House, because I am sure he would like to hear this letter, which comes from Two Wells which, without checking, I think is in his district.

Mr. Ferguson: Wrong again.

Mr. Hall: Will the Minister ever be right?

Mr. Mathwin: That is another clanger.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It does not surprise me that the Leader disowns Two Wells but, nevertheless, I shall read the letter. He may change his mind, but when the member for Goyder sees fit to give up his representation of that district (and I hope that that will not be for many years) perhaps he will bequeath it to the Leader, if he is still Leader then. The letter states:

The following is the context of two motions passed at our recent regional zone council meeting held at Clare.

This, I presume, brings in the member for Rocky River, but I am not too sure of the districts. The letter continues:

This regional council insists that the Government in each State and the Commonwealth Government realize their responsibility and take some action in driver education at all levels.

I think every member would agree that the two States that are now leading in driver education at all levels are Western Australia and South Australia. Western Australia has already established a driver education centre and South Australia is now to spend \$500,000 to establish such a centre.

Mr. Nankivell: And they are two Labor States, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Apparently, the honourable member is way ahead of other members. I was not going to refer to that fact, but I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to it. Perhaps I had overlooked it! Honourable members will be interested in the second resolution carried by this regional zone meeting:

That the wearing of seat belts be compulsory in South Australia.

I do not think I said that this regional zone council meeting was the regional zone council meeting of the Young Liberal Movement. Apparently, the Young Liberals have woken up, and perhaps I should congratulate all members of the Liberal Party, if the press report about the secret meeting last weekend is correct when it reported them as having supported the action of the State Labor Government about alcohol tests. I do not know whether the report is correct: I know that the member for Bragg was there, because his photograph was in the newspaper, and the Leader was there.

Mr. Mathwin: What's this got to do with seat belts?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It has much to do with them, because I should like to find out whether the L.C.L. meeting at the weekend also endorsed the Government's policy (and the policy of the member for Mitcham) for compulsory wearing of seat belts, and whether this resolution of the Young Liberals was endorsed or rejected at this secret meeting held behind closed and barred doors last weekend.

Mr. Mathwin: Pay your fees and we will tell you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the major point that worries most people who are opposed to the principle of the compulsory wearing of seat belts is the compulsion associated with it. I think members are to be congratulated in having agreed with the point of view that circumstances alter cases and that, in many instances, compulsion is necessary. When I sit here listening to the bleatings of Opposition members while they are complaining that this Government makes everything compulsory, it gives me much heart to reflect that it was the member for Mitcham who introduced compulsion on the question of seat belts, to say nothing of what his colleagues in another sphere have done with compulsion for military training. The member for Mitcham referred to an instance in which two young men in the Army were driving out of a military establishment, wherever it was.

Mr. Mathwin: Keswick Barracks, wasn't it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not recall, and it does not matter: these young fellows were not wearing their seat belts, but they were in a private car and driving in their own time, and not under the control of the Army.

Mr. Millhouse: It was not in their own time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member is working on the premise that soldiers are on duty 24 hours a day. When I interjected and said that they would be put on the mat, the member for Mitcham said that he would certainly call them in and talk to them. I do not want these fellows to receive the same treatment as the fellow received at El Alamein when he was in such a situation that he could not afford the courtesy of saluting the honourable major because of other circumstances, and he was matted for it. I hope the member for Mitcham will be a little kinder to these two young men. I support the second reading, and trust that when we reach the Committee stage the amendments on file will be accepted.

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): I support the second reading, and I am pleased to know (as I am sure the member for Mitcham is pleased to know) that the Minister and the Government have accepted the principle laid down in the Bill of the compulsory wearing of seat belts. If there is one person in this House who can speak from practical experience in the wearing of seat belts, it will be me. Members will recall that I was a passenger in a motor car involved in an accident and, at the time, I was wearing a seat belt. I believe that, if I had not been wearing one, anything could have happened to me. It could have been only a miracle that prevented me from being a paraplegic today. On that occasion the back tyre of the car blew out, the driver lost control and, after the car had swayed for about two chains, it finished up inside a paddock with me still sitting in my seat with the seat belt attached. I learned afterwards, of course, that I had fractured my neck and chipped the vertebra, and many members saw me in the House some time afterwards wearing a stiff collar around my neck.

Since the compulsory fitting of seat belts in motor cars was introduced, I believe that people have become enlightened, and they now consider that the wearing of seat belts could save many people from being injured fatally or at least seriously. I know there is all kinds of conjecture concerning whether seat belts prevent fatalities and serious injury, but I think that, if we study the statistics, we will find that, as a result of wearing seat belts, more people have been saved from serious accidents than have those who were not wearing seat belts at the time. Much importance has been placed on the compulsion to wear seat belts: I was brought up in an age of compulsion, especially in respect of family

life in my younger days, and, perhaps if a little more compulsion were applied in that respect today, we might be better off. I believe that the compulsory wearing of seat belts will be in the interests of the motoring public. As the Minister has accepted the principle of the compulsory wearing of seat belts, I can see no point in my canvassing this matter any further, and I therefore support the second reading.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I oppose the Bill. I do not for one moment suggest that individuals should not determine their own view on this matter; my attitude is that this Bill does nothing to reduce the number of accidents that will occur, even though it could well lead to reducing the severity of injury suffered by individuals involved in an accident. Seat belts have been available in motor vehicles for a considerable time, and the fact that many people fail to make use of them is surely some indication of individuals' exercising their own opinion and desire in this respect. Although the member for Goyder has suggested that, but for the wearing of a seat belt, he could well have been a paraplegic, there are numerous examples of people who are now paraplegics because, in fact, they were wearing a seat belt. I refer especially to those who were wearing the lap type of seat belt which, when an accident occurs, keeps the person concerned in one position and which can cause grave spinal injury.

In a recent accident on Eyre Highway, a young girl suffered a complete severance of the vertebra but, because of advances in medical science, and, I suggest, because of providence (this girl was subjected to five transfers over a period of about eight hours, but the movement did not sever the spinal cord), she is walking today. Certainly, many people suffer grave injury as a result of being moved after the seat belt has been released and not as a result of the accident itself. I was not surprised to find the Minister of Roads and Transport enthralled concerning the letter he had received which contained certain words, namely, "insist" and "compulsory".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're the ones who are guided by dictates from outside.

Dr. EASTICK: We see it on the other side, unfolded before us every day.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have it within your ranks every day.

Dr. EASTICK: If I believed that this Bill could result in reducing the number of accidents, I would give it my complete support.

From the knowledge gained from statistical records, I believe that, although in some cases there may be a reduction in the severity of injury as a result of the wearing of a seat belt, in other cases the severity of the injury is increased, because the person concerned is not free to move within the vehicle in the accident, or perhaps because he may be dragged out of a vehicle that has sustained certain structural damage. In addition, many people die as a result of being impaled on the steering wheel.

As yet, to my knowledge, no vehicle has been designed in which there is absolutely no possibility of a person's being impaled on the steering column or on various levers in the driving cabin. How would this legislation be policed? If patrolling officers were required to stop motorists to see whether they were wearing seat belts, I suggest that the time taken in doing that would be far better spent in investigating ways of reducing the number of accidents.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't ever let me come and see you in hospital if you've been involved in an accident but weren't wearing a seat belt.

Dr. EASTICK: I am pleased to know that the Minister would be willing to come to see me in hospital if I suffered such a misfortune. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I strongly oppose the Bill, because of the compulsion factor. Referring to one or two points made by the member for Goyder, especially relating to practical experience, I believe that he cannot give an assurance (nor can anyone else) that, if he had not been wearing a seat belt when he was involved in the accident, he would have been more seriously injured. In fact he may not have had a broken neck; there is no guarantee. We do not know the result. Over a period of two years I had the experience of being compelled to wear a seat belt on the race track. If I did roll over, I could not protect myself; I had to take what came. I also know I was very close to losing my life because I did not wear one when a bearing came through the radiator cowl and the steering wheel and stopped against my chest. I have a photograph of that incident. So I have had some experience, and I have seen men burnt in cars because they were strapped inside.

I take up the point raised by the member for Goyder that people now believe that seat belts are necessary. If that is true, why compel them to wear them? I answer the member for Goyder's point, raised by way of interjection,

because it was made by the member for Mitcham in his second reading speech on this Bill, when he said:

I am quite happy to take the responsibility for the element of compulsion it introduces and for the element of compulsion introduced in 1963.

That element was introduced by the member for Mitcham then, too; but the element of compulsion then was not the wearing of seat belts; it was to have them fitted to cars as a safety factor in case drivers or their passengers desired to wear them. That is entirely different from what we are now saying to the individual—"You shall wear a seat belt." There is some argument that there is a cost to the community. I agree that there is a cost, because of accidents to the community. This legislation, however, will not reduce the number of accidents; it will to a degree reduce some types of serious injury, but that is a chance the individual decides to take for himself or herself. If we are to judge it on the basis of cost to the community, on the basis of hospitalization or other costs to society in general, why not legislate to ban smoking? Why not ban altogether the consumption of alcohol? If there is anything in society that causes accidents, it is the excessive consumption of alcohol.

Some people have argued that in the driving of a vehicle there are certain actions one is compelled, by law, to take. They are to protect other people, not only the driver. All that this legislation today is doing is trying to protect the individual. We are compelling him to protect himself—the very thing for which a former Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) was condemned when he said that we should not allow more gambling or extend drinking hours in the State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: "Poison in the hands of children"!

Mr. EVANS: In other words, people were not responsible for looking after themselves. Now, the member for Mitcham and those supporting him are taking the same attitude, that people are not responsible enough. I would agree if the Minister asked Parliament to approve the allocation of money to help educate people to wear seat belts. There would be some merit in that, but there is not in compulsion. The member for Mitcham stated that this was the next stage. In other words, we had the first stage of compulsion in 1963; we now have the second stage of compulsion in 1971. What will the next one be? What is

the next move that the member for Mitcham contemplates? In his second reading speech he said:

While I make that acknowledgement freely, I am convinced that the benefits to the individual . . .

Whom is the member for Mitcham kidding? How often does he go out of his way to be concerned about benefits to the individual?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Never!

Mr. EVANS: This will deprive the individual of another one of his rights. In 1963 the member for Mitcham introduced a Bill to compel motorists to have seat belts, or brackets for them, fitted to their motor cars. In his second reading speech on this Bill he said:

At that time, I did not think that the community was ready to accept both the compulsory installation of belts in new cars and their compulsory wearing. Then, eight years ago, people were not used to wearing seat belts or seeing them in motor cars; they were a comparatively recent innovation. Their efficacy in saving lives and reducing injury was less well proven then and certainly less well accepted by the community than it is now.

The honourable member believes that today they are acceptable to the community. However, if any member or group of members believes that, I ask them to put it to a referendum to the people and ask them the question—not the type of question asked at the previous Labor referendum.

The Government is setting up an insurance office, so another way we could encourage people to wear seat belts without compelling them would be to give them an insurance benefit. People must have seat belts fitted to their vehicles to keep within the law but, if a person is injured and it can be proved that he was not wearing a seat belt at the time of the accident, the insurance company can have it stated in the insurance policy that it does not accept the risk in those circumstances.

If a person wishes to take out that type of insurance, he can. If he does, he gets a concession rate of premium. If he does not, he can take out a normal insurance policy stipulating that he will not be wearing a seat belt; and he will therefore pay a higher premium. On the member for Goyder's earlier argument that he was still strapped in his car, he would know from experience that even in a serious accident a person would still be fixed to his seat by the seat belt. Very seldom do the brackets, the belt or the sash come away to release the driver from the car. This scheme I have just mentioned would obviate worries about being able

to prove whether or not a person was in his seat belt except when he was on his own and suffered some minor injury and could release himself.

There are two ways in which we can achieve our object: first, by educating people; and, secondly, by giving some insurance benefit. One must consider who will be exempted. Will passengers in service buses be compelled to wear them? If they will not be compelled to wear them, why not? Under no conditions could I support a Bill such as this, which compels people to wear seat belts in order to protect no-one other than themselves. We should offer all the encouragement in the world, but we should not compel. I condemn the member for Mitcham and others who are promoting the idea of compulsion in our community.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Members opposite are often astounded at the freedom that exists in our Party. If ever a demonstration of that freedom has been needed, it has been given this afternoon.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is it being demonstrated in connection with adult franchise for the Legislative Council?

Mr. HALL: The Minister is laughing so much that he almost needs a seat belt right now. Opposition members sincerely differ from each other on the worth of this Bill. I commend the member for Mitcham for introducing a Bill that is much more significant than some of the restrictive Bills introduced by Ministers. This Bill aims at saving lives. The member for Mitcham, a former Attorney-General, has very great standing in our community because he introduced much legislation that still benefits South Australians and will continue to benefit them in the years to come. Although he is temporarily a private member, he has introduced this significant Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He has 12 years to go as a private member. Those are your words, not mine.

Mr. HALL: I hesitate to call the Minister a twister, because that term is often used as a nickname for a typhoon, and it may therefore indicate too much strength on the part of the Minister. I am astounded at the simplicity of the Bill: it is rather too simple.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A simple member introduced it.

Mr. HALL: The wearing of seat belts will be governed not only by this Bill but also by the principal Act and the regulations. If the Minister stopped interjecting he might have

time to consult the principal Act and the regulations. If his relationship with his department were sufficiently good for him to be able to ask it for a copy of the regulations, he would see that the field covered is very wide. The principal Act defines "motor vehicle" as follows:

"Motor vehicle" means a motor vehicle, motor tractor, or mobile machine propelled or capable of being propelled by power other than human or animal power but does not include a motor vehicle operated on a railway or tramway.

That is a magnificently wide definition. Regulation 1 (3), dated January 28 of this year, provides:

Seat belts and seat belt anchorages shall be fitted for all seating positions in all vehicles except motor cycles, omnibuses and specially constructed vehicles and vehicles exceeding 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight . . .

What constitutes a specially constructed vehicle? I notice that the Minister is now turning a deaf ear and refusing to become involved in a serious discussion on a matter of great importance to the community. I take it that seat belts are to be fitted to every tractor that is under 10,000 tons in gross weight.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Pounds!

Mr. HALL: Ah! I have got the Minister at last. I put in that little trap for that very purpose. I am glad to know that he understands the difference between pounds and tons. I take it that seat belts will have to be fitted on every tractor that is driven on a public road.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who drafted the regulations?

Mr. HALL: The present Administration. I take it that seat belts will have to be fitted to every truck that does not weigh more than 10,000 lb. This means that in the country every person driving a tractor, at least across a road, must ensure that seat belts are fitted, and that he is wearing a seat belt. I wonder whether a person would have to wear a seat belt if he were driving in his own paddock. This point illustrates the need to study legislation carefully. Thank heaven we have a House of Review that does study legislation carefully. Because of the importance of this Bill, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 10. Page 680.)

Grand total, \$142,940,000.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): These Loan Estimates provide increased allocations in all sections and show the Government's willingness to

do its utmost to have essential work carried out in many spheres. During this debate Opposition members, especially country members, have shown no inclination to say anything about what the Government has provided for works programmes in their district. The member for Hanson tried to gain political advantage by comparing the work which would be carried out in areas represented by Labor members with that which would be carried out in areas represented by Liberal members. However, he referred only to work in connection with schools. I am sure that I shall be able to deal with this matter more fully. As honourable members know, most suburban districts, especially the expanding districts, are represented by Labor members. Only about five or six metropolitan districts are represented by Opposition members, and those districts have a population that has been stable for many years.

Mr. Evans: But they still need attention, though.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not doubt that.

Mr. Evans: What about Fisher?

Mr. LANGLEY: That district is made up partly of the metropolitan area and partly of what I consider to be semi-metropolitan area.

Mr. Clark: Do you consider that it is well represented?

Mr. LANGLEY: That is a matter of opinion. The member for Fisher has more trees in his district than he has people. In the past, Opposition members believed that there should be votes for all the trees in some districts; at least the present electoral situation is somewhere near what it should be. The member for Hanson said that from these Estimates a certain sum would go to his district but that it was not much. In looking through the Estimates, I have not been able to find much work that will be done in the Unley District during the next 12 months.

Following the meeting that I attended at the Norwood Town Hall, I have received letters from different schools in my district recommending work to bring these schools up to the desired standard that in total would cost about \$500,000. Not one school in the Unley District has its own oval, and all the schools in the district require repair work. At present, the Government is using its resources to provide facilities in newer areas; it is making sure that work keeps up with the increases in school population. As the Minister of Education has said, South Australia leads the way in this field. Older schools need maintenance, and different sites are sometimes necessary. As some of the schools in my district are situated on main roads,

traffic noise prevents teachers from doing their best. The meeting at the Norwood Town Hall showed that more finance was needed so that older schools, including those in my district, could be upgraded. I am sure all members representing metropolitan districts would be pleased if this money was available, but, as I have said before, \$500,000 is needed for my district alone. The member for Hanson is lucky that his district has received the allocations it has received so far. I only hope that in future the Government will be able to find more money and can coax the Commonwealth Liberal Government to give more help to the Minister of Education to ensure that buildings in my district are upgraded. I have seen the trends in building over a period of 30 years and, despite what Opposition members say, I have always favoured licensing of plumbers and electricians, and I still favour it.

Mr. Coumbe: And licensed premises?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, the people have been pleased with the successful change that a Labor Government has made in this social matter. I assure the member for Fisher, who said last night that I was a hypocrite, that, as I have been through the world at least once, names do not hurt me. I am not a hypocrite. I also favour the licensing of builders. I have tried to be as consistent as I can regarding the building trade. This is a vital matter involved in the Loan Estimates, because better workmanship must result in better building, and surely it would be a great help to the Government or to anyone to know that building was being done properly. I know that trends in the building industry have changed. Opposition members have said that we have the best housing in Australia.

Mr. Evans: Is that true?

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not mind members saying that, but I am sure that the standard can be improved, and licensing of builders will improve it.

Mr. Evans: Will it increase costs?

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not doubt that it will, but the purchase of a house is the biggest deal that a person makes in his lifetime, and I ask the honourable member whether he would not like to know that a house had been built properly by trained tradesmen. Can any Opposition member tell me that he has not received complaints about the building work in some houses.

Mr. Evans: In particular, Housing Trust building?

Mr. LANGLEY: It is not applicable to the Housing Trust in particular: it is applicable to all concerned, including special builders. I do not doubt that some Housing Trust building work is not up to standard. There is a certain matter that I cannot mention now, but I shall be speaking about something that happened recently. Even if building in South Australia compares more than favourably with building in other States, that is not a reason why we cannot improve. Trends in the building trade and the quality of work have been strong. As I told the member for Fisher by interjection last evening, I consider that subcontracting is killing the building trade. Collusive tendering occurs at times and builders are able to state the charge for certain work. Some builders may have sufficient finance to operate, but they do not know anything about building.

The member for Torrens has said that he is the only member who has been an apprentice, and I am pleased about that. I do not know whether the honourable member agrees that eventually all persons engaged on building should have served an apprenticeship. I cannot see anything wrong with that. If people in the building trade were willing to do a course and to prove their proficiency by passing an examination we would have a far better building set-up in this State.

We often hear it said that the lowest tender for building contracts is the one that is usually accepted. This happens with Government contracts, and I would think especially in the case of the Housing Trust. Perhaps this does not happen so much on the big contracts where there is more supervision, but when it comes to housing (on which both the Government and private enterprise spend large sums) we find that the lowest tenderer secures the contract. Such a person can add 10 per cent or 12 per cent and then hawk his prices throughout the building trade, with the result that subcontractors can be left in the dark. Many people in the building trade are fly-by-night types, and one has no way of knowing whether or not they are good tradesmen. We need to maintain good workmanship in the building trade, for this is certainly vital to the Government. If we ensure that people in the trade are well trained, we will get the best out of them and building standards will be improved. I support the adoption of the first line.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): It is refreshing to be presented by the Treasurer with a document which at long last accepts and acknowledges

the worth of the Commonwealth Government's contributions to this State. On the very first page of his statement the Treasurer spells out that there has been special assistance from the Commonwealth. This has been very useful, for instead of finishing with a deficit it has allowed the State to finish with a revenue surplus. The sum of \$21,000 is suggested as the revenue surplus, whereas since the session commenced the Treasurer has indicated that the actual surplus is \$521,000; in other words, the \$21,000 shown here plus \$500,000 that has been put aside as a contingency against expected teacher salary increases. It is all very well to present facts and figures and make it appear that we have balanced the Budget so closely that we have finished with a surplus of only \$21,000 when in fact it is the larger figure that I have mentioned.

I want to speak briefly on a few items mentioned in these Estimates. I cannot agree with the member for Unley that every line on the Estimates has increased, for if he looked at the line for country sewerage he would find that there had been a decrease. I know it is parochial to speak of the situation regarding the Gawler township area, but in fact it actually goes beyond the township area and takes in a considerable part of the Munno Para District Council. It will eventually (and has, in one small area) give a service to part of the Mudla Wirra District Council area. The Loan Estimates last year indicated that \$500,000 was to be allotted to this work in the Gawler area during 1970-71. The documents state that the actual expenditure in the preceding year had been \$651,000, almost 80 per cent higher than the amount allotted to this work in the 1969-70 Loan Estimates. But what do we find? The present Estimates show that actual expenditure in 1970-71 was only \$390,000, a reduction of \$110,000 on this project at a time when increasing costs of labour and materials would have eroded the effective work that could have been completed during 1970-71.

In the current period of 1971-72, there has been a reduction of \$100,000 on the allotment made last year and, instead of having \$500,000 provided towards this work, only \$400,000 has been allotted. If there is a reduction in the actual amount spent (and I hope that the reduction in the actual amount spent is nothing like the reduction shown last year of more than 20 per cent), this worthwhile project will grind on and on and take much longer than the original six years, which it was suggested would be the time needed to finish the project.

I refer now to the figures concerning Housing Trust houses. In 1967-68, two houses were completed at Kapunda, and one was completed in 1968-69, but in last year's Loan Estimates and again this year no reference has been made to this town. In 1968-69, one house was completed at Saddleworth, and one was completed in 1969-70. It was proposed in last year's Estimates that two houses would be commenced there during 1970-71. However, this year's Estimates have no reference to Saddleworth: the two houses that were to be commenced in 1970-71 have not been commenced and there is no allotment for Saddleworth during 1971-72.

If we consider the situation with respect to Gawler, which includes Evanston, we find that, in 1968-69, two houses were under construction, and it was intended that 25 houses would be commenced. In the 1969-70 Estimates we found that, at the end of that time, six houses had been completed and 12 were under construction, and it was intended that 45 houses would be commenced during 1970-71. The present Loan Estimates show that only 13 houses were completed to the end of June 30, 1971, and two only were under construction. Of the 12 houses that were under construction at June 30, 1970, and of the 45 that were to be commenced during 1970-71 (a total of 57), we can locate only 15. Although it is indicated that 53 houses will be commenced during 1971-72, I wonder how we shall find the situation when the Loan Estimates are presented next year. It is not as though there is no need for these houses.

A group of 17 flats for the aged, which has been commenced since June 30 last, will provide housing for 20 people, the accommodation consisting of 14 single units and 3 double units. When the announcement was made in the local press as a result of a press release by the Treasurer, pensioners in the district immediately applied and were informed by the Housing Trust that their application would be accepted, but the trust gave these people little or no hope of receiving a unit because, as the member for Elizabeth knows, the demand by aged people for this type of housing is, in terms of units, far in excess of the 20 units to be provided. I hope that, when the Loan Estimates are presented next year, we shall not find, in this district or in any other district, that the number of units to be constructed has been reduced.

I accept the Treasurer's statement that the demand for low-rental housing is at an all-time high; indeed, I know that if he had twice

the money he still could not provide sufficient housing for people seeking this type of accommodation. One of my colleagues was informed today that an application for a house in the metropolitan area to accommodate a man, his wife and small family might be granted, all things being equal, within three to three and a half years. Certainly, there is a big leeway to make up, but I trust that housing will be provided along the lines set out in this document and that the programme will not be eroded away in some areas.

Reference has been made to the sum to be spent at the Roseworthy Agricultural College, which, having become a college of advanced education, serves a real purpose in the community. A total of \$150,000 was allocated during 1970-71, although only \$95,000 was spent. As the sum allocated for this purpose is provided on a 50/50 basis as between the Commonwealth and the State, the fact that the total allocation was not used means that the money that would have been available from the Commonwealth Government is left in the Commonwealth purse. I note that \$590,000 is allocated for 1971-72. Having had the opportunity recently to inspect, with the Public Works Committee, some of the work to be undertaken at this college, I hope that the work will proceed without delay, and that the moneys available from the Commonwealth will be fully used. It is not only in this area that Commonwealth money available to the State is not being used. There are positions on the staffs of several Government departments that will be supplemented by Commonwealth moneys when they are filled. I speak particularly of two positions that I know of in the national brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication programme where money is available today. It has been available for some considerable time to supplement the pay of, or to pay, the officers who are appointed, but no appointments have been made because the local salary offered is not sufficient to attract persons to fill those positions.

We have the situation that grade 3 officers are being offered in this State a salary less than the maximum offered to grade 1 officers in other States. While that is permitted to persist, this State will be denied the opportunity of using Commonwealth funds available to it. I comment on only one other feature of the Loan Estimates—the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, in respect of which the allocation is \$300,000. No doubt, all members are pleased that the Metropolitan and Export

Abattoirs Board has had returned to it a licence permitting it to kill stock for export overseas because not only does that introduce into the economy worthwhile and considerable overseas funds but also by the very fact that cattle and sheep can be sold overseas it creates a worthwhile and greater demand on the local scene, which maintains prices and is to the advantage of the rural sector.

Will this \$300,000 allocation be well spent? Is it \$300,000 that is absolutely essential for us to maintain the licensing situation, and will it have to be followed next year by the same amount or a greater amount of money? What is being done about either rebuilding or planning for the future so that moneys of this nature will go into a project that will upgrade the abattoirs system of this State in order that we do not find ourselves in the embarrassing situation that prevailed during the last financial year of not being able to meet the requirements of the importing countries? There are other features of this document that I shall question when we come to the individual lines. I support the first line.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I, too, support the first line. Although \$1,800,000 will be made available to people operating under the Loans to Producers Act, I read with concern that \$202,000 is coming from funds in hand from earlier borrowings. I took a deputation to the Treasurer last year seeking assistance under this Act, and it was informed that, owing to the shortage of funds, it could not receive assistance. Here we find that \$202,000 is unspent from funds in hand from earlier borrowings. I am particularly concerned because a co-operative in my area is battling against severe odds in order to continue its operations. In recent times large concerns have been taking over co-operatives throughout the State. Here we have a co-operative, serving primary producers in the area, that has been endeavouring to maintain its individuality yet, when it requested assistance, it was told, "Sorry, but there are no funds available."

Mr. Gunn: Yet the Government is willing to spend \$1,000,000 to encourage someone to build a luxury hotel in Adelaide.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, but it is not willing to assist those who are making a valuable contribution to welfare of this State. I am sorry that the Minister of Roads and Transport is not here to hear what I have to say about railways, but he can read it in *Hansard*. The future of our railways, particularly in the North, is far from clear at present. The next stage in

the standardization programme is about to take place, but no mention has been made of what will happen to the northern lines that are severed from the standard gauge. At present the transshipping of grain at Gladstone and Peterborough is a nightmare. A contractor tranships the grain from the narrow gauge to the standard gauge at Gladstone, and at night he rushes to Peterborough to tranship grain there. So, I am concerned that no mention has been made of the northern railway lines.

Primary producers throughout the State have made a significant contribution to our railway system. Not long ago legislation was passed that provided for primary producers to pay 1c a ton a trip for new equipment to be used in the bulk handling of grain. This was a worthy contribution by growers toward assisting the railways in moving grain. I was indignant that from April 1 railway freights through the State were increased by 10 per cent—at a time when primary producers would have wished for some relief from high freights.

Mr. Keneally: When do they not wish for relief?

Mr. VENNING: In connection with the rail transport of grain, I wish to cite the case of Quorn, near the honourable member's home town. The rail freight from that town is 16.599c a bushel, but when grain is moved by road transport the freight cost is exactly half that amount. I wish that the honourable member would do his homework before he interjects on something that does not concern him.

It is pleasing to know that work at Port Giles has now been completed at a cost of \$2,630,000. I remember that these facilities were commenced during the term of office of the previous Liberal and Country League Government. When the Government was returned to office in 1968, just before he went overseas the then Premier agreed to the request of people in the area that the date of completion of the terminal should be brought forward several weeks to assist in the handling of grain. The then Premier agreed that Port Giles should be deepened to take larger vessels. Now that the work is completed, this represents a great asset to the people of the lower part of Yorke Peninsula, and it cannot be taken away.

I have read with some concern that only \$450,000 is to be provided to commence construction of a high-capacity bulk grain loading facility at Port Lincoln, the estimated total cost of which is \$7,050,000. The work is supposed to be completed in time for the 1973-

74 harvest, so that in the years 1972-73 and 1973-74 a sum of \$6,600,000 will have to be spent to complete it. Therefore, much money will have to be found during that latter period.

A sum of \$800,000 is provided for further work at Thevenard. The member for Eyre will be glad to know that this terminal is nearing completion. True, there will be a delay for a month, probably during the harvest period, and certain work will have to be undertaken. I remember with interest the occasion when the Minister of Marine (Hon. Cyril Hutchens) in the previous Labor Government announced at Thevenard that this port would be deepened. From that time, certain work has taken place that will be of benefit not only to people in the area but also to the Australian Wheat Board which has experienced difficulties in the past to get shippers to use this loading port. In future, the anomaly that has existed, whereby only vessels of a small tonnage have been prepared to go to this port to load grain, will be removed. This facility will be greatly appreciated when it is completed.

I am pleased to see that \$20,000 is provided for the Barunga reservoir, \$63,000 for the Beetaloo trunk main, \$15,000 for work at Orraroo, and \$29,000 for work at Wilmington. The improvements to mains and the building of concrete tanks in those areas will greatly assist the provision of reticulated water in northern areas of the State. As a result of diversification by farmers, whereby the production of grain has given way to the raising of pigs and cattle, the pressure put on the Engineering and Water Supply Department throughout the State has been considerably increased. I am sure that the sum spent in my area will greatly assist in providing water reticulation there.

I am concerned that, although councils in some of our country towns have tried to implement effluent systems, they have met with difficulty. The people concerned have considered that the amount involved has been too great and, because of excessive estimates of costs, polls conducted have not favoured provision of the systems. These schemes would proceed if the Government adopted a policy of assisting these councils by subsidy or other financial help. There is a definite health hazard in Clare, in my district, and I view with concern that, because of the costs, a poll taken there did not support the provision of a scheme. I hope that the Minister will give a lead on this matter. He said, in reply to a question

recently, that when certain areas had been completed the Government would consider providing schemes in other areas.

It is particularly pleasing that a new high school is to be built at Gladstone and, although no provision has been made in these Loan Estimates for work on that school, the Minister has said, in reply to an interjection, that some money will be spent on the project. The school is expected to be completed by the commencement of the 1973 school year. The member for Light has referred to the Metropolitan and Export abattoirs and the provision of \$300,000 for expenditure this financial year. I also wondered at the wisdom of spending more money on the Gepps Cross abattoirs, because the provision of new abattoirs is long overdue. Regardless of what sum was spent on the present abattoirs, they could not be brought up to the standard required to handle the quantity of stock expected to be produced in South Australia in the next few years. The establishment of another abattoirs in the metropolitan area should have been considered before now. I support the first line.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened to the comments of members on the first line and the main point of criticism by the Opposition has been that the Government intends to make available assets that it now owns in order to stimulate development in the State. The main basis of this criticism is that we should alternatively spend on building a school the money that would be spent on such a project. If we were to do that, it would involve our selling the site, and we would not possess the money: the money would have been spent. Indeed, the site has been sitting vacant under the previous Government, serving merely as a car park. A great deal of development, of course, was to accrue from that!

Mr. Hall: You intend to give it away.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, in precisely the same way as has been done to stimulate development in a number of other areas, as I shall show clearly to members opposite. They are now having much to say about education, even though this Government is spending vastly more on education than did the previous Government. Last year the Leader of the Opposition criticized the increase in education expenditure and said that we could not sustain it. Well, we are sustaining a marked increase in education expenditure, both in capital and revenue. If we are to educate people in South Australia we will also have

to provide jobs for them, and there is no area in which we can more rapidly expand in diverse employment in South Australia than in the tourist industry, which so far has been hopelessly under-provided and under-stimulated in this State.

The tourist industry generally, the Australian National Travel Association, and the Australian Tourist Commission have all submitted cases that it is vital to stimulate the tourist industry by providing first-class hotel accommodation and that until Australia does this we will not attract the kind of tourist influx which neighbouring countries in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins are now attracting, simply because there is not the accommodation here to provide for the tourists. At present, we are not getting international tourists in any number into South Australia: they are by-passing this State. One reason constantly given for that is that there is not the accommodation here for the people involved.

Mr. Jennings: What's wrong with the Green Dragon?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is wrong with it is that no tourist would stay there. The Leader has said that this is a gross misuse of public moneys, and that we do not need to do this to stimulate hotel development because there will be a number of major hotel developments in South Australia. So far, however, the notifications to the Government and the Licensing Court of applications for licences for hotel development do not, any one of them, provide for international hotels of the standard now provided in neighbouring countries. In fact, there are only two hotels of such standard in Australia at present, and they are not in this State.

Mr. Nankivell: There are more than that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, there are two.

Mr. Rodda: There are a few in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is one in Western Australia which approaches the standard media. It is not a very large establishment, but it certainly is better than anything we can provide in South Australia. But that is the only one. We do not yet have one of that standard in South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How many jobs has that hotel in Western Australia provided? You said that this one hotel would open up a wide range of employment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What has proved to be the case elsewhere constantly is that when we get one hotel of adequate international standard it attracts further investment at the same level, and that is what the Government intends to do: to prime the pump. We are priming the pump with the facility of allowing people to develop on a site that was to be used for a building for the Public Service. In fact, such a proposition was reported heavily against by Professor Jensen who said it was the wrong site on which to erect an additional Public Service building. Alternative sites have been acquired by the Government for further Public Service buildings at the rear of the present State Administration Centre, and we have adequate land available for further development for the Public Service.

What are the problems of establishing first-class hotel accommodation in Australia? The following submission was made to the Tourist Ministers and supported unanimously by their officers. Investment to establish sufficient first-class international hotels in Australia has not materialized in the last five years, despite the actual and potential growth of tourism. There are three major reasons: first, the high cost of land which makes it impractical for private investors to acquire economic sites within the capital cities; secondly, the complete lack of interest by major lending institutions in Australia to finance hotel-type development (I will demonstrate that point in a few moments); thirdly, the lack of any special incentives to establish hotel and tourist plants which are subjected to the same State, Commonwealth and local taxes as all other investments.

In the sphere of the Commonwealth Government, the following tax factors affect the establishment and operation of major international hotels: depreciation allowances on hotel plant and equipment; import and customs duties on special hotel plant and equipment imported from overseas; sales tax, payable on plant equipment and some building materials; and income tax.

In the sphere of State Governments, the following tax factors are also significant: stamp duties on purchase of freeholds, leases, and insurance policies; liquor licence fees, and land tax. In the local government sphere such properties pay the same council and water and sewerage rates as does other city property.

Private financial institutions do not regard lending on residential hotel developments as a sound proposition. On past financial perfor-

mances, this assessment is justifiable. It will be necessary to change that institutional viewpoint, and to do this will require the creation of a favourable investment climate, the establishment of a number of successful large hotel projects, and the passage of years. The potential for tourism and for the exploitation of first-class hotels in Australia has changed dramatically in the past two years. With the numerous international airline services to and through Australia, this potential could now be profitably exploited if Governments wish to foster a new growth industry by granting some basic incentives.

We believe that Commonwealth and State Governments are fully aware of the potential benefits to their future revenues and to general prosperity. It seems surprising, therefore, that apart from the setting up of tourist departments, commissions, and investigatory bodies, and allocating finance for promotional and research activities, no Government in Australia has yet taken any of the basic steps to create sufficient hotel rooms. Truly effective action must be on an Australia-wide basis with the Commonwealth, the States and local government bodies all co-operating. We believe that the Commonwealth should give the lead as it stands to gain the greatest cost/benefit return. That was agreed to by all State Tourist Ministers, but so far we have had no joy from the Commonwealth Government in assisting this area of industrial development.

Adequate numbers of well-appointed and properly managed hotel rooms and hotel facilities in the capital cities are now the first essential to foster continued growth. From the cities, the visitors will progressively spread out geographically through the tourist infrastructure, and the growth of a national tourist plant can then progress on sound lines. If the required facilities are not created the opportunity will be lost. The visitors will by-pass Australia or proceed on as transit passengers to other countries which do cater for them. Countries in surrounding areas do cater for them, but we do not. The submission points out that a special situation was created in relation to one hotel facility in Sydney of which the economics of its surrounding development meant that a subsidy for a hotel project was viable, but that situation was the complete exception to the rule and does not exist in any other capital city. In fact, it was pointed out that there was a basic requirement for assistance regarding capital to develop such a project. It can be easily seen

why, if we examine a first-class hotel project in a neighbouring city: for example, the Southern Cross Hotel in Melbourne.

That hotel has not so far been a financial success. In 1960, when the project was launched, the operating costs were not estimated to be those which in fact they have proved to be. The gross operating profits since the doors of that hotel opened on August 24, 1962, have been about \$1,600,000 each year, but, after servicing loans, the owning company has declared only three dividends, each of 4 per cent, since the commencement, and no account has been taken of depreciation of the building or fittings in arriving at the gross operating profit. Generally speaking, a better return can be obtained from an office block, which in Sydney is estimated to yield \$12 to \$14 a square foot and, in Melbourne, \$12 a square foot compared with a return from an international hotel of \$6.50 to \$7 a square foot.

The cost of the land is a significant factor in these estimates. In Hooker's recent survey for its proposed Gateway hotel at Circular Quay, it concluded that the cost of construction per room would be \$50,000 and, to get a satisfactory return, an average room occupancy of 80 per cent would be needed (this is difficult to achieve), and the average daily room rate would need to be \$35. The Southern Cross hotel was a \$10,500,000 project with a \$4,000,000 equity, the rest being a long-term loan.

In these circumstances, while an international hotel here is a viable proposition it is viable only on the basis of stimulation by the Government by providing some assistance in the way of continuing costs and a marked assistance in relation to capital costs. The Leader has said that he does not believe that this sort of policy should be proceeded with. For instance, he said (concerning me):

He would give \$600,000, which could be used to build a school, to an oversea entrepreneur.

I do not intend to do anything of the kind, but, if the Leader proposes that I should take that land and sell it in order to get \$600,000 to build a school, he had better tell us. It would run entirely contrary to the provisions of the plan for Victoria Square.

Mr. Gunn: You're taking his words out of context.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not: I am saying exactly what he said, namely:

He would give \$600,000, which could be used to build a school . . .

Where would I get that money? It would be obtained only by selling the block. The Leader also said (concerning me):

He will give away the public's asset. Already a large new hotel is planned on the site of the South Australian Hotel, which will be emptied of its contents . . . It is a misuse of public funds, and it is a misdirected use of the land.

The proposals so far submitted to the Government in relation to any hotel development in South Australia do not provide for a hotel of international standard. The Leader then went on to talk about the matters I had raised on the subject of assistance to private industry, and said:

The Treasurer shirks his responsibility to the public by presenting this land to an entrepreneur. The Treasurer has said that subsidies are often given to industry, but I invite him to be more specific about the handing of public resources to private industry.

Well, I shall be more specific in a few moments. Speaking about me, the Leader continued:

Apparently he gives subsidies more readily than he should. When we came to office in 1968, we were confronted with the indenture which the Treasurer had signed with the developers of West Lakes and which almost completely disregarded the public interest in that huge and valuable piece of land.

His Deputy Leader added, "Quite reckless". We will hear about that in a moment. The Leader went on to say:

Yes. We know the stories that have circulated that the document was drawn up . . . It took Sir Glen Pearson to renegotiate that document with the company, which co-operated fully and adequately, and to preserve and even increase the public interest in that development. It is nonsensical for the Treasurer to say that this land was presented on subsidy to that company. He knows full well that the company is obliged to undertake public works in the midst of that development which are worth many millions and which will become publicly owned. That is the basis of the agreement between the previous Government and the developer. How much the company will make and how much value will reside in the public sector from this development is a matter for conjecture, but at least a fair balance was struck at that time; it was certainly not envisaged by my Government that that land represented any gift to that company. The company took a risk, which it must now be considering carefully in view of the present industrial conditions in this State.

It is delighted with that development, I may add. The Leader continues:

If its planning is good and the project is well developed and of high quality, the company will make a profit . . .

Now let us look at the West Lakes indenture. I went out to get that indenture and it was

signed by me with the company; it was signed for a land price that was less than the Land Board's valuation of the market price of the land. It was signed deliberately in order to get a \$85,000,000 investment here and to get the work for the building workers of this State, which has proved of vital importance to them.

What was the figure we obtained for that land under the first indenture? It was \$1,061,000. What was the figure under the indenture finally ratified by a Bill in this Parliament presented by the present Leader? It was \$1,061,000. Where is the increase in public protection? It must have taken much negotiation to get that changed! Let us look at the rest of the indenture and see what extra protection for the public was negotiated and what extra burdens were put on the developing corporation. The Labor indenture required planning by-laws to be approved by the Director of Planning and to comply with the Planning and Development Act and other relevant Acts. The indenture signed by the present Leader establishes West Lakes regulations that override the Planning and Development Act. The Labor Government's proposals provided for a board of directors, two members of which were to be Government nominees, one of whom was to be the Under Treasurer. The existing board of West Lakes Limited has no Government members.

The proposals of the Labor Government indicated that the developing company would pay for all bridges over the lake as well as for all roads except Military Road and those vesting in the councils. The final roads agreement written into the legal indenture is more favourable to the corporation and includes only half the cost of the bridges as well as the main highway (West Lakes Boulevard) to be constructed through West Lakes. The original scheme proposed in 1968 included a boat haven and an inlet from the sea thus providing a more public orientated open space playground than the impounded basin being built.

So at the moment the proposition has provided far more for the residents of West Lakes compared with the general public than the original indenture did. Details of cost sharing towards a drainage scheme are not spelled out in the original proposals, but they do say:

The Development Corporation proposes to contribute a monetary sum representing its share of the total monetary cost to be agreed with the local government authorities concerned.

The final indenture provides for the corporation to pay 25 per cent of external stormwater drainage costs and to pay for all the internal

stormwater drainage costs. Where was the departure by the L.C.L. Government from the assistance given by Governments to private industry not only on capital but on any continuing costs in order to obtain development? The difference is that they were more generous than we were. I sat on the Select Committee on the indenture, and I thought that what it did was satisfactory in order to get the development; I went along with its being more generous than I was. But for the Leader to say that Government does not do this sort of thing for private industry in South Australia is nonsense, and he knows that it is. He is merely trying to make a political point: he has no other motive.

Let us come closer to home, to the Leader's own district. The Labor Government obtained an industry to occupy the old grain distillery at Wallaroo—a wheat bagging industry operated by William Charlick Limited. We owned the premises at Wallaroo and the Labor Government, to get that industry, spent \$7,300 to rehabilitate the premises. That sum was not repayable by the company; it was a direct capital grant to enable the company to use the premises. The Government has exacted from the company the magnificent sum of \$5 a week—a peppercorn rental in order to provide employment in the Leader's district. Since he has represented it he has come along to get further assistance for it. He asked that tarpaulins owned by the Railways Department be used to cover bagged wheat prior to shipment, and we supplied the tarpaulins. Yet the Leader suggested that we should not assist private industry, alleging that it was a misuse of public funds.

What are the facts of the matter? If we are to get development in South Australia we may well have to use public money to stimulate that development. If that leads to more development, more diverse employment for South Australians, and additional growth in a vital industrial area, who is to say that we should not do it? The Leader suggests that some wrong is done in encouraging entrepreneurs to come here by some sort of Government subsidy. However, I point out that such encouragement is not new. I do not apologize for making an offer when we were negotiating for Lysaght's to some here. I offered that firm land at Port Adelaide for nothing and a 10-year holiday from wharfage dues. If by doing this I had been able to get this industry for South Australia, who would have said that I had done wrong? It was vitally important to South Australia to get

it, and we came very close to doing so. In the computer studies made by that firm there was only a narrow margin between the proposal for establishing at Westernport and the proposal for establishing the industry here, on the basis of the offer made. The Leader knows perfectly well that this is a proper and reasonable course that is followed constantly in neighbouring countries.

Mr. Clark: And in other States.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some State Governments give land free. The Leader said that since the Labor Government took office there had been no industrial development that was not originally negotiated by him when he was Premier. I am sorry that he has not read the newspapers. The Australian National Industries drop forge plant has been established here entirely as a result of this Government's negotiations and without any negotiations by the Leader. Only a couple of days ago Fletcher Jones announced that it would establish a factory in Mount Gambier. In negotiating for that factory we were competing against Portland, where the Victorian Government had wanted the factory to be established. In that State subsidies to country industries were far more generous than any that had ever been offered by the Leader's Government. I have a whole list of other areas in which we have had industrial expansion in South Australia since the Labor Government took office, but I will go through it at other times. In fact, we have had a constant and substantial development of industry in South Australia which will be built on by the stimulation of growth arising from the Government's proposals.

I now turn to the second matter that seemed to agitate the Leader: the projected expenditure this financial year of \$800,000 towards the development of a cultural complex on the banks of the Torrens River. I remind the Leader that, in the preparation of the plan for the development of that complex, there was a plan for a multi-purpose hall, and space was left in the plan for the future development of a performing arts complex; that was in the original intention of the plan. That followed the recommendations made by Mr. DeGaetani, who had reported to the State Government, as he was requested to do after we had been asked by the Lord Mayor's cultural committee to bring him to South Australia to report on the needs of performing arts facilities in the State.

In the Government's policy speech at the last election it was pointed out that we would

proceed to develop the performing arts facilities and that a home would be provided for the South Australian Theatre Company, which would become a statutory body. The Government has proceeded on this basis. We have plans, which will be announced before the Loan Estimates are disposed of so that members will be able to see them, for the development of performing arts facilities in the area. The estimates having been made, we are able at present to allocate moneys this year. As it will be necessary to introduce special legislation in relation to the matter, members will have an opportunity to discuss the matter in some detail then. The facilities will be established on Government-owned land and not on council-owned land, but the present discussions between the City Council and the Government relate to the administration of the whole complex, as the present multi-purpose hall is being established on council land, and it is desirable that there should be one administration for the whole of the facilities rather than two administrations.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you tell us this in your original statement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought that I had said sufficient to tell the honourable member what was needed. However, since he has questioned it, I am in the process of giving him a bit more information about it.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you tell us before?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what it is the honourable member always gets fussed about. If he asks a question and gets an answer he then says, "Why didn't you tell us before I asked the question?"

Mr. Millhouse: Perhaps you would have avoided some criticism if you had put this information in the original statement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Knowing the honourable member's manner of criticism, I hope he will pardon me if I doubt that. Nevertheless, if he believes I would save him some effort if I had done so, I apologize to him, but I am trying to help him now by giving further information.

Mr. Millhouse: You should apologize to the whole Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think the remainder of the Committee is quite as aerated as the honourable member seems to have become about this subject. I assure the honourable member that plans regarding these facilities will be available before the Committee

has completed its deliberations, and he will know the sort of thing we intend to establish. We have had an enormous amount of work done on this, because there have been difficulties about site development. The plain fact is that by establishing on this site, picturesque as it is, we have been faced with a number of extra costs, compared with what would have been the position on alternative sites, simply because of the difficulty of traffic arrangement around and related to the Adelaide railway station. That has been a very grievous problem. In fact, the original festival hall programme proved unworkable in relation to traffic arrangements and we had to make several alterations in traffic access to the hall in order to preserve the nature of the original concept. That has been the subject of long hours of work by working committees over the last 10 months. However, we have got the conclusions now and we are able to assign costs to the project, on the architects' advice. The architects have been commissioned to proceed with working drawings and specifications and, probably in the next day or so, we will be able to show the honourable member what is intended.

I think we can leave the matter of school buildings to the Minister of Education to deal with when the appropriate line is reached. I am certain that he will deal adequately with honourable members then and I am sure that they are waiting with eager anticipation to hear him. I think I have answered the gravamen of the criticism from honourable members opposite, and I think other matters can be dealt with in the debate on the lines.

First line—State Bank, \$3,065,000—passed.

Highways and Local Government, \$2,900,000.

Mr. BECKER: One of the major works to be undertaken on the Patawalonga Basin in connection with the south-western suburbs drainage scheme is the rebuilding of the King Street Bridge. While this work is being done, it will be necessary to re-route traffic over the Anderson Avenue bridge, which is of wooden construction and is a single-lane bridge, with a maximum carrying weight of 2 tons. I understand that the Highways Department condemned this bridge a few years ago. If the King Street bridge is proceeded with soon, people living at Glenelg North, on the Glenelg North esplanade, and on the Patawalonga frontage will be inconvenienced seriously, because they will have only a small bridge to drive over. The only other access to the area

would be via West Beach. In the event of a fire at Glenelg North, the fire brigade would have to travel from Glenelg to West Beach and back to Glenelg North. Can the Treasurer say whether work can be deferred until the bridge over the Patawalonga is constructed, so that people living in the area will have an opportunity to have emergency services available quickly at all times? Can he say what is happening with these works and whether they will proceed as planned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I am afraid that I do not have that detail available. However, I shall make inquiries and get a reply for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The south-western suburbs drainage scheme still has not helped one part of my district, namely, Colonel Light Gardens, which is subject to very bad flooding. Only about three weeks ago I drove one evening through the south-western corner of that part of Colonel Light Gardens in the Mitcham District and was almost washed away, and I know that this happens every time there is any significant amount of rain. The Treasurer's speech does not mention the drainage of that area, although it is within the scheme. Can he say when relief will be afforded to Colonel Light Gardens through the construction of drainage?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no time table in my head about that. However, I will get a report from the Minister and endeavour to provide the honourable member with some time table.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Treasurer will be aware that last year only \$50,000 was spent under the line "Public Parks" out of \$300,000 allocated. Does this reflect some different way of financing the purchase of parks under the existing scheme, or does it mean that the work in this area has been greatly reduced? I take it that the lack of any line this year means either that some different method of financing is involved or that the Government has greatly reduced its programme.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, there is a different method of financing. We are channelling moneys through the State Planning Authority in relation to metropolitan purchases. This year some moneys from the public parks funds will be made available to the authority, which purchases without the subsidy required from local government. In addition to this, additional Loan moneys will be provided to

the authority, which has been able to borrow \$300,000 a year, plus some revenue moneys coming from the special metropolitan land tax. The total result of this will be that within the metropolitan area, apart from other provisions for the acquisition of public parks out of revenue, we will be spending about \$1,200,000 on the acquisition of public open space.

Mr. McANANEY: Last year the Government budgeted to spend \$1,000,000 under the line "Roads and Bridges" but spent nothing. I notice that nothing is provided on that line this year. Can the Treasurer explain this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason is that we are providing the money out of the Highways Fund.

Mr. HALL: Does the Treasurer mean that the subsidy scheme for councils to purchase public parks is to be abandoned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Some money will be spent on the basis of subsidy for councils, but there are cases, particularly in the metropolitan planning area, where it is beyond the capacity of councils to find their share of the purchase price.

Mr. BECKER: The south-western suburbs drainage scheme was estimated to cost about \$3,000,000. The estimated total cost is now about \$11,000,000. Can the Treasurer assure the Committee that the total cost of this scheme will not exceed that sum?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. In such a scheme one cannot avoid escalating costs, which occur in many construction and building activities. Increases in wages and cost of materials cause the price to increase and, in this case, alterations were made to the scheme. Also, we have had to find a greater subsidy, because councils have not been able to go beyond a limited amount to support the scheme.

Mr. EVANS: I have always considered that exploratory work and tests should have been made before this drainage scheme was started. Does the Treasurer know of any tests or exploratory work carried out in relation to putting water down bores into the gravel beds in order to build up the underground water supply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know of no work of this kind but I think it would have many problems. However, I will ask the Engineer-in-Chief whether this aspect has been considered in the total survey that is being made of water resources.

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport received any complaints from either the Glenelg council or the West Torrens council concerning flooding in the Glenelg North and Novar Gardens areas as a result of work carried out on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme? It has been claimed that, since the Sturt River has been lined, local council drains are now below the level of the river.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I cannot readily recall any such complaints, although I think complaints have been made by the West Torrens council about its repayment percentage. Perhaps I can examine this matter and bring back further information on it for the honourable member.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Local Government say why the Government did not spend on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme and other urban drainage schemes all the money that was allocated for the purpose last year? Will he say why a delay has occurred, even though so much flood damage was caused last year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The storm at Glenelg to which I think the honourable member is referring had no bearing whatsoever on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme; it was an act of God. The south-western suburbs drainage scheme might be designed to relieve certain acts of God, but it cannot prevent them. I understand that it was hoped that more work would be carried out than, in fact, it was possible to carry out, but several factors were involved, not the least of them relating to weather conditions. I think the honourable member realizes that it is impossible to do the realignment and concreting work on the Sturt River when a large volume of floodwater is flowing down the river, this volume of water having a tremendous effect on the final result of the work done. Further, it is not always possible to obtain contractors for various work.

Mr. BECKER: The Government will contribute \$1,000,000 towards the south-western suburbs drainage scheme and is willing to pay \$1,240,000 for work to be carried out in the Patawalonga Basin, leaving a total of \$8,800,000 to be shared equally by the Government and the councils involved. In view of the financial difficulty that local government experiences from time to time, will the Government be in a position later to make a greater contribution to the scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have already increased our contribution. In fact, the proposal in the Loan Estimates is in accordance with the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act.

Dr. EASTICK: Is \$150,000 the total sum proposed for common effluent drainage for the State or are there other provisions under the department of the Minister of Works for common effluent drains or sewerage schemes necessary to combat pollution in the watersheds of the reservoirs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I can see, this is the only provision for common effluent drainage. Sewerage schemes would come under the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Line passed.

Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, \$2,790,000.

Mr. RODDA: I see that \$6,000 is to be spent on the Western Division and \$88,000 on the Eastern Division. For what is the \$88,000 expenditure in the Eastern Division?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no more specific information than that contained in the statement, but I will get details.

Mr. HALL: What is the basis for the considerable repayment of \$167,000 in connection with national reserves?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A gift of \$190,000 was made to the Government by the Australian Conservation Foundation for the purchase of reserves. Some of that money was spent in purchasing the Oraparinna reserve, near Wilpena Pound. The remainder of the gift will be spent on reserves this year.

Mr. EVANS: In connection with national reserves can the Minister for Conservation say whether some of the allocation will be used to acquire an area for a regional park near Cherry Gardens? Will that regional park be available for people to use as a recreation area, and will it be fenced to keep out vermin, such as foxes, which would destroy the native fauna? Will a firebreak be provided around the park so that neighbouring properties will be protected? Is the Government considering charging for admission to parks in order to help offset the cost of maintaining them?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Conservation): I will obtain a full report for the honourable member on some parts of his question. The Government is not contemplating charging for admission to national parks.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Treasurer say what is involved in the shifting of the headquarters of the South-Eastern Drainage Board from Beachport to Millicent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know offhand, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Woods and Forests, \$3,000,000.

Mr. EVANS: In connection with Hills properties made available by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to the Woods and Forests Department, can the Treasurer say whether the Woods and Forests Department intends to fence those properties to protect neighbouring properties from vermin, and will noxious weeds be kept down in forested areas on those properties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The department will keep down noxious weeds. They have some difficulty growing in open forest areas. I do not know of any proposals for fencing that the department has, but I will inquire of the Minister. I do not think the existing forest reserves in the Adelaide Hills are fenced, and I should not think there would be any change in policy.

Mr. RODDA: Recently landholders have expressed concern that the Woods and Forests Department is doing away with many fences, as it believes that rabbits no longer constitute a problem, as a result of the 1080 programme in the forest area. In the Comaum area landholders close to forest areas are concerned about the control of salvation jane. I have been told that pines are being felled on fences along the boundaries of forests.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will try to get information about this by the weekend.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Government has been offered some land in the Adelaide Hills. Is it expected that any land in the Hills will be acquired for afforestation purposes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I do not know of any proposal to acquire land in the Adelaide Hills for forestry purposes, I will check the matter with the Minister.

Mr. CARNIE: Under this line, the proposed payments are stated as \$3,000,000 and the estimated repayments are stated as \$3,000,000, leaving no proposed net payments. Is this \$3,000,000 provided by the Commonwealth Government under the softwoods forestry agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The total forestry undertaking is worked in South Australia under the Loan programme and is not part of the general Revenue Estimates. Consequently, these are repayments from the normal trading operations of the forestry undertaking.

Mr. McANANEY: Why is there an increase in estimated repayments from \$1,600,000 last year to \$3,000,000 this year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get the information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Railways, \$7,900,000.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to the provision of \$875,000 for special betterment of main lines. Is the line in question the main south line and, if it is, by how much is the capacity of traffic between the States expected to increase?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Most of the relaying is on the main south line, in continuation of the scheme commenced about two years ago after a comprehensive inquiry. The progress desired has not been made, because the Railways Department undertook a programme involving the obtaining of fairly sophisticated equipment compared with what the department had used previously. That equipment has now been obtained and the rate of upgrading will increase materially.

Mr. HALL: Although my Government accomplished many things, at times it was difficult to keep the trains on the rails on the south-eastern line and much investigation was needed before the problem was understood. Has the rehabilitation work done so far resulted in raising the speed limits on that line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The carriage of vehicles has been upgraded where the original track has been upgraded, but I regret that we have not done as much as we would like to have done. I hope that a vast improvement will be made this year, with the new equipment.

Dr. TONKIN: Will it be possible in 1971-72 to increase the traffic capacity as a result of this work?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, I do not think it will be possible as a result of this work. The centralized traffic control system will increase the capacity of the line, because porters at far-flung stations will not have to ride a bicycle up the track to turn switches and then ride back, as the member for Victoria has seen them doing.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understood that the gang now working between Keith and Tintinara

was to continue to the border. However, I now understand that it is to be transferred to Tailem Bend to upgrade the section from Tailem Bend to Murray Bridge. Can the Minister detail the plans for this gang, and can he say when it is intended to complete the balance of the section of the track from Keith to Serviceton?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have that information now, but I will obtain a programme of activity from the Railways Commissioner for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: The sum of \$262,000 has been allotted for new passenger vehicles. The Finnis sleeping car on the Blue Lake express has been upgraded, and I am sure many passengers are grateful for this improvement. However, I do not think that the present service will attract many tourists until further improvements are made, and I am sure that the Minister would be amazed at the increase in patronage if this could be done.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister obtain information on the progress being made on centralized train control, and can he say when it is expected that C.T.C. will control the complete operation from Murray Bridge to Serviceton? As I think \$70,000 is to be spent on providing refreshment facilities on diesel railcars, can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether it means that additional refreshment cars will be provided?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The intention here is to provide on the existing Bluebirds a small area that will be used as a refreshment area.

Mr. Nankivell: Will this cut out the refreshment rooms at Murray Bridge, for instance?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should like to think that it would cut out Murray Bridge, Naracoorte, Wolseley and Bowmans; but, obviously, the facilities at those places cannot be discontinued until we are sure that there are sufficient cars with refreshment facilities. Existing cars will be converted to provide this sort of service.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether, under "New residences", any of the temporary prefabricated residences at Tailem Bend will be replaced?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have details of the programme with me, although under the programme some new houses and replacements will be provided. As I do not have details of location and numbers, I will obtain the information and let the honourable member know.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say on what type of new freight vehicles the \$1,775,000 will be spent? I understand that much less wheat will now be carried on the railways because of cheaper methods of transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain that information.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$3,935,000.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Marine, ask the Marine and Harbors Department to consider deferring or reallocating its works programme at Thevenard so as not to interfere with the shipping programme of the Australian Barley Board and the Australian Wheat Board in regard to the coming harvest? The Treasurer will be aware of the importance to this State of the export earnings derived from this source. However, poor organization by the department will interfere with the shipping programme and, because of the early season in that part of the State, growers are concerned about the matter. This is the first opportunity they have had to ship barley through Thevenard, and it is hoped that they will be able to obtain early shipments, as there is only limited barley storage at Thevenard. The department's announcement that the port will be closed down between mid-November and mid-December has caused growers much concern. Will the Treasurer examine this matter and see whether something can be done?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that the honourable member has already taken up this matter with the Minister of Marine, who will certainly see what can be done about it.

Mr. GUNN: I have asked questions of the Minister but unfortunately the replies have been unsatisfactory and have not referred to the problem I have raised.

Mr. CARNIE: I note that \$450,000 is the allocation for a bulk loading installation at Port Lincoln. Work on the Port Lincoln harbour, when completed over a period of three years, will cost \$7,050,000. That leaves a total of \$6,600,000 for the remaining two years. I realize that initial work often does not cost much money but occupies a great deal of time. Can the Treasurer indicate when the remaining \$6,600,000 will be allocated for this project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Funds will be provided to ensure that the work is done

according to schedule. I expect that the actual payments will be made over a period of about four full financial years. As things stand, we expect that the schedule for completion of the work at Port Lincoln will be adhered to. We have been planning harbour accommodation works on the basis that that will be so and that we shall be able to move on to additional major harbour installations immediately thereafter. Consequently, I think the honourable member will find there will be no difficulty about the allocation of funds to complete this project.

Mr. GUNN: I note that the estimated payments for fishing havens and foreshore improvements amount to \$225,000. Can the Treasurer say how the priorities for this line are determined? The District Council of Elliston and I have made representations to see whether some improvements can be provided at Elliston for the abalone fishing and the general fishing industry in that area. How are the priorities allocated? Is this project included in this allocation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot tell the honourable member whether that project has been included. The allocation of priorities rests upon the nature and length of the case put to the Marine and Harbors Department and the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department. Fishing havens and foreshore improvements are the concern of the Marine and Harbours Department, but at the same time the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department makes representations about the expenditure of money in the area and it recommends the priorities to the Marine and Harbours Department. Consequently, the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department looks at the priorities, demands and needs of the professional fishing interests in various areas of the State and also, I imagine, takes into account the duration of applications for something to be done in a particular area. We are still lacking in fishing facilities of this kind, but we have endeavoured to increase the moneys available in the area to provide for more.

Mr. GUNN: The District Council of Elliston and I are concerned about the abalone fishing, which is a lucrative export earner. Per capita, that industry probably brings in more money than any other in the State. The council is concerned that this industry should be able to advance and develop. At present there are difficulties at Elliston because it is a difficult place from which to launch a boat.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Treasurer say whether any sum has been set aside for making good the damage caused on the foreshore of our beaches during the severe storms?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I wish to raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The item "Foreshore Protection" comes under the line "Other Capital Advances and Provisions": it does not come under the line now before the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can get the information when the appropriate line is being discussed.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Treasurer say what sort of fishing boat pier will be provided at Port Lincoln and where it will be situated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get the information.

Mr. HALL: There seems to be an inordinate delay in connection with the report of the committee investigating a site for a new port on Yorke Peninsula. The Treasurer and other members will recall the controversy that has surrounded the choice of new "super" ports in South Australia. It was decided to upgrade the port at Port Lincoln, but it is necessary to provide a second port. The committee is considering Wallaroo, Ardrossan and other alternatives. When he visited Wallaroo, the Minister of Agriculture spoke about the standard gauge railway line that would be provided from the main line to Wallaroo. It is important that we should know where bulk handling and loading facilities will be needed. Consequently, it is urgent that the Government should make up its mind. The loading and storage facilities already at Wallaroo represent a large capital investment, and a large section of the rural community desires that the new port be at Wallaroo. On the other hand, the depth of water and protection for ships are important factors in the siting of a new port. In all these matters we are reliant on the report of the investigating committee and on the ability of the Government to face up to its responsibility and make a decision. Therefore, can the Treasurer say what stage has been reached in preparing this report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because the report was made to his Government, the Leader would know the difficulties facing development at the present berth at Wallaroo. In fact, all the reports of soundings, of investigation of the structures and of the necessary dredging had been made some time before he

left office and, other than in a general report, have not not been discussed with the people at Wallaroo. When the present Government took office, I had the matter examined. The fact is that it would be easier to establish port facilities at Ardrossan than at Wallaroo. At the same time, that would mean that there would have to be a shift in installations and a social dislocation that the Government does not intend to support. We believe that if anything can be done to establish the next major port at Wallaroo that is a far preferable course. After examining the reports of the investigating committee, the department suggested to the Government that a site at Wallaroo other than the present berth might well give the necessary facilities for the development of the port, and that is now being investigated in order to see whether we can ensure that Wallaroo becomes the next major port. If that can be done, that is where we would proceed, because generally from the shipping and social points of view and from the point of view of the rail link that would be of greater advantage to the State. As yet, that report is not to hand.

Mr. VENNING: In the absence of the Treasurer, the Minister of Works said that he expected that the report would be available before the end of the month. If the report favours Wallaroo, does the Government intend to spend any money on that port before facilities at Port Lincoln are completed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that another proposition is also being investigated in relation to Wallaroo, and that is that some dredging be done to improve the depth of water available at the existing berth. However, this would not upgrade Wallaroo to the port for major grain ships that was forecast by the Marine and Harbors Department; nevertheless it would satisfactorily improve the port facility in the short term. It might well be that we would be spending such money that at this moment cannot be stated definitely. However, if the expenditure is to be on providing a second major port for ships of the size that it is expected will come to South Australia for our grain trade in the next 10 to 25 years, we would not be spending the money at Wallaroo until the Port Lincoln facility was completed.

Mr. HALL: A sum of \$50,000 is provided for a new jetty at Wallaroo. This is to assist the fishing industry and there has been much discussion about whether the old jetty should be repaired, the cost of the repairs, and the site of a new jetty in relation to the existing wharf. I would appreciate a report from the

Treasurer on the planning, any decisions made on the siting, and what can be done from this allocation of \$50,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: Oversea container facilities are required urgently at Port Adelaide. During the last 12 months roll-on-roll-off facilities and provision for interstate containers were made available. A large quantity of rural produce grown in my district cannot be sold to waiting oversea markets because we cannot compete with traders in other States who do not have difficulty about getting shipping. We are prevented from competing and the rural sector is denied the opportunity of selling its produce, particularly peas, oats and chaff, on the best markets. The Treasurer knows that we are also losing wharfage charges because these exports are not being made through South Australian ports. Is urgent consideration being given to the provision of oversea containerization facilities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is under constant review.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$33,350,000.

Mr. HALL: The allocation under this line is \$270,000 more than the allocation last year and is about \$2,000,000 more than actual expenditure last year. I take it that the estimated repayment of \$5,600,000 is the reimbursement by the Commonwealth Government for work on the Tailem Bend to Keith main. I refer to the allocation of \$500,000 for Murray River weirs, dams, locks, etc. That is described briefly in the Financial Statement as provision for a State contribution of \$500,000 towards the cost of capital works being undertaken in terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement. As there are four partners to that agreement, it seems that a reasonable amount of work will be carried out somewhere, involving about \$2,000,000 for the year. This raises the matter of the Dartmouth dam and the impasse we seem to have reached over the ratification of the agreement and the construction of the dam. We have waited for some Government initiative that would mean it would accept the proposal, but so far we have had only a partial ratification of the agreement, and there has been no major response from the other partners, because they do not recognize the Bill that passed this House as a ratification of the Dartmouth agreement.

This year is a favourable year in this State, as we have had plenty of rainfall and our reservoirs are almost full. However, there will be some form of drought in the future not only in this State but also in the catchment areas of the Murray River, and at that stage members will know whether they have been in time in ratifying one of the most essential agreements that have been negotiated on behalf of this State. The Government has desired to obtain some political advantage because of its attitude to this question; it has refused to admit the situation is as it is, and has refused to ratify the original agreement. No doubt it has tried to obtain some alteration to the wording of the agreement to save its face in relation to the promise the Treasurer so recklessly made, as Leader of the Opposition, in that he would renegotiate the Dartmouth agreement. I believe he told a group of people in the Murray River area that he could renegotiate because he was a Queen's Counsel and had the facility to do so.

However, the situation has now moved to a more dangerous stage. A proposal was made in the *Financial Review* that the Dartmouth dam need not be built, as water would no longer be needed in the quantities that were planned earlier from the Blowering dam because agriculture and horticulture in the river areas in other States would not need the suggested quantity of water, so that we could obtain the water that would otherwise have been used from the Blowering dam. Opposition members would not agree to such a proposal, but since then there have been further references to this matter. It has been said that South Australia could more economically obtain the water it needs by purchasing water rights from the various landholders concerned. This would seem to me to be a rather far-fetched proposal, but it illustrates the point I made some time ago that, if we continue to delay, those concerned in the other States will apply themselves to matters other than those relating to our needs and will consider alternatives to the Dartmouth dam or any other dam that may be involved.

As people in Australia are reading more and more that the Dartmouth dam may not be needed, the situation in South Australia is becoming far more dangerous, and this is no way in which to gain the support of Governments in other States for proposals that will largely benefit us. Governments must obtain the support of the electors they represent, especially concerning large schemes of this nature. I am concerned that this Government

is delaying the Dartmouth agreement, thereby encouraging opposition to the dam (not opposition of a legal nature in relation to the agreement but opposition to the whole scheme). The longer we delay, the less chance we shall have of obtaining this facility for South Australia. Need I remind members that the cost of the dam may well have escalated beyond the financial proposals already negotiated. Time is obviously running out for South Australia. During the Treasurer's absence overseas, the Deputy Premier said that certain replies had been received from one of the other parties to the agreement. I urge the Government to hasten its consideration of this matter, to put the State before politics, to understand that South Australia needs the construction of the Dartmouth dam, and to understand also that further delay may lose the very facility that is essential for our progress.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For the water supply project for the town of Cambrai, \$47,000 is to be spent. In past months, this scheme has been bedevilled by a problem that is inherent in most country water schemes where

a township is being supplied (in this case by an extension of the main from Sedan) and also where rural properties along the extension are rated. I believe that that applies to this scheme. I was a little surprised to see that the scheme had reached this stage, because I know that primary producers in the Sedan-Cambrai area are having considerable difficulty, as indeed are rural producers elsewhere. I know that those people who would be affected by the scheme are in no position to pay water rates. However, I also know that the scheme is highly desirable for the township itself.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain the details for the honourable member.

Mr. ALLEN: Under "Country waterworks" \$45,000 is provided regarding Hansborough; will the Treasurer ascertain what is the nature of the work to be carried out there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 12, at 2 p.m.