

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 29, 1972

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

PETITION: PORT KENNY POLICE

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 54 persons stating that the closing of the Port Kenny police station had caused Port Kenny to become unreasonably isolated from the services of the Police Department, and praying that the House of Assembly urge the Government to take action to reopen this police station.

Petition received and read.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PORT ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement. Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has received a report of the special committee appointed to investigate the proposed Queenstown shopping centre in the city of Port Adelaide and the effect of the antipathies in the Port Adelaide council area. I hereby table a copy of the report. I point out to honourable members that the recommendations of the committee are, first, that it should be pointed out to the Port Adelaide council that, in the Government's view, the proposal of Myer S.A. Stores Limited for a shopping centre at Queenstown is considered contrary to the Metropolitan Development Plan, that the site should be developed primarily for residential purposes, and that it would be in the longer term interest of Port Adelaide and the metropolitan area that the Port Adelaide plaza project be encouraged as a nucleus of major redevelopment of the existing Port Adelaide centre. Secondly, the report recommends that discussions be held with the Myer organization with a view to encouraging it either to participate in redevelopment of the Port Adelaide centre or to participate with the West Lakes organization in the proposed West Lakes centre. Thirdly, the report recommends that the West Lakes organization be asked to review carefully the scale of its proposed West Lakes centre. The Government is concerned that the redevelopment of the Port Adelaide centre should be given every encouragement, and is anxious that the proposed West Lakes centre should not operate to the detriment of the Port Adelaide centre. I point out to honourable members that the 1962 plan provided for the development of the Port Adelaide shopping

centre as a major regional shopping centre. Fourthly, the committee recommends that the objective of Port Adelaide Plaza Proprietary Limited to pursue redevelopment of the Port Adelaide centre be encouraged in co-operation with the Port Adelaide council and other authorities, but that their attention be drawn to the need for major revisions to the proposals submitted.

The report gives background information and the history of the whole of this matter, which arose largely from the fact that a proposal came forward from the Myer organization for development at Queenstown in contravention of the provisions in the 1962 plan and the Port Adelaide zoning regulations (as prepared by the Port Adelaide council, submitted without objection to the State Planning Authority, and now gazetted), and without the provision of a supplementary development plan subject to public objection and submission as is required by the Planning and Development Act for any major alteration to the 1962 plan or the land use regulations under it. The findings of the committee make clear that it is not possible to proceed by an approval under interim development control, which is designed to hold existing planning provisions largely as they are until either land use regulations are adopted or a supplementary development plan and consequent land use regulations are adopted. Under these proposals it is not possible or appropriate to have a complete departure from the provisions of the previously existing plan, without a supplementary development plan and proper public participation in the making of it. The Government has communicated the effect of the committee's report to the Myer company and to the West Lakes organization and has indicated that, since both of them are adversely affected by the recommendations in the report, it requests them to meet with the Government and the Port Adelaide and Woodville councils in an endeavour to see whether, given the present difficulties faced in planning provision developments in that area, a mutually agreed solution can be arrived at.

The Government has also indicated that, if a mutually agreed solution can be reached, it would be willing to participate directly in redevelopment proposals in the area, to avoid loss to the people concerned and to ensure that the matter can be resolved, in accordance with the mutual agreement, by introducing special legislation into this House to give effect to it, because the procedure at this stage, in accordance with the normal planning

provisions and as investment has taken place to such a degree, would mean many difficulties and delays. Since development of a major shopping centre within the area is desirable, the Government has indicated that it will co-operate, provided all parties affected by the recommendations in the report can agree on a satisfactory solution in the area.

Mr. Millhouse: And if not?

Mr. Coumbe: Who were the members of the committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speechley, Deputy State Planner with the State Planning Office, was Chairman, and the members were Mr. Beverley, of the Highways Department, Mr. Bowering, of the Crown Law Department, Mr. Hockridge, of the Department of the Minister of Local Government, and Mr. Holliday, of the Department of the Premier and of Development, who is the officer of that department specifically appointed to work with the West Lakes project. I point out to the honourable member that the recommendations of the committee adversely affect some of the proposals in relation to the West Lakes project.

Mr. Millhouse: And if there is no agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend at this stage to go into these hypotheses. I hope that there will be agreement but, if the honourable member does not want there to be agreement, he will take that course.

QUESTIONS

PORT ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Government will give a representative or representatives of the Opposition the opportunity to participate in the discussions that will flow from his announcement about the Queenstown shopping centre? All members will appreciate that as yet we have had no opportunity to read the report that has been tabled, and we have had no assurance from the Premier, in the statement that he has made, that the Government has accepted the committee's recommendations. However, he has stated that there will be a meeting of the people involved, and, as he is likely in due course to ask this House to consider legislation that will flow from that matter, I seek his assurance that the opportunity will be given to members of the Opposition or to a member of the Opposition to participate in the discussions that take place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I give no such assurance. I cannot involve members

of the Opposition in discussions with the parties concerned about solutions that will involve confidential negotiations.

Dr. Eastick: You'll want our concurrence here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite will have the opportunity to give that concurrence, because, if a solution is reached and legislation is introduced in this House, the measure will be a hybrid Bill, and a Select Committee, upon which members of the Opposition will sit, will take the necessary evidence. That is the normal course of proceedings, and what the Leader suggests is unheard of. It has never happened, under any Liberal Government in this State, that in negotiations for development—

Dr. Eastick: It could be a trail-blazer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be interesting to know whether, when the former Government revised the West Lakes project indenture (and the present Deputy Leader and various other Opposition members were then involved), the Leader, if he was Premier, would have invited me or someone else to take part in discussions with the West Lakes people. I can imagine the kind of reply that the then Leader of the Government would have given to me if I suggested that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Government worked out any course of action to be implemented if it cannot get the parties to agree to a compromise and, if so, what is it? As I understood the statement made by the Premier when tabling the report of the committee, the only plans which the Government has depend on agreement between West Lakes, Myers, the Port Adelaide council, and the Government itself.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And the Woodville council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, yet another party. In the nature of things, as the Premier will appreciate, it may be extremely difficult to get agreement between those parties in the complex situation that has arisen, and negotiations are likely to fail, unless the Government intends to use some coercion, which I hope it does not. It is therefore likely that the plans to which the Premier has referred will come to nothing, because there will be no agreement and, as then it will be necessary for action to be taken, I ask the Premier what action the Government has in mind.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to go into a whole series of hypotheses about the future. The position from the outset of this matter has been made perfectly

clear both to Myers and to the Port Adelaide City Council, that is, that the normal planning process should proceed. The Government will not play favourites; it will not take sides; it will act in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act. What has happened in this matter is that the 1962 development plan was accepted by this House and voted for by the honourable member. The 1967 Planning and Development Act provided that that was the accepted plan for the Adelaide metropolitan development area, that land use regulations could be made in relation to the carrying out of that plan, and that the plan could be amended by the promulgation of supplementary development plans which then had to be published and be subject to public objection, the scrutiny of those public objections, the reporting of them by the State Planning Authority to the Government, and subject also to subsequent consideration by this House. In the interim, where it was requested by a local council, and where land use regulations had not yet come into force for the provision of the 1962 development plan, or where there had been no supplementary development plan and consequent land use regulations, interim development control could be applied for, the purpose of interim development control being to hold development and to prohibit changes in use of property within the area until the land use regulations or a supplementary development plan and the land use regulations giving effect to those had been adopted.

The situation was that, in Port Adelaide, land use regulations in accordance with the 1962 plan were adopted by the council and forwarded to the State Planning Authority without objection. The State Planning Authority examined them and was at the stage of reporting to Government on the adoption of those land use regulations. The council had obtained section 41 interim development control, under which there is provision for the approval or consent of the council to a departure from existing uses. Members will know full well that the purpose of that consent to departure from existing use prior to the adoption of land use regulations was only for minor amendments in regard to use and not for a significant departure from a publicly approved plan.

What happened in the Port Adelaide City Council area was that, while land use regulations for the 1962 plan were before the authority and reported on by the authority to the Government that they should be accepted,

there was an application to the Port Adelaide City Council by Myers for consent to departure from existing use in relation to the Queenstown area, and this was completely contrary to the 1962 development plan and to the Port Adelaide City Council's only land use regulations recommended to the State Planning Authority and recommended by the authority to the Government. The proposal for consent was obviously a means of avoiding the proper planning process. From the outset the Government, having been told of the Myer proposal to develop Queenstown, said that it would not play favourites between the competing retailers and that the way the matter should proceed was according to the law and the proper planning processes. When it was discovered that there was a proposal to use section 41 as a back-door method of avoiding the proper planning process (the publication of a supplementary development plan which amended the 1962 plan, giving the right to citizens to object and have those objections considered and giving this House a chance to consider them, as is required in respect of every supplementary development plan) the Government simply gazetted the regulations recommended by the State Planning Authority. That was the position.

If Myers wants to proceed at Queenstown it must have a supplementary development plan and that plan would be subjected to public objection after the proper publication. There would have to be time for objection, and then there would be a report of the State Planning Authority, the recommendation of the Government, and the consideration of this House if that report were accepted. If there is no agreement and if the Myer organization wishes to proceed, that is the way in which it can proceed, and that course is open to it in the law. What the Government has offered to Myers is that, if Myers can come to some arrangement that is likely to conserve its position for the future, avoid loss and produce development within the area, in those circumstances the Government, with the consent of all parties affected, could recommend special legislation to this House to avoid the delays and difficulties that would now be occasioned by the fact that Myers at the outset did not seek a supplementary development plan, nor did the Port Adelaide City Council.

Mr. Millhouse: It does not sound much like compromise to me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously, for all his talk about

concern for the law, does not want the law to be observed in this case.

Mr. Millhouse: That is absolutely ridiculous.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The process is open and it is a process which the honourable member voted for in this House.

Mr. Millhouse: So did we all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All right. Then in that case the alternative is not for the Government to think up something else. Anyone in South Australia can proceed in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, and what the Government has done is to offer to expedite matters if a compromise can be achieved through the agreement of all parties. If a compromise is not achieved, the remedies are in the law passed by this House and voted for by the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Last Saturday I saw the site of the proposed development: it covers a large area and most of the houses have already been bought and demolished. Can the Premier say what recommendations have been made in the report (apart from the negotiations between Myers and the West Lake organization) about agreement or compromise? This is not meant to be a hypothetical question, because the problem arises that, if agreement is reached on a proposal to, say, build at West Beach, a large area of vacant land will be left in the Port Adelaide council area. Does the report make any recommendation on the use of this land? If not, what is to happen in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report recommends that the land be used for residential redevelopment, in accordance with the provisions of the 1962 plan. The Government has indicated that, if a compromise can be reached that encompasses a solution of that kind, it will be willing to co-operate in a residential development on that site, and we will try to make arrangements that will avoid loss to Myers arising from its previous acquisition and demolitions.

Mr. Coumbe: Put the houses back again!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Possibly we could do something better than put back the kind of houses that were there before: we might be able to do something worth while.

Mr. Mathwin: Not another pimple?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, and not a carbuncle, either.

SHARK SALES

Mr. RYAN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say

whether a report has been made to the Government by the Minister of Agriculture as a result of his visit to Melbourne and his discussions with the Victorian Government on the ban imposed by the Victorian Government on the sale of South Australian flake in Victoria? The Port Adelaide Professional Fishermen's Association, which is greatly concerned about the effect of this ban on the export of flake to Victoria, has asked me to inquire into what took place at the Melbourne conference, whether a report has been made, and what the outcome of this matter is likely to be.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I indicated last week, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Casey) went to Victoria and met with the Victorian Premier, who is the Minister responsible for fisheries in that State. My colleague reported to Cabinet yesterday that, as a result of his discussions in Melbourne, a meeting is being sought between the Commonwealth and State Ministers of Health to see whether the level of mercury allowed by legislation, which is currently 0.5 parts per million cannot be increased to 1 p.p.m. There is some confusion about the standard required by the Commonwealth Government and the standard set down internationally. Because of this confusion, efforts are being made to arrange the meeting to which I have referred. The honourable member in asking his question said that the sale of South Australian flake had been banned but, of course, the ban affects not only South Australian flake but also flake from the other States as well as flake from New Zealand. However, flake is not banned entirely and it must be realized that only school shark over a certain size is affected by the ban. The Victorian Government was forced to impose the restriction on the sale of this fish simply because the level of 0.5 p.p.m. is stipulated in the regulations covering that matter.

Mr. Coumbe: They are old regulations.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, but the Government had no course but to introduce this ban in order to comply with the law preventing the sale of fish containing mercury in excess of the level stipulated. The Victorian Government is also concerned about the effect that the restriction has had on the sale of fish in Victoria generally, because it appears that large quantities of fish are stored in cold stores but that the buying public is not purchasing fish of any kind to any great extent at this time. The Victorian Government hopes that the situation will be resolved so that normal sales can be resumed as quickly as possible. I will refer the honourable member's

question to my colleague to see whether I have missed any point of the report he gave to Cabinet and, if necessary, I will bring down a further report for him.

MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government intends to open a branch of the Motor Vehicles Department in the Riverland district? I have been told that a request for such a branch office has been made by one local government authority in the area. As the branch office that has been opened at Mount Gambier recently has proved so successful in providing an efficient service in the South-East, there is very good reason why branch offices should be established in other major country centres.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government intends to open a branch office in the Riverland area. Subject to our being able to acquire suitable facilities, I expect that the office will be located in Berri, this being the most central point for the Riverland area in view of the number of vehicles that are located within a 25-mile radius. That is the basis used to determine the viability of opening a branch office. The branch office that was opened at Mount Gambier several weeks ago has been a tremendous success. I expect that a branch office will be opened soon in Whyalla and, following that opening, the next two branch offices will be established at Berri and Port Pirie, in that order.

Mr. CARNIE: What criteria are used to decide where a branch office of the Motor Vehicles Department is to be established? In his reply to the member for Chaffey, the Minister said that an office had been set up at Mount Gambier and that it was planned to open shortly an office at Whyalla, with the next two offices being at Berri and Port Pirie. Naturally I am disappointed that Port Lincoln is not on this list, as I believe it should qualify not only on the basis of its population but also on the basis of its distance from Adelaide. I ask what criteria are used in this connection, because I believe distance from the metropolitan area should be considered. Because of the area it serves, I ask whether Port Lincoln cannot be given higher priority.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The geographic location of a city or town is considered when we are deciding where to open these offices. However, this is not the major criterion: the

major criterion is the amount of business that it is expected that an office will conduct. Figures supplied to me show that 7,160 local vehicles are registered within a 25-mile radius of Port Lincoln. The 25-mile radius is applied when we consider how many registrations will be involved, as we believe that people within this area will probably commute to the centre. In the case of Port Lincoln, it is accepted that, because of the isolation of the area and the rather unique geographical layout of the peninsula, more than an area within a 25-mile radius could be involved. However, with 7,160 vehicle registrations in the area, it is expected that only about 24,900 transactions will result. This number is far fewer than the estimated number for Berri, where it is expected that there would be 54,500 transactions annually. It is a matter of approaching this from the point of view, first, of serving the area where the greatest amount of business will be transacted, because the cost involved in establishing the centres is an added burden on the State. Perhaps one could say it was a burden on the motorist through taxation, because that is where the money comes from. We expect that, with the establishment of the major centres, there will be some relief in the operations at the Motor Vehicles Department head office and also that some saving, although it will be small, will result. In other words, the establishment of branch offices will not automatically mean the saving, in head office, of an amount equal to the cost of establishing those branches; we expect that the saving will be a proportion of that cost. I think that, after establishing the branches to which I have referred, we will be able to consider establishing offices in such places as Port Lincoln and Murray Bridge. If our friend the member for Kavel was in the Chamber, he would be interested to know that we might also consider establishing an office in Nuriootpa.

LICENSING ACT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 22 about licence fees to be imposed under the Licensing Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The gross amount of purchases upon which licence fees are calculated for the purposes of the Licensing Act includes not only the wine tax but also all other imposts levied by the Commonwealth Government. This procedure is common to all States. Were this Government to exclude

Commonwealth liquor taxation for the purposes of fixing a base upon which to calculate our licensing fees, it would be necessary, in order to maintain revenues and comparability with other States, to increase the rates to some figure higher than 6 per cent, and this the Government does not intend to do at this time.

DRINKING DRIVERS

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation this session to deal with the drinking-driver problem and, if it does, will the legislation provide for random breath tests to be taken by police officers outside hotels? During last session of Parliament, the Minister introduced legislation which, among other things, provided for the taking of alcoltests and blood samples. That Bill lapsed with the prorogation of Parliament. Recently, an article appearing in the *Sunday Mail* advocated that the police should have power to conduct random breathalyser tests outside hotels. As some people to whom I have spoken believe this view was expressed by the Minister, I should be grateful if he would clarify the Government's intention.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me that he would ask this question, I have prepared a statement on this matter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Very thoughtful of him!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought it was. If the honourable member informs me of his questions in advance in future, I shall prepare statements for him, too. Since the article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on August 12, there has been confusion, and I am grateful for the opportunity of stating clearly the Government's position on this very important subject. At the outset, I make it quite plain that the Government does not intend to extend existing legislation to provide for random breath tests outside hotels or, for that matter, anywhere else.

The newspaper article to which the honourable member has referred did carry the quotation "Personally, I favour random alcoltests outside hotels", but this statement was attributed to Police Traffic Chief Inspector Laslett. I do not know whether he was reported correctly, but, if he was, these were his views and are not shared by the Government or me. The article also stated that the Leader of the Opposition called for random breathalyser tests, stiffer fines, and longer gaol

sentences for drunken driving offences. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition was reported correctly, but, if he was, I assure the House that the Government does not share his views.

I point out that the Road Traffic Act contains sections designed to deal with the drinking-driver problem and, by virtue of these sections, 1,522 drivers lost their licences by court order in the first six months of this year. This point was, of course, the basis of my press statement. For those people, like the Leader of the Opposition, who advocate random breath tests, I draw their attention particularly to section 47e of the Road Traffic Act. This section provides that a member of the Police Force who believes, on reasonable grounds, that a person has been, at any time during the last two preceding hours, driving or attempting to put in motion, a motor vehicle, and has behaved while driving or attempting to put in motion that motor vehicle in a manner which indicates that his ability to drive the motor vehicle is impaired, may require that person to submit to a breath test.

This section was enacted by the Labor Government in 1967, and the present Government does not intend to further amend it, as we believe the section caters adequately for this part of the problem. However, there is an aspect that the Government acknowledges is not adequately catered for, and it was for this reason that in the last session I introduced an amending Bill. Although it lapsed with the prorogation of Parliament, I hope to introduce this session another Bill, which I expect will be in similar terms to the Bill of last session. The principal point of this Bill will be to provide for the taking of blood samples from drivers who are involved in accidents and who are admitted or treated at a hospital.

I am having the details of this legislation examined by a committee consisting of Mr. Donald Beard (representing the Road Traffic Accident Committee of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons); Mr. D. A. Simpson, Dr. P. R. Hodge, and Dr. R. Hecker (representing the Australian Medical Association Incorporated); Superintendent J. B. Giles (Police Department); Mr. L. K. Gordon (Crown Solicitor); Mr. John Perry (representing the Law Society); and Mr. M. C. Johnson (Secretary of my department). I expect that the committee will be reporting to me in a few weeks. After the report has been considered by Cabinet, I expect that an amending Bill will be introduced this session.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. WELLS: In view of the recent heavy rainfall throughout the State, can the Minister of Works say what are the current holdings in metropolitan reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As always on Tuesdays, I bring with me the most up-to-date information I have on the holdings in metropolitan reservoirs, and at present they are as follows:

Supply	Capacity m.g.	Storage present m.g.
Mount Bold	10,440	9,267.5
Happy Valley	2,804	2,215.0
Clarendon Weir	72	69.6
Myponga	5,905	5,274.7
Millbrook	3,647	2,202.8
Kangaroo Creek	5,370	2,723.1
Hope Valley	765	606.0
Thorndon Park	142	127.2
Barossa	993	896.3
South Para	11,300	8,108.7

Therefore, of a total capacity of 41,438,000,000 gall., the present storage is 31,490,900,000gall., compared to a storage at this time last year of 41,282,600,000gall. The honourable member will see that, although the present total is 10,000,000,000gall. below the holding at this time last year, we are still in a very healthy position. Although probably more pumping will be required this year than was required last year, the amount required will certainly be below what is normally required.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of August 8 about the appointing of officers to take care of national parks in the South-East?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: While there are some reserves within 30 miles of Penola, including the Penola Conservation Park (559 acres), Calectasia Conservation Park (34 acres), Glen Roy Conservation Park (1,336 acres), and Big Heath Conservation Park (5,809 acres), as well as Naracoorte Caves and Bool Lagoon Game Reserve, the latter two areas are the only manned reserves in the vicinity of Penola. There are no plans at the moment to station a ranger at Penola and, with the very much greater areas demanding attention elsewhere, it is doubtful whether it would be possible in the foreseeable future to consider such an appointment.

PARKSIDE LAND

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question

about the purchase of land on the south-east corner of the intersection of Greenhill Road and Unley Road to enable a slip lane to be provided?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department has completed acquisition of the property at 146 Greenhill Road, Parkside, previously owned by J. M. Foley Proprietary Limited, to enable the provision of a left slip lane from Greenhill Road into Unley Road.

OATS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about the operation of a statutory oat-marketing authority?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that it is intended that the oat-marketing legislation will be brought into operation in time for the next session, and it is expected that the board will be constituted towards the end of the present calendar year.

WHYALLA DISPUTE

Mr. BROWN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about an industrial dispute at Whyalla?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This dispute, which lasted about 12 days, occurred in relation to lighting arrangements in the tanks of the carrier *Clutha Capricorn*. The strikers have agreed to return to work today, but a full settlement may well centre around the fact that 400 boilermakers have been stood down for some time as a result of the dispute about the tank lighting; a full settlement may involve the return to work of these 400 employees. As I pointed out last week, this dispute concerns the Commonwealth Government. I understand that a Commonwealth judge (Mr. Justice Aird) will fly to Whyalla today to have discussions with the parties concerned and to inspect the ship's tanks. As a result of his visit, it is to be hoped that a satisfactory agreement can be reached.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the extension of sewerage facilities to an area at Highbury, including Paradise Grove?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although a few more houses have been built, or are under construction, the main problem of sewerage Paradise Grove and Paradise Close remains, in that the land to the west is still unsubdivided, and either long approach sewers or a temporary pumping station and rising

main would be required. Either means of disposal for the area would be very expensive for the small number of houses involved. As the Loan funds and resources of the department are fully committed for 1972-73, it is intended to defer further investigations into this area for about 12 months, by which time there may be developments which could make a sewerage scheme more feasible.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The provision of a four-teacher open unit at the Morphetville Park Primary School is set down in the design programme. However, the building programme is so heavily committed at the present time that no definite date of completion can be given. When the position for 1973-74 is reviewed soon, a clearer assessment can be made.

WHYALLA ROAD

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether rebuilding work on Highway No. 1 north of Adelaide includes provision for the future widening of the highway to carry four lanes of traffic? If provision for this has been made, will the Minister say whether four lanes will be provided as far as Whyalla? Traffic density and road safety inevitably will make essential the provision of a four-lane highway to Whyalla, and I should be pleased to know whether the Highways Department is rebuilding Highway No. 1 with this in mind.

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

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister say when it is expected that work on the Port Augusta to Port Pirie section of Highway No. 1 and on the Port Augusta to Whyalla section of Highway No. 1 and of the Lincoln Highway will be included in the roadworks programme? I realize that, work on the Port Augusta to Lincoln Gap section of Highway No. 1 already having been approved, it will commence shortly. However, the rest of the roads to which I have referred include some of the most accident-prone stretches of road in South Australia. Although I do not necessarily suggest that the condition of the roads is the only reason for accidents, certainly areas such as the Mambrey Creek crossing would contribute to the

high and disastrous toll of accidents that occurs between Port Pirie and Whyalla. I shall be pleased if the Minister can say when work on these sections of road will commence.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will inquire.

METER CONVERSION

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Works say whether, with the changeover to the metric system, all water meters in South Australia will be converted, at a cost to consumers of \$8 for each conversion? I understand that there are 357,700 water meters in use in this State, and conversion at \$8 each would cost \$2,861,600. Because of the generosity of the Commonwealth Government to this State in providing an additional \$100,000,000 in tax reimbursements and grants in the past two years and because of the huge increases, varying from 33½ per cent to over 50 per cent in water and sewerage rates during the same time, cannot the State Government bear the cost of conversion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know why the honourable member does not bring a little soap box into the Chamber with him. He has spoken of what he calls the generosity of the Commonwealth Government. What rubbish!

Mr. Millhouse: It's fair comment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not want to develop that point, but it would not take long to show that the honourable member was in his usual form. I am not aware that what the honourable member has referred to is happening. I think it may be one of those little things that he has smelt out, hoping to be reported in the newspaper again. However, I will have the matter considered.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister say whether tenders for metric conversion units for water meters will be called in three weeks time?

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

REYNELLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. CRIMES: In the absence of the member for Mawson, has the Minister of Education a reply to the honourable member's question about the purchase of additional land for the Reynella Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been told by the Public Buildings Department that an investigation will be made within the next fortnight into the condition of two allotments

recently purchased as an addition to the Reynella Primary School. Action will be taken as soon as possible thereafter to carry out any work required.

MOUNT BARKER TRAFFIC

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about inconvenience caused to my constituents because of work on the South-Eastern Freeway at Mount Barker?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The construction of the Mount Barker interchange of the South-Eastern Freeway involves major earthworks and structures, and the programming of construction works is a complex operation. The present programme, which has been prepared with some care, necessitates the closure of the existing road between Mount Barker and the Princes Highway for a minimum period of 18 months. During this time, a detour for traffic will be available via Childs Road into Littlehampton. The detour involves a maximum additional travelling distance of about one mile and, while the alignment of the detour is not up to modern standards, no major traffic problems are expected to arise. The inconvenience to the honourable member's constituents is appreciated. However, any reduction in the period of 18 months could be achieved only by a change in the construction programme, which would have the dual effect of delaying the completion of the whole freeway project and delaying the use by traffic of the section between Verdun and Mount Barker. The disadvantages of such a change would be greater than the inconvenience mentioned. The honourable member may be assured that works are carried out so as to reduce inconvenience to an absolute minimum.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I notice in the Speaker's gallery Lady Dunrossil, widow of our former revered Governor-General and one-time eminent Speaker of the House of Commons. I warmly welcome Lady Dunrossil to the precincts of the House of Assembly. I know it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that Lady Dunrossil be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the honourable member for Tea Tree Gully and the honourable member for Davenport to introduce our distinguished visitor.

Lady Dunrossil was escorted by Mrs. Byrne and Mrs. Steele to a seat on the floor of the House.

MURRAY DISTRICT HOUSING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 22 concerning Murray District housing?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust programme for 1972-73 provides for the commencement of 60 houses at Murray Bridge and two at Mannum. The waiting time varies according to the type of housing required, and its location depends on the number of vacancies occurring and the building rate. At present the trust is holding 72 applications from families requiring housing at Murray Bridge, where the waiting time is approximately six months. At Mannum there are 14 applications on file, and the waiting time here is at present from four to six months. Only one application is on hand for Nairne and, if any case was brought before the trust for urgent consideration for housing at Nairne, an offer could be made in the nearby township of Brukunga. Finally, at Tailem Bend the trust has one application from a family, and three applications from single female applicants, requiring housing. As soon as a vacancy occurs at Tailem Bend the trust will be able to satisfy the outstanding family case, but at the present no accommodation is provided there for single females.

WHEAT QUOTAS COMMITTEE

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the chairmanship of the Wheat Delivery Quotas Review Appeals Committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the honourable Mr. L. J. Travers resigned as Chairman of the Wheat Delivery Quota Review Committee on August 16, 1972, and the matter of the appointment of a successor is now being considered.

HOSPITAL FEES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether it is intended that a fee be charged in respect of non-paying private patients in public hospitals in South Australia and, if so, on what basis it will be applied?

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

WHYALLA POLLUTION

Mr. BROWN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question concerning the pollution of the waters of Spencer Gulf, near Whyalla?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Analyses carried out by the Director of Chemistry on

samples of fish and water taken from the localities in which dead and dying fish were reported on July 24 and July 28 last have failed to disclose the causes of death. Cyanide, phosphate and detergents were not detected in the specimens of water. The reaction of the specimen of water was not abnormal. Neither cyanide nor detergents were detected in the specimens of fish. The Director of Fisheries has expressed the opinion that oxygen depletion of the water in a restricted area caused by the introduction of some substance, or the effect of a pollutant in the water on the gills of the fish, which restricted the intake of oxygen, could possibly have accounted for their unusual behaviour and subsequent death.

BREAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what are the terms of reference of the Prices Commissioner in his inquiry into bread baking in South Australia? Last week the Minister indicated that such an inquiry was being conducted.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The terms of reference deal with the distribution of bread (that is, the most economical means of distributing it to the community) and also with the requirements of the public. I do not think that any other aspect is being inquired into.

COUNTRY SCHOOLS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether he has yet decided which rural schools are to be closed at the end of the 1972 school year? Several school committees are concerned lest the schools they represent are closed. Parents are anxious to know whether a decision has been made so that the earliest consideration can be given to placing the students in other schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In replying to the member for Murray last week, I pointed out that I had not yet made a final decision regarding school closures. I have received a series of recommendations on the matter, but in several instances I feel that further investigation is necessary, not only regarding the attitude of parents but also regarding the condition of the receiving school. These investigations have been proceeding and I hope that a final decision on this matter can be made shortly.

FLINDERS RANGE RESERVOIR

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Works say whether recent investigations have been made into the practicability of building

a major water storage in the Flinders Range and, if an investigation has not been made, can such an investigation be carried out? Development in South Australia must of necessity be tied to the availability of water, and the cost and quality of our water in South Australia are of concern to all of us. If a major water storage could be built in the Flinders Range, it would have a twofold effect: it would improve the quality of water available in northern areas and also reduce the quantity of water that has to be pumped from the Murray River with resultant pumping economies. Whilst I appreciate the problem concerning rainfall and choosing a suitable site, I believe that such an investigation would prove whether or not this suggestion was feasible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as I am aware, no investigations have taken place recently in regard to establishing a major water storage in the Flinders Range. I know that recently we did approach the National Parks Commission to try to establish a measuring station at Mambray Creek but, because this is a national park, I think we were refused permission. I am not sure what progress has been made since.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I think you'd have Buckley's chance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will nevertheless check on the matter with the department.

SOUTH COAST SCHOOLS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Education say how planning is proceeding in regard to establishing future schools in the South Coast area? In 1967, not long before an election, the then Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday), in company with the then Labor candidate (Mr. Bob Harris), who has since left the Labor Party, gave an interview and discussed the South Coast school programme for the next 20 years, stating that there would be 49 schools along the South Coast. Reynella was to have three primary schools (there was a question about the sole school there at the time), one high school and one technical school. The small town of Moana was to have five primary schools, one high school and one technical school. Noarlunga was going to be rather poorly treated, I think, by being given just a high school. However, Port Willunga was going to get four primary schools and one technical school, and Sellick Beach would get one primary school and one high school. During the interview, the Minister

said that the project was part of the department's overall programme to avoid overcrowding of schools that had occurred previously. Although I think he made his point, I am wondering what has happened to these proposed schools, because over the last five years I have heard nothing of subsequent planning, and there is now only 15 years to go before the 20-year period expires. Will the Minister of Education say whether these plans are actually in hand and whether the necessary land has been acquired or is in the process of being acquired?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am puzzled that the honourable member should ask me this question; he must be harbouring some sort of grudge about the publicity that occurred on that occasion and has not really got it off his chest in the intervening five years, even though during two of those years at least he was a Minister of the Crown and no doubt ideally placed to find out about the state of planning in relation to this area.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I was not the responsible Minister.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You weren't responsible!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although the honourable member formerly represented the area in question, he may not be fully aware of the extent of development that has taken place.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's your preamble!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Just because the member for Alexandra interrupted a reply I previously gave to the member for Kavel, surely the member for Kavel is not going to object to a reply that I am now giving the member for Alexandra.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're taking your time getting around to it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education is replying to a question asked by the honourable member for Alexandra, and that will be the only question under consideration. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I appreciate the difficulty you have in controlling unruly members. The member for Alexandra, who now represents an area of the State that is outside the metropolitan area, may not be fully aware of the extent of population development in the suburbs immediately to the south of O'Halloran Hill. He is probably not aware that this would be the most rapidly-growing section of Adelaide. The honourable member also probably would not be aware that, of all the electoral districts represented in this House, the District of

Mawson has had the greatest increase in numbers of electors since the last redistribution. Further, the honourable member probably would not be aware of the fact that tenders are being called within the next few weeks for a new high school at Morphett Vale, that high school to be available at the beginning of 1974. He is probably not aware that a new high school was opened at the beginning of 1970 or 1971 and that in the last couple of years, to my knowledge, several primary schools have been opened in the area and that one will open at the beginning of next term.

Mr. Mathwin: That's to house all these British migrants.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They are not all British migrants. The honourable member should not show his prejudice against British migrants! I refer the member for Alexandra to the document put out by the State Planning Authority which deals with population forecasts for the whole of the metropolitan planning area up until 1991 and which sets out those forecasts in terms of the data collection units used by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. I am sure that if he examined that document carefully he would find that in the area to which he refers the extent of population expansion until 1991 is likely to be more than sufficient to justify the forecasts made by the Hon. Mr. Loveday who, as I am sure the honourable member will agree, was a capable Minister of Education.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about the four primary schools—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member will appreciate that the forecast made by the former Minister covered a considerable period: it did not refer to the next two or three years. I am sure he would also know, even though he did not know that the population in this general area was expanding rapidly, that it is not possible to make accurate forecasts in relation, say, to a certain square mile of an area, even though one can make fairly accurate forecasts in relation to the extent of population change over a larger area. It is always difficult to forecast precisely when a new primary school will be needed, because—

Mr. Mathwin: It was apparently not difficult—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw the attention of honourable members to Standing Order 169, and I will act in accordance with that Standing Order. The honourable Minister

of Education is answering a question (lengthy though his reply may be) asked by the honourable member for Alexandra, and Standing Order 169 will prevail. The honourable Minister of Education.

Mr. McANANEY: I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 125 provides that a member shall not debate a matter to which a question refers. I think that the Minister has been debating the matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot sustain the point of order. The honourable member for Alexandra asked an overall question of the honourable Minister of Education, and the honourable Minister is answering the question. However, I draw the honourable Minister's attention to the fact that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: You will appreciate that I always keep to that objective, Sir. A metropolitan primary school has to serve an area around the school of about half a mile to three-quarters of a mile in radius, so the precise time at which a new primary school will be built in the metropolitan area is often difficult to forecast. I will obtain information about the sites which the Education Department owns in this area, and I think the honourable member will be surprised to find how accurate the forecast made by a former Minister of Education is likely to be.

METRICATION

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport give the House any information about metrication in relation to motor vehicles in South Australia? Reference has been made recently in the press to the conversion of speed limits from miles an hour to kilometres an hour. Will the Minister say whether the Australian Transport Advisory Council has made a decision about this? Also, will he say whether a decision has been made about the date by which the speedometers of Australian-made vehicles will have to be converted to kilometres and whether imported vehicles will have to conform to Australian standards?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter was discussed at the last meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council and it was decided that speed limits would be expressed on a national basis in kilometres an hour. The conversion of motor vehicle components was discussed also but no finality was reached. I will get a full reply for the honourable member because I believe it is important to have factual information about this subject.

GLADSTONE ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on the cause of the spate of fatal accidents on the Gladstone to Port Pirie road and the roads leading to this highway in the last few weeks? Last Friday evening two people were killed in an accident at the intersection of the Crystal Brook to Gladstone highway, and on Saturday evening a person was killed in an accident that occurred about a mile from the intersection. About three months ago two people were killed in an accident that occurred between these two points, and I understand that during the last 12 months about nine fatal accidents have occurred between Gladstone and Port Pirie. I believe it is necessary for the Minister to communicate with either the Police Department or the Highways Department to see whether there is a hazard on this road which needs to be eliminated, because I am sure these deaths would not have occurred under normal driving conditions.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report.

YORKE PENINSULA SCHOOLS

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Education tell me what progress has been made towards establishing a high school at Yorketown and a primary school at Minlaton? My question is not as extensive as the one asked by the member for Alexandra—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask the question without commenting.

Mr. FERGUSON: These are the only two new schools planned for the district, so I believe the Minister will probably have some information readily available about them.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member. As he always treats me with due politeness, I will take more urgent action than I would take in relation to some other gentlemen.

OPEN-UNIT TEACHING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what investigations were carried out overseas into the evaluation of open-space teaching? During a television interview last evening Mrs. Thatcher, who is Britain's Secretary of State for Education and Science, was questioned about open-space teaching in Great Britain. Among other things, she said she believed that less emphasis was being placed on it now because an evaluation of

results in reading showed that more progress was made in more formal classroom conditions in Great Britain.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot give the honourable member a precise reply. Mr. Rowland Johns, who is one of the principal architects in the schools section of the Public Buildings Department, went overseas recently, but I have not yet seen his report about open-space teaching. The only comment I can make in relation to Mrs. Thatcher's remarks about open-space teaching units is that if any difficulty is experienced in obtaining a certain standard in reading it is always possible within that framework and organization to take appropriate action to ensure that more time is spent on reading and to make use of teaching aids, if they are available, to help out or, alternatively, to make use of others who offer their services to help out in giving the students concerned sufficient practice in reading. I point out that at several schools mothers come in and assist with this problem, in order to try to ensure that this aspect of education is not neglected. I will see what specific investigations have been made into this kind of evaluation and whether I can obtain a reply for the honourable member.

HALLETT COVE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what action the Government will take to protect forthwith areas of great tourist and historical value to Australia generally and South Australia in particular? In a similar question last Thursday I asked the Minister when the report, which is to be made to assist the Land Board in valuing land at Hallett Cove, would be available, and in his reply the Minister stated:

I can assure him that the site of geological interest and the necessary protective area around it are being closely watched because of the development that is going on nearby. Certainly, no damage is being done, and the matter will be closely watched in the future. I visited Hallett Cove at the weekend specifically to see what type of damage was being caused. If the Minister suggests that no damage is being done, he should go and see for himself. On Sunday a motor cycle was being ridden around the area, young children were climbing the cliffs, and people were walking willy-nilly all over the place. As the Minister has said that he will protect the area, will he take some action to do so forthwith?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am somewhat surprised at what the honourable member has said, because for many years people

have been entering this area and climbing and walking willy-nilly, as the honourable member expressed it. This is why the area was so important—

Mr. Mathwin: What about the motor bike?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is another question. We wanted to ensure that the area was protected, so that people could visit it. If the honourable member had the energy to climb to the top of the cliff and walk around that area, he would realize that it consists of hard rock and that no damage could be caused by people walking over the site. For many years the entering of motor bikes to this area has been a problem, as there is no way of preventing people from entering the area from along the beach or from the other side. This problem has always caused concern to those people who have been interested in this area, but when the area is obtained for the public of South Australia and handed over to the national parks organization to control, I think it will be necessary for it to be fenced, and then access by foot only into the area will be provided. Until the Government owns the area—

Mr. Mathwin: You could put a sign up about motor bikes.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —and controls it, no real action can be taken to improve the present position. The matter raised by the honourable member has been a problem for many years.

SOLDIER SETTLERS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Repatriation what will be the extent of the assistance given to soldier settlers under the policy announced by the Commonwealth Government last week? The Minister of Lands, when replying to a question by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, said, amongst other things:

It is known that \$2,500,000 is to be made available for stock mortgage takeover for war service settlers; this is not restricted to Kangaroo Island.

As the Minister knows, in my district and in the South-East generally single-unit soldier settlers have made out a case and have expressed concern about their financial position in the present rural crisis. Will these settlers be considered when the amount referred to by the Minister of Lands last week is allocated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The Acting Minister of Lands said in another place last week that \$2,500,000 was to be made available for stock mortgage takeover for soldier settlers, that this was not restricted to Kangaroo Island, and that each case would be

considered on its merits. Wherever soldier settlers are now situated, those who seek to have their mortgage taken over by the department will be successful, if their case merits it.

Mr. Rodda: In other words, single units are not excluded?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not wish to speak for my colleague about this matter, but I should think that single units would not be excluded. However, I will inquire and let the honourable member know soon.

SALISBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about Salisbury High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the former Leader of the Opposition and, no doubt, the prospective Leader of the Opposition—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was worried—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has no worries: he should address the honourable member as the member for Gouger.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As honourable members will no doubt recall, I announced last year details of a book loan scheme that would be introduced as from the beginning of this year for senior secondary students at Government schools throughout the State. Under the scheme, parents of fourth and fifth-year secondary students are able to choose whether they will join a school loan scheme or continue with present arrangements for the purchase of books. Parents whose children join the scheme agree to make over the Government paid secondary book allowance to the school. For fourth-year students this amount is \$28, and for fifth-year students the amount is \$30. From these funds the school purchases all necessary textbooks, either new or secondhand, and lends them free of charge to student members of the scheme. Because most books become available for re-use, the scheme economizes on book costs. This enables part of the book allowance to be used to pay for some of the subject fees normally charged to parents.

When the scheme is fully developed, it is hoped that subject fees can be eliminated, apart from those which are used for materials to make a product that ultimately becomes the property of the student. A deposit of \$10 is paid for books received at the beginning of the year. The deposit is refundable on return of the

books in good order at the end of the school year. The problem at Salisbury North has arisen because of the coincidence of the promotion and transfer of the book room manager at the end of 1971, and the retirement of the Headmaster. It was not until some months had elapsed this year that it was realized that fourth and fifth-year students had not been asked to pay the school fees amounting to \$10.50, as set down in book lists. These included fees for library, sport and physical education amenities, oval, parents and friends, and duplicated notes. The non-collection of these fees would have resulted in a considerable deficit.

The new Headmaster, therefore, with the knowledge and consent of the school council and the parents and friends committee, approached parents by circular telling them frankly of the financial position and asking that they agree to pay these fees. He suggested that the \$10 deposit on books that would normally be refundable at the end of the year should be made over to school funds, and 50c be paid in cash, the school to accept the responsibility for the safe return of textbooks in good condition at the end of the year. Parents of free-book scholars (those who qualify under the means test) were asked to pay \$10.50 if they could, but discussion with the Headmaster resulted in full remission for most free-book students and part contribution by others. All other parents at the school, with the exception of the one to whom the member for Gouger referred, have agreed to the payment. This student was not a free scholar. The parent refused to make over the \$10 deposit she had paid or to pay the 50c requested. She declined to visit the school to discuss the matter with the Headmaster.

During the only telephone communication she had with him, the Headmaster states that the parent said that had the fees been asked for at the beginning of the year she would have paid them. In fact she did pay \$7 fees in 1971, refusing only to pay the Parents and Friends Association contribution. With regard to this year, in view of her attitude to the matter, the parent will be asked to pay for only the library, sport and physical education and duplicated notes fees which are not amenities but school necessities and should be classed as subject fees. In the meantime, no prohibitions have been placed upon the student concerned in connection with her use of duplicated notes, physical education or the library, as this would interfere with her

education. It is regretted that this situation has arisen, but it is hoped that those concerned will appreciate that a reasonable course of action is being adopted, bearing in mind the interests of all students at the school and the fact that failure to resolve the situation can only react adversely on the student.

PINE PLANTINGS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about pine plantings?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that pine plantings have decreased in recent years because of the shortage of suitable land.

RURAL EDUCATION

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is intended to extend to other centres the certificate course in rural education and, if it is, when that will be done? A report in yesterday's *Advertiser* states that a certificate course in rural education will begin at the Mount Gambier Technical College next year. The report also states that the course has been developed by the Department of Further Education in response to the finding of the Ramsay report. I am pleased to see that this recommendation of the Ramsay report is being implemented by the department. As I represent one of the more important primary-producing areas of this State, I ask whether Port Lincoln can be placed high on the priority list for such a certificate course.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I correct straightaway one matter by pointing out that the specific recommendations of the Ramsay report on this matter were rejected. Certainly, the introduction of the course is in response to the need for this type of education in the Mount Gambier area and in other areas as well. It is designed to be introduced in such a way that we can expect, over a time, to develop much wider coverage of rural areas than could conceivably be achieved under the recommendations of the Ramsay report. True, the Mount Gambier Technical College (as it is presently known) will pilot this course. We hope that we shall be able to extend it to several other country centres throughout the State, depending on our ability to provide the necessary qualified staff to give the course, and depending also on the demand for it in certain areas. At this stage, I do not think there are precise plans as to the rate at which the course will be extended.

I will discuss this point with the Director of Further Education to see whether it is possible to develop a planned programme that can satisfy the honourable member's craving for the development of such a course in his own district. Clearly, Port Lincoln ought to be one of the areas where we shall be interested in establishing such a course. Accommodation at the Port Lincoln Adult Education Centre has already had some upgrading. If this centre has staff and to some extent can make use of other qualified teachers in the area, the potential for this sort of development will be enhanced considerably.

WHEAT SALES

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about wheat sales?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the wheat quota system was initiated by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and is solely an industry matter in which the Commonwealth and State Governments have co-operated by enacting the necessary enabling legislation. In these circumstances it is considered that any proposal to increase quotas should emanate from the federation.

DIAL-A-BUS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport anything further to report on the dial-a-bus system, which he said in 1970 would be operating before Christmas? During the two previous sessions of this Parliament, this question has been raised in the House, and members are still looking forward with interest to any developments that have taken place. In particular, perhaps the Minister can say whether this scheme will operate before Christmas, 1972, or whether it has lost favour since a more practical approach to transport problems has been adopted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member says that I said that a dial-a-bus system would operate by Christmas, 1970. I should be interested to see whether the honourable member can back up his statement and show me where I said that. Apart from that, I have nothing to report other than to say that the matter is still being considered.

Mr. Mathwin: Ha, ha.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that this is a joke to the honourable member. Anything that is progressive is a joke to the members for Bragg and Glenelg.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he is considering providing that disqualified drivers should pass a special driving test before their driver's licence is restored? The Minister will appreciate that a report on page 3 of this morning's newspaper, headed "Back on Road Test", states that he is considering this matter. I can only say that I laud the suggestion, because anything that we do to improve road safety measures is worth while. However, in praising this suggestion, I ask the Minister whether people who are required to go to Marion will, in effect, be asked to pay their debt to society twice. I refer more particularly to those people who come from distant places, such as Port Augusta, Whyalla, or Mount Gambier, and I should like to know whether provision would be made for those people to attend a course, bearing in mind that they would be at a financial disadvantage if they had to visit the centre at Marion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter is being considered at present but I do not expect that finality will be reached on it for some time, for several reasons. First, the capability of the new Road Safety Instruction Centre at Marion must be assessed thoroughly. I am pleased to be able to say at this stage that it is impossible to book a party in to that centre for some months, even though the centre is not yet open. This is a clear indication of the importance that the people of South Australia place on this venture, which this Government commenced.

Mr. Clark: That happened in Western Australia, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is right. Secondly, I do not know whether the honourable member is aware that, regrettably, an average of more than 1,000 drivers' licences is being cancelled each month. Therefore, to give effect to the suggestion that a person who has his licence taken from him would have to do a course (which I would hope was both theoretical and practical), the centre would have to cater for 1,000 persons a month, in addition to the other people, particularly the younger people, for whom we desire to cater. I do not see the role of the Road Safety Instruction Centre as being merely to satisfy this area, although I see that as one role that the centre could fill and so benefit the people of Australia as a whole, certainly those who use the roads.

The third point I think I should make in relation to the Leader's question is that he saw

this scheme as a double penalty. I know that there are many ways of looking at anything but, with due respect, I think it completely cockeyed to consider this as a double penalty. To me, it is no more a double penalty to require a person to go to the centre than it is to gaol a person and suspend his licence for three months.

Dr. Eastick: My point is that this is coming on top of that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the Leader wants to consider it as a double penalty, he has the right to do so. I just say that I completely refuse to accept it, any more than the current penalties that this Parliament has agreed should operate, as being so. I do not think it would be practicable to require country people to go to the Marion centre but, if the scheme was put into operation, I would expect that there would be a corresponding requirement on country people to do a test conducted by the police in the town where they lived. All in all, we are a long way from being in a situation where a decision can be made. The first thing is to assess the ability of the centre to cater for this need.

PROSPECT INTERSECTION

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about difficulties experienced by traffic at the intersection of Main North Road and Regency Road, Prospect?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations for the acquisition of land from the Northern Hotel property have been suspended at this time, for two reasons. First, the owners' claim for compensation is considered to be excessive for the actual land required for the left turn lane. Secondly, alternative plans for the layout and control of this intersection have been devised which should allow satisfactory operation for some years ahead.

CURRENCY REVALUATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government favours the revaluation of the Australian dollar and considers that this would be beneficial to the economy of South Australia? Since the House last met, revaluation has become a matter of much controversy in Australia. There has been a difference of opinion publicly in the Labor Party, and this was reported in the *Advertiser* last Friday as follows:

Labor's rural spokesman (Dr. Patterson) publicly contradicted his leader (Mr. Whitlam) last night over revaluation of the Australian dollar.

This is not a Party matter—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —but it is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —a matter of importance—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —for the economy of South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that his original question dealt with revaluation of the dollar. This matter is not under the control of the State or of the State Parliament in any way. If the honourable member wants to seek information on what may happen arising from revaluation, I shall allow him to continue, but he cannot continue to speak about revaluation of the dollar.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I noticed that you referred to the first part of my question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That part is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the second part is whether this would be beneficial to the economy of South Australia. I therefore put that question, with the explanation I have given, to the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a matter on which the South Australian Government has expressed an opinion. Doubtless, the honourable member has an opinion and, if he has, he can express it.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you an opinion on it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: No opinion?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. MATHWIN: In the absence of the member for Fisher, I ask the Minister of Education to reply to that honourable member's question about Education Department buses.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The reply is lengthy and, as it is now almost 4 o'clock, I could not give it now. I will bring it down tomorrow.

ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make public the report on the environment made by the committee headed by Professor D. O. Jordan? If not, why not?

2. If so, when will it be made public?

3. What are the reasons for the delay in doing so?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Within one month.

3. There is no delay. The report will be made available at the earliest possible date.

VENUS BAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Government to install lead navigation lights at Venus Bay?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The provision of lead lights at Venus Bay has been considered along with numerous other requests for improved facilities for fishermen in South Australia. Works of this nature are considered on the basis of priorities and the allocation of Loan funds. It is not expected that this work would be commenced before 1975-76.

HIGH-RISE DEVELOPMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have officers of the Community Welfare Department been asked to comment or advise on social welfare aspects of high-rise development considered by the State Planning Authority for Hackney, Kent Town, and other sites?

2. When, in each case, were such requests made?

3. When, in each case, were reports given?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Premier has requested the Minister of Community Welfare to make an officer available to serve on the redevelopment committee.

3. No reports have been given. Arrangements have been made for an officer of the Community Welfare Department to be a member of the redevelopment committee.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government been informed of the results of representations to the oil companies, made by the Premier's Department in relation to rents, for August, of company-owned service stations?

2. If so, what was the decision?

3. If not, when is the decision to be made?

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

1. No.

2. See answer to 1.

3. The representations made by an officer of the Department of the Premier and of Development to representatives of the oil companies conveyed the support of the Government to

negotiations by the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce for relief from rent charges as a result of the petrol shortage. Those negotiations are continuing between the chamber on behalf of its members and the oil companies.

MOTOR REGISTRATION FEES

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. How much has been collected from increases in motor registration fees since the last revision?

2. How has the increased amount been spent?

3. Has there been a decrease in the accident rate since the availability of increased finance for road safety?

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

1. Approximately \$3,250,000.

2. In accordance with the decision of Parliament as expressed in the Highways Act with special reference to section 32 of that Act.

3. As the increased finance for road safety only commenced to be available as from January 1, 1971, insufficient time has elapsed to enable a long-term comparison to be made. However, the available comparable statistics show that at the rate per 100,000 motor vehicles there were 136 more accidents reported in 1971 than were reported in 1970, but at the same time there were 15 fewer persons killed and 160 fewer people injured in 1971 as compared with 1970.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Mr. Millhouse, for Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How much was paid by the Highways Department in each of the financial years from 1968-69 to 1971-72 inclusive for work performed by private contractors and interstate private contractors respectively?

2. How much was paid by the department to both private contractors and interstate private contractors, respectively, in each of the foregoing financial years, for hire of plant and equipment?

3. What is the Highways Department's estimated difference in cost of removing material with a 20-yard scraper as against a 35-yard scraper?

4. What earth-moving equipment does the Highways Department intend purchasing in the fiscal year 1972-73 and what is the estimated cost of same?

5. What is the average number of hours a year that earth-moving equipment works on the South-Eastern Freeway?

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

1. Payments to contractors, all of whom have established offices in South Australia, for works associated with construction and maintenance of roads and bridges have been as follows:

1968-69	\$1,900,000
1969-70	\$3,800,000
1970-71	\$3,500,000
1971-72	\$6,400,000

(These figures do not include expenditure listed under Part 2 of this reply.)

2. Payments for hired plant on works carried out by departmental gangs excluding payments for hired trucks normally associated with gangs were:

	Intra-State	Inter-State
	\$	\$
1968-69	250,000	Nil
1969-70	520,000	45,000
1970-71	860,000	180,000
1971-72	595,000	370,000

3. Comparison figures for 35-yard scrapers are not available. However, in 1971-72, pusher-loaded 30-yard scrapers handled materials for 5c a cubic yard less than pusher-loaded 20-yard machines. Where pushers were not used, the saving was 3.2c a cubic yard. On these known figures it is estimated that savings using 35-yard scrapers could amount to 8c a cubic yard if pushers were used or 5c a cubic yard without pushers.

4. The proposed plant purchase programme for 1972-73 includes the following items which will be used predominantly in earth-moving operations; five 2WD pneumatic-tyred crawler tractors; one 2WD pneumatic-tyred tractors; five class 6 dozers with rippers; two class 6 towing tractors; one class 4½ dozer with ripper; six 35-ton capacity dump trucks; two 2-cub. yd. crawler loaders; eight 1-cub. yd. pneumatic-tyred loaders; two 2WD backhoe pneumatic-tyred loaders; two 4WD 1¼-cub. yd. pneumatic-tyred loaders with rippers; seven 4WD 2-cub. yd. pneumatic-tyred loaders; two 4WD 9-cub. yd. pneumatic-tyred loaders; two 4WD 3½-cub. yd. pneumatic-tyred loaders; one windrow eliminator (grader); six light graders; nine medium graders; two heavy graders; three self-propelled 10/12-ton steeldrum rollers; three self-propelled 12/15-ton steeldrum rollers; two grid rollers; one motor scraper, open bowl 10-cub. yd. roller; three vibrating 72in. drawn rollers; one mobile rockbuster; 107 trucks of various capacities; 10 prime movers of various sizes; six 1,000gall. water trucks; and six 2,500gall. water trucks. The estimated cost of the above items is \$3,262,740.

5. The average time each year that departmentally-owned earthmoving equipment works on the South-Eastern Freeway is 1,500 hours. Contract equipment was hired for 1,000 hours in 1971-72, this time being worked during the drier months of the year.

BREAKING OFFENCES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many breaking and entering offences have been reported to the police in the metropolitan area since July 1, 1972?

2. How many of these offences have been cleared up?

3. What proportion of these offences has been committed by both boys and girls under 18, respectively?

4. How many of such offenders have committed these offences after having absconded from (a) McNally Training Centre; (b) Vaughan House; and (c) Windana?

5. What penalties have been imposed on persons committing breaking and entering offences?

6. What proportion of offenders had committed a similar offence previously?

7. At what times of day were these offences committed?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The information requested is not normally available without specific collation. The only question which can be answered at this time is No. 7. The answer is that in most instances the time of the day at which the offences are committed is difficult to determine because they are reported to have occurred over a period of hours or even days prior to being discovered. In many instances when offenders are detected the time of the day the offence is committed is still not capable of being ascertained because the individuals deny that they are the persons responsible. In order to obtain the information requested it will be necessary to employ at least two people for several weeks with varying parts of the questions being capable of being answered on a progressive basis over a period of from one to three weeks. The parts of the questions which are capable of comparatively early reply are those in relation to parts 1 and 2. The other parts relate to information which is not normally collated by the Police Department at the present time and necessitates considerable research. It is not intended to allocate moneys to provide for the employment of necessary personnel for this research and collation.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many breaking and entering offences have been reported in country areas for the years ended June 30, 1971 and 1972, respectively?

2. How many of these offences have been cleared up?

3. What proportion of these offences was committed by juveniles?

4. At what times of day were these offences committed?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The information requested is not normally available without specific collation. In most instances the time of the day at which the offences are committed is difficult to determine because they are reported to have occurred over a period of hours or even days prior to being discovered. In many instances when offenders are detected the time of the day the offence is committed is still not capable of being ascertained because the individuals deny that they are the persons responsible. In order to obtain the information requested it will be necessary to employ at least two people for several weeks with varying parts of the questions being capable of being answered on a progressive basis over a period of from one to three weeks. The parts of the questions which are capable of comparatively early reply are those in relation to parts 1 and 2. The other parts relate to information which is not normally collated by the Police Department at the present time and necessitates considerable research. It is not intended to allocate moneys to provide for the employment of necessary personnel for this research and collation.

TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have any of the proposals contained in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan been accepted by the present Government?

2. If so, which are they, and when were the decisions taken to accept them?

3. Are any other such proposals under consideration for acceptance? If not, why not?

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

1. Yes, to the extent that the M.A.T.S. proposals coincide with the policy of the Government.

2. The policy of the Government was publicly released on January 29, 1971, and subsequently debated in this House on February

23, February 24, February 25, and March 2, 1971. This House adopted the Government's policy on March 2, 1971.

3. No.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT
BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1 (clause 4)—After line 18 insert—

“(aa) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage ‘12.30 p.m.’ and inserting in lieu thereof the passage ‘11.30 a.m.’;”

No. 2. Page 2, line 4 (clause 4)—Leave out “12.30 p.m.” and insert “11.30 a.m.”.

No. 3. Page 2, lines 5 to 20 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 4. Page 2, line 34 (clause 5)—Leave out “221c, 221d and 221e”.

No. 5. Page 3, line 1 (clause 5)—After “221b” insert “(1)”.

No. 6. Page 3, lines 9 to 44; page 4, lines 1 to 44; page 5, lines 1 to 41; page 6, lines 1 to 16 (clause 5)—Leave out all words after the word “shops” in line 8, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“(a) in the case of such shop assistants other than hairdressers, shall be 5.30 p.m. Mondays to Thursdays inclusive, 9 p.m. on Fridays and 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays and no shop assistant shall be required to work in such ordinary hours on more than five consecutive days in any one week and more than eighty hours in any period of two consecutive weeks;

and

“(b) in the case of shop assistants being hairdressers, shall be 6 p.m. Mondays to Thursdays inclusive, 9 p.m. on Fridays and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays and no shop assistant shall be required to work in such ordinary hours on more than five consecutive days in any one week, and more than eighty hours in any period of two consecutive weeks.

(2) Shop assistants, for all work performed on a Friday after the hour of 5.30 p.m. within ordinary hours of work and on a Saturday within ordinary hours of work, shall be paid such additional hourly rates of pay as the Commission or the Shop Conciliation Committee shall determine.

(3) Shop assistants being hairdressers, for all work performed on a Friday after the hour of 6 p.m. within ordinary hours of work and on a Saturday within ordinary hours of work, shall be paid such additional hourly rates of pay as the Commission or the Hairdressers Conciliation Committee shall determine.”

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. H. McKee (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

I believe that these amendments make the Bill completely unworkable. Similar amendments were attempted by the Opposition when this Bill was previously considered, and they were strongly resisted by the Government for reasons that are well known to members. The Government and I believe that the amendments destroy the whole principle of the Bill and take away all protection from employees. As explanations were given when amendments were previously moved, I will not go into detail—

Mr. Becker: You can't.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member knows that every amendment moved was dealt with and that the Government gave reasons for refusing each amendment. We are going to ensure that a Bill is passed that will be acceptable to people employed in the industry, as well as to employers and, indeed, to all concerned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I realize, as the Minister realizes, that this matter is proceeding inevitably to a conference between the two Houses, but I point out to him that it is usual, and that it is only a courtesy to members, to explain the purport of the various amendments made in another place. Even a most cursory glance at these amendments shows that they are not precisely the same as those moved in this Committee previously. For example, I point out to the Minister that the Opposition opposed clause 5 altogether. However, the other place has moved amendments to clause 5 which make it, on a first look, anyway, slightly less objectionable than it was originally, but certainly—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You would have gone further.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I expressed strong opposition to the clause and divided the Committee on it at the time. I suggest that the Minister owes the Committee an explanation of the amendments. Even though he may have the numbers and thinks he can roll us, this Committee (and this Opposition) should not be treated with a total disregard. As at present informed, I should be willing to resist the rejection of all these amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think that if the Minister studied these amendments he would find that at least some of them are eminently sensible. One of the major complaints about the Bill is that it seeks to write industrial conditions into legislation, and that is not the precise function of Parliament. In my view,

amendment No. 6 overcomes the main complaint about the Bill as it left this place. I refer especially to new subsection (2), which sums up the feeling of many members. There is no suggestion that shop assistants shall not be paid some rate for overtime worked. This amendment seeks to place this function where it ought to be placed. The Government seems willing to reject these amendments out of hand for a good political purpose.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The reason advanced by members opposite in support of these amendments is that they wish to avoid writing industrial conditions into legislation, but I am amazed at that suggestion. Even the most cursory reading of these amendments shows that the Legislative Council is writing industrial conditions into the legislation. It is specifically saying, in fact, that there shall not be a 40-hour five-day week for shop assistants, but there may be an 80-hour fortnight, and it is specifically saying that the ordinary hours of work shall be more than 40, and that is by legislation. The reason why previously it has not been possible to achieve through arbitration a 40-hour week for shop assistants is that the court has taken into account the hours at which shops are allowed to open and dealt with them as ordinary hours, and that has prevented shop assistants from getting the same sort of treatment as people are getting in other avocations. The only way that situation can be dealt with, if we are to provide for a wider range of hours, is by putting it into legislation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is the commission crook?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A mere reading of these amendments shows that the Legislative Council intends to write in industrial conditions, but these reveal industrial conditions that would be impossible for shop assistants to accept in any circumstances. It has been said that in all circumstances we should have a five-day 40-hour week, and no Saturday morning work, but the Government cannot agree to that position at the moment in a service industry. Therefore, there must be some provision that will protect shop assistants and ensure that their ordinary hours shall be 40 or, if there is any departure from that, it shall be with their agreement. The measure as it left this Chamber was exactly in accordance with the proposals put forward by members of another place at the last conference we had. It is in accordance specifically with the three-point plan put forward by the retail traders. The only objection that has been raised by the retail traders is that it

should not be in legislation but that we should leave it at large in the legislation and accept an undertaking from them that that is what they will agree to before the Industrial Commission. We cannot agree to that, because in those circumstances there is no guarantee.

Mr. Millhouse: You do not trust them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We cannot say that they speak for the retail traders. If they are prepared to agree to it before the commission, why should they not agree to it in legislation? It is absurd to suggest that the reason for the Legislative Council's attitude is that we are writing into legislation something that should be dealt with by the Industrial Commission: the Legislative Council's proposal is doing just that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It is still objectionable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member would object to anything coming from this side in any circumstances. In fact, he tries to put words into our mouths about other things. He is not concerned about policies. Members opposite know from the debates in this place and from the long course of negotiation about this legislation that it would be impossible for the people working in the industry to accept this proposal. There has been widespread industrial unrest about this proposal. In these circumstances, I think the Committee should reject these amendments.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Whilst at the last conference we had reached the point spelt out in the Bill, there was no agreement on this matter at that point. After lengthy discussion, when the matter had been dealt with by the managers from both Houses, with the help of the Parliamentary Counsel, a position was reached that was not acceptable to the members of another place, even though the Government was prepared to make concessions to that degree.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: At their request.

Dr. EASTICK: Discussion had reached the point where the Parliamentary Counsel was able to give us an outline that was basically, as the Premier said a few minutes ago, that which was introduced into this Chamber recently. However, there was no agreement with the managers from another place that that was a satisfactory point at which to finish.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the Leader of the Opposition to persist along these lines, because we are dealing with the amendments of the Legislative Council. If the Leader is referring to the remarks that I understood the Premier to make, that the amendments

under consideration were those that were contained in some previous legislation, he is in order; but I cannot allow him to continue along the lines of what happened at the conference.

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier did refer to these amendments as those arrived at the conference, but I will not persist with that point. The Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 relates to the sale or availability of fresh red meat. I should be shirking my responsibility to the consumers and producers if I did not point out that it is essential that this commodity be available.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee (teller), Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Becker, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hopgood and King. Noes—Messrs. Allen and Evans.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments destroy the principles of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Broomhill, Dunstan, Eastick, McKee, and Millhouse.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council Conference Room at 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Industrial Code Amendment Bill to be held during the

adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PAROLE)

Third reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I again state my concern about the release of people referred to in this Bill, and stress that every effort should be made to ensure that, if any uncertainty prevails, the main consideration should be the protection of the public. This Bill follows closely a similar Bill operating in the United Kingdom, and in the second reading debate I cited two cases of people being released under licence by a parole board. Again I warn that extreme caution must be exercised before these people are released under licence. The member for Bragg supported the Attorney-General in a way that would suggest that he was the Attorney's second lieutenant for this Bill. He supported the Attorney so ably that he was congratulated by the Attorney on his speech, in which he stated:

The Attorney-General can give no unqualified assurances that no such cases as those to which the honourable member has referred will occur. It is not within the Attorney's province or ability to do this . . . Some people who are detained will never be released: there will never be any question of releasing them.

Therefore, it can be debated whether these people will be released or not under the provisions of this Bill, and the decision will be left to the parole board or psychiatrists to make a recommendation, as they did in the cases I cited. I refer particularly to the case of Young, who was released on the recommendation of a psychiatrist in addition to the knowledge of another four psychiatrists, who said that Young was capable of being assimilated into the general public again. The member for Bragg also said:

The cases to which the member for Glenelg referred are rather bizarre. They were unusual

enough to attract a tremendous amount of attention.

I agree that such cases attract attention, but in no circumstances should this matter be considered lightly. The cases I referred to should suggest to the Government (and particularly to the board or the people dealing with these people who are to be released) that they must bear some responsibility in deciding these matters. The Attorney-General, when replying to the debate, stated:

It is a grave responsibility to keep any person in custody not as a punishment for any wrongdoing on his part, but simply because the community needs the protection of having him kept in custody.

This may be a grave responsibility, but it is a responsibility which must be accepted and which should not be passed over lightly. In the case of Straffen in the United Kingdom, this man murdered a child and was released or escaped, but was then placed in an institution, because he was declared insane.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot use the third reading debate to repeat the arguments he submitted during the second reading debate. He must confine himself purely to the contents of the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Mr. MATHWIN: But you are gagging me because—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not gagging the honourable member. I am informing him of Standing Orders, which have been adopted by this Parliament and which I am responsible to administer. It has been the tradition for many years and it is written into Standing Orders that the remarks of an honourable member on the third reading must be confined to the Bill as it comes out of Committee, and I ask the honourable member to do that.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That stopped you!

Mr. MATHWIN: That has pleased the Minister, too, has it not?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: The Bill deals with people who are to be released under licence. Would I be in order, Mr. Speaker, in giving details of cases of people who have been released under licence, and also referring to other evidence that I have not referred to during the second reading debate?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot introduce any new material: he must speak to the Bill as it comes out of Committee.

Mr. MATHWIN: In that case, I repeat my deep concern that it seems that the Government intends by this legislation to make it easier for people to be released under licence.

They will have to report from time to time to a parole board or be interviewed by a board, but I emphasize that this is not a matter to be treated lightly. The first consideration must be the general public, and there must be no repetition of what has happened in other places and recently in this State. I have in mind the cases reported last weekend in the *Sunday Mail*. Every effort must be made to protect the public; the psychiatrists who interview people to be released under licence must ensure that such people will never again subject innocent victims to further attacks.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STOCK FOODS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

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.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1025.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill, which increases the salary of the Auditor-General by \$1,100 to \$21,300—an increase of 5.44 per cent. The salary of the Commissioner of Police is increased by \$1,100 to \$19,700—an increase of 5.91 per cent. Further, the salary of the Chairman of the Public Service Board is increased by \$1,100 to \$21,300—an increase of 5.44 per cent. The salaries of the Commissioners of that board are increased by \$1,100 to \$18,200—increases of 6.43 per cent. The salary of the Valuer-General is increased by \$1,050 to \$13,400—an increase of 8.5 per cent. The expense allowance of the Agent-General in London is increased by £(St)550—an increase of 13 per cent. These increases are in line with Public Service salary increases handed down on June 26.

When one considers the salaries of the officers I have referred to, one realizes that some public servants appear to be underpaid. Of course, the Auditor-General has a tremendous responsibility; further, the Commissioner of Police has under his command many men and vehicles, and he is responsible for maintaining law and order in this State. The work of the Valuer-General has a wide impact, but his salary is considerably lower than those of some top public servants. The Chairman

of the Public Service Board is at the top of the salary scale.

For the purposes of comparison, I shall refer to the salaries of other public servants with great responsibilities. The Director of the Department of the Premier and of Development (Mr. Bakewell) receives \$19,700; the Director, Industrial Development (Mr. Scriven), \$18,200; the Director of Mines, Government Geologist and Warden, \$18,200; the Director-General of Medical Services, \$21,300 (a salary that is comparable with the salaries of the Chairman of the Public Service Board and the Auditor-General); the Director of Mental Health Services (Dr. Dibden), \$19,700; the Director-General of Public Health, Chairman, Central Board of Health, and Vaccination Officer (Dr. Woodruff), \$19,700; the Master of the Supreme Court, \$18,200; the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, \$18,200; the Under Treasurer, \$21,300; the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, \$21,300; the Director of the Public Buildings Department, \$18,200; the Director-General of Education, \$21,300; the Director of Further Education, \$18,200; the Director of Agriculture, \$18,200; and the Conservator of Forests, \$18,200.

When one considers these salaries, the responsibilities of the positions, and the percentage increases (ranging from 5.44 per cent to 8.5 per cent), one realizes that the increases are not unduly high. Because the salaries of the Auditor-General, the Commissioner of Police, the Chairman and Commissioners of the Public Service Board, and the Valuer-General, are fixed by Statute, it is necessary for Parliament to deal with the matter every time Public Service salaries are increased. Perhaps the system could be altered by placing the matter under the control of the Public Service Board. Perhaps, instead of these salary increases, the officers could have received a tax-free allowance of \$800. If they had been granted such an allowance, they would have received greater take-home pay, while at the same time there would have been some saving to the State. As things stand, more than half of their increases will be absorbed by taxation, while some will be absorbed by superannuation payments. So, the net gain to the officers will be very small.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): The honourable member has convinced me that, in comparison with the salaries of public servants with great responsibilities, the salary increases provided in this Bill are justified. I take this opportunity to stress that the inflationary trend in the Australian economy must be

arrested before Australia gets into trouble in competing with other countries on world markets. Various factors contribute to increased costs. Of this increase of about \$1,000 that these senior officers will receive, about \$600 will go in taxation, and there will be increased superannuation contributions, so that the officers concerned will be little better off. However, to the average working man, who receives increases of only about \$1 or \$2 a week, the increases received by these officers cause much dissatisfaction. Ultimately we must devise a tribunal that assesses salaries for all sections of the community, instead of having the present piecemeal system. When general increases of 5 per cent or 10 per cent apply no-one is much better off, but Australia loses opportunities to compete on world markets.

We need large-scale production in this country so that we can really raise living standards. This is one of the major problems that we must solve. Having regard to the salaries of other public servants, the increases provided by the Bill are justified, but overall I do not believe that such increases are beneficial. I know of a case of a tradesman who, after five years apprenticeship, still receives considerably less than does his wife, who works in the Commonwealth Public Service and who has had little training. Because she is pregnant, she has had to leave work, and the income of that family has been reduced by over half. This sort of discrepancy in our wage structure must be straightened out. The many inequities in the wage structure must be dealt with fairly if we are to have harmony in industrial relationships to the benefit of the Australian economy. We should look at what is best for Australia, trying to achieve something that will arrest the decline in our living standards, when they are compared to those in other countries of the world.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): In supporting the Bill, I must express sentiments similar to those that have been expressed by the member for Heysen. This fairly simple Bill prescribes salary increases for some senior public servants. In the light of salaries paid elsewhere and in the Commonwealth Public Service, one cannot argue against these increases. However, by continually increasing such salaries, all we effectively do is make certain sections of the community worse off financially. In this sense, I refer to those on the middle and lower rates of income. As incomes spread out more widely, people at the lower end of the scale are relatively worse off.

I believe that it is absolutely essential that prices and salaries and wages in this country be stabilized. From this Government, we hear about the necessity to stabilize prices, and from the Commonwealth Government we hear of the necessity for wage-fixing tribunals. If a Government had the courage to stabilize prices and wages at the same time, we would beat this inflationary trend. To talk about stabilizing one and not the other is unrealistic.

In measures such as this, we do not make top public servants that much better off. By these continued increases, we disadvantage certain people in the community, namely the lower income group, which includes pensioners and others. Moreover, the rural section of the community is disadvantaged, as it depends on selling its commodities overseas, and it cannot hope to compete when these wage increases apply. If rural producers are to maintain their relative position in the community, they must produce and sell more goods. In the Bill, an increase in salary of 5 per cent or 6 per cent is provided for, and such increases occur fairly regularly. This means that, if rural producers are to maintain their relative position, they must produce 5 per cent or 6 per cent more or get an increase in price of 5 per cent or 6 per cent, and that is impossible.

If we grant a percentage increase of this type to pensioners and others they are still not compensated for the wider spread in incomes that occurs. Many people in the community maintain a wife and family on a quarter of the salary that we are considering in this Bill. If an increase of 5 per cent is granted to a person earning \$4,000 a year that is not the same as an increase of 5 per cent to a person earning \$20,000 a year. People earning the lower salary are not compensated for the spread in income, with people at the bottom end of the scale becoming progressively worse off.

Mr. Nankivell: That's us.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Most people in the community earn a salary of \$5,000 or less, and such people are continually disadvantaged by increases in top salaries. In addition, I do not know how much good we do for these senior officers by increasing their salaries in this way. By the time they reach these positions, they are senior men in their departments, with their dependants grown up. What we do really by granting these increases is to subsidize the Commonwealth coffers by providing for increased taxation payments. If we increase the salary of the Auditor-General or the Commissioner of Police by \$1,100, probably half of that sum or more goes to the Commonwealth

Government. If we really want to make these people better off, we must think of some type of scheme, such as that referred to by the member for Hanson, of a non-taxable allowance. I do not favour that scheme, but I question this continual spiralling of salaries and prices. I believe we must do something to fix both prices and wages: it is no good dealing with one and not the other. What we effectively provide by these increases is that the poorer sections of the community become that much poorer. If wages are increased, prices will inevitably be increased.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Can one State move alone?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For many years South Australia had the lowest cost structure in Australia. Because of that, salaries were relatively lower here than they were in the other States. However, it is completely unrealistic to think that we can have prices lower in South Australia than they are in other States while providing for the salaries here to be at the same level as those in the other States. From my knowledge of prices and wages in this State, I believe that people in South Australia have been relatively better off than people living elsewhere, and I believe that is still the position. Regarding housing, the cost of public utilities has for many years been less in this State than it has been in the other States.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Thanks to the Prices Branch.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister knows very well that the Prices Commissioner was operating in South Australia many years before this Government came into office. Indeed, the Prices Branch has been used effectively to keep costs in South Australia lower. If the Minister believes that costs can be kept lower by keeping the same wage levels, he is being completely unrealistic. The time is fast approaching when we must examine the whole matter of continually increasing salaries and wages. If these increases continue, it is inevitable that costs also will increase. We cannot fix one without examining the other. The only Government that had the temerity to do this was the Wilson Government in Great Britain, which attempted to fix wages and prices.

Mr. Nankivell: And New Zealand.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so. The difficulty is that what a Government does must be popular; otherwise, it will not remain in office. If a Government takes the type of action to which I referred, it will run into

trouble with a certain section of the community. The time is coming when the whole economic structure will have to be dampened down, so that we are not faced with continual increases in salaries and wages, as we are at present. All we are doing is making the poor in the community poorer, and increasing costs tremendously. I am not opposed to the increases in salary referred to in the Bill, which can no doubt be justified in the light of what is paid elsewhere. The contents of the Bill merely indicate a trend that is operating today. Many times in the past, we have voted increases that have greatly exceeded the incomes of a vast proportion of the community, and it is hard to justify that action. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1026.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Opposition members support this Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said that the aim of the Bill was to clear up certain deficiencies and to make administrative improvements. He also said that the Bill contained a special provision to enable the Government to make a grant to the Field Naturalists Society of South Australia. This is a move that I and, indeed, all Opposition members support. However, it is a pity that the Government has not seen fit to examine the position regarding primary producers and landholders who have set aside certain areas for regeneration or for the preservation of fauna and flora. In my district and in those of other members primary producers have set aside certain areas for this purpose and have successfully allowed regeneration to occur. I am pleased that that practice has been successful. In the past, it was necessary for the Government to grant a \$1 subsidy to the Field Naturalists Society so that the society could be exempt from land tax, and the Bill contains a provision to avoid the necessity for that.

Section 12c of the principal Act is being amended so that, where the Commissioner is satisfied that declared rural land, or any part thereof, has ceased to be used for primary production, or an application is made by the taxpayer for the revocation of the declaration, such a revocation may be made. Landholders at Waterloo Corner have been required to pay excessive land tax and, in fact, our rural

land tax generally is totally out of proportion. The amount of tax cannot be justified, because of the serious economic position of many primary producers. Many parts of Australia have progressive Liberal Governments. I say "progressive" because our Party is progressive.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation and I cannot hear the honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: The Liberal Governments have abolished rural land tax. This is our policy and we will put that policy into effect after the next State election. The Treasurer states in his explanation that provision will be made to assist people in the metropolitan area who otherwise would suffer financial hardship, and the explanation refers to defining certain classes of people. I understand that the Commissioner will define the classes, and I think this will be difficult to do. Probably, pensioners who hold medical entitlement cards will be the first class to be exempted. I strongly support this provision and hope that all pensioners will receive the concession. The Opposition does not raise any objection to the measure, which clarifies the existing Act without altering the principle or the taxing measures.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the concept of the Bill but wish to mention one matter concerning section 12c that is causing concern. I do not think the measures explained by the Treasurer will correct that provision. The hundred of Mudla Wirra is the specific case in point. Basically the hundred is above the Gawler River and the South Para River, but a small part of the hundred below the Gawler River is used for both housing and agricultural pursuits on the contiguous land. The present provisions and proclamations recommended by the Lands Department in the past have not given to people who own land in the portions of the hundred below the Gawler River the advantages of section 12c.

I have raised this matter previously in the House and the Treasurer obtained from the authorities information that, in their opinion, the area involved was too small to be concerned about and they did not intend to make available to people owning land below the river the benefits of the lower tax provided by section 12c. If we are to have an advantage for people undertaking rural enterprise, even though the land is contiguous to land being developed, every person who has undertaken *bona fide* rural pursuits should obtain the advantages of the section. The matter should not be decided

arbitrarily on a hundred basis or some other basis that leaves people at a disadvantage. If it is necessary to set out in detail the areas in which people have been at a disadvantage in this way, I shall do so. Perhaps the Treasurer can say whether the Government intends to make these advantages available to all persons involved in rural pursuits, particularly those pursuits where the concession provided by section 12c can be granted. If that is done, the measures that the Treasurer has mentioned will be of advantage in administering the Act.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Special provision for rural land."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to make the benefits of this provision available to people involved in *bona fide* rural pursuits?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): If the Leader will give details of the areas involved I will have my officers look at the matter to see how we may deal with the problems he has raised.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 and 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COUNCIL 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.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1028.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I am happy to be leading the debate for the Opposition on this matter, because I believe it is one with which we are all deeply concerned: it is not only a matter of purely local interest but is one of international interest. There is an old Yorkshire cynicism that says, "Where there is money there is muck." Many of the problems of pollution of the environment with which we are concerned today are associated with industry in its various forms. The changes in the method of operations of industry and the changes in farming operations and in technology that have taken place have all substantially affected the environment. In 1962, when Rachel Carson wrote *The Silent Spring*, many people became extremely concerned, per-

haps for the first time, about the effects of insecticidal chemicals and bacteriocidal chemicals being used as a means of plant control and a means of controlling plant pests—for example, D.D.T. Subsequently we had problems with other chemicals being used to stimulate growth. We are concerned with the effect they have on the quality of meat and other foodstuffs we are now eating. We have seen, in recent weeks, the effect on our fishing industry because of the quantity of mercury that has been isolated in sharks forming part of the catch of the fishing industry in South Australia and Victoria.

We are trailing behind the other States and behind the European countries with this type of legislation, because we have not been confronted with the problems in such a dramatic manner as they have. In Britain, under the Wilson Labor Government, concern was expressed for the quality of life, and in the second reading explanation of this Bill concern was expressed for the quality of life of the people of South Australia. This is 1972, and the matters that led up to the establishment of the Department for the Environment in Britain also revolved around the question of the quality of the environment. If I may quote from *Keesing's Contemporary Archives* of October 24, 1970, I think it will help to explain the point. Under the heading "Department of the Environment", it states:

It is increasingly accepted that maintaining a decent environment, improving people's living conditions, and providing for adequate transport facilities all come together in the planning of development. These are among the main functions of local authorities and are having an ever-increasing impact on ordinary people, in town and country and especially in and around the larger urban areas. Because these functions interact, and because they give rise to acute and conflicting requirements, a new form of organization is needed at the centre of the administrative system.

It further goes on to state:

There is a need to associate with these functions responsibility for other major environmental matters: the preservation of amenity, the protection of the coast and countryside, the preservation of historic towns and monuments, and the control of air, water and noise pollution: all of which must be pursued locally, regionally, nationally and in some cases internationally. And it will have the leading responsibility for regional policy: certain economic aspects, including industrial development in the regions, will remain with the Department of Trade and Industry, but the Department of the Environment will have important executive powers for the development of regional infrastructure and the maintenance of regional services. . . .

It can be seen that the British Government at that time was concerned with many aspects of the environment in the broader sense when it saw fit to introduce legislation to control environmental problems in Britain. It went a long way towards doing this, much further than is proposed in this legislation. For instance, a new department was set up in Britain under the Secretary of State for the Environment, a senior Minister with three Ministers under his jurisdiction to control various sectors of this new area of environmental control. The three Ministers concerned were the Minister for Housing Construction, the Minister for the Transport Industries, and the Minister for Local Government and Development.

We all realize that there is centralized Government in Britain and the principal administration comes from Westminster, but we see here an attempt to co-ordinate all the areas of the environment under one senior Minister so that effective overriding control could be provided at top level. It is interesting to note that, when this legislation was introduced, the then Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson) said that, in addition to the Secretary of State for the Environment and the understudying Ministers, it was important that there be a senior Minister in charge, together with a scientific staff to carry out research. This, of course, has been incorporated in the new Department of the Secretary of State for the Environment.

Our Bill refers to research, but it does not state specifically that a department of research will be established under the control of the principal Minister. In Britain an advisory committee of 20 was set up. An inter-departmental subcommittee, as one could well imagine, was set up and comprised those senior public servants involved in the departments concerned. So the Minister had an advisory committee and a subcommittee of public servants to advise the department on all aspects that were covered by the three Ministers under the senior control of the Secretary of State for the Environment; this makes for a very comprehensive system of control.

But there are other aspects of the matter as well. They did not just establish this Ministry of control and give the overriding control of these various departments to the Secretary of State for the Environment: they also set out at the same time to provide guidelines as to what was being done, what was proposed to be done by these departments, and what further areas needed to be covered by the new Department for the Environment. In May, 1970, a White Paper on the control of pollu-

tion was published. The White Paper, entitled *Protection of the Environment*, was described as a progressive report that set out in broad outline the nature of the problems, the current situation, and proposals for Government action.

The matters referred to in greater detail in the report were the requirements for control and proposed action. Pollution was covered under various headings, such as air pollution, noise, pollution of the land, pollution of fresh water, pollution of the sea and pollution by radio-activity. A section on international action covered such matters as international pollution of the high seas (such as when the *Torrey Canyon* sank off the coast of Britain, and the problems associated with that sinking became international as well as local). The White Paper showed how far these various departments now involved in the one Department for the Environment had progressed in their various areas of authority. In other words, the current level of achievement was set down in a paper. I think that possibly the most important aspect of the British legislation, and the one to which I will refer in some detail, is the question of appointing a Royal Commission completely independent of the Ministry and the Government. That was a major step concerning this legislation. Sir Eric Ashby, who is the Master of Clare College (Cambridge), and until recently was Vice-Chancellor of that university, was made the Chairman of this Royal Commission. There were eight other members, all of whom are people of great prominence in various areas, such as Professor Beckerman, who is the head of the Department of Political Economy at the University College, London; and Mr. Aubrey Buxton, Director of Anglia Television and British Trustee of the World Wild Life Fund.

The other members are also people of some substance, including Lord Zuckerman, who for many years was Chief Scientific Adviser to the Government. This Royal Commission was set up with a Chairman and eight capable and well-qualified members who were given independent powers to act as a watchdog to ensure that executive departments did not fall down on their job and also to see that any questions or problems that arose were immediately brought to notice and investigated as rapidly as possible so that there would be no unnecessary delay.

Although this Bill provides powers of a Royal Commission to the Minister's council, and provision is also made for the council to

delegate authority to subcommittees and, with Ministerial consent, for those subcommittees to have the powers of a Royal Commission to undertake inquiries, I point out that, as I see the difference between what has happened under the British legislation and what is intended here, in our case the council is made up basically of senior public servants, and this would correspond to the advisory subcommittee (to which I have referred) to the Secretary of State for the Environment.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Half of them are not public servants.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I admit that: four of them are independent, but the Chairman is the Director of the department and, in the event of a dispute, I think it is undeniable that he would have an overriding discretionary power, because he is given both a casting vote and a positive vote. In America (I think this matter needs to be dealt with in some breadth, although I do not think we have given sufficient breadth to this legislation), the comparable body is known as the Cabinet Commission on Environment, comprising the Vice-President of the United States; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; the Secretary of the Interior; and the Secretary of Transportation.

These are men involved in areas similar to those covered by the minor Ministries that come under the Secretary of State for the Environment in Britain. There is a wide coverage of people and interests concerning these committees. In addition, other nominees can be appointed to the President's committee, such as heads of departments and agencies, and others that the President may from time to time direct to be appointed. As well as this statutory committee a citizens' advisory committee, made up of a chairman and 20 appointed members, is also available. This is an outside advisory body to the statutory body. Although we refer to other people being consulted, we have not made an attempt to set up an advisory committee of people who are interested in certain aspects, a committee with a wider breadth of interest than could possibly be involved in the four independent members who are to be appointed to the council.

I can understand why the Minister does not wish to follow legislation introduced in Victoria and Western Australia. The Environment Protection Bill, introduced in Victoria in December, 1970, is a very limited Bill and

an authoritarian Bill, because it sets up an authority of three that is the responsible group: it is not the Minister but an authority of three which is responsible and which is supported by an advisory protection council of 17 members. These members are drawn from a wide range of people and from Government departments involved (mainly the directors of the departments or their nominees). In Victoria the Bill defines the problems: it defines pollution, something that we do not do in our Bill. We refer to the environment in such general terms that it covers almost everything, but the Victorian Act defines pollution in the following terms:

Any direct or indirect alteration of the physical, thermal, chemical, biological or radioactive properties of any part of the environment by discharging, emitting, or depositing wastes so as to affect any beneficial use adversely, to cause a condition which is hazardous or potentially hazardous to public health, safety, or welfare, or to animals, birds, wild life, fish or aquatic life, or to plants or to cause a contravention of any condition, limitation, or restriction to which a licence under this Act is subject.

I emphasize the word "licence", because our legislation is not concerned with issuing licences and is not so specific. We still describe the environment in general terms. In Victoria the problems are defined as problems of controlling waste: the legislation discusses licensing, appeals against penalties provided under the Act, and so on. It is a restrictive Act.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you know how it is working?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, I have not had—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There are many problems.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. It is a very authoritarian Act and I see the difficulties in such an Act, the same as I can see difficulties in the Western Australia legislation, which was introduced on December 15, 1971, in similar terms. It provides for setting up four bodies. The first is an authority consisting of a director and two members appointed by the Governor; in that respect it is identical with the Victorian system. Secondly, a department of environmental protection is established; in that respect it is similar to South Australia, because we already have an Environment and Conservation Department. Thirdly, there is an environmental protection council of 14 members, comprising the Director (as chairman) and 13 appointed members. Fourthly, there is an environmental protection board of three members.

Provision is also made for an appeal board of three members, because the legislation tends to be overlord legislation, in that it defines the problem and prescribes remedies without any further investigation and it sets out penalties for infringement of the regulations. I do not believe that the Victorian and Western Australian Acts have very much to commend them. What the Government has done here is at this stage much better. We are not attempting to define the problem at this stage, but we are setting up a council with power to establish what the problems are, and we will probably deal with the problems in a completely different way.

Mr. Mathwin: The Bill has no teeth.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I agree. In the *Gazette* of December 23, 1971, the office of Director of the Museum Department was abolished, and the Museum Department and the State Planning Section of the Premier's Department were merged to form the Environment and Conservation Department. The Minister of Environment and Conservation had departments transferred to him from other Ministries, but it was not until February of this year that a Director of Environment and Conservation was appointed. So, we are proceeding very slowly. Now, we are setting up a council presumably to define our problems; this council will decide the sorts of problem that it considers we in this State should be concerned with and it will make recommendations on what action should be taken, what further research should be conducted, and what additional legislation and regulations should be prepared.

So, in leaving the Bill as wide as possible, we have to accept it as only a stepping stone towards the stage already accepted by Western Australia and Victoria. I believe that those States have tried to define their problems, while we are still analysing ours. This Bill is a stepping stone towards the situation already reached in the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe, where further investigation and research are being conducted into the problems there. They have an independent authority set up to consider their problems. This is one of the criticisms I have of the Bill: we have set up what I regard as largely a subcommittee of public servants—the heads of the departments concerned with this type of legislation. They are people such as the new Director of Environment and Conservation; the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department; the Director, Department of the Premier and of Develop-

ment; and the Director-General of Public Health. In addition, there will be four other members. These men are very competent, but they are busy men. Although I accept that in some measure they deal with these matters now (pollution is dealt with under limited regulations, with limited legislation such as the Clean Air Act, and there are Engineering and Water Supply Department regulations relating to the Murray River), the interpretation of the environment provided in this Bill is extremely broad, stating:

"the environment" in relation to the State, includes any matter or thing that determines or affects the conditions or influences under which any animate thing lives or exists in the State.

That is an extraordinarily wide definition, taking in almost anything. It covers pollution, the preservation of buildings under the National Trust, and so on.

Mr. Mathwin: It could cover politics.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It would not work so well in here. In the Bill, we are about to define the problems as we see them in this State. I believe that we can best define these problems by having a completely independent authority. I think it would be better if the council set up under the Bill became a secondary body, as is the authority established by the British legislation. It could be an administrative body that would make a recommendation to the Minister after someone had defined more specifically within this definition of environment what were the problems in the State with which we really needed to deal. The Jordan committee was a special committee set up to look at beaches and foreshores.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The total environment. Its report will be available in a month or two.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Perhaps that committee dealt with the definition of the overall problem of the environment as it relates specifically to South Australia, and it is in this way that I think the Bill is lacking. I believe we must define these problems more precisely, as has been done in legislation elsewhere. However, I do not think we should follow the example of Victoria and Western Australia, where I believe the definition is too restrictive and limited in its thought and application. Until we are able to define the areas of environmental protection and conservation to which we need to direct our attention, I do not think we are moving much farther forward by establishing this council in its present form.

I see this council as being more of an administrative than a directive council that will

seek to put into effect proposals and recommendations made to it by some other body responsible to examine more closely local environment and problems and to define, if only in breadth rather than in detail, those things that should be studied and given priority. The *Advertiser*, in an article concerning the council, entitled "Power Given to Criticize" and appearing in the edition of August 26, recently provided me with what I considered to be one of the funny stories of the week. I wonder whether the council, consisting as it will of four senior public servants, the chairman of which will also be a public servant, will be critical of the Government of which it is a servant, even though it is provided that the Public Service Act shall not apply to certain aspects of the council's deliberations.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a hot one.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is ludicrous to suggest that the council will criticize the Government. Of course, it has power to initiate an inquiry and to investigate certain matters that the Minister refers to it. In its reports, which are due to be tabled in June of each year, it will be proper for the committee to outline the projects that have been referred to it for investigation. In those circumstances Parliament would be able to criticize the Government if it had been tardy in taking action on those matters. However, to suggest that the council itself would be openly critical of its master is ludicrous. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 30, at 2 p.m.