

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 19, 1972

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Footwear Regulation Act Amendment,
Highways Act Amendment,
Juvenile Courts Act Amendment,
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment,
Planning and Development Act Amend-
ment (Committee),
Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil
Act Amendment,
River Torrens Acquisition Act Amend-
ment.

QUESTIONS**RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, tell the House whether there has been any alteration in the method of distributing funds under the rural unemployment scheme? The Minister will be aware that these funds, which have been made available by the Commonwealth Government in respect of persons in the rural sector who are unemployed, are managed in this State by officers of the Lands Department. Over a long time, councils have asked that projects under this fund be considered on a definite basis. Basically the stipulation has been that 70 per cent of the funds be used for the employment of labour, and the balance for materials. Many councils throughout the State have been able to employ many people (both male and female) who would otherwise have been unemployed. It is now stated that there has been a marked reduction during the second quarter of funds to be made available to the various councils. In fact, the figures I have indicate that the grant to one council for the July-September period was \$13,260, or an average monthly rate of \$4,420. This sum allowed for the employment of 12 people in July, 16 in August, and 15 in September. The total sum available for the rest of the year will be only \$3,210, even though it had been indicated earlier that the sum made available would probably be equivalent to the sum for the previous quarter. Therefore, the average monthly rate for the rest of the year will be only \$1,070, which means that it will be diffi-

cult to employ more than two persons, despite the fact that the number registered for employment in the area is still high. This picture, in less detail, has been presented to me by representatives of several other councils throughout the State. Can the Minister say whether there has been any change in the management of this scheme? A check with the Commonwealth Government indicates that there has been no reduction in the sum made available by that Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In explaining his question, the Leader said that one of the criteria laid down by the Commonwealth Government (and this is not the province of the State Government) was that 70 per cent of the money spent should be spent on employing labour. That is not correct, as the actual proportions are 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent and 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. I will certainly refer this matter to the Acting Minister of Lands to have it thoroughly checked, but I will say a couple of things about it with which I am familiar. The policy followed by the Lands Department has been to consider an individual project listed among other projects put forward by councils, even though the amount of labour to be used in that project may be as low as, for instance, 20 per cent, because the department then looks at the performance of the council over the whole range of the projects put forward. In this regard, even applications from councils for special consideration can be taken into account, having regard to the position over the whole State. By this, I mean that the criterion laid down by the Commonwealth Government can be satisfied, provided that about 66 per cent of the funds employed over the whole State is concerned with the employment of labour and about 33 per cent is used for the cost of materials. Individual applications can be made, as this criterion does not have to apply in each case. One of the reasons why I think there has been a substantial reduction in the allocation of funds to councils at this stage is that many councils have believed that the same sums would be made available as were made available in the first six months of the scheme. I point out that in many cases councils were slow to put forward applications and projects for consideration. Therefore, ample sums were available in the latter part of that six-month period. Consequently, employment was at a very high rate. This could not be sustained over the next six months, because the councils were actually geared for it and consequently money would have been spent. It could well have been that in the original

allocation the department considered this money might not be fully spent, and would come back into the pool to be reallocated. That might have happened. The Leader asked whether there had been a change in management. I know that the Lands Department officer handling the matter (Mr. Bean) was appointed to a position with the Highways Department, which meant a promotion for that officer, but I do not know whether he has yet left the Lands Department. However, I will have the matter looked at for the Leader and, if he has a specific case where he considers an injustice has occurred, I shall be pleased to receive information about it from him and to place it before my colleague.

BRUCELLOSIS

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what is the programme regarding the eradication of tuberculosis and brucellosis in cattle? Following a meeting of South-Eastern dairymen four or five weeks ago, which I attended, this matter was discussed, and I have been in touch with the Minister of Agriculture about the possible shortage of money for the eradication programme, with a view to having the Commonwealth Government assist. I understand the Minister has a reply to the representations made to the Minister of Agriculture on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the situation in regard to the tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication campaign in this State is that, although State funds allocated for this purpose have been increased from \$107,000 in 1971-72 to \$130,000 in 1972-73, the Commonwealth will provide this year only a matching grant of \$130,000, as against the \$177,000 made available last year, and in order to maintain the campaign against tuberculosis it will be necessary to require producers to pay for brucellosis vaccination. The Premier has asked the Commonwealth to accept producer payments for vaccination as a State contribution to the brucellosis campaign which would qualify for a matching Commonwealth grant; and, in this event, it could be continued at a level commensurate with the urgency of the campaign. At the meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council held this week, the Minister of Agriculture made strong representations (in which he was supported by other State Ministers) for additional Commonwealth assistance to accelerate the eradication programme. I believe that the Commonwealth Minister agreed to have a

further look at the possibility of providing further finance for all States for this purpose. It has also been made clear to the Commonwealth Government that its decision not to assist with compensation could prejudice the testing programme, as the State compensation fund is almost exhausted.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the absence from the Chamber of both the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport, I direct my question to the Minister of Works, who is the Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to act on the suggestion that persons charged with driving under the influence of alcohol or a drug be tried and sentenced by a judge? My question is prompted by a report in yesterday's *Advertiser* of a comment made by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of the driver-training centre. His Excellency is reported to have said:

People convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol should be treated as criminals. They should be tried and sentenced by a judge rather than a magistrate.

I take it that His Excellency had in mind that the offence should become an indictable offence and triable by a judge and jury, but that does not appear from the report. Certainly, His Excellency's comments highlight the gravity of this offence, which we know is very prevalent and which at present is dealt with in a summary way by a magistrate. Therefore, I ask the question of the Premier, especially as the suggestion for the change has come from His Excellency.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Mitcham, in opening his remarks, in his usual snide fashion referred to the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport from the Chamber. For the honourable member's edification, I point out that the Premier is absent on Government business in another State and that the Minister of Roads and Transport is also absent on urgent business. In addition, I remind him that the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport are far more assiduous in their attendance in this House than he is.

Mr. Millhouse: I take exception to that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In reply to the honourable member's specific question, the Government does not intend to alter present procedures.

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what action the Road Safety Council will take to ensure that members of the public and schoolchildren will be tutored in road safety at the new Road Safety Centre, which was opened by the Minister last Tuesday? Everyone who saw this centre operating at Oaklands Park must realize the Minister's keenness to stop the road carnage, the work carried out by contractors and the gifts made by business people in respect of this project. This scheme warrants continued patronage and augurs well for a future reduction in the number of road accidents. The Minister has received many tributes for his efforts in this field of road safety and for his co-operation in making finance available to establish this centre.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Safety Council has a most ambitious programme which, with the opening of the Road Safety Centre at Oaklands Park, will now be put into full operation. In this respect, the youngest section of the community is dealt with by the close co-operation that exists between the Education Department and the Road Safety Council, as road safety is now part of the curriculum of the various schools. With regard to young people who actually drive, statistics show clearly that people in the under-25-years age group are the most accident prone. Knowing this, the Road Safety Council over recent months has invited selected people in that age group to attend various schools that have been arranged by the council. With the advent of the centre at Marion, this type of activity will be stepped up. I hope that, in the long term, this will have a marked effect in reducing the road carnage. However, I think that I should stress that we are seeking a long-term solution to the problem, our efforts being directed to that end. It may be that some time will pass before the real impact of our programme is felt, but I am certain that its impact will eventually be felt.

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport considered introducing a minimum speed limit on sections of South Australian roads? My question is prompted by the following article that appears in Tuesday's *Advertiser*:

The Victorian Road Safety and Traffic Authority will consider whether there should be minimum speed limits on sections of Victorian Highways.

It is claimed that a really slow driver can cause dangerous situations when other motorists are forced to pass him.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The whole question of speed limits is currently being considered. At present, we are examining a proposal that, instead of a *prima facie* maximum speed limit being imposed, speed zones should be established, after consideration has been given to the geometry of a road, and other factors such as sight distances, and so on. However, the matter of minimum speeds has not been considered at this stage, although it will certainly be examined. I can see some dangers in this. Nevertheless, the specialist committee that is looking at the whole matter will undoubtedly consider this question.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government has considered testing drivers of motor vehicles at regular intervals? Last Tuesday morning most members attended the opening of the new driving centre at Oaklands Park. I think I have asked the Minister this question before but I wonder, now that the facilities are available, whether he would consider testing drivers at regular intervals, because there are many drivers who did not have to undergo a practical test before obtaining their licences.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That would be a very desirable thing to do, but the matter has not yet been considered seriously, because we must first assess the capabilities of the centre to handle the number of people that wish to use it. I would certainly like to see those people who have had their licences taken away by the courts required, as a prerequisite to regaining a licence, to complete a course at the driving centre. However, between 12,000 and 13,000 are so affected annually; therefore, if this was done, the work of the centre would be concentrated solely on that section of the community.

I, and the Road Safety Council, believe that if we are to make an impact on the road toll it must be done initially through the younger people. This constitutes a long-term solution but I think it will be the most successful approach to make. As soon as the ability of the centre to cater for numbers of people can be accurately assessed, we will look at areas where we can expand our activities. and the suggestion of the member for Davenport is certainly one that we will investigate.

LIBERAL MOVEMENT

Mr. HOPGOOD: I address my question to the Leader of the Opposition. Is the successful attempt by the Leader to recruit seven new members of the Liberal Parliamentary Party in the House of Assembly the latest ploy by the L.C.L. to contain the activities of the Liberal Movement and will the Leader please produce these seven new members so that they may be properly sworn in? On page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser* we read that seven members of the Liberal Movement joined with the Government to defeat a Bill which had come down from the Upper House to amend the Constitution. Later in the article we were told that the vote was 25 to 17. Unless the new maths has changed the rules, my understanding is that 17 plus seven makes 24, which, with the absent Messrs. Brookman and Nankivell, would bring total Liberal strength from both factions in this House to 26. I do not know if this is a trick the Leader performs with mirrors or if he has found a loophole in the Constitution, but whatever the truth of the matter, his innate sense of political generosity—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to reply?

Dr. EASTICK: My comment is similar to that made by Ministers on the front bench during the time that I have been a member: one should never believe everything one reads in the press.

GLAZIERS' DISPUTE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the present position concerning the glaziers' strike?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This dispute has not been brought to my attention at this stage, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. BECKER: In the absence of the Premier, can the Deputy Premier say what action the Government intends to take to curb the continuing increase in the cost of living in this State? I understand from figures released today that the cost of living rose by 1.6 per cent in Adelaide for the quarter ended September 30, and that the increase in Adelaide was greater than that in any other capital city. I understand that the highest rise in Adelaide was in the cost of food, which rose by 1.8 per cent. On the average Australian figures, rises in price of food (the highest in recent years) would add 44c to a weekly food bill of \$20.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government intends to counter this increase by advising everyone in South Australia to vote Labor in the forthcoming Commonwealth election.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government is concerned at the increase in the cost of living index for the quarter ended September 30, which shows the increase in South Australia to be the greatest in any State, and will he outline the administrative steps the Government intends to take to arrest this sharp increase? In view of the Minister's previous reply and in view of the Australian Labor Party's slogan at the last State election, "Live better with Labor", how can the Government justify the spiralling of the cost of living in this State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Naturally, the Government is concerned about the increase in the cost of living in this State. When I replied to the honourable member previously, I said that the first thing the Government would do would be to advise people to vote Labor at the next Commonwealth elections. I meant that, and the honourable member would know that the Commonwealth Labor Party believes that there should be a prices tribunal before which people desiring to increase the price of goods supplied to the community would have to justify any such increase. In my view, that would lead to a far better system of control than that which currently obtains. Even though we have a Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs in this State, the honourable member knows that it is not always possible to curb the increase in prices as satisfactorily as we would like. I will refer the question to the Treasurer. Many factors go to make up an increase in the cost of living. I recall that on one occasion an increase in hospital fees, bus fares and similar costs was the main reason for an increase. I am not personally aware of any specific factor that may have conduced to the increase just referred to, but I will certainly have the matter studied and, if steps can be taken in a specific direction, I will let the honourable member know what they are. I will refer the matter to my colleague for examination.

Later:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the absence of the Premier, I ask the Deputy Premier to what factor does he attribute the increased cost of living in South Australia over the last three months.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that two similar questions have already been asked on that matter today.

MISCELLANEOUS LEASES

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Acting Minister of Irrigation, say what discussions have taken place with miscellaneous leaseholders in the Loveday area and what terms have been offered for the renewal of the leases? During the past few months I have accompanied two deputations to the Minister of Irrigation, and the Minister has inspected the area and had discussions with the leaseholders on their properties. On March 22, I asked a question about the matter and, although I received a reply, further information on the present situation is needed. I told the Acting Minister of Irrigation this morning that I would be asking this question this afternoon and the Minister of Works may have a reply for me.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the following report from my colleague:

You will recall that in reply to your question on this same matter on March 22, I stated the broad basis for the annual rentals to apply to new miscellaneous leases, namely, for the use of ground improvements on the irrigable portion only 4 per cent of their assessed value plus for a residential site \$12 and for agricultural or horticultural land with an irrigation supply available from Government head works \$4 an acre. In the event that the ground improvements were to be purchased instead of rented, then lessees would be allowed 10 years in which to meet the purchase price. Furthermore, the Barmera Vegetable Growers Association was informed by letter, as well as in discussion with my colleague the Minister of Irrigation, that any particular vegetable grower who considered that he had a particular problem on his land as a result of which the rental or other conditions were unjust should individually submit his case to the department and arrangements would be made for a detailed report to be submitted for consideration in Adelaide. I did not, at that time, advise that land for which an irrigation supply was not available or which was classified as non-irrigable carried a lower rental on a sliding scale from being \$2 an acre for the first five acres to nil for unusable land.

Since that time there was a further deputation from the Barmera branch of the Market Gardeners and Vegetable Growers Association which waited on my colleague the Minister of Irrigation on May 9, as a result of which the association representatives were again informed that individual growers could put their case for consideration if they felt there was any justification for it and that, if the association wished to pursue a claim for reduced rentals on the grounds that returns for vegetable production were insufficient to enable them to afford the new rents, then the association should put up factual information in support of that claim. There have been no individual claims for specific consideration from any vegetable grower but 44 miscellaneous leases due for renewal have recently been re-examined by departmental officers and in every case the

lessee was present during the inspection and given the opportunity to state what disabilities, if any, there were on his lease. Following these inspections, new rentals have been fixed by the Land Board and there have been some minor increases as well as decreases in a number of cases ranging from a few dollars to \$20 a year in one case. Twenty-five of the 44 lessees have been advised to date what their new rents will be. Only six have replied indicating that they accept the rental and conditions advised but the remainder have not yet submitted any reply whatever. This, I might add, has taken place over the past two months only. In a few instances, because of the possibility that portion of the irrigable land may deteriorate through the development of seepage, recommendations by the District Officer for the term of the lease to be five years instead of 10 and so allow an earlier review of the rental have been accepted and offered to the lessees concerned. It would therefore be up to them to decide whether they want the rental reviewed earlier than 10 years from now. To assist migrants to understand the position the department has distributed explanatory circulars in the Italian and Greek languages.

REPATRIATION HOSPITAL

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to have an investigation carried out in order to ascertain whether there is any potential use to be made, within the State field of social welfare and health services, of the repatriation hospital at Florence Terrace, Belair? If there is an opportunity for the State to use this 50-bed hospital, will the Attorney-General ask his colleague to ensure that negotiations are undertaken with the Commonwealth Minister for Repatriation (Hon. R. M. Holtzen) with a view to making these premises available at least until an expected increased bed demand is made on the Repatriation Department in the 1980's? It was recently announced that use of the repatriation hospital known as "Birralee", at Belair, is to be gradually phased out, and it has been suggested that here is a golden opportunity for the State Government to use those premises, if there is any area of need in our society for such a facility. I have been informed that the property, which was bought at the end of the Second World War, has been developed as a 50-bed hospital and has seldom had full occupancy, especially since the introduction of antibiotics, with its resultant decline in tuberculosis patients.

The average occupancy last year was 29, and the Repatriation Department will gradually transfer the present operations at Birralee to Daw Park Hospital, resulting in a \$60,000 a year saving to the taxpayer. The ultimate future of the property has not been decided

by the Commonwealth Government but it is expected that the demand for beds for long-term care patients will possibly increase in the 1980's, as returned servicemen from the Second World War require treatment. If the State Government does not have a long-term use for the property, it may be able to negotiate short-term use until such time as the Repatriation Department begins to receive the expected influx of patients in the 1980's. I am informed that the major returned servicemen organizations understand the reasons for phasing out the repatriation hospital and have raised no real objections.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary is well aware of this situation and is keeping in touch with the position. Although he is considering the matter, no decisions have yet been made.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: VOTING

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: I refer to a report appearing on page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser* in which there seems to be some misunderstanding concerning how certain Opposition members voted yesterday on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Electoral). In fact, it is not correct that seven members of the Liberal and Country League who are also members of the Liberal Movement joined the Government and voted against the Opposition.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It should have been correct.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: I would not have raised this matter (nor would I have considered it necessary to do so) except that this morning the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House (Mr. DeGaris) used this report to denigrate members of the L.C.L. who are members of the L.M. when he was discussing this matter with certain colleagues outside this House. I therefore reiterate that all members of the L.M. who are members of the L.C.L. voted in accordance with their obligations under the agreement made with their colleagues.

ARTHRITIS ADVERTISEMENT

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask officers of his department to investigate an advertisement being widely publicized in newspapers and circulated by way of letterbox pamphlets to see whether or not it constitutes unfair advertising? I draw members' attention

to the advertisement headed "The Truth About Arthritic Pain", showing a photograph of a woman bent over, clutching her hip.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg has the call, and there are far too many audible interjections. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The advertisement states:

Method developed to ease the pain. Get the facts free. Write today. Millions of people . . . thousands of doctors . . . have discovered this dynamic new concept of body care. You can get this information free.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to be continually rising to my feet calling for order. Members on both sides of the Chamber must maintain order. The honourable member for Bragg has the call and should be heard with courtesy. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: The company is Niagara of Australia Proprietary Limited, of an address at North Adelaide, and I believe it is the company that was referred to previously or that the advertisement, anyway, is the same as that which appeared formerly under the heading of "Niagara Cyclo-therapy". It is significant that this advertisement avoids making any claims of curing people or of providing treatment. I am informed that the products advertised are items of furniture, with high-frequency vibratory units, which are offered at a considerable price, and that those people who write in reply to this advertisement, expecting some form of help or treatment for arthritic pain, certainly do not realize that they are to receive a catalogue of furniture of this nature. I believe that this could well constitute unfair advertising.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter investigated.

FIRE BRIGADE CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary any information on contributions made to the Fire Brigades Board in this State? I raised this matter previously, expressing the consternation of local councils regarding the contributions they are expected to make this year (a considerable increase on those made last year) to the Fire Brigades Board for protection purposes, and I referred to representations made to the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary reports that the matter of the increased contributions from the corporations of Enfield, Prospect and Walkerville to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board is being investigated, and it is hoped that a reply will be available in due course.

RAILWAY FINANCE

Mr. GUNN: In view of the importance to the economy of the operations of the South Australian Railways, I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what action he expects to take to correct the serious financial position that has arisen in respect of the department's operations. An article appears in a newspaper this week referring to a statement by the Railways Commissioner in which he referred to the existing crucial financial situation. In view of this situation, does the Minister plan to obtain a report on the finances of the railways as a whole, along lines similar to those applying to the report of a committee set up in Victoria?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would have expected the member for Eyre to rely on the Railways Commissioner's official report which I tabled in this House rather than on a press report. It is obvious from the tone of his question that he has not even taken the trouble to read the Commissioner's report, and I suggest to him that it may well be worth his while to do so. The operations of the South Australian Railways have been a matter of grave concern for a considerable time. However, this situation has existed not only during the life of this Government but also during that of former Governments, and that is the very reason why the various State Ministers of Roads and Transport, all of whose departments are in a similar position, varying only by degree from State to State, have stated a strong case at the Australian Transport Advisory Council, requesting the Commonwealth Government to provide the rail transport industry with financial aid similar to that given the air transport industry, the sea transport industry, and the road transport industry. The submissions made by State Transport Ministers have been subjected to an in-depth evaluation by the Commonwealth Government's own Bureau of Transport Economics, which has made reports, first, in February this year, and again in July this year, that show clearly the urgent need to have finance injected into the railway systems of Australia, as well as into the urban public transport sector. Up to the present, however, the Commonwealth Government has completely turned its back on these recommendations.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister say why he has not made available the special report on railway finances that the Railways Commissioner prepared last year? Will he make it available so that members of Parliament and members of the public can consider this matter and be brought fully up to date with the financial affairs of the South Australian Railways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, the honourable member has read the stop press in the *News* in which his colleague in another place gave forewarning that he would ask for the report to be released. From time to time the Government receives many reports, and this report is one of those various reports. It is now being considered by the Government and it would not be proper for me at this time to publish it for the general public.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Acting Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about drought relief?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that an expenditure of \$3,228 has been incurred to date in respect of drought assistance because of unfavourable seasonal conditions. The payments have been made to subsidize the cost of transporting stock and fodder.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Works inquire about spotlights that are burning all night at the intersection of Brighton Road, Sturt Road, and Old Beach Road, at Brighton? Several constituents of mine have requested me to ask the Minister to look into this matter, because they believe that the burning of these lights all night is causing a great waste of electricity and fuel. The Minister will know that at present work is proceeding on relaying a section of the water main in Brighton Road and that part of the road is closed to traffic. There are warning signs and "one way" signs near all four corners, each corner having at least two spotlights. For the past fortnight or longer these spotlights have been burning day and night.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As this intersection is in the district of the Minister of Education and as he is also concerned about the matter, when I have inquired into the matter I will give the reply to the member for the district.

BUSH FIRES ACT

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say (and this question may also concern the Minister of Agriculture) whether it is intended to amend sections 49 and 54 of the Bush Fires Act as a result of the introduction of daylight saving? Section 49 deals with the rules for burning stubble during the conditional period, and section 54 relates to the rules for burning scrub during that period. Section 49 (1) (f) and section 54 (1) (j) both provide that such fires must not be lit before 12 noon. As 12 noon will be the equivalent of 11 a.m. with regard to sun time during the period of daylight saving, does the Government intend to alter the time referred to in these sections to 1 p.m. for the period during which daylight saving operates?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I understand that the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for the legislation, is currently examining this matter. I will ask him what is the position, and let the honourable member know.

DUNCAN INQUIRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say when it is expected that the two English police officers who have been brought out here to conduct investigations into the Duncan case will complete those investigations?

Mr. Mathwin: Are they still here?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they are. A report in today's press refers to the cost so far of the investigations that have been continuing for about 2½ months. I understand that a large staff from the Police Department is assisting the two gentlemen in their investigations and, after this time, one would expect that a result would be forthcoming soon. I therefore put the question to the Attorney and ask him to stress to his colleague when he relays the question that, in the public interest, a speedy reply would be appreciated.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to investigate the current availability and sales of the drug Methyprylone (Noludar) in South Australia with a view to taking urgent action to control the alarming increase in its use? A concerned pharmacist has contacted me regarding this drug, which is a depressant affecting the central

nervous system and which is used as a sedative in cases of mild insomnia. He informs me that the Poisons Schedule Sub-Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council in its Uniform Poison Standards of May 14, 1971, recommended that Methyprylone be made available in all States only on prescription. All States except South Australia have amended their legislation either before or subsequent to that recommendation. I am not sure what the present situation is in South Australia and this is one reason for my asking the question. The pharmacist has expressed extreme concern about the use of this drug in South Australia, as he believes that its use is following the usual pattern of such drugs when they are available. Other drugs such as Doriden, Sleepinal and Relaxa Tabs were freely available previously without prescription, and the use of these three drugs was responsible for many cases of drug dependence. It now appears that, since the sale of the other drugs has been controlled, there has been an alarming increase in the use of Noludar.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

BUS FARES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport discuss with officers of the Municipal Tramways Trust the possibility of implementing reduced fares for small groups of people who travel on M.T.T. buses during off-peak periods so that groups will be encouraged to see our city and suburbs and at the same time increase patronage of M.T.T. buses during off-peak periods? I believe that there are many small groups which, if given a fare concession, would, in groups of 10 or 15, visit the various suburbs, perhaps stopping at a park for lunch and then travelling back by bus on another route or on a ring-route. Not only would that increase the patronage of trust buses: it would also enable people to take more interest in our city and suburbs.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The whole matter of the fare structure is currently under consideration. I shall be pleased to include this matter for consideration.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. J. KING: For some time the Government has been considering the advisability of introducing new procedures and methods in respect of applications from persons seeking appointment as justices of the peace.

A committee known as the Appointment of Justices Committee was formed and its recommendations assisted the Government to formulate a new policy in respect of such appointments. The committee comprises Judge Marshall (Chairman); Mr. E. L. Bonython, J.P. (President of the Royal Association of Justices of South Australia); and Mr. A. R. Bishop, LL.B. (Senior Solicitor, Crown Law Department).

All applications, except those rejected on grounds of non-eligibility, will be referred in due course to this committee for consideration. This committee will make a recommendation to the Attorney-General in respect of each application and, in any case where an appointment is not recommended, report briefly to the Attorney-General the reasons for the refusal to recommend. Occupations rendering an applicant ineligible are as set out:

- (i) legal practitioners and articled clerks, police officers (State and Commonwealth), licensees and managers of premises licensed under the Licensing Act, land agents, land salesmen, land brokers, managers of land agent companies, hotel brokers, commercial and private agents, insurance salesmen, loss assessors, and persons with other similar occupations or employment where the taking of a statutory declaration or the witnessing of a document as a justice may involve a conflict between a person's business interests and his responsibilities and duties as a justice of the peace;
- (ii) public servants (State and Commonwealth) except upon request by the permanent head of the applicant's department;
- (iii) in the case of an application by a minister of religion, the applicant will be required to give an assurance that he will not exercise the court functions of the office.

The Attorney-General reserves the right, however, to recommend the appointment of a person in the above categories in special circumstances. Under the new procedure—

- (a) the Government will continue the practice of establishing quotas for the appointment of justices of the peace in various parts of the State;
- (b) the existing practice of forwarding all applications through a member of Parliament has been modified to allow an applicant the choice of following

that procedure or forwarding the application form direct to the Secretary of the Attorney-General's Department;

- (c) a person nominated as a referee on the question of the character of the applicant will be asked to submit a written statement; this replaces the existing practice, whereby a referee merely signs the form of application;
- (d) age limits for appointment are minimum 25 and maximum 65;
- (e) applicants are to be interviewed by a stipendiary magistrate or a member of the appointment committee.

All existing applications, that is, those received at the Attorney-General's Department but not yet dealt with, will be considered on their merits in accordance with the procedures set out above. It will not be necessary for these persons to reapply for appointment.

The Government acknowledges that the duties carried out by justices of the peace are of great value to the community, and I note, with pleasure, that there has, in recent years particularly, been an improvement in the general standard of the work of justices. Whilst this has been caused largely by the interest and enthusiasm displayed by justices, it has been contributed to by the publication of the *Handbook for Justices*, the correspondence course of instruction available free of charge to justices through the Technical Correspondence School of the Education Department, and the various lectures and seminars arranged by the Royal Association of Justices of South Australia Incorporated. The Government is of the opinion that the new procedures regulating the appointment of justices will make a further and very substantial contribution towards the maintenance and improvement of the existing standards. It is pleasing to know that the suggested procedures have the approval of the Royal Association of Justices in this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether any action will be taken when a justice of the peace enters one of the occupations referred to by the Attorney as barring appointment? I listened with attention to the Attorney's statement. I sympathize with him in the problem associated with the appointment of justices, having experienced it myself. I hope that the system that he has announced for appointments will be satisfactory and workable. However, there is the difficulty that, when a justice enters one of the occupations that normally bar appointment if he is not

already a justice, he retains the appointment. I know that several people, because they are already justices, have been able more easily to enter those occupations. From the statement of the Attorney, it seems as though this problem (which I have experienced in the same way as other Attorneys-General have experienced it) is not tackled.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No action is being taken at this stage. The practice in the past has been to treat each case on its merits. A justice of the peace is under no obligation to notify anyone if he changes his occupation. It is difficult to introduce any water-tight system. I think that in the past, where it has become known to the Attorney-General's Department that a justice of the peace has become involved in one of the occupations that has rendered him ineligible for appointment, he has sometimes been asked to resign his commission, but not always. Each case has been treated on its merits. I do not think this is a wholly satisfactory system, and the matter deserves further attention. When the new system settles down, I intend to ask the committee whether some more formal system should be instituted to endeavour to ensure that, where justices are engaged in occupations which make it undesirable that they should continue as justices, it should be brought to the attention of the committee, so that at any rate some consideration can be given whether they should be asked to resign their commission. It may be difficult to do this in all cases. I think that the matter requires much consideration before anything definite is done.

Dr. EASTICK: In preparing his statement, has the Attorney-General considered the position of those people who become justices by virtue of the office they hold, and whether the appointment of those people as justices will become permanent or will remain temporary? The Attorney will appreciate that some officers in various departments (and certain mayors and chairmen of councils) seek to be and are appointed justices, but their commission terminates once they leave that office.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I see no reason to alter the present position in that regard; indeed, I think that to alter it would create problems. I have adopted the practice that, where a person has held a commission of the peace on a temporary basis and ceases to hold the office on the basis on which he has been appointed a justice, I will ordinarily (if he so desires) make his appointment permanent. There are cases when that cannot be done, the

most common case being where a person is engaged in an occupation that would preclude him from being appointed a justice. Although it is necessary that a person who is in one of the ineligible occupations should have a temporary commission whilst he is, say, a mayor, it is no longer necessary that he should be able to hold a commission of the peace after he ceases to be mayor. If there was no disqualification, ordinarily I would always recommend his appointment as a permanent justice, irrespective of the quota for the district. I do not think it is possible to lay down any hard and fast rule. I think that the temporary appointments must remain temporary. However, certainly as long as I am concerned with the matter, people who are appointed justices on a temporary basis will be specially considered at the termination of their office.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Attorney-General say what will be the quotas justifying the appointment of a justice of the peace, and by what method will they be fixed? Will they be fixed in relation to the number of electors or citizens, or will other factors be considered? In the past, with the quota system we have had, there has often been an imbalance between the number of justices of the peace in one area and the number in another because of residents changing addresses. In some areas there are many new citizens, not naturalized, who make a bigger demand on the services of the justices than is made in other areas, and this often happens in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The recommended quota, I think, is one justice for each 250 residents in the metropolitan area, and one for each 150 residents in the country. I do not know whether the quota is based on census statistics or on the electoral roll, but I will obtain the information and let the honourable member know.

REED GROWTH

Dr. EASTICK: Has the attention of the Minister of Works been drawn to a marked increase in the growth of reeds in the upper reaches of the Murray River? A letter has been received at my office from a fishermen's association in the Upper Murray area indicating that its members are concerned about the increased silting of the river, and drawing attention to the fact that there has been a marked increase in reed growth, which they believe to be uncontrolled. I have not seen this growth: I merely recite the information given to me.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of any increase in reed growth in the river, but, if it is happening, I do not know, frankly, what measures can be taken to prevent it. It may be caused by the river flow under certain conditions but, in any case, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say whether a pamphlet has been prepared to explain to water users on the Murray River the provisions of the Control of Waters Act? Also, will the Minister consider extending the term of water diversion licences for a longer period than one year, and will he consider issuing temporary licences when water in excess of normal requirements flows to waste? A report in last week's issue of the *Murray Pioneer* about a meeting of the South Australian Murray Irrigators Association drew attention to these matters, and members of that association are concerned about them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In reply to the first part of the question, a pamphlet is being prepared now by Mr. Ligertwood, the engineer in the Engineering and Water Supply Department responsible for this area. It is being prepared as a result of an undertaking I gave to a meeting of irrigators at Renmark some time ago that I would circulate to those involved details of the policies and conditions that would affect them under the Act. However, any delay that has been caused is the result of Mr. Ligertwood's suffering a broken leg recently. I understand that the pamphlet has almost been completed, and will first be sent to the executive of the association to be considered. Suggestions will then be made as to clarity and so on. I understand that a copy of the circular will then be sent to each irrigator.

On the second point, concerning annual licences being extended for a period of five years, the reply is "No". I have sufficient difficulty at present in convincing people who receive annual licences that they are not the holders of a water right. The honourable member is probably aware that in a year of water restriction in South Australia we are over-committed by about 100,000 acre feet. In these circumstances I could not consider extending the term for which the licences are issued: they are issued on an annual basis and will continue to be issued on that basis. Also, I will not allow people to use additional water in a year of plenty, which is the reply to the third part of the question.

Yesterday, when replying to a question from the member for Murray about this matter, I indicated that I would, because of drought conditions, issue temporary permits this year to those people who wanted to irrigate additional areas in order to produce feed for stock that otherwise would be affected by drought conditions. These conditions of issue will apply strictly to the additional areas that are to be irrigated. In any other circumstances it could well be that, for a temporary licence or an annual licence (and I said that we are having difficulty in convincing the holders of these licences that they are not the holders of water rights), if I encouraged people to outlay extra capital in order to provide additional irrigation, and the following year I revoked their licences, the licence holders and the Government would be placed in a difficult situation. It would be difficult to maintain any kind of reasonable policy in such circumstances.

PENOLA COURTHOUSE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Attorney-General say whether he has plans for an official opening of the new courthouse at Penola? The people of Penola are particularly grateful that this long-awaited facility is almost completed, and they are grateful to the Minister for making it available.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but, because of the audible conversations in the Chamber, I find it impossible to hear what he is saying. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: As the people of Penola would appreciate having an official opening, I ask the Minister to consider this suggestion.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am pleased that the Government has been able to provide this long-needed facility at Penola for the benefit of the honourable member's constituents and others who have business at the Penola courthouse. I consider that the event deserves to be marked by an official opening in some form. No plans have been made yet, but I shall certainly consider the suggestion in order to determine what form of official opening would be suitable for this courthouse.

MURRAY RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question on the Murray River system?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The following were the storages in Murray River reservoirs on October 4, 1972: Hume Reservoir, 1,999,900 acre feet, Lake Victoria, 539,860 acre feet, and Menindee Lakes, 1,339,000 acre

feet. It is expected that South Australia will receive quota supplies this summer, and there is very little likelihood of restrictions being imposed. It is probable that by the end of summer the level of Lake Alexandrina will have fallen below its present level of R.L. 109.00. It is too early to forecast the level likely to be reached, but indications are that the fall will not be as severe as that experienced in 1967-68.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister ascertain what is the highest level of the Murray River that can be obtained at the barrage at Goolwa, and, if it is higher than R.L. 109.5, will he ascertain why the department did not ensure the higher level was achieved so that there would be a better level in Lake Alexandrina or that the level would not be too low during the coming summer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I cannot answer that question, I will obtain a report and let the honourable member know.

MURRAY BRIDGE INTERSECTION

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask his officers for a report on the progress made on installing traffic lights at the intersection of the Mannum road and the Swanport road with Princes Highway? For many years this intersection has been discussed because of the problem caused by the land rising sharply at the western end of the main street of Murray Bridge. Correspondence has taken place recently about the installation of traffic lights in the main street and this matter has been raised. I can recall that for at least 10 years there have been many and varied plans for traffic control at this intersection and I understand the most recent plan is for the installation of traffic lights. Are traffic lights to be installed and, if so, when?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO. I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the cost of correspondence school courses?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The average number of effective full-time students of the Correspondence School in 1971 was 1,065. The expenditure for the school was \$384,423; thus the cost for a full-time pupil was \$361. From his study of the figures in the Auditor-General's Report the honourable member will be aware that this figure exceeds the average cost per primary student in a Government school, which in 1971 was \$307.

CHLORINE

Mr. HALL: How does the Minister of Works reconcile his recent statement that it is not illegal to discharge chlorine into the sea with the fact that chlorine is added in great quantities to the water supply of Adelaide before it reaches the sea through the sewage treatment works? This matter was brought to my attention by Mr. Bruce Harris, the fisheries writer in the *News*. In a recent newspaper article Mr. Corcoran is reported as saying:

It has been put to me that effluent from Bolivar sewage treatment works encourages cabbage weed. On the other hand it was suggested recently that chlorine-treated, high quality effluent from Glenelg has killed seaweed and that it is illegal to allow chlorine in the sea.

Mr. Corcoran is also reported as saying that there is no evidence that chlorine affects fish or sea-weed growth and that there is no question of the legality of discharging treated and safe effluent into the sea. Chlorine is included in the list of noxious substances listed in the regulations made under the Fisheries Act, 1971. Regulation 26 provides:

No person shall release or discharge or cause or permit, whether directly or indirectly, the release or discharge of any substance declared to be poisonous or injurious to fish or the spawn thereof, whether alone or mixed with or chemically compounded with any other substance, into any waters containing fish or into any place or waters from which it will or may reach any waters containing fish.

It may be argued that, when the chlorine reaches the sea, it is in a different form having been chemically compounded with various substances. However, his own regulation shows that that is not an exception. Can it be "chemically compounded with any other substance"? The department under the control of the Minister obviously adds large quantities of chlorine to Adelaide's water supply and it obviously proceeds to the sea through the effluent disposal system, even though the regulations say that is illegal.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Gouger has said that my department adds large quantities of chlorine to the Adelaide water supply, but he forgets to refer to the large quantities of water involved. In fact, the proportion of chlorine in the Adelaide water supply amounts to about 3 parts per million.

Mr. Hall: What is the tonnage each year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So what! What is the tonnage of water?

Mr. Hall: What do you mean by "So what"?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is trying to imply that we dump tons of chlorine into small quantities of water, but surely the measurement in parts per million must be considered, not the overall tonnage of chlorine added to the water supply. Surely the member for Gouger understands that. That is the point we consider when talking about the dangers or otherwise of chlorine.

Mr. Hall: Is it legal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Gouger did not read the whole regulation. Apart from that, the effluent that goes into the sea at Glenelg North is the only effluent treated by chlorination (and the chlorination occurs only during the summer months) in order to protect people who may go to that part of the beach to swim. The quantity of chlorine used is so minimal that it dissipates rapidly once the substance has been discharged from the outlet. I am informed by experts in this matter (not by a *News* writer—

Mr. Millhouse: Are you implying—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —and not by a fisheries writer) that there is no danger at all.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be too arrogant.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

Mr. Hall: Is it legal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am coming to that point. I am also informed by the same experts that there is no question about the legality of the form in which the substance is being discharged into the sea, and that covers what the honourable member has said about this matter. I am informed by the people paid to advise me that there is no question about the legality of the practice of discharging effluent in its present form into the sea. However, I will have the matter checked again for the honourable member, although I have no doubt that my experts will be correct on this occasion, as they normally are.

POLICEMAN'S SHELTER

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Works say whether any solution has yet been found to the problem of providing a shelter for the policeman on duty outside Parliament House? In July and August (I do not think I followed up the matter in September) I asked the Minister a similar question, and the latest reply I received was that the Minister would approach the architects in the Public Buildings Department and try to find a solu-

tion to this problem. Although winter has passed and it is unlikely that we will receive much more bad weather this year, I point out that we may be in for a nice hot summer, and the policeman who is on duty outside this building will again be at some disadvantage through not having adequate shelter. Has any decision been made on this matter or any solution been found to the problem?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is quite correct in saying that he has raised this matter previously.

Mr. Millhouse: You were the first one to raise it in the House many years ago, when you were in Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is correct, and I expressed concern at the time. Indeed, I express concern again about the constable on duty outside Parliament House. On each occasion that I have replied to questions on this matter by the member for Glenelg, I think I have indicated that I also have personally raised the matter. Does that satisfy the member for Mitcham?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On the latest occasion that I replied to the honourable member, I said that in no circumstances would I entertain the construction of a sentry box (I think that is what he called it), or something of that kind, because I did not think it was suitable. Also, it might look like something that one finds in the backyard of houses in the country and, in this case, it would be stuck in the front of Parliament House. After the honourable member last raised this matter, I discussed it with no less a person than the Director of Public Buildings, because I visualized providing an entrance at the side of the stairway closest to the railway station, leading into a room underneath this building but, frankly, the expense of such a project was prohibitive. However, I asked the Director of Public Buildings to see whether the number of policemen provided for duty outside Parliament House could be increased from time to time, or at certain times of the day, so that it would not be necessary for one person on duty to be exposed to the elements for any long period. In other words, I asked whether an arrangement could be made whereby these officers could use the messengers' room as a sort of station and not be required to be exposed to the elements for long periods. Indeed, at certain times there

is really no need for a policeman to be standing at the front of Parliament House, for most of the area for which the officer is responsible can be observed from inside Parliament House. Although I have not followed up the matter since, I point out that I did take it up at the time. Whether or not any alteration to the present arrangement has been made, I do not know, but I will find out and let the honourable member know.

GLADSTONE SWIMMING POOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education confer with the Treasurer on the matter of providing financial assistance in order to install a filtration plant at the Gladstone community swimming pool? I asked the Minister a question about swimming pools two days ago, requesting a copy of the press statement that he had made concerning his Government's attitude to financing the provision of swimming pools. The Minister gave the House considerable information about this matter, stating:

We have decided that we will not subsidize the construction of full-size or half-size Olympic pools at secondary schools, but will pay a subsidy to councils on a \$1 for \$1 basis up to a level of \$8,000 . . . I have expressed disappointment at the rate at which pools are being constructed under this policy, because the policy relates to the capital cost of constructing swimming pools: it does not relate to maintenance costs or, in particular, to diving pools, but it is concerned with the establishment of swimming centres that are available for the general community and for school use.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. VENNING: I am just reading the Minister's reply. This small committee which runs the Gladstone swimming pool wrote a letter on August 25, 1972, setting out the problems at Gladstone. The committee had applied to the Minister for assistance from the Education Department. Because the Tourist Bureau had granted the committee only \$6,000 on a project costing \$19,000, it was impossible for the committee, without further assistance, to proceed to construct this filtration plant. I asked the Premier, five weeks ago yesterday—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is making a speech. The honourable Minister of Education.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Subsidies provided for the construction of community pools are provided for the construction of new facilities. As the honourable member is aware, additional subsidies are made available through

the Tourist Bureau, which is under the control of the Premier. Therefore, I suggest that, as the filtration project does not qualify in relation to Education Department subsidies for the construction of new facilities, the honourable member should take up the matter again with the Treasurer.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Treasurer, obtain a reply to a letter I wrote on September 13 regarding assistance to the Gladstone Swimming Pool Committee by way of the grant of a further Government subsidy? I seek leave—

The SPEAKER: What is your question?

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Speaker, I said what the question was.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Premier, will the Deputy Premier obtain for me information about costs of the Adelaide Festival Centre project? Earlier this week, in a Question on Notice, I asked the Premier about what costs had been involved in the additional delays in work on the project. The Premier said that the delays to the drama theatre project and the road contract as a result of the cement industry dispute were nine days and four days respectively. With regard to additional funds beyond the \$40,000 that has been provided to meet overtime payments so that the time lost in the previous delay can be made up, the Premier said that this would depend on matters currently the subject of negotiation with the contractor. I now wish to know the projected final cost of this project. As this matter is of great public interest, I would appreciate a reply as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report.

AUSTRALIAN DENTAL PLANS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to consider the possibility of using the services of dentists, under the Australian Dental Association's proposed Australian Dental Plans, to relieve the current overloading and extended waiting list at the Dental Hospital? Australian Dental Plans is a non-profit company which performs dental services on a pre-paid basis for groups that require such services. The point is made in

literature supplied by the Australian Dental Association South Australian Branch Incorporated that the advantages of using the Australian dental plan include freedom of choice of dentists, because dental services would be available at concessional rates to all those eligible to take part in the scheme. There would be a wide geographic coverage. Instead of facilities being available at only one centre, dental services will be available at many centres spread throughout the entire State. The pamphlet then states:

While the provision of facilities for dental treatment has a place in any large hospital, the provision by the Government of additional facilities on a regional basis could to a very large extent be rendered unnecessary.

It continues:

It is recommended that the Government investigate the provision of dental services through Australian dental plans for pensioners and others unable to afford the fees of private dentists.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what changes are to be made to the main South-East road (Highway No. 1) in the reconstruction of the section of one mile between Measdays and the Eagle-on-the-Hill? The schedule of proposed work for the financial year ending June 30, 1973, shows an allocation of \$150,000 for the reconstruction of this section. Work is currently being done by surveyors and I should like to know whether any thought has been given to increasing the number of road lanes there, because such provision would be, in effect, an extension of the freeway and would give motorists another mile of freeway conditions. Can the Minister also say whether consideration has been given to re-routeing the main road from Leawood Gardens around the back of the Eagle-on-the-Hill to come out opposite the chicken hatchery, thereby eliminating winding and dangerous sections of that road, providing a more direct route, and saving the cost of maintaining half a mile of road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will examine the matter.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the consultants' fee in respect of work on the new Government Printing Office?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The consultants have not yet submitted an account.

However, the estimated fee for their services is \$2,500.

DIPLOMA OF EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education have investigated the situation regarding the Diploma of Education course undertaken by students preparing for a teaching career? This matter was discussed at a meeting of the Adelaide University Council last Friday afternoon, at which meeting two headmasters and one headmistress of secondary schools were present. The applying of a quota in respect of the number of students undertaking this course in the Department of Education at the university was discussed. Apparently, many graduates undertake the one-year diploma course to prepare themselves for a teaching career and, because of what appear to be chaotic conditions applying to that course, it seems that a quota will have to be applied. I understand that the Education Department has assisted by making finance available to the university department administering the course and that there was an agreement between the university and the Adelaide Teachers College to the effect that some of the training of students was undertaken by the college. However, it appears from the opinion expressed by one of the headmasters and the headmistress present at the council meeting that conditions applying to the teaching for this diploma are such that students going into schools after completing the diploma course are not adequately trained, and one can only conclude that, because of the large number of students—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel is commenting.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I am explaining the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am ruling that the honourable member for Kavel is commenting and not explaining. The honourable Minister of Education—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am—

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wouldn't know what was going on.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel was asked to resume his seat. However, he was most rude and discourteous. Further he continually talks after I have asked him to resume his seat. If I hear him talking again, I will name him. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter is being investigated at present and discussions

are proceeding about the arrangements that are to apply next year. It is extremely unfortunate that some of the comments made at the Adelaide University Council meeting were reported in the press so as to imply that certain criticism of the Adelaide Teachers College had been expressed in respect of the arrangements applying this year. I make clear that the Adelaide Teachers College staff came to the rescue in providing methodology courses for the university's Department of Education this year because the department could not provide those courses.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was most unfortunate that such a misleading report was published in the press regarding the meeting. However, I was pleased to see, subsequently, a letter in the press from those concerned trying to put the matter right.

HISTORIC HOME

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government intends to demolish the house at Ovingham believed to have been owned by George Fife Angas and, if it does, why? A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states that the owner of a house that is reputed to have been the home of George Fife Angas in the late 1860's and in the 1870's has protested to the Minister about the demolition of the house to make way for the proposed Ovingham overpass. I am sure that all members would agree—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that it would be a pity if it were to be demolished if that could be avoided. Therefore, in the interests of conservation of this historic building I put the question to the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I agree with the part of the honourable member's explanation in which he said it was a pity when homes had to be demolished, but he seems to be concerned only with homes of historic significance. It is a great pity when any home has to be demolished, because the owner or occupier regards it as something valuable. The old saying that a man's home is his castle is true. This property is to be demolished because society requires that improvements be made to a road system that is inadequate as a result of the rather negative policy on public transport that was followed by previous Governments for many years. The claims that have been made concerning the historic signifi-

cance of this home have been considered and, without entering into a debate on that question, it is sufficient to say that these claims have not been substantiated.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you satisfied that they are untrue?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must not answer such unruly interjections.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not intend to do so, because I do not want to contravene Standing Orders. I was about to say, when the honourable member so rudely interrupted me, that a plaque is to be erected so that those people who believe that this property has historic significance will know that it is not being demolished without recognition.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Minister of Education aware of any departmental advice to school heads or school committees recommending that they should seek from councils in their areas an allocation of unemployment funds to undertake school works? Members will be aware that funds have been made available by the Government for the relief of unemployment in the metropolitan area and that councils were requested to undertake work on behalf of the Government and to apply for the necessary funds. We have received advice of the initial allocation of funds to the various councils. I understand that, subsequent to the initial advice of funds being available, many councils received letters and other forms of request from schools in their districts referring to works which would normally be undertaken by the Public Buildings Department but which might qualify for assistance by way of the grant. Has there been any official suggestion of this nature, or has action been taken by individual school heads or school committees?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Rural employment relief grants apply to certain works being undertaken in country schools which would not otherwise have been undertaken and which are of permanent benefit to the schools. When the metropolitan rural unemployment grants—

Dr. Eastick: You mean metropolitan only?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When these grants were made available, the opportunity for work of this nature which might otherwise have not been undertaken in many schools clearly arose, and I instructed the department to issue a circular asking schools at which there was work which could conceivably qualify, which would not otherwise be undertaken, and

which would be of permanent benefit to the school, to contact councils in their areas. I should have thought that councils, in thinking of projects that might have permanent value to the local community, would automatically think of local schools.

Dr. Eastick: You don't think that local schools are the responsibility of the Education Department?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the Leader would appreciate (and it is a pity if he does not) that every school in the metropolitan area would have work which could be undertaken, but which could not be undertaken at present because of limited funds being available, even though this Government is spending far more on education than any previous Government has spent. I should have thought that the Leader, as a former Mayor of Gawler who no doubt was concerned to look after schools in the Gawler area, would consider automatically that the Gawler council should take action to ascertain which schools in that area would have any projects that could be assisted by this grant. After all, it is public money designed to relieve unemployment and secure permanent benefit for the community.

AMOEBIC MENINGITIS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my question of September 21 about amoebic meningitis?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that tests of water in the Morgan-Whyalla main are carried out on a regular basis. Samples are collected from 30 points along the main, and included are five sampling points at Port Pirie, nine at Port Augusta and one each at Paskeville, Bute, and Kadina. Chlorine residual tests are made weekly at each of the sampling points, except at Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Yorke Peninsula where these tests are carried out three times weekly. Water supplied to Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Kadina-Wallaroo has been dosed continuously to a level of residual chlorine in excess of 1 mg/litre: .5 mg/litre is considered to be the level at which the amoebae will not multiply.

At the Bolivar laboratories samples of water taken from the main are tested for bacterial contamination and the presence of amoebae. Tests have shown that the water is of satisfactory microbiological quality, and so far no pathogenic amoebae have been found. Duplicate samples of water from the main are also checked for the presence of amoebae at the

amoebic research unit of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. So far pathogenic amoebae have not been detected.

LETTER BOMBS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question on letter bombs?

The Hon L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that members of the ballistics section of the Forensic Science Laboratory of the Police Department have received some training and are equipped to deal with the type of device referred to. Independent of this, a liaison has been established between the Criminal Investigation Branch and both the Commonwealth Police Force and the Postal Investigation Branch in connection with any request for assistance received in relation to such matters.

MAIN ROAD No. 46

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to one of my recent questions concerning Main Road No. 46?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There are no plans to prepare a detailed design of any alterations to that section of Main Road No. 46 which passes in front of Clare High School. However, steps are being taken by the Road Traffic Board to include that section of roadway adjacent to the high school within the 35 m.p.h. speed limit zoning and it is expected that this will be brought into effect this week.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will you, Mr. Speaker, say which Standing Order you invoked when you refused to allow me to complete the explanation of a question I was asking the Minister of Education?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entirely out of order. The honourable member should know that Standing Orders require that he must take a point of order at the time the matter arises. The question is out of order.

PATAWALONGA WATER

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether tests have been made of the water being discharged through the Patawalonga outlet at Glenelg North and of the water flowing through the Torrens River outlet at Henley Beach South? Many statements have been made about the effect on marine life of water near the treatment works outlet at Glenelg North, but no reports have been made on the

condition of water flowing through the outlets to which I have referred. If the Minister has no information available, will he arrange for an investigation to be carried out?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am sure that officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department would test the water at those outlets from time to time. I will refer this matter to the Minister of Works (to whom the question should have been directed) to see whether the information is available and, if it is not, whether tests can be undertaken.

MAIN ROAD No. 46

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the other question I asked recently concerning Main Road No. 46?

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. NANKIVELL

Mr. EVANS moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Mallee (Mr. W. F. Nankivell) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That for the remainder of the session Government business take precedence of all other business except questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I desire to speak to the motion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Oh, you do, do you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education will be relieved to know that I do not intend to oppose it. I am surprised that the Government has moved this motion at this stage, because there seems to have been a dearth of Government business. Two full evenings have been given up to the discussion of private members' business, presumably because the Government has not had enough to go on with, and one would have hoped that we could have a little more time for private members' business. I do not really complain

about the run private members have had this session, but I do speak in order to see whether I can find out just when the Government intends that the House shall rise—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham is not going to use this as an extension of Question Time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not mean to.

The SPEAKER: Well, you are. You are opposing—

Mr. Millhouse: I am not opposing it.

The SPEAKER: Well, what are you doing?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If you listened to me—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member made it clear and, if he checks *Hansard* in the morning, he will see that he was opposing the motion to try to ascertain from the Government when the session would end.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not say I was opposing it. Why don't you listen? I suggest you have a look at *Hansard* in the morning and see just what I did say.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mitcham, in speaking to you in that way, is, I believe, reflecting on the Chair, and I therefore ask that his remarks be withdrawn. If the Speaker made a mistake in a comment he made about what the member for Mitcham was saying (it may be he did not hear correctly what the member for Mitcham said), there is absolutely no call whatsoever for the kind of arrogant and insolent manner the honourable member adopted towards the Chair and therefore the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. If I may now resume the comments I was making, I point out that the matter I raised in speaking to the motion relates to the date on which the Government intends that the House should rise, because this motion is traditionally a signal for the end of the session: it is moved towards the end of the session, because Government business must be completed. A fortnight ago, the Attorney-General moved that the Select Committee on the Bill of Rights, the measure I introduced, should report on November 30, that measure, of course, being private members' business. Little move has been made for that Select Committee to meet, and it is only since I inquired, as one of those appointed by the House to that committee, that anything whatever has been done about its meeting.

This is the first time, in my experience in Parliament, that the Minister on a Select Committee has not himself immediately taken the initiative to have a meeting called. I suspect that the device adopted by the Attorney-General was to kill the Bill of Rights, because it is not expected that we will be meeting on November 30 and the Select Committee will therefore disappear at the end of the session. That is a clever way, of course, of avoiding any debate and, therefore, any commitment by the Government to the Bill. I may be wrong—

Mr. Clark: You are so seldom wrong!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and I therefore invite the Minister when he replies—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must take his seat. He knows full well that he should have raised that matter at the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When?

Mr. Clark: Here he goes again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, you say that I should have raised this. When do you say that I should have raised this, if now is not the proper time?

The SPEAKER: At the time the matter was before the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: How was I to know when the matter was before the House that the Select Committee would not meet for more than three weeks? How could I raise it then? What an absurd thing to say, with respect, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I am entitled to know when it is expected that the House will rise. We all know (let us not fence about this) that there is a Commonwealth election on December 2, which is the Saturday following November 30, the day nominated by the Attorney-General for the reporting of the Select Committee on the Bill of Rights. We all know that it has been the Government's plan to rise some time before then so that it can go electioneering. Here, we have the motion that heralds the closing stages of the session, and all I desire to ask (I do not intend to oppose the motion, as I made clear when I started to speak) is when the Government intends to bring the session to a close.

Mr. Langley: That's our business, not yours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest to the Government Whip that it is the House's business. It is the House's business to know when it is intended that Parliament shall rise. Why should the Government be so secretive about this? What prevents the Minister's saying, when closing this debate, that it is expected

the House will rise in the middle of November or whenever it is to rise?

The Hon. L. J. King: It depends on the Legislative Council's attitude and on its disposing of business.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to know for my own sake whether, in fact, the Attorney-General has cleverly killed my Bill, as I suspect he has. But that is not the only reason, nor is it the main reason, why other members in this place will want to know when Parliament rises. We all want to make arrangements and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, despite your interjections, that this is a perfectly reasonable request to make.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I oppose the motion, simply because we have had no indication when the session will end. Items of private members' business are on the Notice Paper, and these include the Bill I introduced containing amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act. I was disgusted yesterday to find that the Attorney-General, who was to speak to the measure, had not been provided with the required information by the Chief Secretary. A far worse situation than that concerning my Bill has arisen in respect of the Bill introduced by the member for Davenport dealing with the registration of occupational therapists. That measure, which was introduced on August 9, has hardly been dealt with since, no-one having been allowed to speak to it.

The Hon. L. J. King: That's because you occupied your time yesterday on other business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: The matter has been continually adjourned, and that is most unfair to the member for Davenport; indeed, it is a gross insult to her. As this motion prohibits private members from introducing any further legislation that we believe may be necessary in the interests of the State, I oppose it.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the motion for reasons similar to those given by the member for Hanson, to whose Bill the Attorney-General should have the opportunity to speak. I object strongly to the fact that Government time has been provided in respect of two private members' measures, simply because this was in the Government's own interests. Only last evening a private member's measure was rushed through this place, and I voted against that measure only because I had not had time to study it.

The Hon. L. J. King: You didn't have the guts to vote for it.

Mr. McANANEY: On the contrary, I received a telegram from a lady only last week who admired my guts—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: We have had a raw deal regarding private members' business, the Attorney-General on several occasions not having spoken to measures on which he has had the adjournment. I refer especially to the Bill introduced by the member for Davenport, who has not been given an opportunity to proceed with her measure. However, another measure, placed on the Notice Paper only last week, has been debated in Government time. On those grounds, I strongly object to the Government's attitude to private members' business.

The Hon. L. J. King: Are you saying I didn't reply to your Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: I said nothing of the sort.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable Minister speaks, he closes the debate. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The member for Heysen, from his experience in this House, knows full well that a week's notice is usually given (it was given in this case) of when private members' business will finish. He also knows (and it has been the case ever since I have been in this House) that some legislation on the Notice Paper has always been left not debated. However, it has always been the case, even in the days of Sir Thomas Playford, that an opportunity is given at the end of the session to vote on the issues in question without debating them, and this occasion is no different.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course it is.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is no different at all. Is the honourable member suggesting that we go on and on until private members are completely satisfied that everything they want done has been done? I suggest that, if that were the case, private members' business would never end, and the honourable member knows it. This is a matter of the Government's prerogative, and this Government has always acted properly and responsibly in this regard. We have given more than adequate time to private members this session. If the honourable member compares the position this session to what has happened at other times, he will see that the Government has bent over backwards to give private members a fair go. I do not agree

with the points made by the member for Hanson and the member for Heysen. The member for Mitcham was so arrogant and disrespectful in putting his case and in making demands that I do not intend to tell him anything.

Motion carried.

OMBUDSMAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from October 17. Page 2137.)

Remaining clauses (28 to 31), schedule, and title passed.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): If the Legislative Council passes this Bill in its present terms, a heavy responsibility will lie on the shoulders of the Government with regard to the person it selects, because this selection will affect the effectiveness and acceptance of this position in the future. If an error is made now in selecting the ombudsman and if the person chosen shows bias to one political Party or the other, the community will have little respect for this office. In that case, people who distrust the ombudsman will be reluctant to make representations to him. The method of appointing this officer as provided in the Bill is not what was intended by most members who originally supported this idea. When we have an ombudsman, those in the community who feel that an injustice has been perpetrated against them will have an opportunity to try to have that injustice undone. We know that all injustices will not be corrected. However, as the Premier has said before, at least now justice will be seen to be done, and I think that is the important point.

I stress again that the Government has the responsibility for selecting the right person to fill this position. This office will be different from other offices, where standards have already been set and procedures established, and where a staff is available which has existed for some time and which can give advice on the functioning of the office. If this office starts off on the wrong footing and people begin to distrust the ombudsman, the real effectiveness of the position will be destroyed. I have enough faith in the Government to believe that it will do the right thing, but I hope that it will not leave room for any criticism. I thank the Government and congratulate it on going ahead with this Bill, as this was something that I could not convince my own Cabinet to do, when it was in office, even though Parliament had approved of such an appointment.

Mr. Mathwin: You still haven't convinced me.

Mr. EVANS: I believe that this office should have been created a long time ago. I hope that the ombudsman will do his work in such a way that he will convince those who did not believe in such an appointment that it can work to the satisfaction of society.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOWER RIVER BROUGHTON IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1881.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill, which is only a machinery measure. It makes metric conversions to the Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust Act, and it also makes several decimal conversions. It reduces the age at which a ratepayer may vote in elections or polls held by the trust. This trust was established in 1938. The Broughton River runs into the sea south of Port Pirie. The history of the matter is interesting, although not of great consequence with regard to the irrigation scheme. About 40 years ago there was trouble in this area. I remember that, when I was a small boy, the *Hill v. Abbott* case resulted in a judgment of about \$1,600, which was a lot of money in those days. In recent years, when Mr. Dridan was engineer for the Crystal Brook district, he had much to do with setting up the irrigation scheme in connection with the Broughton River. Although this river floods once or twice a year, invariably only once are areas contiguous to the river affected by flooding. On areas of this river, the pumping of water takes place, although at certain times of the year it is rather brackish. It is only during a period of flooding that the water is really suitable for watering pasture. The trust was established in 1938 to give a fair allocation of water to people living near the river. I support the Bill, because it updates the machinery of the trust.

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

SWIMMING POOLS (SAFETY) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1881.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the principle involved in this Bill. All members are concerned about the distressing circumstances in which several small children have drowned in swimming pools. Unfortunately, this Bill is typical of what we have come to expect from the Minister. Although he is generally most vocal when on his feet, when he intro-

duces a measure of any importance he does not spell out the details of the measure that members require.

Mr. Wright: It depends on how quickly you pick up things.

Mr. GUNN: Obviously the member for Adelaide has not read the Bill, otherwise he would be aware that some of the definitions in it are very wide.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: This matter has previously been covered by section 346 of the Local Government Act, and this section was introduced in 1934. In 1969, the member for Mitcham, as the Attorney-General in the Hall Government, had the Act amended to make it possible for a district council or corporation to force people to fence swimming pools if the council or the corporation thought it necessary. According to the Minister's explanation, that provision has not proved satisfactory. However, the Minister did not advance any evidence for that statement. Perhaps councils have not seen fit to enforce this provision but, had the Minister pointed out his concern to them, they may have been prepared to act. The Minister referred to clause 3 of the Bill, in part, as follows:

I draw members' attention to the rather wide definition of "owner" in relation to a swimming pool.

True, it is a wide definition, and the Minister could have explained that clause further. The definition of "exempt swimming pool" is as follows:

"exempt swimming pool" means any swimming pool or any swimming pool of a class or kind for the time being exempted pursuant to section 5 of this Act from the provisions of this Act:

This is an amazing set of circumstances. The Minister decides to have all swimming pools fenced, yet he gives himself power to exempt some pools. He should be more specific. My main bone of contention concerns the definition of "swimming pool", which is as follows:

"swimming pool" includes any excavation or structure capable of being filled with water and used for the purposes of swimming and also includes any excavation or structure capable of being used as a paddling pool:

As the clause now stands, I believe that this provision will apply to any hole in the ground, for example, holes made during excavations and by road builders. It will also include any dam or tank on a farm or other property. I sincerely hope that the Minister will tell the House whether what I understand to be included in the definition is what is meant.

The current definitions in the Bill are too wide, and more specific definitions are required.

I now refer to clause 6 regarding the fencing of pools and the type of fence to be provided. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the fence shall be designed to prevent children gaining access to the pool, and he made further reference to the locks that were to be fitted to gates or doors leading to pool areas. He said that the fence must be so constructed as to prevent a small child from gaining access to a swimming pool by passing beneath the fence or building, or climbing over it. However, I believe that the Minister expects to see fitted the type of fence that is constructed around most municipal swimming pools, and one problem I see (and I have seen this at first hand) is that any child could climb over the top of such a fence. I have seen children doing this: it is not difficult. I stress that Opposition members strongly support the principle of this measure, but we are aware that the Bill is not explicit about what the Minister intends to do. I know he has amendments on file, but I am not permitted to discuss them at this stage. We are concerned about certain aspects of the Bill, because many anomalies will be created and there may be difficulty in policing its provisions. However, it will help prevent the type of tragic accident that has occurred in the past.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): It would be generally conceded that most members agree that something must be done to prevent children from getting into properties on which swimming pools are situated. We are aware of several tragic accidents, and too many small children have lost their lives in swimming pools on private properties. It is the responsibility of parents to ensure that small children do not roam and, as a first precaution, parents should be aware that it is necessary that their own fences are sufficiently high and their gates securely padlocked so that small children are prevented from entering grounds on which swimming pools have been erected and from being able to enter public parks where swimming pools are situated. Behind the home in which I lived at Tasmore was a delightful wading pool: it was popular with many children who visited it with their parents. No admittance charge was made and the pool was situated in an open park. Many children not accompanied by their parents used this pool, but I suggest that the first responsibility to look after the children must

rest with parents. We are all aware of door-to-door callers who leave gates open, thus allowing small children to leave the premises.

Mr. Clark: There are no fences these days, either.

Mrs. STEELE: That is so, but in these cases there should be a secured enclosed area for the use of the children. We have seen many instances of very flimsy obstructions being provided to prevent small children from getting out of their parents' property. Last Monday I was driving along Penfold Road, and the Burnside council had been excavating on the side of the road in order to widen it. As always in such cases, the council provides sand tracks to enable people to have access by motor car to their homes. Between these access sand bridges there were pools of water at least 1ft. deep. How does one safeguard children from this type of unfenced hazard?

It could be said that they were natural hazards, but my point is that the first responsibility lies with parents of toddlers to ensure that the toddlers are kept within the confines of their home. We know of parents who do not accept the full responsibility and who hold others culpable when their children get into trouble. Usually, nothing that I say in this House is reported in the newspaper, but I hope my comments on this measure are considered important enough by the press to be used. Sometimes I ask questions of real public interest, for example, about water rating on units, but they receive no publicity. I hope that my comments will become known to parents of children and that they will realize that primarily the responsibility is theirs.

Many people with swimming pools in their properties have children of their own: in fact, that is usually the reason for installing the swimming pool. Swimming is a delightful and healthy sport, and it is necessary that as many children as possible in Australia should be able to swim. We live on a continent surrounded by water, and many thousands of people visit beaches during the summer months. We should be grateful for the learn-to-swim campaign organized by the Education Department in which so many people are taught to swim. A swimming pool in a private home is one means of keeping the children at home instead of their going elsewhere to find entertainment. People who own swimming pools usually realize the importance of having them properly protected. Friends of mine have swimming pools and I know that they have taken what they believe (in

the absence until now of any statutory law) to be proper precautions to ensure that these pools are safe. A pool in the house at the back of my property has a substantial fence around it. It has a specially-locked gate so that small children (and there is in the family one small child who, fortunately, can swim quite well) cannot gain access to the pool. That pool is never open to small children unless older people are present. I do not think that fence, which is of solid wooden construction and about 3ft. 6in. high, would meet the requirements of the Bill. It does not give any child a foothold to enable it to climb over the fence, because its supports are on the inside of the pool.

I make the point that under this Bill the owners of that pool will probably have to go to the expense (having gone to considerable expense already) of adding to the height of that fence, which would be almost as expensive as erecting a new fence, because of the extra timber and work involved. I know an amendment is on file providing that the height of fences shall be not quite 4ft. However, that will not get out of their difficulty people with fences 3ft. and 3ft. 6in. high. There should be some loophole in the Bill (I do not really mean "loophole", because this is not the kind of legislation that should contain loopholes) to assist people in this respect: there should be some kind of regulation whereby people who have already gone to the expense of erecting around a pool a fence that does not meet the Bill's requirements could have their properties inspected by someone who could then say whether or not they should go to this expense. There should be some form of safeguard for these people, in much the same way as happens when new kinds of medical discipline are registered, when certain allowances are made for those who were practising in the profession before the promulgation of the Bill to regulate them. There should be some kind of dispensation to enable this to happen.

Under clause 5, the Minister has this power, but I imagine that certain categories, into which pools now fenced will fall, will have to be published in the *Gazette*. However, if not, I believe a grave injustice will be done to those people who have already been shown to have a sense of responsibility. People provide not only fences but also substantial covers over pools as a means of protection against children falling into them. Under the Bill the Minister has power to say that these covers are a sufficient precaution. I also believe he has power, where a property is enclosed by a fence, to

say that that fence is a sufficient precaution under the Act. Also, he can say that the pools which are placed on the surface of the ground and which are about 4ft. high are also a sufficient precaution under the Bill. However, one must remember that all these surface pools must have a ladder giving one access to them, and it would have to be stated definitely that the ladder must be removed at all times except when the pool is being used and an adult is present. One must also consider that, although not many of them come right up to one's door these days, tradesmen are notorious for leaving gates open. Therefore, even though a property may be enclosed with a fence, the danger still exists that people will not close the gate correctly.

Mr. Mathwin: This could happen when politicians are canvassing.

Mrs. STEELE: That is another point. However, I hope I do not fall within that category, and I would not like to think that the member for Glenelg would, either. I always look for properties that have one gate at each end, so that I can enter from one and leave from the other.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Canvassing is only a memory for you now.

Mrs. STEELE: No doubt it will be soon. I am not necessarily sorry that I, as a Parliamentarian, am to be relieved of that chore, although I have always found it to be extremely interesting. Nevertheless, the human error is always involved in these matters. Last Friday, I went to the Magill Demonstration School on the occasion of the opening by the Minister of Education of the school's swimming pool, and a fine complex it is, too. The school has a nice-sized pool measuring about 40ft. by 18 ft., and is complete with dressing sheds that can do double service as change rooms for football and other games. It is surrounded by a cyclone mesh fence of at least 6ft. high. I mentioned this aspect to the Minister, but he did not agree with me: I consider that a mesh fence is not the slightest bit of good around a swimming pool, because small children are notorious for climbing anything. When I said this, the Minister replied, "They could never keep their balance." The Minister must have forgotten what his own children could probably do, because I do not think such a fence would be a deterrent to any child when there was the attraction of a swimming pool on the other side.

Mr. Mathwin: I am sure they would be able to scale it easily.

Mrs. STEELE: I am sure they could, as could any child. Here, we have a fence that the Government in its wisdom considers to be a sufficiently high and impenetrable barrier.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What children are you talking about?

Mrs. STEELE: I am talking about the wandering child that gets in—not the children from the school.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A 10-year-old child?

Mrs. STEELE: No, a child that gets out of its own home and wanders. Such a child could get to the Magill Demonstration School and, on seeing the pool there, climb over the fence. A child aged four years could do that. I am sure the Minister was a good climber when he was a child. I know I was and that I got into all sorts of scrapes. This point is well worth making: that mesh fences are no good if they are to be used as a deterrent to prevent small children getting into pools, because I am certain that those children will scale them without any difficulty.

I should like the Minister to give me assurances regarding the points I have raised, because if he does not satisfy my objections I will move an amendment in Committee. I make these points because this is such a complex matter, which breaks new ground. As I said when I first got to my feet, something must be done to overcome the often tragic circumstances that follow a small child's roaming. For that reason, I think the Bill would have the support of all members. I reiterate what I have said and I hope that the Minister, when replying to the debate, will satisfy my queries. I support the Bill.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I, too, support the Bill. All members are always horrified to hear, unfortunately all too often, of the death by drowning in a swimming pool of a small child. I do not have statistics (the Minister did not refer to them in his second reading explanation) to show whether the number of deaths occurring in this respect is increasing or is static. However, it seems that many deaths are occurring as a result of the present situation, and I really have no doubt that the number of such deaths is increasing, for that is the impression I get from the newspapers. There is no doubt, either, that the risk of death through drowning in private swimming pools will continue to increase as the number of pools installed continues to increase.

I travel to and from Adelaide twice a week (certainly when the House is in session) and from my own observations, from the window of the plane, of the western suburbs of Adelaide at least, the number of backyard pools in that area has at least doubled in the last two years. There are many more pools in that area than there were a couple of years ago. I also have no doubt that the number of pools in the metropolitan area generally will continue to grow. One has only to read the daily papers, especially the weekend paper, to see the package deals and terms advertised and inducements offered to people for them to install a swimming pool.

Although I support the Bill, I must comment on certain of its provisions. Clause 3, to which the member for Eyre referred, contains the definition of the owner of a swimming pool, and the Minister himself drew members' attention to this rather wide definition. He did not explain why this definition was so wide, but I should like to know what would be the position of a man who let a house to another person, that house perhaps being in another town away from the area in which the owner of the house lives. The tenant may install a portable pool in the backyard, the pool perhaps being 15ft. in diameter and 3ft. deep. Although a portable pool may be covered under clause 6, let us suppose that the tenant asks the landlord's permission to install an underground pool in the tenant's backyard. This may be done by way of an agreement, even though the tenant knows that he may eventually have to leave the premises. Who owns the pool in those circumstances? As I see it, the owner of the property could be liable and forced to pay for the fence required to be erected around the pool, even though he may not use the pool and even though he may not be able to see it.

I will certainly raise this matter with the Minister when we are in Committee, and will seek information on it. In addition to querying who is responsible to pay for a fence in these circumstances, I raise the moral issue of who is responsible if a child drowns. Clause 4, among other things, deals with the size of swimming pools coming within the ambit of this Bill (5 m² or more in area, or .3 m or more in depth). These figures were probably decided on fairly arbitrarily. A depth of .3 m is equivalent to about 1ft. (the minimum diameter specified would involve an area of about 50 sq. ft.), and the Minister would well know that children have drowned in water

considerably less than .3 m deep. I know of two instances of children drowning in water less than 6in. deep. In view of this, perhaps the legislation should cover all wading pools of any depth whatever, because, as I say, it is possible for children to drown in water of a depth less than that prescribed. However, an arbitrary figure may be necessary in these circumstances.

The main provision, which is contained in clause 6, provides for the height of the fence necessary to be erected (1.3 m), which I had carefully worked out to be about 50in., until I saw that the Minister had an amendment on file to lower that height to about 4ft. Penalties are provided in respect of fences that do not meet this requirement, and I think that height of about 4ft. is sensible. It is difficult for a child younger than five years to climb a fence of this height unless there are any hand-holds or foot-holds. However, as the member for Davenport pointed out, I am sure that a child younger than five years could scale a 6ft. high cyclone fence. I once knew of a child (admittedly an unusual child) about 18 months old who could scale a 6ft. paling fence and drop down the other side. Although I do not know how many Adelaide swimming pools are unfenced, I believe most of them would be unfenced.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I think it would be easier to find out how many were fenced.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes. Those whose swimming pools are unfenced will be involved in expense, and perhaps inconvenience, in order to meet the requirements. This may also call for some ingenuity, because, as a result of some of the positions in which I have seen pools in backyards, it will be difficult to fence them, while still being able to use them. However, I think these instances will be rare. Many fences that have been erected around swimming pools hide the pool from sight and serve as an ornamental fence. The member for Davenport having cited the case of a 6ft. high cyclone fence, I know of one pool that has a 6ft. high wooden fence around it and, although it is an attractive fence, it would not comply with this legislation, because it consists of interwoven timber, which provides hand-holds and foot-holds. What is the position concerning that type of fence? Will the Minister have the power to make exemptions in cases such as this that are referred to him? This situation will arise often. I have seen brick fences around swimming pools, these fences providing hand-holds or foot-holds, but they may have a gate and, in every other respect, comply

with the legislation. However, because there may be gaps here and there for ornamental purposes or people may put up a brick structure of any random design, again for ornamental purposes, they will not comply with this Bill. What must such a person do—pull down an expensive fence, start again and build another one? Erecting a fence is not cheap.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Building a swimming pool is not cheap.

Mr. CARNIE: True. Even a plain, simple, galvanized fence is not cheap, but we could put people in the position of having to destroy perhaps \$1,000 worth of ornamental fencing in order to put up something that will comply with this legislation. I appreciate the Minister's problem, which is difficult: he wants this safety measure, which we all support, but if it becomes law it is obvious that some people will be more affected by it than others will be. I ask the Minister to appreciate the problems and expense that will confront many people. I will ask the Minister, in Committee anyway, whether he will have liberal powers to examine individual cases on their merits.

I also raise the point (which I cannot see covered in the Bill, but perhaps I have missed it) of the above-ground pool that is more than 1.2 m in depth. It would be as difficult for a child to scale the walls of that type of pool as it would be for a child to scale a fence, provided the ladder was removed. Will it be permissible to have an unfenced pool of this type and make it an offence if the ladder is not removed from the walls? I shall seek information on that in Committee.

As was mentioned by the member for Davenport, this measure will obviously have some effect on people without children. I wonder whether that is completely fair. Many people do not have a fence around their home (certainly there is often no fence at the front, as the Minister well knows). Often, the house and garden are designed so as not to need a fence at the front. Those people will object to having to build a fence, to prevent other people's children from going near their pools, because parents often do not watch where their children go.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You tell me the parents capable of watching a child for 24 hours a day and I will show you Einstein.

Mr. CARNIE: I appreciate what the Minister is saying, for I am a parent myself. Fortunately, my children are now grown up so I no longer have the problem. At the same time, is it right that people who have no children should be responsible for other people's

children? This is an obvious anomaly. Someone may have an unfenced fish pond. He is not covered by this legislation; he is exempt. He has no responsibility; he does not have to go to the expense of erecting a fence.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have not read the Bill.

Mr. CARNIE: I see that I am wrong there, and I apologize. That is covered in the definitions. I withdraw those remarks. I thank the Minister for his interjection, to which I should have paid no attention but which, because I listened to it in this case, prevented me from going along the wrong track. Of course, a swimming pool is a greater temptation than other bodies of water are. Usually, swimming pools are attractively laid out and it is obvious that a child is more likely to stray towards a pool of that sort than towards the fish pond of which I was speaking.

Finally, I must raise this point—I have raised it in this Chamber previously, on those occasions far more vehemently than I do now: how far does one have to go to protect people from themselves—or, in this case, to protect a child from the carelessness of its own parents? No measure can prevent the death of a child that drowns in a bath because the mother is careless enough to leave it unattended.

Mr. Evans: There is no legislation to prevent a child running in front of a motor car.

Mr. CARNIE: That is true; yet the death occurs, all the same. Who is morally responsible for the death of a child that drowns in an unfenced swimming pool—the person who did not fence the pool or the mother who sent that child out to play and did not bother to keep watch to see that the gate was shut, if there was a gate? Who is responsible in those cases? There are too many cases where other people have to take the responsibility for what is basically the responsibility of one's own family. There is nothing more tragic than the death of a child. For that reason, I am sure all members will support this Bill, but I raise the points I have raised and will seek further information from the Minister on certain matters in Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading of the Bill. I am told (and I am speaking now of what the member for Flinders said about the number of pools increasing) that the "in" thing nowadays is not to have a swimming pool in its natural state but to have a swimming pool filled in because it is no longer needed. It is socially acceptable not to have a normal swimming pool but to have

one that is filled in because the children no longer use it. If all pools were like that, the problems would disappear. I have had the same experience as the member for Flinders has had: every time one flies over Adelaide, one can see pools all over the place, and when one approaches West Beach one can see more pools than ever in the gardens in that area.

Mr. Hopgood: It has been said that one can now get from Norwood to St. Peters in a canoe.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can one? The honourable member has probably engaged in such a typically useless activity. Many pools are portable; they are not permanent but they will be caught under this legislation. Even if one erects a pool in a back garden for just a few days, it will need to be in a properly fenced enclosure. This Bill (I am not putting my thoughts in as good an order as I should) has many difficulties. I know that because this matter has been under consideration for a long time. It was considered during the lifetime of the previous Government. We took one step, which was to give local government the power to enforce fencing in its own area. I must acknowledge that that has not been entirely satisfactory; it has not been acted upon where it should have been acted upon. There is no doubt that swimming pools should be fenced. This is a matter of safety, and we must tackle the problem. Having said that and having said that I support the Bill, there are a number of matters in it to which I want to draw honourable members' attention. First, there is no definition of "fence", and it seems to me that we should provide particularly for a living fence. If we look at the clauses, and particularly clause 6, we see a reference to "a fence, wall or building or any combination thereof". Many hedges (living fences) are as effective in keeping people out as are artificial or man-made walls or fences. I think we should provide for hedges, where appropriate, to be regarded as a sufficient enclosure. The big problem I see is in clause 6, particularly subclause (3). If I have read this subclause correctly, an ordinarily fenced allotment in the suburbs would suffice, and it would not be necessary that there be a special enclosure around the pool area itself. It would depend on the height of the front fence, but subclause (4) provides:

For the purposes of this section a fence, wall or building or any combination thereof shall be deemed to enclose a swimming pool

notwithstanding that it also encloses other land, buildings or structures.

So, it could enclose the whole house. The difficulty about subclause (3) and the preceding subclause is that the gate does not have to be kept shut, nor does the mechanism referred to in clause 6 (3) (c) (ii) have to be locked; it could be kept open. I realize the difficulties here, but it means that the protection we are attempting to give under the Bill could be entirely nugatory. I think we should try to help and encourage people to keep their places shut. Frankly, I do not know what the "positive self-locking mechanism" referred to in clause 6 (3) (c) (i) is. It may have some meaning, but I think we ought to assign a meaning to it in the Bill. I am having an amendment drawn up which I hope will define what is meant by a "positive self-locking mechanism". I think it means something that will keep a gate shut, not locked—against pressure from the outside, as the member for Bragg reminds me.

Mr. Hopgood: I think he had better shift back to his own seat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, especially after last night. I think we should make the meaning clear. Clause 6 (3) (c) (ii) refers to a mechanism that enables the gate or door to be permanently locked. I see no reason why we should have to have a padlock on our front gates.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where does it say "padlock"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It does not say "padlock".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why must it be on the front gate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A person must have a mechanism that enables the gate or door to be permanently locked, and one form of such a mechanism is a padlock. I do not believe that this is necessary, as I was explaining when the Minister interrupted me. Most of us who have had young children have fitted to our gates a latch and chain that is at least as effective in keeping children in or out as a mechanism that enables a gate or door to be permanently locked. I think that, in the interests of encouraging people to keep their places secure, we ought to include such a latch and chain, because it is much easier to apply and it is more likely to be applied. Therefore, it would provide the safety we think is necessary.

I do not know that we have covered all the problems in this Bill or whether even the amendments I am suggesting will cover them

all. However, I think the amendments will improve it. Several people have come to me and complained that it will cost them \$600, \$700 or more to enclose their pools, because their present fences are inadequate.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What price would you put on the life of a child?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One cannot put a price on the life of a child, and I was going on to say, before the Minister interjected again—

Mr. Mathwin: He rudely interjected, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! And so did the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not hear him, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I heard the honourable member for Glenelg. The honourable member for Mitcham must not try to usurp the Speaker's role. The honourable member for Glenelg has been most rude and disrespectful in not addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In my view, \$600, \$700 or \$1,000 is not too high a price to pay to obtain safety around a swimming pool; but if it is possible to achieve a high degree of safety without that expenditure being necessary we should make it possible for this to be done. I hope that my amendments will, in fact, do that and that they will not in any way weaken the Bill but make it more acceptable to the many people who are entirely conscientious and who desire to have their pools safe. An amendment I shall move may enable them to do it for a lesser sum than otherwise would be the case. I support the second reading and hope that the amendments I will move will be acceptable.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the second reading. The member for Mitcham and other honourable members have dealt with many of the points with which I wished to deal. I was pleased that I was able to be of such assistance to the member for Mitcham. Nevertheless, it is only right that we should canvass the various aspects, because this is a serious matter. It has been said that the time, trouble and expense that might be taken as a result of the Bill would be well worth it if the life of just one child was saved; I agree with that. This is an emotional approach, but it is no more emotional than the reaction and horror that would be felt by the owner of a pool in which a child drowned because insufficient safety precautions had been taken. It is an emotional subject and, as the member for Mitcham has said, it is an extremely difficult subject to handle.

I believe the Minister has done the only thing possible by introducing the Bill. I agree with many of the points made by the member for Mitcham, and his amendments will no doubt improve the Bill. I hope the Minister will give the amendments the consideration they undoubtedly will deserve. There are extreme difficulties, and the member for Hanson (I am not sure whether he is a medical man now, as he is mentioned in the press as being a past president of the Australian Medical Association)—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The *News* mentioned that the south-western drainage—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Bill deals with swimming pools, not with south-western drainage.

Mr. Venning: Do you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The interjections of the honourable member for Rocky River must cease. I will not continually rise to my feet to warn him. This is the last warning I intend to give him. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: I speak about this matter with certain personal knowledge because, opposite my house, is a park through which runs the Waterfall Gully creek (First Creek). The park has a paddling pool that is well patronized in the summer months by toddlers and children. In addition, I have a swimming pool which, I understand, was one of the first swimming pools built into the ground in South Australia. This combination of circumstances has given me, with my young family, cause for some concern. As a result, I have taken certain steps, but, having regard to this legislation, I am not sure that they have gone as far as they might have gone. We have on the swimming pool a fibreglass cover that will take the weight of the average young child, and more than that weight. It is strapped down around the edges of the pool. Frankly, people who say that a cover of this type provides adequate protection have not had practical experience on the matter. To be effective, such a cover must be strapped down at intervals of not less than 3ft. I am sure that in the summer months all children are happy to take a cover off a pool, but most children, like my children, when it comes to putting something back, putting toys away, and so on, could not care less. They have to be asked at least three or four times.

Mr. Ferguson: They do it in the end.

Dr. TONKIN: True, but it takes some time. It is quite a job to put a cover back on a pool. I do not believe the average young family would bother to do that. For instance,

at the evening meal time, the cover would be left off because the pool would be used again in about an hour, or it might be pulled back over the pool and not fixed firmly, so that it would look safe but would, in fact, prove to be a greater hazard than if the pool were not covered. I do not know what provisions the Minister will make to exempt certain pools with covers, but I hope he will exempt only those pools with fixed covers of a rigid type that can be easily placed over the top of a pool. Even then, I am not convinced that that will be the final answer. I shall be interested to hear what the Minister says about this later.

I am also worried about the creek that runs across the front of my front garden. Although this year the creek has been low, it can carry a considerable volume of stormwater after rain. It runs at a considerable rate and can be as deep as 3ft. I think that any child under five years of age who fell into this creek could be in extreme danger. I remember the tragedies that occurred in the creek that ran down the middle of St. Peters Street, St. Peters. That creek was open, but fenced, so this adds some substance to the point I am making. Tusmore Park has a paddling pool that I suppose is not more than 1ft. deep. Paddling pools are located in other park lands, such as the east park lands. Obviously there comes a point in all these matters where practical considerations far outweigh the requirements of safety, but the difficult thing is to decide where the point of balance comes. Should we perhaps require that paddling pools have a fence around them? During the winter months, these pools are usually empty. The argument could be used that in the summer months so many people are in these parts that no tragedy could occur. However, once again that is not so. In many cases children have drowned in small ponds in public parks. Although this has not necessarily occurred in Adelaide, such cases have been reported.

Indeed, as we all know, children can drown even when there is a large crowd present. In fact, children can drown in a swimming pool when the most stringent supervision is being provided, as was evidenced by the tragic occurrence at a school pool in my district last year. I think this all comes back to the responsibility of parents. I am afraid that, as the Bill seems to recognize, we are all aware that, although some parents have every regard for their responsibilities, others have not. I do not believe that this lack of responsibility is

wilful. I think that those parents who do not fully consider their responsibility to ensure the safety of their own children (as well as that of other children who might come in from the street) in swimming pools are probably unaware of the danger or have not thought about it, perhaps because they are unaccustomed to having a swimming pool. When most people acquire a swimming pool, either of the built-in type or the type that stands above the ground (in view of the heaviness of these pools when they are full, I do not think I can agree with the member for Mitcham's description of them as the portable type), they are enthusiastic and excited, and are thus often blind to the need for safety measures and the responsibility that goes with having a swimming pool. If some action is not taken to impress on them the need for safety measures, some people never get around to thinking about them.

I agree entirely with the member for Mitcham that a chain and latch on gates would be an additional safeguard. I think that the Minister is open to persuasion on this matter. I hope he is, for I do not think that a fence around a house property is an adequate safeguard. I believe that the milkman, baker or Patraman can come into a house, and be followed by children. I have had this happen, finding children swimming in my pool without my knowledge. Children do not understand that the people who own the pool must take the responsibility. They are not concerned at all with who takes the responsibility: all they want to do is get in and swim. No matter how good a fence and front gate are, there are still dangers to children. If we are to be sincere about this Bill, we should not exempt that form of protection, except perhaps in rare circumstances.

The question of the self-locking mechanism has been dealt with adequately by the member for Mitcham. There is always a risk that that kind of mechanism can go astray; this particularly applies to front gates, because the latch may fail and the people may be away on holiday for a long period without the protection of the self-locking device. I believe that a chain and a latch are necessary. A person would never forgive himself if a child drowned in that person's pool because he did not take the necessary safety precautions and did not live up to the responsibilities he automatically acquires when he has a swimming pool.

I pay a tribute to the learn-to-swim campaign, the teachers, and the workers in the Education Department who make the campaign possible. The provision of swimming pools

has led indirectly to a great reduction in the number of deaths by drowning. Nowadays children can swim at a far earlier age than was previously the case, as a result of the greater number of swimming pools in the metropolitan area. Of course, the pools are a danger even when children can swim.

Mr. MATHWIN (Gleneilg): I support the Bill in principle. Because of the efforts made to introduce it quickly, the Bill is, in fact, silly.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You say that it is silly, yet you support it!

Mr. MATHWIN: I said that I support it in principle. I realize that we must have better protection in connection with swimming pools. Something must be done, but I believe that the Bill is silly in its present form. Clause 4 provides:

(b) any swimming pool, the water surface of which does not exceed 5 square metres in area;

(c) any swimming pool so constructed that it cannot be filled to a depth of greater than .3 metres;

I believe that .3 m is just over a foot in depth. Would anyone suggest that a wading pool is not a danger to children? A greater number of small children use wading pools in back gardens than use swimming pools. Any child could drown in a very small depth of water, yet wading pools are not covered at all in this Bill. I believe that such pools are just as dangerous to the children the Minister is trying to protect as are swimming pools.

Mrs. Steele: Do you mean the type of pool with inflatable sides?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes.

Mrs. Steele: That type of pool is a menace.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is, indeed. Owners of swimming pools are more conscious of the dangers than the normal run of people are. Clause 6 provides that every gate or door incorporated in a fence used to gain entrance to a swimming pool must be fitted with a self-locking mechanism situated not less than 1.1 m from the bottom of the gate or door. Is it to be on the inside or the outside? We must know that. What about properties with more than one gate? We have gates on either side of the house and many properties in the metropolitan area have a back entrance from a right of way. Such a gate is not covered in the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I suggest you should sit down for a quarter of an hour and read the Bill and then you might be able to talk some common sense.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have read the Bill, and if the Minister will curb his impatience to reply—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have obviously not understood it or you would not be talking such rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Clause 4 does not mention that a wading pool is dangerous to children under five years of age. Is the Minister willing to stand up in reply—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg has the call, and there is no Standing Order which would permit him to call upon the Minister to debate the issue. The member for Glenelg must address the Chair. He must not enter into a cross-fire in an effort to get the Minister to reply.

Mr. MATHWIN: With all due respect, I was not suggesting the Minister should reply now, but when he closes the second reading debate. I would never incite the Minister to interject, because I know he has a very quick tongue. I was asking him, in his reply, to say whether he believes that a wading pool in the back garden is a danger to children under five years of age. He is the father of children and he has had young children.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I never had any children myself. My wife had them all.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister must have had some part in that. However, there is still the matter of where the locks should be, and I would like the Minister to mention this in his reply. Clause 3 defines a small child as being a person of or under the age of five years. As the member for Davenport pointed out, a child of that age could scale a fair-size wall without any difficulty at all. The cyclone fence will not keep children out. We have had adequate proof of this with children who have got into the properties of the Electricity Trust at Glenelg, which are normally surrounded by chain wire or cyclone fencing. Perhaps most of these pools should be surrounded by a galvanized iron or similar type of fence. I would be the first to admit that dangers are apparent and that we need to do something about them, but this legislation does not cover all aspects. The most dangerous private swimming pools are those situated in front gardens of houses.

People who own these pools should be made to fence their properties, because these pools are more open than are those in back yards. We have to educate children and parents about the problems associated with swimming pools. The best way to teach children to swim is to do so at the earliest possible age, and in this regard the learn-to-swim campaign has been most successful. The campaign was originated by a former member for Glenelg (Sir Baden Pattinson). Perhaps we should build more swimming centres, and all schools should have training pools. In Australia people have far more chance to swim and to visit beaches, and training pools are needed more in this country than they are needed in other countries.

As a member of a school committee, I tried to influence the other members to build a training pool within the schoolgrounds, but the suggestion was opposed, because some members said that we did not need it. This school was situated in the Seacliff area, and the opposition came from people who believed that, as most of the children lived near the beach, a training pool was not necessary. That is the wrong attitude, because we should train our children to swim at an early age, and the best way to train children to swim is by using a swimming pool rather than training them at the beach. I support the principle of the Bill and the safety measures and the means by which the Minister is trying to protect children. It has been said in the debate that many of its provisions are not clear, so that much will need to be done in Committee.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

METHODIST CHURCH (S.A.) PROPERTY TRUST BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 24, at 2 p.m.