# HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 14, 1972

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

## PETITION: LAND BROKERS

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 2,187 persons praying that the clause in the Land and Business Agents Bill that would not allow land brokers to prepare documents of a transaction if they were employed by the land agents making the sale be deleted.

Petition received.

## INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL

At 2.4 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

*As to Amendments Nos.* 2, 3, 6, 7 *and* 8:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Page 5, lines 26 to 42 and Page 6, lines 1 to 26 (clause 6)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert new definition as follows:

"employee" means—

(*a*) any person employed for remuneration in any industry;

(*b*) any person engaged to drive a motor vehicle, used for the purposes of transporting members of the public, which is not registered in his name, whether or not the relationship of master and servant exists between that person and the person who has so engaged him;

(*c*) any person (not being the owner or occupier of premises) who is, pursuant to a contract or agreement, engaged to perform personally the work of the cleaning of those premises whether or not the relationship of master and servant exists between that person and the person who has so engaged him; and

(*d*) any person who is usually employed for remuneration in an industry or who is usually engaged in an occupation or calling specified in paragraphs (*b*) or (*c*), notwithstanding that at the material time he is not so employed or engaged;

but does not include—

(*e*) any person employed by his spouse or parent;

(*f*) any person employed in a casual or part-time capacity where that employment is wholly or mainly carried on in or about a private residence and is not for the purposes of the employer's trade or business; or

(*g*) any person or persons of a class prescribed as not being an employee or employees for the purposes of this definition.

Page 6, lines 27 to 43 and page 7, lines 1 to 15 (clause 6)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert new definition as follows:

"employer" includes any person or body, whether corporate or unincorporate, who or which on behalf of himself or itself or another employs one or more employees in any industry and—

(*a*) in relation to Public Service employees other than railway employees, means the Public Service Board;

(*b*) in relation to railway employees, means The South Australian Railways Commissioner;

(*c*) in relation to a person referred to in paragraph (*b*) of the definition of "employee", means the person or body, whether corporate or unincorporate, in whose name the vehicle was registered; and

(*d*) in relation to the person referred to in paragraph (*c*) of the definition of "employee" means the person or body, whether corporate or unincorporate, who engaged the person to perform personally the work.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to Amendment No.* 9:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment as follows:

New paragraph (*e*)—In the passage "harsh, unjust and unreasonable" leave out "and" and insert "or"

and that the House of Assembly agree to the Legislative Council amendment as amended.

*As to Amendment No.* 10:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendment and that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No.* 11:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendment and that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No.* 16:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

*As to Amendments* 15 *and* 20:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendments and that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No.* 31:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 59, lines 1 to 9 (clause 82)—Leave out all the words in these lines and insert in lieu thereof new subclause as follows:

(4) Every employee shall, in respect of annual leave, whether granted pursuant to this section or to an award, be entitled to payment in lieu of annual leave or proportionate leave on termination of employment and

such payment shall be made irrespective of the reason for, or the manner of, such termination.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to Amendments Nos.* 36, 37 *and* 40:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 64, after line 23 (clause 93)—Insert new subclause as follows:

(3) No order or decision or proceedings of any kind of the Full Court shall be challenged, appealed against, reviewed, quashed or called in question save on the ground of excess or want of jurisdiction before the Full Court as defined for the purposes of the Supreme Court Act, 1935, as amended.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to Amendment No.* 49:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendment and that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No.* 51:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist thereon but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Page 30, line 14 (clause 29)—After "(*c*)" Insert "subject to subsection (1a) of this section,"

Page 30, after line 37 (clause 29)—Insert new subclause as follows:

(1a) An award referred to in paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1) of this section shall only provide for preference in employment to members of a registered association of employees in circumstances where and to the extent that all factors relevant to the employment of such members and the other person or persons affected or likely to be affected by the award, are otherwise equal.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to Amendments Nos.* 54, 55 *and* 56:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

*As to Amendments Nos.* 57 *and* 58:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendments and the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*Later*:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The conference sat for many hours commencing last Thursday evening, continuing throughout Friday, and sitting again yesterday afternoon before reaching an agreement. This House had agreed to many of the Legislative Council's amendments and the conference discussed the remaining matters. The first dealt with the clause referring to subcontractors. A compromise was agreed upon when the managers from another place agreed to include taxi-drivers and persons doing cleaning work pursuant to contract.

The second amendment dealt with unjust dismissals and the House of Assembly agreed that the court and not the commission should deal with such matters. Another amendment dealt with the retrospectivity of awards. The original Bill provided that the court might give retrospectivity when making or varying awards. However, the managers for this place eventually agreed to adopt the date of application rather than seek retrospectivity.

The next matter deals with average weekly earnings and annual leave. The Legislative Council rejected the proposal about average weekly earnings and wanted the matter to be left to the general standard determined by the Full Bench of the commission and the words "irrespective of the reason for, or the manner of, such termination" have been inserted and agreed to by the managers for the House of Assembly.

The next matter related to appeals from the Industrial Court to the Supreme Court and the new subclause sets out what was agreed to. The Legislative Council has agreed to modifications and the new provision means that no appeals from the commission will be allowed. The next matter deals with the matter of torts and whether civil action can be taken in the Supreme Court. As I have pointed out, this matter is associated with the commission's power to declare disputes to be industrial. It relates to clause 145. We did not reach agreement in this area. Therefore, we are left with the *status quo*. The position regarding torts will remain as it is now, and I notice a smile on the face of the member for Mitcham about that.

The next matter related to preference to unionists and the Legislative Council agreed to omit subclause (1). Subclause (2) is retained and the words "other things being equal" are included. Regarding penalties being paid to the complainant, it will be more or less mandatory for fines to be paid to the unions. Regarding the power of the commission to deal with contempt, the court, rather than the commission, will deal with this matter.

I regret that we could not reach agreement about industrial matters being dealt with in the Supreme Court. I consider that the correct place for industrial matters to be dealt with is

the Industrial Court and I regret that we could not achieve this. This is possibly the only State in Australia where this applies, and it is now being bandied around and used for political purposes.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not want to develop that argument with the honourable member. I congratulate the managers for the House of Assembly on trying earnestly to retain the Government's proposal in the Bill as it left this place.

Mr. COUMBE: This was the longest conference I have attended, with a weekend intervening between discussions, and I certainly would not want to attend another similar conference, because matters can be forgotten over the weekend. The managers from both places applied themselves in the best way possible to achieve the purposes of the Bill according to the majority wish of the House they represented. At about 11.40 p.m. on Thursday evening, it was apparent that there was a spirit of compromise and several compromises were suggested.

Several matters arising from the conference retain the Government's main desires but some opinions of the minority Party in this place have prevailed, and that is fair. Regarding the definition of "employees", the provision dealing with subcontracting in building work and also with owner-drivers has been deleted. Consequential amendments have been made to the definition of "employer". The deletion of subcontractors in building work and of owner-drivers was urged by members on this side during the debate. The phrase "harsh, unjust and unreasonable" has been changed to "harsh, unjust or unreasonable", and the substitution of "or" is significant. It will make the provision work more reasonably. The Council did not insist on its amendment dealing with the question of whether a dispute was or was not an industrial dispute. The recommendations regarding amendments Nos. 15 and 20 involve retrospectivity to the date on which the application was lodged. The recommendation regarding amendment No. 31 involves annual leave, and provision is made for the court to have discretion in this regard.

The recommendation regarding amendments Nos. 36, 37 and 40, in effect, waters down the Legislative Council's amendments so that the Supreme Court in future will have the right to review, quash or call into question on appeal a matter only on the grounds of excess or want of jurisdiction, that is, cases concerning which the Industrial Court is exceeding its jurisdiction or lacking therein. I think that the recommendation regarding amendment No. 45 is a reasonable one. The Minister commenced his second reading explanation, about six weeks ago, by stressing the word "conciliation": the Legislative Council went to some trouble to provide that certain conciliatory actions should take place before any court proceedings, and its amendments on this matter ran to several pages. I believe that it approached this matter with a genuine desire to bring about a compromise and to overcome a difficulty confronting the conference. However, objection was raised to some of the points made. I believe that the suggestions made regarding what might be called a cooling-off period—

Mr. McRAE: I rise on a point of order or to seek clarification from you, Mr. Chairman. The member for Torrens is referring to certain discussions that took place during the course of the conference between the managers. As a member, I am not sufficiently experienced to know whether or not this is the right course of action but, if it is allowed by the Chair, I and perhaps other managers may seek the leave of the Chair to discuss the merits of these proposals and counter-proposals which were bandied about at the conference and which subsequently led to a decision by the managers. The ruling I am seeking from you is whether it is permissible under Standing Orders for one of the managers to discuss some of the interim proposals which were advanced by way of a possible settlement but which were not adopted by the conference.

The CHAIRMAN: I would have to rule in this case that the motion before the Committee is that the recommendations be adopted. The Committee is dealing with the recommendations made to it, and the discussions that took place at the conference could be referred to only if they were relevant to those recommendations. I will have to rule that way: the only discussion to be permitted is that on the actual merits of the recommendation.

Mr. COUMBE: Definite efforts were made by both sides to solve the problem before the conference. The first compromising suggestion came from the Legislative Council managers, but no result was obtained. The result is that clause 145 is deleted. Preference to unionists was also discussed by the conference. Another amendment provides for the court to make a decision on this matter and the court may consider preference to unionists in making an award or order. This is in line with the view put forward by other members and by

me that this should not be determined by legislation but should be left to the court to decide: the court may direct that this provision shall be included in an award. It is like the old common rule that used to apply. The last three words "are otherwise equal" are important. Each side has given a little, but clause 145 has been deleted, and the provision relating to "employee" was amended instead of deleted. The matters of annual leave and of preference to unionists have been transferred to the court. I commend the managers of the conference for the work they have done and the application they have shown.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the motion. It was of great interest to me to attend the conference as manager. I believe that the managers from both sides did a good job and compromised satisfactorily. Managers from another place were conciliatory in outlook, and I congratulate the managers on both sides.

Mr. CRIMES: As one of the managers, I support what the Minister, the member for Torrens, and the member for Glenelg have said. Many gains have been made for industrial workers as a result of the conference, and more gains have been made by the passing of the Bill by this House. However, there are a number of bitter pills in what has resulted, and in this regard I refer mainly to the clause dealing with torts. The Bill will now confer many increased benefits on the industrial workers of South Australia. I commend all the managers, whatever the stance they took, for their efforts to expedite the work of the conference, and I should like to commend also the staff of the House because, without their assistance, the conference would have lasted much longer and been much more exhausting.

Motion carried.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DROUGHT RELIEF

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the past three weeks the Minister of Lands and I have received representations from representatives of the Murray Lands and Riverland Local Government Associations and from zone 10 of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia seeking assistance to alleviate the effects of the drought in these particular areas. Representations have been made seeking—

(1) an acreage bounty scheme on the basis of crop deficiencies below 6bush. an acre, on a sliding scale;

(2) qualifications for social service benefits be eased;

(3) loans for carry-on purposes (including seed and super) and for restocking be made available, free of interest, to those farmers and share farmers who have reasonable prospects of recovery and to whom credit is not available through normal commercial channels;

(4) grants be made to councils to provide employment on roadworks; and

(5) supplies of seed wheat and seed barley to be made available at specified points in the drought-affected districts.

The Government, in the short space of time available to it since receiving those representations, has considered the matter and has decided on the following policies in relation to these proposals:

(1) Acreage bounty: The question of an acreage bounty is a very complex one as, quite clearly, it could not be confined to the Murray lands and Murray Mallee areas in a season wherein very large areas of the State are suffering from drought and are, in fact, unlikely to produce 6 bushels an acre for cereal grains. In these circumstances the Government has decided to have this question investigated with the view to formulating proposals which it can submit to the Commonwealth for consideration. Honourable members will recognize the magnitude of this problem when I say that preliminary estimates indicate that the cost could approximate $15,000,000, an expenditure which this State could not contemplate from its own resources, and an approach to the Commonwealth must be made, as acreage bounties are not included in current Commonwealth-State drought relief arrangements.

(2) Social service benefits: There is clearly no action which the State can take in this matter at present beyond what it has done, that is, seeking the assistance of the Commonwealth department regarding the sympathetic administration of current provisions. Farmers who consider themselves likely to be eligible should register for employment with the

Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service and, if employment is not available, apply for unemployment benefits. It is understood that each individual application will then be considered by the Commonwealth departments concerned, in the light of the circumstances disclosed.

(3) Loans for carry-on purposes: The question of interest to be charged on loans for carry-on purposes presents some problems. At the present time the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act prescribes interest at State Bank overdraft rates. Interest for carry-on charged on debt reconstruction cases is 4 per cent and the rate in the 1967 drought, when the Commonwealth provided the whole of the finance, was 3 per cent. In considering the policy which it should pursue in this matter the Government cannot ignore the fact that those farmers who are able to obtain credit from normal commercial sources will be obliged to pay interest rates varying between 6¾ per cent and 8½ per cent. In consideration of all of these factors the Government has decided that, as a matter of policy, advances will be made for carry-on purposes free of interest for one year. If necessary, the matter can be further reviewed at a later stage and particularly if and when any Commonwealth funds may be introduced. Loans will be repayable over a term of up to seven years.

(4) Grants for employment: Representations have been made from all councils within the most severely affected drought areas seeking grants to provide employment. The councils within the areas which are most severely affected by drought and which have experienced adverse seasonal conditions for the past several years are as follows: Loxton, Waikerie, Paringa, Marne, Sedan, East Murray, Morgan, Browns Well, Karoonda, Mobilong, Mannum, Pinnaroo, Lameroo, and Franklin Harbour. The Government proposes to make an initial grant of $250,000 available to these councils, in proportions to be decided, to promote employment opportunities within their areas. The Government does not propose to extend this scheme to district councils outside of those most severely affected not only in this year but in past years.

(5) Supplies of seed wheat and barley: if the Australian Wheat Board and Australian Barley Board find it necessary to move seed wheat and seed barley from other districts into the severely affected drought areas, the Government is prepared to provide a freight subsidy to cover the cost of the abnormal movements which may be involved. Freight subsidies on the movement of stock and fodder as announced in June last will continue to apply. The Government has agreed to the foregoing immediate actions and will continue to keep the situation under close review.

## QUESTIONS

### MURRAY NEW TOWN

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether he has had any contact with a Japanese investment team currently looking at real estate prospects in Australia and, if he has, whether it has expressed any interest in South Australian projects, including Murray New Town? I understand from an article in the *Financial Review* of last Friday that a group of Japanese executives from the Japan-based publishing group Jutaku-Shimpo-Sha is currently in Australia looking into investment potential in Australian real estate, especially industrial estates and residential subdivisions. I understand that this group plans to visit Adelaide (this was the prophecy in the article), and I should like to know whether it has been in touch with the Premier or the Government to discuss investment opportunities in this State. I am especially interested to know whether the Premier has mentioned or intends to discuss with these investors our plans for the development of Murray New Town, with a suggested population of 200,000, and whether he intends to offer them any deals to attract their money. The Premier has often referred to the importance of increased co-operation between Australia and Asian countries, and I understand that the Japanese-style hotel to be developed in Victoria Square is in line with this thinking. I should like to know whether this desire by the Premier for greater commercial and investment involvement between Australia and, in this case, Japan is likely to lead to preferential

treatment for these Japanese real estate investors, particularly in relation to Murray New Town.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No request from this group of investors has reached my desk, although it may be within the department. However, as I cannot tell the honourable Leader without inquiring into the matter, I will inquire whether the group has been in touch directly with the department. Groups of potential Japanese investors do investigate opportunities in this State almost weekly, and naturally we provide them with all the available information on investment opportunities, but I have not seen a proposal from this group yet. However, I will get a report for the Leader.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry, following the recent release of figures by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service that appear to indicate a reduction in the number of unemployed persons in South Australia, say what is the current unemployment situation in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The figures to which the honourable member refers were released this morning and, as I expected that a question would be asked on this matter, I had a report prepared. The employment statistics released last evening by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service revealed that, at the end of October, 10,645 persons were registered for employment in South Australia and the Northern Territory. Although this represented a decrease of 1,406 for the month, the number of unemployed is 2 per cent of the estimated work force of the State and, on a seasonally-adjusted basis, the fall for the month in the number of persons registered was only 380. The main fall in the number of persons registered for employment was in the Adelaide metropolitan area, where the reduction was 1,208. In country districts the fall was 198. This indicates the effectiveness of the State Government's grants to alleviate unemployment in the metropolitan area: without it the number of unemployed would have been much higher. Although during the month the number of unfilled vacancies increased by 262, there were at the end of October 2,780 registered vacancies, or about one-quarter of the number of persons seeking employment. A disturbing feature of the latest figures is the number of juniors registered for employment. At the end of last month there were 1,987 junior males and 1,538 junior females registered for employment. This is an increase of 858 junior males and 499 junior females compared to the end of October last year. In other words, there are now 1,357 more juniors seeking work than there were a year ago.

In less than six weeks time about 21,000 school leavers in South Australia will be seeking full-time employment. Only then will the full impact of the Commonwealth Government's past economic mismanagement be felt by these young people, who will be joining the 3,500-odd young people who even now are unemployed. This number of school leavers does not include persons who will be returning the following year for further tuition. Even though the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits in the Adelaide metropolitan area fell by 973 during October, there was an increase of 74 in the country districts. There are still 3,984 people in the State receiving unemployment benefits, and that is more than double the number at the same time last year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say how many persons have been employed as a result of the Government's metropolitan relief scheme which he claims is partly responsible for the decrease in the number of unemployed in this State?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister give me information about the number of registered job vacancies in this State: that is, the number of applications lodged by employers for people to fill vacancies? When the Minister was reading the statement, I did not catch the number of registered job vacancies that he mentioned. I know that there is a serious shortage of skilled tradesmen in certain categories at present in this State. I ask the Minister whether he can also state the areas in which the largest number of registered job vacancies is occurring at present.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: True, the major shortage of tradesmen is in the metal trades industries, as the honourable member is well aware. He asked me a question on the matter and I have told him that I have a reply. At October 27, 1972, the number of persons in South Australia registered for employment was as follows:

| | Number |
|---|---|
| Adult males | 5,442 |
| Junior males | 1,987 |
| Adult females | 1,678 |
| Junior females | 1,538 |
| Total | 10,645 |

At October 1, 1971, the number of vacancies available for adult males was 2,011, whilst at October 27, 1972, the number of vacancies was 1,756. At October 27, 1972, the number of vacancies available for females was 1,024, making a total of 2,780 vacancies at that date. The number of male recipients of unemployment benefit at October, 1972, was 2,784 and the number of female recipients at that date was 1,180, making a total of 3,964. As I have said, I understand that most vacancies occur in the metal trades industries.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked recently about the allocation of unemployment relief?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe the honourable member's question relates to the relief of unemployment in the metropolitan area. Of the $2,000,000 made available for this purpose $1,500,000 has been provisionally allocated for local government works and $500,000 for Government departments. Councils have been advised of preliminary grants totalling $1,029,170 and Government departments' projects to cost $428,000 have been approved. Within the limits of the abovementioned provisional allocations the Government will review the scheme, with the object of advising the precise allocation of additional grants, in the light of experience of its operation. I have a schedule of preliminary grants and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

PRELIMINARY GRANTS

| Council | Amount $ |
|---|---|
| Adelaide | 23,340 |
| Brighton | 24,670 |
| Burnside | 43,670 |
| Campbelltown | 42,670 |
| Garden Suburb Commission | 4,000 |
| East Torrens | 4,000 |
| Elizabeth | 46,670 |
| Enfield | 90,000 |
| Glenelg | 21,340 |
| Henley and Grange | 19,340 |
| Hindmarsh | 18,670 |
| Kensington and Norwood | 16,700 |
| Marion | 73,350 |
| Meadows | 5,350 |
| Mitcham | 60,000 |
| Munno Para | 26,670 |
| Noarlunga | 33,350 |
| Payneham | 18,670 |
| Port Adelaide | 53,340 |
| Prospect | 24,670 |
| St. Peters | 14,670 |
| Salisbury | 76,670 |
| Stirling | 9,340 |
| Tea Tree Gully | 50,000 |
| Thebarton | 23,340 |
| Unley | 46,670 |
| Walkerville | 4,670 |
| West Torrens | 60,000 |
| Woodville | 93,340 |

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I, too, wish to ask the Minister of Labour and Industry a question, but he will be glad to know that it is on another topic. Can he say whether the Government intends to respond to the invitation extended this morning by Mr. Justice Hogarth to intervene in the matter of *Adriatic Terrazzo v. Robinson Owens and the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation?*

Mr. McRAE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, this matter is *sub judice.*

The SPEAKER: Did the honourable member for Mitcham refer to a matter that has been referred to the court?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can I explain about my question?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know whether this matter has been referred to the court but, if it has been so referred, it cannot be dealt with in this Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: May I take a point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take the point of order that the question I have asked deals with the attitude of the Government and what the Government intends to do about the matter. I do not desire to canvass what has happened in court. However, as I understand it, His Honour has directed that the papers in the matter be handed to the Minister of Labour and Industry and to the Crown Solicitor with the invitation that the Government intervene. It is on that aspect of the matter that I direct my question to the Minister. I do not intend to canvass what has happened. Certainly in the past questions have been allowed on such matters.

Mr. McRAE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I maintain my first point of order. This matter is *sub judice.* A writ has been issued and the matter is now in the course of proceedings in the Supreme Court.

As I understand Standing Orders, no matter what the circumstances may be it is improper for members to discuss utterances of a Supreme Court justice in relation to matters currently before him for settlement.

The SPEAKER: I must give a ruling on the honourable member's point of order. As I understand the question of the honourable member for Mitcham, the matter has been referred to the court, and the honourable member for Mitcham understands that the court has taken certain action. Is that the position?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: His Honour made an outright invitation to the Government to intervene in the matter and I want to know whether or not the Government intends to intervene. It is a matter of Government action and policy. I remind you, Sir, that we have had such questions in the past and they have been allowed.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked what the Government intends to do. This is somewhat hypothetical.

Mr. Millhouse: It's not hypothetical: it has happened.

The SPEAKER: I do not know. I do not have the documents before me. It is a difficult subject and the honourable member, who is versed in law, knows that anything that is before the court should not be dealt with in this Chamber. If it is a question of the Government's intention I will permit a question on that and that alone, and the Minister's reply will be strictly confined to that aspect. I cannot uphold the point of order raised by the honourable member for Playford.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate your allowing me to ask the question in the circumstances. I will direct my question entirely to that aspect. A civil claim was referred to open court this morning and I understand that His Honour in open court (therefore publicly) directed that the papers relating to the matter be handed to the Minister of Labour and Industry and to the Crown Solicitor (and no doubt to the Attorney-General) with a view to the Government's intervening in the proceedings. I have no doubt that the Minister has been told already about this matter, because it involves aspects that have been discussed by this House in respect of similar proceedings concerning Kangaroo Island, and a Bill on this matter is at present before the House.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This is some question: the honourable member went from Kangaroo Island all over the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must confine his reply to the question.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I can only say the honourable member's mailing system must be far better than mine. I have received no notice from the court as yet and, even if I had, I should not be replying to the honourable member's question at this stage, because the matter would have to be considered.

## ELIZABETH ABATTOIR

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked last week about an abattoir proposed to be erected at Elizabeth?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that, although he is aware that certain negotiations have been proceeding for the establishment of a smallgoods factory in the Elizabeth West area, he has not received any formal advice of the stage which those negotiations have reached, nor has he received any written representations from the promoters. The Minister points out that before such a project could be implemented, the approval of the local government authority would be necessary, and the establishment of a works of this nature within the metropolitan abattoir area would also require the prior sanction of the South Australian Meat Corporation pursuant to the provisions of the South Australian Meat Corporation Act. If and when the matter comes before the Minister officially he will certainly have regard to the honourable member's representations on behalf of residents living near the proposed works.

## ROAD MOIETY

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether the developers Graham James and Company are obliged to seal Hutchinson Lane, Hackham? Hutchinson Lane, or part of it, seems to lie within the boundary of the James estate at Hackham. When two of my constituents who live at the corner of Paterson Drive and Hutchinson Lane recently received from the Noarlunga council an account for a road moiety, they were most surprised, because they assumed that the developer had to seal this roadway and that, in fact, they had already contributed to the cost of such sealing as part of the price they had paid when they purchased their block of land. After contacting the Noarlunga council on their behalf, I received a written reply which I can give the Attorney and in which the council states that, although it has tried, it has been unable to get a

commitment from Graham James and Company to seal this roadway and that the council is therefore enforcing its normal right under the Local Government Act to obtain the money from these people. As my constituents have purchased the land believing that the roadway would be sealed (as is normal under the Planning and Development Act these days) and as they are now faced with these extra costs, I ask the Attorney to take up the matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will examine the matter.

## NEWSPAPER CIRCULATION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier again see whether anything can be done to permit the *Sunday Telegraph* (incorporating the *Sunday Australian*) to be sold by newsagents before 12 noon on Sunday? The Premier will be aware that this newspaper is printed and published by News (Adelaide) Proprietary Limited, at its registered office at 116-120, North Terrace, Adelaide, for the proprietors, so it is not necessary to bring the newspaper from another State. Apparently, an original agreement between News (Adelaide) Proprietary Limited and Advertiser Newspapers Proprietary Limited prohibits the sale of the newspaper earlier than mid-day on Sunday. Many people who have tried to purchase the newspaper before that time on Sunday have been refused a copy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is the subject of a contract agreed to by the interests involved, namely, News (Adelaide) Proprietary Limited, the Murdoch interests, and Advertiser Newspapers Proprietary Limited. At present no State legislation allows us to intervene in any way. I understand that proceedings other than those involving the State Government will eventually determine the matter. For us to intervene would require special legislation being passed by this House and, since the matter involves a series of private interests, there would be difficulty and the Bill would have to be a hybrid Bill. I have had no application directly from the parties about the matter and, although I have had some investigations made on the subject, I doubt whether at this stage of the session we could introduce legislation to deal with this matter.

## PETROL

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a report from the inter-departmental committee on petrol? On October 25, in the temporary absence of the Premier, I asked the Deputy Premier whether the inter-departmental committee appointed by the Premier had submitted its report to him. The committee comprised representatives of the Crown Law Department, the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, and the Premier's Department. The South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce Incorporated had also contacted the Premier before I asked my original question. I understand that the committee discussed the matter with the oil companies and the management consultant firm that acted on behalf of the service stations. I also understand that a follow-up contact was made later.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have the report and I also have a report from the Commissioner of Prices and Consumer Affairs. As a result of this, I saw the Chairman of the committee and the Commissioner, asking that certain further information and recommendations beyond those in the committee's report be supplied to me. This information is being prepared and, as soon as it has been completed, I will again have personal consultations with the representatives of the resellers and of the oil companies. The Government's decision will then be announced.

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week regarding retail petrol prices?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has reported that the company trading as Lake City Freighters is in fact not engaged in selling petroleum products; however, other companies with overlapping directorates and/or shareholdings are doing so. Although the level of discount allowed by these companies is relatively high, the sales volume is insignificant in relation to the overall market. Petrol prices are at present under review, and discounting in the industry is one of several factors being considered.

## AFRICAN DAISY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question about the Government's policy on eradicating African daisy in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that the policy regarding African daisy is clearly defined under the terms of the Weeds Act, 1956-1969. Following a debate in Parliament at the beginning of this year, it was placed on the second schedule of the regulations under the Act, despite moves to have it removed from that schedule to the

third schedule. The Act requires that second schedule weeds be "destroyed" or "controlled" in any way that will stop propagation and spreading. Under these terms, the Act attempts to face practical realities and require control only when eradication is not feasible. I emphasize that, agriculturally, African daisy is not regarded as a "dangerous" weed. Under the terms of the Act a "dangerous" weed is clearly defined and the first schedule is reserved for such weeds. The Government is therefore following the requirements of the Act and aiming to achieve practical "control" of this pest throughout the Adelaide Hills. It would be beyond the resources of any Government, and well-nigh impossible, to eradicate African daisy from these areas, and that is not the aim. The plant seeds very freely, the seeds are wind-borne, and the seedlings are very aggressive. With current technology it would be impossible to destroy every plant over such large areas.

The current programme in the national park aims to achieve overall control to such a degree that these areas will remain representative of our natural flora and not dominated by this alien weed. It is considered unlikely that "eradication" will ever be achieved.

The Government has taken steps to obtain the co-operation of the C.S.I.R.O. to research methods of biological control in South Africa. If successful biological control agents were found, they could reduce the weed to a much more acceptable level than present methods based on chemicals, pasture competition and hand pulling will allow. If sufficient funds can be found it will be six to eight years before any worthwhile results can be obtained.

## ADELAIDE SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what action the Government will take following the report of the recent statement by the Chairman of Adelaide Steamship Company Limited (Sir Richard Hawker), involving the Adelaide Ship Construction yard at Port Adelaide? The shipbuilding industry is important to South Australia and, as the Minister is no doubt aware, the number of employees at this yard has fluctuated over the years. This company has been subjected in the past to some of the most disruptive union tactics South Australia has seen. I draw the Minister's attention to the position that arose about a year ago when striking workmen at this yard prevented staff members from attending work and from going about the business of obtaining tenders for more work to be undertaken at that yard in Port Adelaide. In view of the past history of disruption of the unions concerned, and in view of the apparent reverse position now applying when the company is having difficulty in obtaining sufficient tenders in order to continue operating, I ask the Minister to say what constructive action the Government will take to support the company and to try to preserve this valuable industry for South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Gouger—

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I addressed my question to the Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I point out that on a matter of policy I am entitled to answer any question on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: It's too dangerous for the Minister to answer this one.

Mr. HALL: I do not want to stop the Premier from answering the question. In fact, I should be happy if he did so but, for my own knowledge of the working of the House, I should like to know whether or not I can obtain an answer from the Minister of Labour and Industry, as I directed the question to him. I do not do this antagonistically, but I should like to hear the Minister first.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has a right to reply to any question asked of any Minister, and I have given the honourable Premier the call.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I answer this question because the company concerned asked me to take action on behalf of the Government in this matter and, since the matter is within my own knowledge, I am replying to the honourable member, whose question has been directed to the Government in the usual form that he adopts, namely, berating and deriding the trade union movement and the workers of this State.

*Members interjecting*:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government entirely stands by the action that the company has taken in this matter, although the honourable member evidently does not like it.

Mr. Mathwin: You're getting nasty.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am telling the honourable member the truth. Obviously he does not like the fact that companies in South Australia are seeking the co-operation

of workers regarding difficulties in their industries, but I point out that this action (that of taking worker participation into industry) has been supported by the Government. The approach was made to me by executives of the company and, in consequence, I approached the major trade unions involved in the matter.

Mr. Hall: What did they say?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They said that they were interested in the approach of the company, that the matter would be put sympathetically before their members, and that in due course their members would hold meetings on the matter. That is happening and the honourable member has already seen from press reports that certain sections of the workers have lauded the action of the Government in this area. The honourable member has asked what constructive action the Government has taken: we received the submissions from the company and we then made direct approaches to the trade union movement seeking its co-operation.

## GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the planting of trees and grass along Greenhill Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A planting scheme is being prepared for the median strip of Greenhill Road between Anzac Highway and Glen Osmond Road. The proposal is for stage development with trees, shrubs and grass over several years. Trees and shrubs for the first stage were ordered in March, 1972, so that they would be of reasonable size when planted. Work is expected to begin next autumn.

## CARD PRICES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the price of greeting cards?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The five main suppliers of greeting cards are interstate firms and production costs are not available to the branch. Information available at this juncture indicates that the retail selling margin, although high, could not be considered excessive when regard is had to the various factors involved. Sales tax is also incurred at the rate of 15 per cent. Prices of all types of card cover a wide range, with the 15c to 30c being very extensive and the most popular. However, many Christmas cards are available for between 3c and 6c. The branch found that retailers appeared to adhere to the prices indicated on the back of the cards and, while manufacturers indicated on invoices that nominated prices were recommended only, it is considered that the removal of prices from the back of cards would make pricing more competitive. With this in view, the matter is being reported to the Commissioner of Trade Practices, who is responsible for the resale price maintenance legislation, and manufacturers have been requested to delete the prices from the back of cards. A comparison of prices of paper-back novels and greeting cards is not valid, because of the difference in quantities produced, the quality of paper used and designing and colour printing costs.

## RUNDLE STREET

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the closing of Rundle Street to normal vehicular traffic is now considered for reasons of public health to be a matter of urgency? If this is so, when is it expected that action will be taken? Numerous suggestions based mainly on aesthetic reasons have been made that Rundle Street be converted to a shopping mall. However, the suggestion has now been advanced that this plan be instituted for reasons of public health, because high air pollution readings have been recorded. How urgent is this problem? How much of a danger is presented? Are the figures that have so far publicly been quoted average readings taken during normal trading hours, or are they figures taken during daylight hours, and on what basis have they been assessed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can inform the honourable member, as I have informed the public through the press, that the readings were taken in several locations in Rundle Street over recent months. The figures are currently being assessed and analysed by the Public Health Department. Regarding the sites at which readings were taken and other information to which the honourable member refers, I expect the department's report to be placed before me at the end of this week, when I shall be able to comment further about this matter.

*Later*:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. Will he say what action, if any, the Government intends to take because of the reported level of pollution in Rundle Street?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg has asked a similar question on this matter earlier today.

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Government, as was reported in the press at the weekend, taken action to warn all major bodies that would be affected by such a decision that, because of air pollution, Rundle Street may be closed to traffic? I believe the press report stated that an analysis of pollution readings revealed a carbon monoxide level far in excess of accepted world safety standards. The Minister said that the readings were not yet processed, and he was unable to make a statement because of this. The press report goes on to say that the Government is trying to keep the situation secret until it is ready to make the pollution figures public, and we are used to that sort of attitude. However, the photograph in the newspaper shows the Minister and the Director-General of Public Health observing the results of the report. Will the Minister say just what is the situation and whether any warning has, in fact, been given to those interested parties in Rundle Street?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No warning has been given, simply because the report in the newspaper was accurate only in relation to the fact that the figures had not yet been processed.

Mr. Mathwin: You were looking at a plain piece of paper, then?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The photograph was taken some months ago at the site of the air pollution mobile unit van at Port Adelaide. I suggest to the honourable member that he should not continue to jump to conclusions.

## CLARE WATER SUPPLY

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Since the summer of 1969-70 several major works have been undertaken to augment the capacity of the supply and distribution systems of Clare. In 1970 a 6in. connecting pipeline was laid to connect the northern area of Clare to the central main feed and a comprehensive scheme of improvement valued at $92,000 was commenced in December, 1971 when 2,700ft. of 8in. pipeline was laid as an express feeder to the town tank to improve the outflow capacity from this balancing storage. The capacity of the rising main from Hanson was increased from 440gall. a minute to 675gall. a minute in February, 1972, by the provision of a booster pumping station at Hanson. This is a temporary station at present and a contract has been let for the permanent equipment, which is scheduled for installation next winter. At present a new 8in. pipeline is being laid along the Farrell Flat road to the northern parts of the town, augmenting supplies to the hospital and the South Australian Housing Trust area and improving further the capacity of the system in the area of the high school. This work is planned to be completed by the end of November, after which further small connecting mains will be constructed. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that watering at the school was not adequately supervised and there was excessive water wastage. As 11 track-type sprinklers were used at once, these were bogging down. In all, 14 acres of grassed area was being developed and with such an irrigation demand it was inevitable that a normal township reticulation system would become overloaded.

## RAILWAY SLEEPERS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the production of concrete sleepers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Bureau of Transport Economics report on timber sleepers *versus* concrete sleepers, dated October, 1972, contains the following information:

Tarcoola to Alice Springs line—115 men would be employed at Port Augusta for 3.6 years to manufacture concrete sleepers for this line. Cost per sleeper (excluding fastenings)—$8.25.

On the basis of 2,400 sleepers a mile for a distance of 550 miles, the total cost of sleepers required (excluding fastenings) would be $10,890,000.

## PORTABLE CLASSROOMS

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the number of fires occurring in South Australian schools has had the effect of slowing down the Education Department's building programme? Unfortunately, the high incidence of fires in South Australian schools appears to be the result of arson (and the Minister knows that a school building at Cleve was burnt down during the last weekend). The high number of fires must press on the department's resources regarding the replacement of rooms as well as the finance required to remedy such problems. Although I understand that schools at which fires have occurred must receive priority for the replacement of classrooms, I wish to know whether this replacement affects the rate of construction of new school buildings?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not believe it has that effect. Schools that are due to receive portable classrooms in the normal course of events sometimes have to wait longer for portable classrooms to arrive, because those classrooms have been used to alleviate the problems created by fire. That may mean that we have to extend the contract applying to one of the two companies making portable classrooms so that the requisite number of portable classrooms is available. I do not think that in any one year the cost of fires to the department has been more than $100,000 for portable classrooms and, in a programme of over $23,000,000, that additional expenditure is not significant in delaying the construction of new schools.

Mr. Carnie: That is finance, but what about the rooms?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If any problem occurs, it concerns the delay in sending portables to schools that need them in order to provide extra accommodation. For instance, the situation can arise where a school may not have sufficient science rooms or an activities room and we may have decided to provide that accommodation by means of a portable classroom. If a fire occurs and a portable classroom is required to replace a classroom that has been burnt down, another school will have to wait longer before it obtains a portable classroom. In the case of such a school as Port Lincoln High School, where portables are necessary to enable the wooden classrooms to be demolished so that new buildings can be constructed, the provision of those portables is governed by the contract let with the builder concerned. Clearly, the department must provide those portable rooms when the builder requires them, so that he can get on with his job. The terms of the contract entered into between the contractor and the Public Buildings Department, as well as the requirements for the building, would dictate the situation. We have now over 400 portable classrooms. We are getting additional portable rooms from the two builders, Sigal and Wowic, each year, but during any one quarter portable classrooms become available as a result of the completion of building contracts elsewhere. For example, as the Enfield Primary and Infants School (as I think it is known) has just been completed, portable classrooms, used while that school was being constructed, will now be released. We are not far from the stage where our stock of portable classrooms will be sufficient to supply the regular flow of these classrooms that is necessary for the kind of purpose about which the honourable member would be worried in relation to Port Lincoln.

## WHEAT QUOTAS

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that the possibility of removing delivery quotas on wheat was discussed at the meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council held in Melbourne recently. At that meeting, the Minister referred to the advantages to wheatgrowers if wheat quotas were removed for one or two seasons on existing wheat quota holders. However, he also pointed out that this was a matter to be finally decided by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation in discussions with the Commonwealth Treasury. The consensus of opinion at the council meeting appeared to be that, notwithstanding the poor seasonal prospects this year and the expected buoyant oversea market for wheat, it would be preferable at this juncture to encourage farmers to deliver as much wheat as possible, irrespective of their quotas, and to devise means whereby all wheat delivered this season would be regarded as quota wheat. Presumably, if the general situation next season warrants similar action, the same procedure could be applied. My colleague can foresee practical difficulties for some wheatgrowers and serious administrative problems if, after the complete removal of quotas for one or perhaps two seasons, restrictions then had to be reimposed. The Government therefore intends to introduce within the next few days a Bill to amend the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act which it is hoped will meet the present seasonal situation and any future similar circumstances.

## HYNAM BUILDING

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about the future use of the Hynam school property? I apologize to the Minister, as it appears that I was given a bum steer in relation to this matter. However, undoubtedly the Minister will be able to clear up the position in his reply.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I certainly do not intend to do anything about the steer with which the honourable member has been having some anatomical difficulties. Subsequent to the closing of the Hynam school in 1968, the property was handed over to the District Council of Naracoorte which has leased it to Hynam

Hall Incorporated on a 21-year lease. The Hynam Tennis Club therefore should make its application to Hynam Hall Incorporated.

## GLENELG ROADWORKS

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about roadworks at the intersection of Brighton Road and Diagonal Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reconstruction of this intersection will be completed about the middle of February, 1973. The necessity to maintain traffic flow, the alteration to services, and other factors have required stage construction which is time consuming. The installation of traffic signals is also expected to be completed in the same period. The Glenelg Primary School has been kept informed on the progress of work and temporary crossing arrangements made for children. A school crossing has been and will be available across Brighton Road near the intersection at all times. It was necessary to close the school crossing on Diagonal Road for some time. However, it is expected that a new crossing will be installed across that road by about the end of this month.

## LAMEROO SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: As tenders for the Lameroo Area School closed last Friday, can the Minister of Education say whether they have now been processed and whether a tender has been let?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member was good enough to let me know that he would ask this question, I have been able to ascertain that tenders are at present being evaluated by the Public Buildings Department and it is hoped that a contract will be let next week.

## BUSINESS DIRECTORY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Attorney-General say what is the legal position of a firm in another State that is soliciting for entries in a business directory?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not permitted to ask the Attorney-General for a legal opinion. He will have to reframe his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will rephrase it. Is the Attorney-General aware of the activities of a firm from another State that is soliciting business for business directory entries, and can he say what action can be taken if the activity of this firm is deemed to be a malpractice? The matter was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine who received a notice, which looked like an account, from Brandon Publications for an entry in a business directory under the heading "Butchers-Retail". It so happens that my constituent once worked for a butcher, but at no stage did he own his own business. I think that perhaps this firm has been perusing the electoral roll. My constituent received this document, which looks very much like an account for $42. It appeared to him (and other people in the district have had a similar experience) that he was being billed for this sum to have his name and occupation inserted in this business directory. If one studies the document carefully, on the back, in fairly small print, it states:

Publishing conditions: The Australian Classified Business Directory will be published with the payee's entry as overleaf or as corrected by the payee. This is a solicitation and not an assertion of a right to payment.

However, the strong impression one gains from looking at the front of this document is that it is an account for payment. My constituent also received one of these forms last year. He went to the trouble of replying, stating that he was not interested in the listing, yet he has still received a form again this year. This appears to be bordering on a shady type of practice that should be brought to the attention of the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General know about this practice and, if he does, can he say what action, if any, can be taken to curb this activity?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter was raised in the House last week, I think. I am having it investigated and I will let the honourable member have a reply as soon as I can do so.

## WEST BEACH SANDHILLS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what action the Coast Protection Board is taking to prevent further desecration of the sandhills at West Beach? I refer to an article appearing in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*, about the desecration of the West Beach sandhills which has been caused mainly by people taking their horses through the sandhills to the beach.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I had the pleasure recently of visiting this district when I opened the yachting season. At that time I noticed that erosion was occurring in the area within the West Beach Recreation Reserve and I referred the matter to the trust. I have arranged to speak with the Chairman of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust to see

what can be done in regard to the future preservation of the sandhills. The area was fenced but a storm destroyed the fencing. It may be necessary to fence the area again to make sure that it is not damaged by horses. It may be necessary also to plant the area in order to hold it together. I assure the honourable member that the matter is being investigated and, as a result of discussions I shall be having with the trust, I hope that some positive steps will be taken to ensure that no further damage is caused.

## SIGN POSTS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the need for more sign posts on the Mingary to Curnamona road, via Kalabity, in the North-East of the State? On visiting the area over the weekend I had my attention drawn to the danger that is caused to strangers who travel this road. Unfortunately, people from the Eastern States are being directed to use this road as a short cut to the Flinders Range and many dangers exist on the road becauses of lack of sign posts. One landholder owns a patrol grader so that he can keep his roads to the water point well graded. His roads look better than the main road and people taking the better-looking road find themselves at Lake Frome, near the dog fence, without water and petrol. Some people have lost their way recently and this could have resulted in tragedy.

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

## SAFETY GLOVES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether State Government contracts for the supply of safety gloves, both P.V.C. and leather, have recently been let to oversea companies? Does he agree that the loss of such orders for the local manufacturers in Adelaide and Whyalla has seriously affected the continued operation of these local industries? A recent press report states that a factory at Whyalla is to close with the consequent loss of employment for 25 people who are engaged in the manufacture of safety gloves. I also understand that other manufacturers of safety gloves in Adelaide have recently lost contracts to the South Australian Government, the contracts having been given to manufacturers in Hong Kong. The contracts lost were for 246,000 dozen pairs of leather gloves and 160,000 dozen pairs of P.V.C. gloves. I ask the question because an order has been given to an oversea company apparently at a time when we wish to maintain employment in South Australia at a level higher than the present level.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of the order that would have been let by the Supply and Tender Board. A marked preference is given by the Supply and Tender Board to South Australian companies. That policy existed under Liberal Governments and is being carried on by the present Government. It is exactly the same; there is no difference. As to the company concerned, the difficulty regarding the manufacture of permanent industrial gloves (that is, industrial gloves of long life) from leather in Australia is twofold. Despite a code of preference, competition has been possible from oversea manufacturers who have now captured a substantial proportion of the market because of the much lower prices they can charge in Australia despite tariff preference to Australian manufacturers. In addition, the habit has grown up in employment in Australia of preferring gloves of shorter life, which are much cheaper. The second factor adversely affecting the supply of these goods from Australian manufacturers is that, because of oversea competition for hides in Australia, the price of hides here has increased markedly. In fact, the whole tanning industry in Australia is in trouble as a result of this marked increase in the price of hides in this country. Consequently, it is difficult for tanners to supply hides to Australian manufacturers at anything like the previously existing prices.

Dr. Eastick: Has the department suggested to them a product of lesser life?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have had discussions with James North Proprietary Limited but, again, the difficulties have been compounded by the fact that an oversea company has taken that company over and is proceeding to rationalize, from England, the whole of its operations, and that is right outside the purview of the Industrial Development Branch. We have been carrying on discussions with James North Proprietary Limited about Australian manufacture for some years but the take-over of the company has altered the whole nature of those negotiations.

Dr. Eastick: What about P.V.C.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware, although a competitive item, it does not enter into this operation as far as James North Proprietary Limited is concerned. Manufacturers in other parts of Australia also have closed down as a result of the situation that I have explained. This is a general

economic situation facing manufacturers of these gloves in Australia that is widening but, frankly, it cannot be solved on a purely State basis.

## DOMICILIARY CARE

Mr. PAYNE: I ask my question of the Attorney-General; that is, him who represents the Minister of Health in this place.

Mr. Mathwin: He who represents.

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Attorney a reply to the question I asked recently about the provision of finance for domiciliary care?

The Hon. L. J. KING: It would be better, if the member for Glenelg insisted on correcting the grammar used by the member for Mitchell, that he made sure he was right before he tried to make the correction. The Chief Secretary states that supportive financial and other assistance is provided for needy patients of Royal Adelaide Hospital from funds made available by the Commissioners of Charitable Funds, the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary, and the Da Costa Samaritan Fund Trust. Such assistance is recognized by the social workers at the hospital. Funds from these organizations for the above purpose are not becoming exhausted and there appears to be no need for supplementary finance to be provided by the State Government.

## KANGAROO ISLAND PLANNING

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he will desist from making any arrangement whereby the planning regulations for Kangaroo Island will be passed by Executive Council during the Parliamentary recess? As the Minister knows, the planning regulations are extremely far reaching, and they have become one of the hottest topics of discussion on Kangaroo Island, many residents being extremely concerned about aspects of them. The residents are forming committees and, indeed, as the Minister also knows, the council has had many discussions with the residents and with him. At a meeting that I attended recently, a group of citizens expressed to me the fear that, even though the discussions were far from being concluded as far as the residents were concerned, the Minister might be tempted to get the regulations through as law during the Parliamentary recess, when they would operate straightaway and not be subject to disallowance for many months thereafter. On behalf of the committee, I undertook to ask the Minister whether he would desist from taking any such action.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There is no doubt in my mind that the preparation of the regulations and the discussions that need to follow could not be achieved before Parliament resumed next year. Therefore, the fear the honourable member has expressed on behalf of residents of the island is not likely to be realized, for that reason. I hope we shall be able to have further discussions with the residents of the island and the council. I should have liked to see the regulations brought to a conclusion much earlier, because of the urgent need to have them in operation. However, because of the problems to which the honourable member has referred, as well as the discussions that need to be held and the consideration that needs to be given to the regulations, I see no possibility that the regulations will be ready before the next session of Parliament.

## PORT STANVAC OIL REFINERY

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 27 regarding gas emissions from the Port Stanvac oil refinery?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director-General of Public Health has reported that representatives of Petroleum Refineries of Australia Limited have had preliminary discussions with officers of the Public Health Department regarding proposed extensions to the refinery at Port Stanvac. This industry is a scheduled industry under the Clean Air regulations, 1972, of the Health Act, and Petroleum Refineries of Australia Limited will be required to submit for approval all plans and specifications of any alterations or extensions. The Public Health Department is aware of the problems of air pollution arising from the refinery industry and that local residents have been inconvenienced from time to time by operation of the existing plant. The Director-General considers it necessary for a complete meteorological survey to be made of the locality and he has made submissions to the Bureau of Meteorology for this purpose.

## WATER RESEARCH

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works now give me the information I sought recently about a water research project being carried out in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Projects being undertaken in South Australia at the present time involving research into river and dam gaugings and other allied matters which involve participation by the Australian Water Resources Council are as follows:

(1) Establishment of a State-wide network of stream-gauging stations being the South Australian contribution to the National Water Resources Assessment Programme. At June 30, 1972, a total of 58 stations having a continuous record and a further 73 supplementary stations having a discontinuous record had been established. Some of the stations included in the total are over and above the basic requirements of the national programme and they represent additional effort at defining water resources in areas of high water demand. The latest stream-gauging station now under construction is at Cooper Creek, near Innamincka.

(2) The engineering and hydrological survey of the South-East region of South Australia partially involves participation of the Australian Water Resources Council to the extent that the stream and drain-flow stations mentioned before and underground water measurements qualify for financial assistance from the Commonwealth under the States Grant (Water Resources Measurement) Act.

(3) Cabinet approval was given on October 30, 1972, to complete the instrumentation and operate three representative basins in South Australia as part of this State's contribution to the Australia-wide representative basins programme being conducted by the Australian Water Resources Council. The locations of these basins are as follows:

Bray Drain—South-East.
North Para River—Lower North.
Tod River—West Coast.

(4) A eutrophication study of Onkaparinga River is in progress involving an assessment of the way in which different kinds of land use in the metropolitan catchment affect the nutrient enrichment of water entering the metropolitan water supply. This study is in part assisted by the Australian Water Resources Council.

(5) Smaller research projects are being undertaken in South Australia by various organizations which are assisted by the Australian Water Resources Council. The following works give an indication of the type of project being undertaken in South Australia: interpretation of geophysical logs in bores in unconsolidated sediments; extraction of water from unconsolidated sediments; research requirements in urban hydrology; corrosion of groundwater pumping equipment; review of current practice of detection, etc., of water quality characteristics; and roaded catchments (their cost and use for farm water supply).

## MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked him on November 2 about a major addition to Modbury High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Sketch plans have been prepared for a two-storey complex at Modbury High School comprising a library resource centre and some special purpose rooms on the ground floor, and an eight-teacher flexible open-space unit on the top floor. At this stage, no clear indication can be given of when the project can proceed.

## TARCOOLA ROAD

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the feasibility of constructing a road from Tarcoola to Ceduna? If he has, I hope that on this occasion he will give a reasonable and lucid reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure whether or not the honourable member wants the reply that I have for him. If he does, it is as follows, namely—

Mr. Venning: Don't preach a sermon.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is for the member for Eyre, not the member for Rocky River.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department is currently undertaking an investigation to assess the effects which the proposed railway between Tarcoola and Alice Springs will have on road usage patterns in the far northern and western areas of the State. This investigation may reveal that an improved connection between Ceduna and Tarcoola may eventually be warranted. However, the pressing demands on funds which are available for other rural road works preclude any serious consideration of this proposal at this time.

## STANDING ORDERS

Mr. EVANS: I wish to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. Will you have included on the agenda at the next meeting of the Standing Orders Committee the proposal that Standing Order 150 be amended by deleting the words "or the name of the Governor"? Standing Order 150 provides:

No member shall use Her Majesty's name or the name of the Governor irreverently in debate, or for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations.

Now that we have a Governor who is quite vocal on many subjects, it may become necessary in debate for a member to refer to some of his statements, and this Standing Order prevents that sort of discussion.

*Members interjecting*:

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You don't have to disagree with what he is saying.

Mr. Millhouse: Ask the Speaker whether he's ever going to call the committee together.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher is quite capable of asking a question without being rudely interrupted by the member for Mitcham. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: If you find that it is not possible or desirable to have the matter included on the agenda, I should appreciate it if you could explain to the House in what way members could avoid discussing in the Chamber any statements made by the Governor on issues relating to the State and even to international matters to which he refers. I believe that it is desirable that members have this opportunity.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has referred to Standing Order 150, and it would be for the Speaker to decide in any specific case what constituted an irrelevant reference. The honourable member's suggestion that I refer to the Standing Orders Committee the question of the possible deletion of the word "Governor" from Standing Order 150 will be referred to the committee. In the meantime, I will apply Standing Orders as they are and decide each case as it arises.

*Members interjecting*:

Mr. Mathwin: Who called him "old Mark"?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg certainly makes himself heard, and I should appreciate it if he would conduct himself in accordance with the Standing Orders that have been set by this Chamber.

## LIQUOR IDENTIFICATION

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question of October 26 about liquor identification?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague the Minister of Health reports that amendments to regulations under the Food and Drugs Act have been recommended by the South Australian Food and Drugs Advisory Committee to incorporate the uniform wine standard recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council which includes labelling provisions.

## FIJI HURRICANE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked regarding relief to the victims of a recent hurricane in Fiji?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Normally assistance to another country in a national disaster is dealt with by Austcare. The South Australian Government has made more generous donations proportionately to Austcare than has any other State Government. If, however, we receive from Austcare a request to consider a special provision in relation to Fiji, the request would be examined. Basically, of course, assistance to another country is normally considered by the Commonwealth Government on a national basis.

## GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say, if his Leader will allow him to reply, whether unions whose members are employed at the South Australian Meat Corporation's premises at Gepps Cross will look more favourably on overtime worked during the week than they have in the past, now that there has been a change in management at the Gepps Cross abattoir? It is well known by those associated with, and depending on, the operations of the Gepps Cross abattoir that the unions involved there have actively discouraged overtime during the week, so that overtime can be worked at the weekend at much higher rates of pay. As this has been most inconvenient for all those who depend on the abattoir, I ask the Minister whether the new management will enjoy better co-operation from the unions than that enjoyed by the old management.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This rather hypothetical question is a question that the honourable member should ask the unions and the management concerned. This matter must be dealt with by the unions and the management, and at this stage I cannot see where I come into the matter at all. I am sure that, as the abattoir is now under new management, the question of overtime and working conditions at the abattoir is a question between the management and the employees.

## DIESEL FUMES

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of November 7 regarding diesel fumes and the road hazard resulting from dense black smoke belching from diesel trucks?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Section 101 of the Road Traffic Act provides:

A person shall not drive a motor vehicle while that vehicle emits—

(*a*) an undue amount of noise, smoke, sparks or visible vapour; or

(*b*) an offensive smell.

Penalty $50.

The whole matter of emissions from motor vehicles is constantly under review by committees of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. At the July, 1972, meeting of A.T.A.C., Ministers agreed that a monitoring programme be undertaken with a view to determining an appropriate level of exhaust emission capacity which could be permitted under normal operating conditions. No final results are available but, as I indicated to the honourable member on November 7, the matter is well in hand and will be pursued once test results are available.

## SCHOOL HOLIDAYS

Mr. BECKER: I ask the Minister of Education, when he can look up from his newspaper, whether he has a reply to my recent question concerning a change in the dates of school holidays currently applying in this State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My officers confirm that no thought has been given in South Australia to any suggestion to lengthen the end of the second-term vacation by five days and shorten the summer vacation by that number of days. According to information in the Education Department, the second term vacation in New South Wales corresponded to that in South Australia in 1971-72. Unless a change has been made without informing us, the present intention is for the holidays to coincide in 1973 and 1974. I seriously suggest to the honourable member that he make an effort to inform himself better about all sorts of things by a more conscientious reading of what is in the newspapers, because such knowledge would be most helpful to him.

## HAHNDORF SEWERAGE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of October 17 last about the provision of sewerage facilities at Hahndorf?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health reports that the Public Health Department is aware of the difficulties which exist in the disposal of effluent in Hahndorf and other towns in the Adelaide Hills and common effluent drains are currently being designed for several towns. It is expected that a preliminary survey of Hahndorf, to enable an estimate of costs to be submitted to the council, will be made early in 1973.

## NURIOOTPA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what is the current state of planning for the new primary school at Nuriootpa? I have received a letter from the Secretary of the school commitee, who complains that conditions at the primary school are deteriorating. In reply to an earlier question on this matter I was informed that the new school would be ready in 1974. However, the current situation at the school requires that a new school be built or that urgent repairs be made to the existing building. As the Minister has been invited to inspect the school (and I do not think he has inspected it), I shall certainly be pleased to accompany him on his visit. Enrolments at the school are increasing and class sizes are increasing, but, because the schoolgrounds are small, there is no room for more buildings to be erected on the present site. Further, an unflattering report on the toilets and the schoolgrounds has been submitted by the school medical officer. The committee is worried about the future of the present school which has not been repaired, because it was understood that a new building was to be erected soon. Will the Minister give any information he has on current planning for the new school and will he say whether the expected date of completion has been put back (although I hope that is not the case)?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have received a letter similar to that received by the honourable member. The matter is being investigated and, when I can give the honourable member a more detailed reply, I will do so.

## MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education further information on the progress of plans for the new primary school at Murray Bridge? In a reply to a question, the Minister said a couple of months ago that the date could not be given at that stage for the commencement of the new school, which presumably would be built in several stages. However, he concluded by saying that more definite information would be available in October. Does the Minister now have that information?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I do not have that information with me, I will obtain it and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

## PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say what will be the position with regard to appeals to the Privy Council after the entry of Great

Britain to the European Economic Community? Associates of mine believe that there may be some complications in this regard.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot see the connection between Britain's entry to the European Economic Community and appeals to the Privy Council. The Commonwealth Government has taken action in relation to appeals from the High Court to the Privy Council. There has been a discussion with the States concerning appeals from Full Courts to the Privy Council. From memory, I believe that is where the matter now rests.

## STRZELECKI TRACK

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about upgrading the Strzelecki Creek track?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department maintains the Strzelecki Creek track in a reasonable condition consistent with the normal usage of the road, and it is economically impossible to significantly upgrade the road in preparation for short-term concentrated use. Consequently, the contractors that will be involved in the cartage of pipes cannot expect a better class of road than that which currently exists. The Highways Department will effect liaison with the authority responsible for the installation of the pipeline to ensure that the State's interests in the road are preserved, and that the cartage of pipes does not cause permanent deterioration in the Strzelecki track or any other road that may be involved in the cartage of material for the pipeline.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier indicate both the origin and purpose of a questionnaire which has been forwarded in recent weeks to senior public servants, particularly heads of departments, and which requires them to answer extremely personal questions, including questions about their religious and political affiliations, and other matters? This questionnaire, which has now been circulated twice to some heads of departments, has been resisted by many of them. Some have filled in part of the questionnaire but have declined to indicate their religious or political affiliations. It is alleged that a reminder that this form has not been submitted by several of the people involved has been identified as coming from the Premier's Department. In view of this, and in view of the fact that the people involved fear the consequences of having such personal details on a permanent file, I ask the Premier the origin and purpose of this document. If, as I judge from the look on his face, he is unaware of the document, will he obtain information about it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know of such a document. If it has been circulated within the Public Service, it can only have been, I should think, with the approval of the Public Service Board, but that matter has certainly not been communicated to me by the board. I will inquire about this because I would never give Ministerial authority for the circulation of such an inquiry. I will get a report.

## SUMMONSES

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General consider making it mandatory that summonses be delivered enclosed in an envelope? I understand that many summonses are now served through the post, thus being enclosed in an envelope. However, a constituent has told me that a summons was delivered to his address and not to him personally (and this was not delivered by a postman but was delivered by some other person), and that it was entirely open. I believe that a person named in a summons is at least entitled to the privacy of having the summons enclosed in an envelope.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It has certainly always been the practice to serve summonses without their being enclosed in an envelope. It is a new thought to so enclose them (I cannot say it has occurred to me before). I will consider the matter and let the honourable member have a reply.

## BUS TOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of tourism, say why it is considered that permits to operate bus tours from Adelaide should be restricted to places within a 50-mile radius of Adelaide? I have been approached by the operator of a tour about the refusal of the Transport Control Board to allow him to venture even a foot outside the 50-mile radius. He has raised the matter with the board. He has also been to his local member of Parliament, who is a Government member and who has not been able to satisfy him. He has shown me a letter dated September 28 which was written by the Premier's assistant (the Minister of Environment and Conservation) and which states in part:

The board considers that you are providing a valuable service to passengers who wish to go on a day or half-day trip, but it considers

the trips should be restricted to places within the 50-mile radius of Adelaide. It is pointed out that no operator in the State has an unrestricted licence or permit to engage in charter work or tours anywhere in the State.

That just begs the question why he is not allowed to do this. Therefore, I put this question to the Premier in the hope that he may satisfy the inquirer and me, and in the greater hope that there may be a change of policy that will enable this man to operate his service fully.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know exactly the basis on which the Transport Control Board has laid down this policy; it has certainly not been as a result of any direction given by me. I will consult the Minister of Roads and Transport and get a further reply for the honourable member.

## JARRAH ROOTS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to get a report about jarrah root rot (*Phytophora Cinnamoni*)? As this matter has received some newspaper publicity recently, I am sure the Minister knows about it. There is much alarm amongst almond growers in the Willunga area, who have gone as far as asking that the road to Victor Harbour be rerouted. I believe that one person at least has written to almost all the Ministers about this. I think that probably the most appropriate way to deal with the matter would be to ask the Minister of Agriculture to report on the spread of the disease and on any other relevant matters.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly do that.

## MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question of October 31 concerning the establishment of a canteen at Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Applications for the lease of the canteen at Modbury Hospital are being called currently by advertisement in the press. The closing date for receipt of applications is November 16, 1972, after which date applicants will be interviewed.

## APPRENTICES

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about the number of apprentices at present undergoing training?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member, in asking for information regarding apprenticeship enrolments following the appeal I made to employers earlier this year, said that there was presently a severe shortage of highly skilled tradesmen in the engineering industry and allied heavy industries. However, that statement is not borne out by the facts. In the monthly review of the employment situation at the end of October which was released last night, the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service indicated that at the end of last month there were 506 unemployed persons in the skilled metal and electrical occupational group but only 320 vacancies in that group. It is clear that there is no shortage of skilled tradesmen; in fact, the reverse is the position.

Unfortunately, at the end of last month the number of indentures of apprenticeship lodged with the Apprenticeship Commission was 110 fewer than at the same time last year, the numbers being 2,031 in 1972 and 2,141 in 1971. This is a decrease of about 7 per cent. The total number of indentures commenced last year was about 100 more than in 1970. This year it appears that the number will revert to about the same as in 1970. Most of the fall in apprenticeship enrolments this year has been in the engineering industries. In fact, the 866 new apprentices in the metal trades is 137 fewer than at the same time last year, but the 297 electrical apprentices is 35 more than last year.

The fall in new industries of apprenticeship in this State is in line with the trend in Australia. At a recent meeting of the Australian Apprenticeship Advisory Committee held in Adelaide last month, figures produced showed that the national intake of apprentices for the financial year ended June 30, 1972, was about 7 per cent less than in the previous year. Thus it is obvious that the downward trend in the South Australian figures is in line with the national trend, which can only be blamed on the Commonwealth Government's economic policies and the general lack of confidence in the business community. Before any employer decides to take on an apprentice he needs to have confidence in his ability to continue to produce and sell his goods so as to offer an apprentice stable employment conditions for the four years of his apprenticeship.

It is an understatement to say that employers over the past 12 months have had little confidence in the economy as it has been managed by the present Prime Minister. In fact, a survey of industrial trends in Australia made by the Associated Chambers of Manufactures and the Bank of New South Wales for the September quarter, the results of which were

published, shows that 67 per cent of manufacturers have reported that they are not working at a satisfactorily full rate of operation.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

## DUNCAN INQUIRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the report on the Duncan case prepared by the two officers from New Scotland Yard contain any recommendations for further action?

2. If so—

(*a*) what are those recommendations; and

(*b*) what action is it proposed to take?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2. For reasons already given, it is not intended to make public the report of the two officers from New Scotland Yard on the Duncan case and it would, therefore, not be proper to furnish information as to its contents by way of answers to questions.

## HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many children who live in the Elizabeth, Smithfield, Salisbury, Para Hills and Gepps Cross areas are attending:

(*a*) Ashford House?

(*b*) Somerton Crippled Children's Home?

(*c*) Townsend House?

2. From what radius does the Government taxi service operate in taking children to each of these institutions?

3. What is the total cost a week for this taxi service to each institution?

4. How many taxis are used transporting the children to each institution?

The Hon. L. J. King, for the Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. (*a*) Nine children from these areas attend Ashford House.

(*b*) Two children from these areas attend Somerton Crippled Children's Home.

(*c*) Six children from these areas attend the South Australian School for Deaf and Blind (Townsend House).

2. When establishing taxi services, no definite radius or limit is defined. Taxi or mini-bus routes are organized where children can be economically transported in groups to a school. Sometimes where many children reside long distances from a school, mini-buses can be used to provide transport where it would be uneconomical to use taxis.

3 and 4. The department does not provide taxis to Ashford House, the South Australian School for Deaf and Blind (Townsend House), and Somerton Crippled Children's Home from the areas referred to. Therefore, no taxis are used and no cost is incurred. The Crippled Children's Association provides transport to Ashford House for nine children from the Para Hills and Elizabeth areas and also for one child to the Somerton Crippled Children's Home.

## EGGS

Mr. WARDLE (on notice):

1. How many egg producers keep the following numbers of laying hens:

(*a*) 20 to 500;

(*b*) 500 to 1,000;

(*c*) 1,000 to 3,000;

(*d*) 3,000 to 5,000;

(*e*) 5,000 to 10,000; and

(*f*) over 10,000?

2. What percentage of the total quantity of eggs produced came from each of the above categories in 1970-71 and 1971-72 respectively?

The Hon. L. J. King, for the Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (*a*) 1,685; (*b*) 249; (*c*) 168; (*d*) 54; (*e*) 36; and (*f*) 23.

2. Separate production records for the various categories listed are not maintained, and actual percentages cannot, therefore, be supplied.

## FESTIVAL CENTRE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is now the estimated cost of insulating the festival theatre from the noise of an underground railway?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Any acoustic isolation of the festival theatre from a railway in the vicinity of the Adelaide Festival Centre will be carried out at its source, that is, isolation of railway track from its foundations. In view of the uncertainty regarding the location of tracks and the likely proximity of other buildings (for example, Parliament House), the isolation of tracks rather than buildings is considered a logical procedure. The cost of isolation of railway tracks is dependent on the distance the tracks are from the buildings which need to be isolated. As the location of any underground railway in the area has not been finally determined, the cost of any resultant isolation of tracks cannot be estimated at the present time.

## MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It makes miscellaneous amendments to the Mining Act, 1971. The major amendment concerns the opal fields. Honourable members will be well aware that amongst the population of the opal fields there is an unlawful element that tends to cause or provoke violence and other criminal activity. These fields are situated far from the centres of population and tend to attract a certain number of avaricious and unscrupulous people who are anxious to get rich at any price without regard to any form of social obligation or restraint. I should make clear that I am speaking only of a small minority of the total population of the opal fields, but the trouble caused by these people is out of proportion to their number. Therefore, what is necessary is a power to exclude from the opal fields people who have proved that they are trouble makers. The Bill inserts such a power, providing at the same time necessary safeguards to ensure that it is not used in a capricious or unjust manner.

The Bill also inserts amendments providing that the Minister may reject an application for a private mine where the area to which the application relates has, since the commencement of the Act, been subject to a mining tenement. Thus, where a mining operator had established a tenement before the commencement of the Act, he cannot be deprived of his vested rights by an action on the part of the owner of the land. The Bill sets out in greater detail the procedural powers of the Warden's Court. These had previously been determined by reference to the powers of a court of summary jurisdiction. However, the Warden's Court is not a punitive court and so, rather than confer on the court power to punish for contempt of a summons, it was felt better to set out the powers of the court expressly and provide that failure to comply with a summons of the court would expose the person in default to prosecution before a separate court of summary jurisdiction.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends section 19 of the principal Act. The amendment enables the Minister to reject an application for a private mine where the area to which the application relates was at the commencement of the Act, and at the date of the application, subject to a mining tenement. Clause 4 amends section 59 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is to bring section 59 into line with the original intention that subsection (1), which provides a prohibition against the use of declared equipment except upon a registered claim, should extend to a precious stones field.

Clause 5 amends section 65 of the principal Act by inserting the procedural powers of the court in the section. Clause 6 amends section 74 of the principal Act by inserting new subsections. New subsection (2) provides a penalty for a person who is on a precious stones claim for the purpose of illegal mining. New subsection (3) empowers the Minister to prohibit a person from entering or remaining upon a precious stones field. New subsection (4) enables the person against whom an order is made under the new provisions to appeal to a court of summary jurisdiction constituted of a special magistrate. The court of summary jurisdiction may hear the appeal in private, and without formality, and may determine the appeal in such manner as it considers just.

New subsection (8) provides that a person who disobeys an order under the new provisions shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $2,000 or imprisonment for two years. New subsection (9) provides that offences against section 74 of the principal Act are to be dealt with in accordance with the procedure prescribed for minor indictable offences under the Justices Act. Clause 7 amends section 91 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential upon the amendment to section 74.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## NORTH HAVEN DEVELOPMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve, ratify and give effect to an indenture made between the State of South Australia, the Minister of Marine and the Australian Mutual Provident Society relating to the development of the portion of the State to be known as North Haven and for matters relating thereto, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Yesterday with the Minister of Marine, and on behalf of the Government of South Australia, I executed an indenture with the Australian Mutual Provident Society to provide for the establishment of a low-cost housing development in an area near Outer Harbour which will be known as North Haven. The purpose of this Bill is therefore, first, to ratify and give effect to the indenture as executed, and secondly to enact into law certain undertakings that are contained in the indenture.

The indenture effectuates the desire of the Government to make available to the average income earner land in a pleasant environment and conveniently situated in relation to the Port Adelaide industrial area. For its part, the Government is making available to the society land at somewhat below market value though without loss to itself, and the society for its part is required to subdivide the land and to provide some major and quite expensive works, the most important of which are an enclosed boat harbour and launching ramp for trailer boats. In addition, other recreational facilities including a golf course will be provided by the society.

Honourable members will be aware that the eastern shore of St. Vincent Gulf provides few sheltered anchorages for yachts and, in addition, launching facilities for trailer boats at the northern end of the Outer Harbour wharf are badly needed. It is envisaged that the development undertaken by the society in this area will supply these facilities at no great cost to the public purse. The development, which is described in detail in the indenture, includes a considerable amount of open space, new picnic beaches inside the harbour, and considerable recreation areas. In addition, the project itself lies very close to a natural beach that is already in existence. In the interests of conservation of the natural flora and fauna of the area, as large a part as possible will also be left in its natural state.

In general, the society will be obliged to comply with most of the obligations usually placed on a subdivider, although in some areas, which will be explained in detail when I deal with the specific clauses of the Bill, these obligations are somewhat modified. It is appreciated that all developments of this nature to a greater or lesser extent disturb the existing environment and it follows that some modification of the environment cannot be avoided here. Nevertheless, it is clear that the environmental background of North Haven will be enhanced by the development. There is, however, a steady demand for land and houses in the general vicinity of Port Adelaide and, if access to reasonably low cost land is not provided, we may expect a steady increase in the price of land in this area. The Government is of the opinion that the provision of this kind of development will, to some extent at least, contain these price rises.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides the definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure. I would draw honourable members' attention to the provisions relating to the registration of amendments to the indenture. These provisions, when read with those relating to the deposit and registration of the original indenture, mean that the indenture as amended from time to time will be, in effect, a public document. Clause 4 provides that any agreements that have the effect of amending the indenture will not have any effect so far as the Statute law of the State is concerned until they have been approved and ratified by Parliament. This will ensure continuous Parliamentary oversight with respect to any variations of the scheme.

Clause 5 formally approves and ratifies the indenture, and subclause (2) of this clause formally charges the Premier, the Minister of Marine and the Government with the responsibility of carrying out the provisions of the indenture. Clause 6 gives the Minister power to acquire land for the purposes of the scheme of development. Acquisitions under this clause are, of course, subject to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969. Provision is made in this clause for title to be passed to the Minister from the former owners of the land. Here it might be mentioned that, since the majority of the land in the area is already vested in the Crown or an instrumentality of the Crown or the Port Adelaide council, substantially no acquisition from private persons will be involved. Clause 7 will enable the Minister of Marine, who will be the Minister responsible for the general oversight of the project, to close roads without recourse to the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act. It is generally agreed that action under this Act is inappropriate where a whole new subdivision is contemplated.

Clause 8 provides for the vesting in the Minister of lands within the area which are not vested in him and which were immediately before the commencement of the Act proposed by this Bill vested in the Crown, a Minister of the Crown or the council. This vesting is, of course, a necessary prerequisite to the Minister's disposing of the land to the society for development. Clause 9 provides for the Minister to be registered, under the Real Property Act, as the proprietor of the land vested

in him. Clause 10 formally provides for the bringing of any land, vested or to be vested in the Minister, under the Real Property Act. Clause 11 gives effect to an agreement with the society that it will have full and free access over the lands comprised in North Haven for the purposes of carrying out the development. For this limited purpose this clause confers on the Minister power to modify any Act or law which would prevent this access.

Clause 12 is intended to ensure that the lands proposed to be subdivided will be zoned as residential R2 notwithstanding the fact that portion of the lands proposed to be subdivided is not at present subject to planning regulations, since they lie outside the area of the Port Adelaide council. Clause 13 is proposed partly in aid of clause 12 and partly to ensure that, until the expiration of a period commencing on the commencement of the Act proposed by the Bill and concluding at the end of the third year after the subdivision is completed, the society will be able to ensure that no "land use" of the subdivided lands is permitted until it has been agreed to by the society. It is submitted that this restriction is a reasonable one having regard to objects of the development, which could be frustrated if certain undesirable land uses were permitted. Clause 14 relieves the society of the obligation to provide reserves in the proportions required under the Planning and Development Act since, having regard to the reserves that the society has under the indenture covenanted to provide and also having regard to nearness of the development to the open beach frontage, it is considered that reserves available will be adequate.

Clauses 15 and 16 together vest in the Minister and the society certain rights to control the movements of persons in and about North Haven until the completion of the works. In all the circumstances, this power seems a reasonable one, since the works proposed are of a substantial nature and the risk of injury to unauthorized persons who come upon the land is always present. Clause 17 makes a formal appropriation to ensure that money will be available to satisfy any payments required to be made under the indemnity provision of the indenture. These provisions will be found in clause 11 of the indenture and relate to the provision of an indemnity to the society after the major works have been handed over to the Minister. Subclause (2) of this clause also ensures that other persons in whom control of the major works are vested will also be obligated, by Statute, to indemnify the society in appropriate circumstances. Clause 18 limits the society's road-making responsibilities in the manner set out in the clause. It is suggested that the obligations here imposed on the society are, in all respects, reasonable ones in the circumstances.

Regarding clause 19, clause 13 of the indenture enjoins the Premier to cause the South Australian Railways Commissioner and the Commissioner for Highways to construct two railway crossings, at the expense of the society, and this clause of the Bill merely acts in aid of that provision by formally requiring those authorities to carry out the necessary work. In regard to clause 20, clause 8 of the indenture empowers the Minister to carry out and complete the major works at the cost of the society in the event that the society does not carry out its part of the indenture. This clause provides that such works will not be a public work within the meaning of the Public Works Standing Committee Act, since it is not likely that the works will ultimately be a charge on public moneys.

Dealing with clause 21, clause 14 of the indenture confers on the society certain temporary rights over roads and railways with the area of development, and this clause of the Bill ensures that those rights may, at law, be freely exercised. Clause 22 provides that the Mining Act will not apply to or in relation to any mining or quarrying operations carried our pursuant to the indenture which are specifically referred to in clause 15 of the indenture. However, subclause (2) of this clause is intended to ensure that all other Acts relating to mining (for example, the Mines and Works Inspection Act) will apply to the operations.

Clause 23 gives statutory protection for the society against proceedings by way of injunction while it is carrying out the works incidental to the scheme. Works of this nature often do, in fact, create a "nuisance" at law, and it seems reasonable that this protection should be provided. Regarding clause 24, clause 17 of the indenture requires the authorities named in clause 24 of the Bill to dispose of certain property to the Minister of Marine, and clause 24 specifically empowers those authorities to do all things necessary to give effect to clause 17 of the indenture.

Clause 25 merely confirms certain exemptions from stamp duty and certain rates and fees that are provided for in the indenture. Clause 26 is a formal provision, and provides that the Act proposed by this Bill will apply to land that is subject to the Real Property

Act. Clause 27 is intended to give full effect to clause 27 of the indenture, which contains a provision for arbitration and is also intended to ensure that all parties to the indenture and persons named therein will be bound by the arbitration clause. This Bill is a hybrid Bill and will, in the ordinary course of events, be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the second reading. As the Bill is a hybrid Bill, it will be referred to a Select Committee. At first glance, it seems that a wise move has been made. Good use will be made of a block of land and those concerned seem to have tried to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible. The allotments to be created will give average-income earners medium-cost or low-cost housing. Without knowing exactly what is in the indenture, I say that the move is sensible and I support it, looking forward to discussions in the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, and Messrs. Becker, Evans, Harrison, and Ryan; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 22.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONSOLIDATION)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934, as amended, and certain other Acts relating to local government. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It makes several amendments that are essential to enable the Local Government Act and its amendments to be consolidated and reprinted under the Acts Republication Act. When the principal Act and its amendments were examined and checked with a view to preparing them for consolidation and reprinting, several errors and obsolete provisions were detected in some of the Acts concerned, as well as several references to proportions expressed in the old currency which have no exact equivalents that can be expressed in decimal currency. These need amendment by Parliament before the Act can be consolidated with its amendments and reprinted, and that is the main purpose of this Bill.

Although there is authority in the Acts Republication Act for a reprint made under that Act to express in exact equivalents in decimal currency, where this is possible, any references to the old currency, it is preferable for this to be done by Parliament. The opportunity has therefore been taken at the same time to convert to decimal currency the other references to the old currency which are in the principal Act and which are directly convertible but have not been dealt with in the other Bill to amend the Local Government Act which is before Parliament.

Clause 1 is formal. Subclause (1) of clause 2 amends various provisions of the principal Act, and I shall explain those amendments when I deal with the first schedule to this Bill. Subclause (2) of clause 2 repeals section 895 of the principal Act. That section amended the Industrial Code, 1920, which was repealed by the Industrial Code, 1967, and is no longer required in the Act.

Subclause (3) of clause 2 repeals the present tenth schedule to the principal Act and re-enacts it with exact decimal currency conversions, except that the charge relating to sale and delivery of goods of 6d. in £1 has been converted to 3c in $1. Clause 3 strikes out an erroneous amendment from the Local Government Act Amendment Act, 1946, as the word "exceed" purporting to be struck out of paragraph VII of section 206 of the principal Act by that amendment was not included in that paragraph.

Clause 4 inserts into the principal Act, as section 319a, the whole of section 6 of the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 1), 1954, which had been enacted by the amending Act in 1954 as a substantive provision but without a "home" in the principal Act. Unless that section is included in the principal Act by Act of Parliament, it could not be incorporated in a reprint of the principal Act (of which it is not a part) and it would probably be forgotten. Clause 5 corrects an obvious error in the Local Government Act Amendment Act, 1968. Clause 6 also corrects an obvious error in the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 3), 1969.

I shall now deal with the first schedule to the Bill. The amendments that make direct and exact conversions to decimal currency need no explanation. I would, however, like to draw the attention of honourable members to the amendments to sections 234 (ii) (*a*), 234 (ii) (*b*), 240, 244, 245, 246 (1), 247, 248, 424 (1) II, 424 (1) V, 488 (*a*), 488 (*b*). In recommending the conversions made by these

amendments, the Secretary for Local Government has had regard to the fact that exact equivalents are not practicable and he has therefore recommended the nearest equivalent proportions that would be practicable in the circumstances of each case.

The amendment to section 307 is consequential on the enactment of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967. The amendments to sections 425 (1) and 476 (3) correct old drafting errors. The amendment to the heading immediately preceding section 528 is consequential on the removal of the divisional heading to Division I of Part XXV. The amendment to section 883 (1) and (1a) merely updates the references to the District Council of Kapunda. The amendment to the thirteenth schedule merely substitutes for form 5 a new form setting out in decimal currency a specimen table to be incorporated with a debenture for the repayment of principal and interest by instalments. The new form is set out in the second schedule to the Bill. It is hoped that the Bill will be dealt with expeditiously to enable the principal Act and its amendments to be consolidated and reprinted at an early date.

I draw members' attention to the title of the Bill, and I am sure that they will be interested to see that the measure was prepared by Mr. E. A. Ludovici. May I take this opportunity to compliment Mr. Ludovici on the work he has undertaken in preparing the Bill. I think he is well known to every member as a former Parliamentary Counsel. Since his retirement, Mr. Ludovici has continued his duties in connection with a consolidation of the Statutes, and this Bill represents part of those duties. I am certain that all members would agree that I should place on record and express my appreciation to Mr. Ludovici for the work he has done both as Parliamentary Counsel and in connection with his current duties involving a consolidation of the Statutes.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is happy to support this Bill, and to do so right now, so that it may pass through all stages without further delay. This procedure has been facilitated by virtue of our having seen yesterday a copy of not only the Bill but also the Minister's explanation. The facts outlined by the Minister have been checked and are totally acceptable to the Opposition. Indeed, the corrections made by this measure are obvious ones. It is interesting to note that many errors have existed in the present Act for a long time, and it is only when there is an exercise such as the one being undertaken by Mr. Ludovici for the benefit of the State that those errors are revealed. We on this side endorse the comments made by the Minister regarding the valuable work undertaken by Mr. Ludovici.

I am a little perturbed that the present Act is so antiquated that it is causing considerable concern to those in the community who are bound by it and also those who work under it. I am aware of the difficulty in introducing a completely new measure; indeed, it was previously indicated to me that this might take 18 months to two years. We on this side hope that there will be no more delay than is absolutely necessary in introducing a Bill to implement an entirely new Act. I support the Bill.

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

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Peterborough Primary School (Replacement),

Risdon Park (Port Pirie) Primary School (Replacement).

Ordered that reports be printed.

## MURRAY NEW TOWN (LAND ACQUISITION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act, 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act, 1972, authorizes the acquisition by the State Planning Authority of not more than 10,000 ha of land for the purpose of establishing a new town in the vicinity of Murray Bridge. The 10,000 ha proposed for designation as the new town site would be capable of housing a population of between 100,000 and 150,000 people on the basis of 10-15 persons a hectare. Such a figure could be reached within about 20 years after construction begins, if sufficient finance and employment opportunities are forthcoming. Some studies have indicated that a city needs to reach a population of about that size before it becomes self-generating. The experience at Canberra and new towns overseas substantiates this theory. Lack of foresight in setting aside and acquiring adequate lands for further long-term

city development could eventually result in high prices having to be paid to acquire land for further expansion, if such expansion is desired. A larger area would also provide for greater flexibility in planning in the design of the new town especially if it is found that a large lake or series of small lagoons can be established as a focal point in the design of the town. The Government has studied various reports and recommendations received both from the State Planning Authority and the Murray New Town Steering Committee that the Act should be amended to enable more land to be acquired for the reasons already outlined. It is proposed therefore that the figure of 10,000 ha be increased to 16,000 ha.

Some flexibility is also necessary in the Act to enable the State Planning Authority to purchase land by agreement outside but in the vicinity of the designated site. Such a provision may avoid costly severance claims where land that lies partly within the designated site and partly outside it is to be acquired. The principal Act enables the Director of Planning to refuse applications to subdivide land within the establishment area if the proposal would be prejudicial to the establishment of the new town. The Act also provides for the State Planning Authority to control all changes of land use and building development within the designated site when that site is proclaimed.

The State Planning Authority has recommended that powers to control land use should apply to land outside, but in the vicinity of, the designated site and that control over land subdivision should also be exercised over that land. After the site is designated the 30 km radius establishment area will have served its purpose. The important areas for controlling land use and land subdivision will then be the designated area and the land adjoining. It is expected that some additional powers will be available under the amended Planning and Development Act. However, the extent to which they could be used to safeguard the new town will be limited, as that Act makes no reference to the new town and at this stage there is no authorized development plan for the Murray Mallee planning area in which the new town site is situated.

The Bill therefore provides that, following designation of the site, the control of land use and building development and the control of land subdivision will apply to the designated site and within 10 km of the boundary. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition section of the principal Act and provides a definition of "adjoining area". In substance this adjoining area comprises a belt of land 10 km wide surrounding the designated site. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act and increases the amount of land that may be declared as the designated site from 10,000 ha to 16,000 ha. The reason for this extension has been adverted to earlier. Clause 5 amends section 4 of the principal Act by permitting the authority to acquire land, in the adjoining area, by agreement. Generally this power will be used to obviate the need for claims for severance, when part of the land being within the designated site has been acquired.

Clause 6 amends section 5 of the principal Act by limiting the control over land subdivision which at present extends throughout the establishment area to the designated site and the adjoining area, as defined. Clause 7 amends section 6 of the principal Act by somewhat extending the control over land use outwards to cover land use in the adjoining area. At present under section 6 this control is limited to the designated site. The need for this additional measure of control has again been adverted to earlier and is, briefly, to ensure that the proper development of the new town is not prejudiced.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

### THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Crown Lands Act Amendment Bill, 1972, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry your committee held one meeting and took evidence from the following witnesses:

Mr. C. N. Storry, Chairman,
Mrs. R. L. Foley, Secretary, and
Miss O. Baker, former Secretary, representing the Lyrup Village Association.
Mr. R. J. Daugherty, Parliamentary Counsel, Adelaide.

2. Advertisements inserted in the *Advertiser* and the *News* inviting interested persons to give evidence before the committee brought no response.

3. Your committee is of the opinion that the financial assistance to be given to the Lyrup Village Association under this legislation will be beneficial to the association and enable it to carry out the necessary and urgent works in the area.

4. Your committee is satisfied that there is no opposition to the Bill and recommends that it be passed without amendment.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): On behalf of the Lyrup Village Association I point out that the association is entirely happy with the arrangement that has now been made with the Government for the financing of the proposed irrigation pipeline works. The amendments are necessary because the constitution of the association precluded its borrowing from anyone other than the Government, and it was then found that clause 107 of the Crown Lands Act prevented the Minister from lending money. The scheme suggested has been accepted by the Lands Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department as a proper scheme that will achieve the upgrading of the irrigation scheme for the area. The cost of the scheme is acceptable and the terms of this amendment cover those costs. This morning we were told, by way of a reply to a question, that the association was satisfied that the sum the Government was prepared to make available would cover its costs and contingencies. This is a generous gesture and I am sure that the people of Lyrup support it, as I wholeheartedly do.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This short Bill amends the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act, 1921-1972 and is intended to make quite clear the class of bull that is required to be licensed. Previously the requirement as to licensing of bulls was expressed to relate to "bulls maintained or kept at, or for any purposes connected with, certain specified dairy farms in the metropolitan and country areas". It appears that the measure will be easier to interpret if the licensing requirement is set out a little more clearly. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 6 of the principal Act by setting out in plain and unambiguous terms the licensing requirements.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

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

That the adjourned debate on the second reading of this Bill be now proceeded with.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of many people in the State, I am gravely concerned at the situation that appears to be unfolding in the Virginia area. Members will recall that questions about the use of effluent from the Bolivar scheme have been asked in the House over a long period. I also point out that questions have been asked of the Premier about the sociological aspects of the matter not only with regard to the immediately adjacent area likely to be improved by the availability of this water but also with regard to the whole area that would be affected if there were any reduction in the underground water available. The Government has, rightly in the first instance, refused to grant further licences with regard to this underground water. The Bolivar scheme also represents a major problem because of the failure to provide reticulated water supply to most of the area involved. People in the area therefore rely totally on water from the underground basin, or on water that they can store in a tank or dam.

The sociological problems have been the subject of several reports, as the Premier has said. Recently he said that one sociological report had been referred to a committee of inquiry for evaluation. In reply to my question of October 31 about any activity that might be taking place in the Virginia area, especially in relation to the effluent drain, the Minister of Works (and I do not deny that he gave me all the information he had at that time) said that there had been no extension whatever in the availability of water from this source and that no action would be taken until tests being conducted by the Agriculture Department had been completed. My question (*Hansard*, page 2542) was whether there had been any additional authorization for the distribution of water, and the Minister replied:

The only authorization of which I am aware was given some time ago at, I think, Angle Vale, where water is pumped from the channel for the growing of vines and, I think, olive trees. No other quantities of water have been allotted to any group or individual, but that does not mean to say that there have not been applications: applications have been received from three major groups which wish to take vast quantities of effluent and which, in fact, could easily utilize the whole of it. However, the Government has not agreed to make any allocation to these bodies, because an investigation is currently being conducted by the Agriculture Department on behalf of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Unfortunately, it will probably be another 18 months before we have the final report of that investigation and before we will be able

to determine whether or not it is feasible and reasonable to use the effluent on the Adelaide Plains. The honourable member is, of course, fully aware of the need that exists there. Until we receive the report and can evaluate it, we cannot really allow any authorization for the use of the effluent. When a decision is made, we will know how much is required, what are the likely requirements for the future, and what quantities can be supplied in other areas. However, I am sure that the activities to which the Leader has referred are not in connection with irrigating from the channel which takes the effluent from Bolivar to the sea.

The latter part of that reply relates specifically to information I had given in the explanation of my question that considerable activity seemed to be taking place, with the provision of electricity service lines and the preparation for pumps. On November 2, I was able to point out to the Minister that information given me indicated that in fact piping had been laid east along McEvoy Road, adjacent to section 142 in the hundred of Port Adelaide, and that electricity mains had been completed to the site of the sump. In reply, the Minister said (*Hansard*, page 2687):

As yet, the matter has not been considered, but the question was forwarded to the department for a reply. It seems that something is happening in the area, although there has certainly been no recent discussion of which I am aware. This activity could have resulted from an agreement reached some time ago, but I cannot readily recall it and I shall certainly be interested to see the reply.

Since then, the matter has been referred to in another place. At page 2705 of *Hansard*—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Reference may not be made to a debate in another place.

Dr. EASTICK: Reference was made in the newspapers to the conflicting information that appeared to have been given to people in the area. Allegations were made about the cost extracted from people for water.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Graft and corruption.

Dr. EASTICK: That is the Minister's term.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That was the headline in the *Advertiser*. Do you deny that?

Dr. EASTICK: I do not have a copy of that report in front of me.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Didn't you see the *Advertiser*?

Dr. EASTICK: I will accept the Minister's statement that those words were used. On behalf of these people, I point out that urgent information on the sociological and agricultural aspects of this matter appears not to have been available from the source in this House from which it could have been expected to be available.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Say that again.

Dr. EASTICK: I have received no reply from the Minister to the question I asked about two weeks ago regarding activities in this area. In the information given to me today about salinity, which matter I raised about five or six days ago, there is no indication that the Minister has a reply to my questions about matters of extreme importance to the people in the Virginia area. On behalf of those people, I record that it is urgent that clear and concise statements be made so that these people will know what their future is. Not only must the Minister of Works make a clear statement about effluent, which matter is under his control, but the Premier also should give a clear indication of what is intended regarding the present sociological problems that are multiplying month by month. I record my concern for these constituents.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): As this seems to be the last opportunity that members will have during this Parliament to make a complaint in this place, I desire to take advantage of it and discuss what I regard as one of the most important issues that has confronted our community in the recent past. I hope that my complaint will be short and to the point. It concerns the Duncan case and the unsatisfactory situation that has been reached.

My complaint is based on the reply that I have received today from the Attorney-General to a Question on Notice. I had asked the Attorney-General whether the report by the two officers from New Scotland Yard contained any recommendations for further action and, if it did, I asked what the recommendations were and what action was intended. Doubtless, Cabinet considered the Attorney's reply which states:

For reasons already given, it is not intended to make public the report of the two officers from New Scotland Yard on the Duncan case and it would, therefore, not be proper to furnish information as to its contents by way of answers to questions.

In other words, no member of Parliament in South Australia or anyone else in South Australia is to hear anything further, and I protest vigorously about that. On May 10 this year there occurred an apparently dreadful tragedy, in which a man was murdered by being deliberately thrown by other men into the Torrens River. Secondly, the police made inquiries and, during the course of the inquiries, three police officers resigned from the Police Force.

Thirdly, the Government offered a reward of $5,000 for information about the murder and it promised immunity from prosecution to anyone who came forward and gave information. In the Government's eyes this case merited the offer of such a reward and immunity. Fourthly, we had an inquest into the death of Dr. Duncan. What were the findings of that inquest, which lasted for more than 10 days? All that the Coroner could get from the evidence presented at the inquest was the cause of death of drowning due to violence on the part of persons of whose identity there was no evidence. However, Mr. Cleland, besides making the finding, made a statement about the facts of the case that gave rise to many questions that remain unanswered. I desire to quote only one or two sentences from the findings. Mr. Cleland stated:

Shortly after 11.00 p.m. on May 10, 1972, Dr. Duncan was thrown into the Torrens River, from the southern bank. . . . Dr. Duncan was a homosexual.

Then, during the course of the inquest a man who is called Mr. X came forward to give evidence and the Coroner's report states:

After leaving the toilet he was on the bank of the river, overlooking the place where Dr. Duncan was thrown into the water. He was there seized by two men and flung down concrete steps into the river. He incurred some injuries.

Then there is a reference to a Mr. Williamson, who had been at the Torrens training depot. He saw four men running across Victoria Drive and into Kintore Avenue. Apparently, one must assume, that was after Dr. Duncan had been thrown into the river. Then a Mr. James came forward and said that he saw four men following Dr. Duncan, one on each side of him, anyway, and he saw them dragging him down to the river. He saw them throw him in, and Mr. James was then seized by two of the men. He resisted and received a blow on the head, and he also was thrown into the river. He saw the four men making off in the direction of Kintore Avenue. The Coroner's findings also state:

At the direction of the Commissioner of Police, Inspectors Turner and Lehmann made thorough inquiries. They found that police officers were in the vicinity at times which might have been relevant.

The names of Constables Clayton and Hudson are mentioned in the findings, and the Coroner continued:

At this inquest Constables Clayton, Cawley and Hudson each declined on legal advice to answer questions on the ground that their answers might tend to incriminate them.

Then we come to this finding:

I find that the deceased was George Ian Ogilvy Duncan, aged 41 years, Doctor of Philosophy, and lecturer of Law at the University of Adelaide, late of Lincoln House, 45 Brougham Place, North Adelaide.

Then there is the finding of the cause of death that I have mentioned. This is a scandalous set of circumstances by any standards and it cries out for investigation and solution, as I think all members agree. After the inquest, it was announced that two officers would be brought especially from New Scotland Yard to inquire into the matter. The Police Commissioner (Mr. Salisbury) said:

I think everything possible has been done and is being done in the investigations. It is felt that, to show that absolute impartiality is being exercised, an outside and detached investigation will dispel any suggestion of bias or favour.

I agree with that. Some people criticized bringing men from outside South Australia to make this inquiry, but I did not. However, unless we know something of the result of the inquiry, how can that inquiry dispel any question of bias or favour? I remind the Premier of what he is reported to have said in commenting on this announcement. The report states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said today it was essential for the Police Force as well as the public that the mystery surrounding the death of Dr. Duncan was solved.

He went on to praise the men who were coming from New Scotland Yard. The Premier said that the South Australian Police Association supported the decision to bring the officers here. It was that there should be, if I can sum it up, an independent inquiry because members of the Police Force were obviously involved in the inquiry. That inquiry has failed to unearth anything, so far as the public knows at present.

The two officers were brought here at some significant expense (although I do not begrudge that), involving about $20,000, and their coming here culminated in a report being given to the Government. Some weeks later we learnt of it, and an announcement was made that there was not sufficient evidence in that report to charge any person. There has since then been only some vague hope expressed by the Government that something or someone will turn up. Obviously, for reasons that it keeps to itself, the Government is anxious that the matter should be allowed to drop. Since Dr. Duncan's death, there have been suggestions of a scandalous nature about poofter bashings in

this area and elsewhere, about the activities of the police, about the way in which the original inquiries were made, and about the reasons why the matter has been allowed to drop.

I do not refer to these allegations and suggestions for their veracity, because I cannot assess their veracity: I refer to them only to show the sort of thing which is being said and which is at present going completely unanswered. The Council of the University of Adelaide has passed resolutions on the matter. Dr. Harry Medlin has made comments about his own experience when walking in an area close to that in which this crime took place: that is, as I understand it, where the Festival Centre is now being built. He is not the only one who has made comments of this nature. The first motion passed by the Council of the University of Adelaide was as follows:

That this council publicly expresses its grave disquiet at the circumstances surrounding the death of a member of the academic staff of the university, Dr. George Ian Ogilvie Duncan.

The second resolution was as follows:

That this council believes that action should be taken to make the river area adjacent to the university safer for members of the public, including staff and students of the university.

We do not know whether any action is being taken or, if it has not been taken, why it has not been taken. Then there have been reports in interstate newspapers concerning this matter, and I refer only to two reports in the publication *Nation Review*. One of those reports states this about the area:

Vice Squad activity at Adelaide's beats has been of such a vicious intensity over a long period of time that stories constantly circulate among homosexuals about these confrontations.

There was another report, to which I referred in a question asked in the House, concerning recommendations that prosecutions for offences less than murder should be launched. These are the things that are being said both in South Australia and outside the State. Having raised them by way of question in this place, I have had no reply at all from the Government, except personal abuse. I have deliberately used the term "utterly unsatisfactory". Much emotion has been generated by the affair, and the Premier acknowledged as much recently when we were debating the Bill on legalizing homosexuality. There is now uncertainty and suspicion about the circumstances surrounding this whole incident; that uncertainty and suspicion should be cleared up if it is at all possible, and no effort should be spared to clear it up.

I have referred to what the Premier said when the New Scotland Yard detectives were coming out here, namely, that it was essential for the Police Force and the public that the matter should be cleared up. Yet what have we now, after the failure of those two officers apparently to make any progress? We have a blank wall of silence from the Government and a refusal to take any further initiative. There has been a refusal to make public anything contained in their report; the Attorney-General has defended this refusal by saying that parts of the report reflect on individuals and that it would be grossly unfair to them that the report should be made public. I just do not know; he may be justified in saying this but, on the other hand, he may not. I have made several suggestions in this place and elsewhere as to what should be done. I suggested, first, that the names of those mentioned in the report and anything that could identify them should be excluded from whatever information is released.

I have suggested, secondly, that a summary of the report should be prepared so that people might know what lines it took. Thirdly, I have suggested that some other inquiry altogether should be made so that the public might know as much as possible about this unhappy affair and about the way it has been handled. I have referred to a Royal Commission: let us remember that in its 2½ years in office this Government has not been loath to set up Royal Commissions in this State, and we had a Royal Commission on the moratorium in September, 1970. In my view, that happening was far less serious in its implications than is this situation. Yet, within two days of that happening, the Premier was in the chambers of the counsel from another State who subsequently assisted the Royal Commission. There was no hesitation then in setting up a Royal Commission; it was done before the House met on the next Tuesday, and it concerned a matter which I regard personally as less important than is this one.

Finally, I make another suggestion, although I fear that, because of what has already been said by the Attorney-General and others in the Government, it is too late to act on this (although, in my view, it would have been the proper and the best way of proceeding): those on whom there is suspicion should be put on trial to see what comes out in the evidence, especially in cross-examination, and then leave it to a jury to decide.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Cross-examination of whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier can smugly say, "Cross-examination of whom?". He knows the contents of the report; I do not.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You say that something can be brought out in cross-examination: cross-examination of whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Those who are charged.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How do you know that they will be subjected to cross-examination? You don't know that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier knows quite well that it is likely, at the least—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It wouldn't even get to committal.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier says that we may not get to committal. How do we know that? Why should we have to take his word on that?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You've seen what's in the inquest.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Premier was serious in saying that, why did the Government go to the trouble of bringing anyone from New Scotland Yard out here at all? Why did it do that, if the inquest were to be the be-all and end-all of it? The Premier knows that that is not the answer to the suggestion I made. If it were, the two men would not have come here at all; it would have been useless even to do that. Whatever the Premier may say and do now by way of interjection, I say that the proper course for the Government to have taken would be to put on trial those on whom there must be suspicion, and let a jury decide what should be the situation. I am afraid—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What you are saying is absurd and improper.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier is entitled to say that to me because he knows the facts, and I do not. That is the very thing I am complaining of: that we have to take from him and from the Attorney-General what the situation is, without being able to make up our minds, and no-one in South Australia or outside the State is to be given the opportunity to decide what the position really is. Only the Government knows, and that is the crux of my complaint about this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: As Attorney-General, you would reveal the contents of every file that ever came into your possession.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Don't be so utterly absurd!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's what you're saying.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not saying that at all. It is interesting to hear the Premier talking like this. I was in this place in 1959 when we last had a matter that could be compared to this one. That was the Stuart case. Who spearheaded the demand for a Royal Commission and an inquiry into that matter? It was not I: it was not the Attorney-General of the day; it was the Premier (the then member for Norwood). It was he who was more vocal than was any other member on his side. Why is the present situation different? Why did he then complain day after day in this House about the circumstances of the trial of Stuart? Why did he press on with the matter until there was a Royal Commission into it? He did so because he believed that justice had not been done and that there was more to know than had already come out.

I am now in that position. I may not press my claim as effectively as he did (I will give him that), but the position is now precisely the same, although the roles are reversed. My complaint is that I do not know, and no-one knows, what the real situation is. We are told by the Government, "We will make this decision. We will not tell on what grounds or on what information; that is our decision, and that is the end of it." I complain most bitterly that this should be so, and that is my reason for taking this opportunity to complain about this matter. I hope that, by raising it at this time, I will give the Government the opportunity, before it is too late, to take some effective action to have this matter fully ventilated. I believe that this matter deserves a full ventilation.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I wish to raise two matters that I believe are of extreme concern to the community. The first deals with the frustrating delays experienced by the Nurses Memorial Centre Committee in establishing a nurses memorial centre; and the second involves what I believe to be a gigantic confidence trick being played on the people of South Australia. In March, 1972, the Nurses Memorial Centre Committee was told by the State Planning Authority that its land would be required for the Kent Town redevelopment scheme.

The Premier offered the nurses at a meeting held in May the opportunity of being involved in the Kent Town redevelopment scheme with parking facilities provided by the Government, or of being relocated on an alternative site at Government expense. Later it was found that no alternative site offered by the State Planning

Authority was actually available, except by negotiation. In August, the Premier met the nurses committee and said that the aerodynamics in the area of the malthouse could make the nurses centre uninhabitable for at least 10 years. What he thought was going to happen with the development, I do not know. The Premier requested facts regarding requirements and costs of the nurses centre developed, first, independently on the nurses' land, secondly, as part of the Kent Town redevelopment scheme and, thirdly, on an alternative site.

The Lord Mayor of Adelaide was consulted regarding a possible alternative site on the corner of Wakefield and Frome Streets, and he received a letter in mid-September indicating the nurses' interest. Later in September the facts and figures requested by the Premier were forwarded with details of four alternative sites and, early in October, the possibility of the nurses returning to their original property was discussed. In mid-October the Mayor of Kensington and Norwood indicated that there was no impediment to the nurses' proceeding with their centre on the present site, provided they fulfilled parking requirements in excess of parking regulations gazetted as recently as March, 1972. A formal request for clarification was submitted to the Mayor of Norwood. The nurses own a unique park land frontage block on Dequetteville Terrace, have $40,000 cash in hand, and are anxious to erect the most modern and comprehensive nurses' headquarters in Australia. They have had no satisfactory reply following two letters to the Premier, five and seven weeks ago, and phone calls to his Secretary, the last on November 7.

Because the nurses are not a vocal pressure group and do not have strong independent financial backing, it appears that the Government does not care about their plight. Although they owned another property, which they sold early in 1969 for $35,000 (following information given them by the Highways Department which was later found to be inaccurate), and they now have assets worth over $100,000 more than this, it seems that their attempts to help themselves are doomed to endless frustration and are being bogged down by bureaucracy. Some nurses asked the Premier in May, 1972, whether the same obstacles would have been placed in their path if it had been the Trades and Labor Council that owned the property and wished to build new headquarters. Others have wondered whether the Premier is anxious to build more flats in the area because it is his own district and he wants the population there to increase. The nurses are now asking why could not another area be commandeered for high-density housing. Why must the nurses tolerate and accept this seemingly endless delay? Is this sorry situation that has befallen the nurses an indication of what can happen to any landowner under the Dunstan Government? Can the Premier—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Did the nurses formally ask you to put this to the House?

Dr. TONKIN: —or the Government—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Did they ask you to put this to the House?

Dr. TONKIN: If the Premier is so upset by what I am asking, I will say that this information has been given to me by the committee concerned.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The committee concerned asked you to raise this matter?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, indeed it did.

Mr. Clark: You should be used to his tactics.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have heard some of them on a previous occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I seem to have upset the Premier, and I do apologize. It seems that perhaps second thoughts are being given to the three 12-storey tower buildings on and behind the nurses' property. The nurses are in a position where they could proceed with their project at any time this year if they are given official approval from the authorities concerned. What is the reason for this seemingly pointless delay and frustration for the members of the nursing profession whose main professional organization, despite recent events, the Royal Australian Nursing Federation, is still restricted to two small inadequate rooms for its offices? When will the Premier, the State Planning Authority and the councils decide where the nurses may proceed with the building of their memorial centre? Will the Premier honour his verbal undertaking to arrange a loan at low interest rates through a State lending authority? Can the nurses be given an assurance that their memorial centre can proceed and be fully functioning before the end of 1973? Was the Premier really sincere in his promise to do all in his power to help the nurses? I hope that these things that have been promised will come about. I hope that the Premier and the Government will do something to make it possible for the nurses memorial centre to go ahead without this seemingly endless delay and prevarication,

which is hindering it at the present time. Perhaps the nurses will be able at the election in March to express their distrust and disenchantment at the State Government's attitude.

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

Dr. TONKIN: I sincerely trust that the Premier will not continue in the petty attitude he demonstrated so thoroughly in his interjections before the dinner adjournment, and that he will not place any impediment in the way of a satisfactory solution of this problem with regard to the Nurses Memorial Centre simply because the matter has been aired in the House today. I hope I am wrong in the inference I drew from the tone of his interjection.

Another matter that I regard as fundamentally important to the people of the State is the gigantic confidence trick that I say is being played by this Government, through the agency of the Minister of Roads and Transport. First, there has been a lack of a clearly defined policy on public transport in this State and, secondly, there has been a lack of any tangible action resulting in any actual improvement of our public transport system. The public is being treated by the Government, and particularly by the Minister, in an extremely shabby fashion. I believe that this is being done for purely political reasons. Other Opposition members and I know from experience exactly how adept the Minister is in side-stepping questions that ask for details. He is an expert in double talk, prevarication, and in drawing red herrings across the trail. The only person in this House better qualified in these arts is the Premier, and at least he retains a sense of the decency of things and is not plain, downright rude to members of the House.

Mr. Langley: You ought to talk!

Dr. TONKIN: When the Minister of Roads and Transport is rude to members on this side, he is treating the House with contempt, and that applies to the member for Unley, whether he likes it or not, because he is a member of this House and is being treated in the same way. However, as the honourable member is under Caucus control, he does not have much say in the matter. During the last year or so, and in the last few weeks particularly, Opposition members have asked exactly how the public transport system has been improved during the Minister's term of office, but we have not been able to get a straight answer. We have not had one definite answer from the Minister in that time, although he did say in reply to one question that he would see that the Glenelg tram was repainted and the track updated. I should have thought that work would be regarded as maintenance work and not as a practical improvement to the transport system. If that is the best the Minister can come up with, all I can say is "Heaven help the State."

I want to be fair. As members will recall, last Wednesday I asked several questions about the matter. When I asked the Minister about transport policy, he said that obviously I had not been listening when the announcements had been made and that, had I been listening, there would have been little need for me to ask such a question.

Mr. Mathwin: That's his favourite answer.

Dr. TONKIN: I agree. When I asked the Minister a supplementary question, he said:

If he looks at the reply I gave to his question last week, he will see the areas in which we are currently conducting investigations.

I have never experienced a Minister or a department with such a tremendous flair for conducting investigations and yet not achieving anything. When I asked a further question about the Director and what measures had been instituted, the Minister said:

Obviously, the honourable member has not yet got around to reading the reply I gave him.

I had read the reply given to me; that was why I asked a supplementary question. The position is not good enough. To make sure that I was being fair to the Minister, I did some research into the matter, taking a considerable time. I looked through *Hansard* for the earlier sessions in this Parliament and for this session, and I want to give examples of the sort of gobbledegook answers that the Minister has been feeding members on this side to put off making any direct statement about what he has done. I will leave honourable members to draw their own conclusions. Obviously, the Minister has done nothing. If he had done anything, he would not have had to camouflage his action behind a whole range of double talk.

Mr. Wells: He's the best Minister of Roads and Transport this House has had.

Dr. TONKIN: All I can say is that if the honourable member really believes that he has no business being in this house. I looked through questions that directly related to public transport. The Minister has given answers to many other questions dealing with various aspects of transport, but I limited my inquiry to those questions dealing with public transport. On August 10, 1971, when he was asked a question about the future of the Henley and Grange railway line (*Hansard*, page 639), he said that a survey was to be

undertaken. On July 22, 1971, when he was asked about the future of the Lonsdale spur line, he said that the Government intended to introduce legislation that year to enable the line to be extended to the Christie Downs area. On August 18, 1971, when asked whether the Henley and Grange railway line could be extended to Henley Beach, he replied that a survey was in hand. On August 17, 1971, when he was asked about the underground railway proposed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, he said that the position with regard to the underground railway was one on which no positive statement could or should be made then. What an answer from a responsible Minister of the Crown! On April 5, 1971, when asked to say whether any decision had been made whether the State would have an underground railway, he replied that the matter was in the investigation stage and that no decision had been made.

Mr. McRae: That's perfectly clear.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and I am glad that the honourable member is following what I am saying so far, because perhaps he can explain at some stage why no advance has been made in this matter since then. On August 31, 1971, when asked whether trolley buses would be reintroduced, the Minister said that the matter was in the investigation stage.

Mr. Wells: What would you expect?

Dr. TONKIN: I currently expect nothing better from the Minister; that is the point I am making.

Mr. Wells: Do you expect an off-the-cuff reply to a question of that type?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister was asked by the member for Heysen about fare evasion. He said, during his reply, "Information is always readily available." Well, Sir, you could have fooled me, because we have not got a thing from him yet.

Mr. McRae: You have not given one unclear answer yet.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Playford is quite right. The Minister has given clear answers containing unclear facts (in fact, no facts at all) ever since he has been asked questions in this House. On November 18, 1971, he was asked by the member for Hanson whether weekly and monthly bus and tram fares would be reintroduced. "The matter," said the Minister, "is being considered. No decision has yet been made." I have never yet come across anyone so well able not to make a decision. It is amazing. If anyone tried not to come out with any positive statements you could not find anyone anywhere better than the Minister of Roads and Transport.

He was asked about bus shelters by the member for Unley, one of his colleagues, someone we might expect would get a decent answer. What happened? Are we going to get these shelters built in King William Street? The Minister will look into the matter further. I looked into the matter further, as far as *Hansard* showed it, and no reply was given to the member for Unley.

Mrs. Byrne: But what—

Dr. TONKIN: I have stimulated the member for Tea Tree Gully into making some interjection. The next question would interest her, because the member for Mawson, on March 9, 1971, asked a question about private bus time tables, and the Minister of Roads and Transport talked about the close liaison between the department and all forms of public transport, and as tangible evidence of the positive ways in which he had improved public transport in this State he quoted the production of the first Adelaide metropolitan transport map. I refuse to comment! The member for Unley (and this may surprise some honourable members who believe the member for Glenelg and the member for Hanson are the only people who ask about the Glenelg tram) asked about upgrading the Glenelg tram. That was on July 21, 1971. The answer was "Yes"—a positive.

Mr. Langley: I am not sure that is correct.

Dr. TONKIN: I invite the honourable member to look at page 211 of *Hansard* of the last session.

Mr. Gunn: He can't read.

Dr. TONKIN: That is a difficulty which is not my responsibility. In answer to the query about upgrading the Glenelg tram, the Minister said that Glenelg trams would be painted, the track would be upgraded, and the destination signs would be repainted and would appear as new. This was some form of tangible example of what the Minister of Roads and Transport was doing to improve our public transport. He has a duty to do this, because it is purely maintenance. He must keep the trams up to date.

Mr. Langley: What are you doing—nothing?

Dr. TONKIN: I respectfully submit that if I had the opportunity of doing the things for public transport in South Australia that the Minister of Roads and Transport has, I would do a whole lot better than he obviously is doing.

*Members interjecting*:

Dr. TONKIN: Another query on the Glenelg tram line came from the member for Hanson on July 28, 1971, page 405, for the benefit of the member for Unley. He asked whether a third track could be laid to relieve the congestion on the Glenelg line. The Minister of Roads and Transport said something with which I agree. He said the right of way would never be given away. Grade separation would have to be planned. The whole public transport system was being reviewed. That was a new statement, was it not? That was something unusual and to be commended. He said, at the same time, that he would like transfer facilities for tickets, but he pointed out to the member for Hanson that this would not happen next week. It will not happen next week, nor, as far as I can see, next year.

Mr. Langley: He will not be here. No worries.

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister of Roads and Transport will not be here next year I will be very happy indeed, and the people of South Australia will be very happy indeed. I thank the member for Unley for giving me this reassurance.

Mr. Langley: I said the member for Hanson, not the Minister. Don't get me wrong. Don't tell lies.

Dr. TONKIN: We had another query, this time from the member for Gouger, on August 18, 1971, regarding transport corridors. That is a new note in this whole business. Up until that time they had been called freeways, but suddenly they became transport corridors. I have often wondered whose inspiration that was in Cabinet. I doubt very much whether it was that of the Minister of Roads and Transport. I suspect it might have been that of the Minister of Works, or perhaps the Minister of Education.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Dr. Breuning!

Dr. TONKIN: It was Dr. Breuning. Quite right. I thank the member for Kavel.

Mr. McRae: What is unclear about a corridor? You know a hospital corridor. Get to the point.

Mr. Mathwin: You are still in the dark. You have been in the dark ever since you came here.

Dr. TONKIN: In August, 1971, the member for Gouger asked whether some publicity could be given to the draft regulation of the State Planning Authority concerning the reservation of certain transport corridors in the Adelaide metropolitan area to enable better and more informed public discussions to take place. He quoted the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, South Australian division, as expressing concern on this matter. The Minister said there was no need to, none at all. He suggested that the member for Gouger amend the Act if he thought it was necessary, but the Minister did not think it was necessary and he was not going to tell anyone why.

Mr. Wells: Is he a mate of yours?

Dr. TONKIN: I could almost be tricked into believing that the member for Florey has been supporting the Minister. I gave him credit for a better sense of public responsibility, but apparently I am wrong. We come now to what I consider to be a tremendously important aspect of the South Australian public transport system. I have heard mention of it previously. Although it might have been called "dial-a-prayer" by the member for Albert Park, I do not think he meant to say that last Wednesday, but it sort of sneaked out. Dial-a-prayer is probably a pretty good substitute.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about dial-a-something?

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister of Works ever gets to the stage of dialling a bus I am sure he had better dial a prayer to fill in the time, because the bus will not come. The member for Victoria asked a question on July 21, 1971, requesting that the Minister should elaborate on his recent references to fairly early introduction of dial-a-bus by using taxis. That was a fair proposal—a proposal by a group of taxi owners who suggested that taxis could be multiple hired.

Mr. McRae: You have never shown us one—

Dr. TONKIN: He has been consistent in his lack of decision and his lack of action. He is positively inactive; in fact, he is completely passive in this matter of transport. The Minister's reply was that the proposal was being examined in depth. The dial-a-bus concept was to be the subject of more definite study.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How deep?

Dr. TONKIN: One would have to go fairly deep to get to that stage: the Minister would be out of sight. On August 4, 1971, the member for Peake kindly asked the Minister a question. I do not know whether this was a Dorothy Dixer but I do not think it could have been, because I think they would have arranged it better between them. The member

for Peake asked whether action was being taken on dial-a-bus, and the reply was that action was being taken. That was tremendous! Do you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the action was? A steering committee was being established to investigate the feasibility of undertaking such other research. Did you ever read such rubbish in your life? I wish to quote some immortal words that are enshrined on page 540 of *Hansard* of 1971. The Minister said:

I would like to think that well before Christmas—

that is, of 1971—

a dial-a-bus system will be operating in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: Amen!

Dr. TONKIN: I suppose that is a fitting conclusion to dial-a-prayer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation. The Chair cannot hear what the honourable member is saying.

Dr. TONKIN: I am desperately sorry that the audible conversation is worrying you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is not worrying me one little bit. On August 19, 1971, I asked the Minister whether Dr. Alston was coming. That name probably has been forgotten in this State, but he was the man who had agreed to accept the position of Director-General of Transport in this State but decided not to come.

Mr. Clark: After this, I would like to forget all doctors.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure the member for Elizabeth and other members on that side would like to forget everything that the Minister of Roads and Transport has done, but there is one slight difficulty: the Minister has not done anything! On September 28, 1971, the member for Alexandra asked why, when the Estimates were being discussed, the Minister had not told the House that Dr. Alston would not be taking up his appointment. In predictable form the Minister stated that negotiations were proceeding at the time. The member for Mitcham asked the Minister why he had concealed the fact, and the member for Mitcham was ruled out of order. This was the subject of a motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling. On September 30 a reply was given to the question asked by the member for Alexandra regarding the time when Dr. Alston had resigned. On October 5, 1971, the member for Davenport (I give credit where credit is due) asked the Minister about the future of the Glenelg tramway and he said he was in favour of preserving it.

Mr. Payne: And don't forget—

Dr. TONKIN: I am sorry, I did not hear what the embarrassed member for Mitchell said. The Minister said, in reply to this question, that the Government was in favour of preserving the Glenelg tramway and was considering the parcticability of using the system as a feeder for the south-western suburbs. He also stated:

At this stage I do not have any positive details to bring before the House.

That was not at all unusual! On July 13, 1971, the member for Gouger, dealing with transport policy, asked the Minister to cease making confusing and conflicting statements. I know that the Minister continually makes conflicting statements, except when he says that nothing is being done. He is unanimous in his own opinion (a majority of one for himself) that he is doing the right thing. The member for Gouger asked the Minister to define clearly Government transport policy so that public authorities and individuals could plan properly for the future.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't—

Mr. Mathwin: Go and get the Minister.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why should I?

Mr. Mathwin: He is too ashamed to show his face in this Chamber.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Gouger said on that occasion:

In the first instance, when the Government opposite came to office, the Minister said that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan had been scrapped and he criticized the plan, particularly the underground railway proposals for King William Street. The public was then confused, because the Minister and his colleague in another place stated in Parliament that last year a sum of, I think, $12,000,000 to $13,000,000 had been spent on the M.A.T.S. proposals, and subsequently during the year significant proposals for building highway facilities that were part of the M.A.T.S. plan were announced. The Minister then adopted the dial-a-bus plan as the best solution for Adelaide's public transport problems but, after returning from an oversea trip, he has adopted a plan for rapid electric railway transport and there is a real possibility that the underground railway proposal for King William Street will be adopted. There are many other confusing details in the trail the Minister has left in his apparently off-the-cuff comments on metropolitan Adelaide transport. . . .

That just goes to show how poorly the Minister regards the whole question of public transport, when he makes statements with little thought about what they mean. I agree entirely with the member for Gouger when he

says that the Minister's attitude to transport planning is incoherent, because that is exactly what it is.

Mr. Wells: You don't dare to disagree.

Dr. TONKIN: I thought I had made it clear to the member for Florey during the last 20 minutes that I did disagree with the Minister.

Mr. Clark: Is that what you're doing?

Dr. TONKIN: One must not be unkind to the senior members of the House. Many other questions have been asked in this House, and they have been reported faithfully, as one would expect. One honourable member asked the Minister whether freeways were still part of the Government's policy, but there was no straight reply to be got. All that the Minister could say at that stage was that the position in relation to Government policy on transport was completely clear to all other than those who did not want to understand it. The Minister has given us nothing to understand. It is not clear to anyone.

I hope that it is not clear to the Minister because, if it is and he sincerely believes that he has imparted this clarity of thought to this House, he should not be in his present job. The Minister said that the policy was stated in simple, clear, and single-syllable words in this House when the Government carried the motion to adopt the Breuning report. That may be so, but I wonder whether all this can be styled policy implementation: I do not think it can. Let us examine events following the return to office of the Australian Labor Party Government. One election promise was to review the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. That is exactly what the Minister did. He stayed in his office for a whole week after the election and reviewed the M.A.T.S. plan. That is one of the easiest ways to honour an election promise.

Mr. Wells: How did you know that?

Dr. TONKIN: If he did not do that, he did not do anything, so he must have done it there. I am giving him the benefit of the doubt: he did not make clear that he had done anything else at all. There were many statements in the press. A report in the *Advertiser* stated that the Minister recognized that, with the development expected in the metropolitan area, freeways from north to south, from Tea Tree Gully to Port Adelaide and Glenelg, would become necessary. Yet the Minister had said earlier that the Government did not intend to proceed with freeways. Of course, the secret came out later: they are not freeways at all; they are high-speed transport corridors. That sounds so much more genteel! It is rather a contradiction when one considers it. In July, 1970, the following press report appeared:

Mr. Virgo emphasized that the $700,000 spent on the M.A.T.S. Plan was not wasted. "Most of the money was spent on compiling data necessary to undertake any examination", he said.

A little later, on July 22, the Minister described the M.A.T.S. freeway system as the "product of poverty-stricken imagination and tardy administrative know-how". Where does the Minister stand? He does not know where he stands. Michael Cudmore, writing in the *Advertiser* on July 29, 1971, about Dr. Breuning (the less said about that, probably the better) said:

There has been no clear indication from the Government whether the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals for an underground railway or the controversial North Adelaide connector through the north parklands and the Hindmarsh interchange complex are still considered desirable.

In the Assembly yesterday the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) again refused to disclose Dr. Breuning's terms of reference to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall). Mr. Hall said the public was deeply disturbed by the mysterious attitude of the Government.

That is quite correct; the public was disturbed. But when the report was released, what a beauty it was! I refer members back to the debates recorded at the time. Policy decision was presumably made at this time, as the Minister stated it would be, but this was in 1971, and we are now approaching the end of 1972. What did the Breuning report state? What did the Minister use to justify his indecisive attitude? He said that there would be a complete review of the transportation policy of this State, that the Director-General would co-ordinate all aspects of transport, and that all forms of transport would be brought under the control of the Minister. The Minister did not hesitate to take on himself the mantle of greatness; in fact, he quickly took control of all forms of transport, but that is about all he has done. Can this be considered to be implementing policy? In my view, it represents a complete deferment of any decision on policy.

What has the general public been given in the way of improved transport facilities in the meantime? Nothing! It has received nothing but promises of inquiries, investigations and reports. After more than 2½ years, this Government has nothing whatever to show regarding an improvement in public transport. and the Minister is still dodging the issue,

as was shown last Wednesday in reply to questions. Perhaps the Minister has not been presented with any definite proposals on which to take positive action, but I cannot believe that that is true. The staff of his department must have come up with detailed proposals. There are only two possible conclusions. The first is that the Minister does not like the recommendations made by his department, because they prove him to have been wrong in the attitude he took when he first came to office. In spite of his statement that he would be the first to admit that he was wrong (that was in one of the answers that I think I talked about), the Minister is not willing to admit it now. At the expense of the people of South Australia, he is willing to take no action to improve public transport in this State, and the people are suffering because of this.

The second alternative is that the Minister does know what has been proposed but is willing to let the present unsatisfactory state of affairs continue, without taking any positive action, so that he can use the proposals as election promises, again, without regard whatever for the present and urgent needs of the travelling public. If this is so, I believe that the Minister is abrogating his Ministerial responsibility and is treating the South Australian public in a cynical and cavalier way. If this is so, he is not worthy to hold Ministerial office. As I said when I introduced this subject, this is a massive confidence trick played by the Government on the people of South Australia at their expense.

It does the Government no credit whatever and, indeed, I am not surprised that it is so quiet, obviously embarrassed and, I would tend to think, ashamed. I am not surprised that the Minister has not shown his face in this Chamber. He has nothing to be proud of, and I sincerely trust that the people of South Australia will wake up to the underhand evasions that have been used. We have seen no improvement in South Australia's public transport system and, as long as this Minister and the Government are in office, I say that we can expect no improvement whatever.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I concur in what the member for Bragg has said: I think he has strongly and adequately described the deficiencies of the Minister of Roads and Transport. When the Minister was in Opposition, he was ranting and raving without offering one constructive suggestion concerning how the transport system could be improved. If we had had a strong Speaker in those days (even now we do not have one), the Minister would have been thrown out.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Burdon): I warn the honourable member that I take exception to those remarks.

Mr. McANANEY: I am sincere in what I say.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member is reflecting on the Chair, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. McANANEY: What do you ask me to withdraw?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you referring to me as Speaker?

Mr. McANANEY: No, not to you, Sir.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you referring to the Speaker?

Mr. McANANEY: I think I must admit that I was referring to him.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member to be careful about whom he refers to.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Bragg has adequately demonstrated that the Minister of Roads and Transport, up until now, has not produced anything constructive regarding public transport that would benefit the people of South Australia. The situation concerning the railways has deteriorated rapidly over the last two or three years, yet not once has the Minister offered a constructive alternative to the situation, other than screaming that the Commonwealth Government should take over the railways, give us more money, or that it has deliberately told lies regarding railway and road finance. Road transport is financed more than adequately by the people who use the roads, through money collected by way of petrol tax and sales tax on goods transported, etc., yet the Minister has stated in this House and publicly that road transport is favoured compared to the railways, which makes no contribution through the forms of taxation to which I have referred and which is subsidized by the taxpayer to the extent of $20,000,000. The Minister in this State and the Ministers throughout Australia have not faced up to their responsibilities in relation to transport systems. They are now asking the Commonwealth Government to take over and finance them. The difference between Liberal policy and Labor policy is that the latter expects the general taxpayer to make up every loss made on every service provided, whereas the former expects those obtaining a service to pay for the service received; and this is how we get away from the fundamental principles of what should be

involved in our system of private enterprise in which competition is necessary to determine what is the best type of transport. This can be determined only through competition and adequate payment for the service rendered by the people who use the service.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are getting back to the horse and buggy days.

Mr. McANANEY: We are in the horse and buggy stage when we say we will use the railways on short hauls, for example, between Adelaide and Victor Harbor. There is something basically wrong with the railways if they cannot provide a competitive service on interstate routes: the railways are in the horse and buggy days.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: I repeat that—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member does not repeat himself.

Mr. McANANEY: I inform you, Sir, that the Minister of Labour and Industry is advocating a horse and buggy system. We should be more constructive. The member for Bragg has destroyed the veracity and capacity of the Minister of Roads and Transport, but I believe that we must put up some alternative suggestions. When I first entered this House in 1963 the railways paid its running expenses, which is as much as we can expect, because the capital expenditure that has been invested in that transport system has gone down the drain. But we should expect the railways to pay its own working expenses.

The railway system deteriorated considerably between 1965-68. On the return to office of a Liberal Government in 1968, the Railways Commissioner recommended the closing of certain uneconomic lines. Between 1968 and 1970, many of those suggestions were implemented, and the then member for Edwardstown (the present Minister of Roads and Transport) opposed every move. He said we should not do this, although each action was designed to save money on the railways. When he became the Minister of Roads and Transport, did he reinstate these services which, on behalf of the finances of this State, we had discontinued? What has happened since the Minister of Roads and Transport took up his portfolio? He has made no action to cut losses. More than $1,000,000 is included in this Appropriation Bill to make up additional railway losses. What has the Minister done regarding the railways?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What have you done?

Mr. McANANEY: He has done not one thing. I have been a member of this House for eight years and have advocated changes. The Railways Commissioner has advocated many things that should be done.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Why didn't you get on to the member for Gouger when he was Premier?

Mr. Venning: Order!

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections in the House. I remind the honourable member for Rocky River that I happen to be in charge of the House. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: Action was taken between 1968 and 1970, and the only criticism I can level regarding that period falls on the Transport Control Board, because, if it had done its job and provided a reasonable alternative service between Adelaide and Victor Harbor, that line would now be closed. As a result there would be a great saving to the people of South Australia and a more convenient service would be available to the people living on that line.

The Mount Barker town plan has had to be completely redrawn to fit in with the railway, which is used only by a few pensioners and a few students, to whom the same concessions could be given on modern bus services. We took action between 1968-70 regarding the railways.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You did nothing.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister of Education has now chipped in. Who set up the Karmel committee? Who provided the money that the Minister of Education has used to implement his policies? The Commonwealth Government did. That Government provided a 20 per cent increase in taxation reimbursement. That Government has given this State more money since 1970 than was given at any previous time. Increased taxation barely covers the increased loss incurred by the railways, the waterworks and various other undertakings. Every cent going to education and hospital services in this State comes from the Commonwealth Government, but that Government cannot continue to dole out money continually to this extent.

Father Christmas last night said he was going to do this and that, and spend thousands of millions of dollars, all from the normal taxation rates, so the Minister should have contacted him immediately regarding the promises his Government made on coming into office in

South Australia in 1965. The then Leader of the Opposition in 1965 said that his promises would be financed from the normal increased taxation, he not realizing that the normal increase in taxation was counter-balanced on every occasion by the normal increase in expenditure. I do not blame the then Leader of the Opposition, because he did not have the background that the present Minister of Education has. The Minister has some sort of degree in economics, and he supported Mr. Walsh. In 1965, he came in and said that all sorts of things would be done.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What year did you come into this House?

Mr. McANANEY: October 1, 1963, and it has been a much better place ever since. Last evening, Father Christmas, that supreme optomist (the Commonwealth Leader of Opposition), said he would take over the railway systems of New South Wales and Victoria, those State Governments having offered the systems to the Commonwealth. I do not know whether South Australia will do this. If we hand over to the Commonwealth everything on which we make a loss, we will have nothing left to administer. We should not waste the money we receive from the Commonwealth on an inefficient railway system. As I have said several times during the last two or three years, and as the Railways Commissioner now says, country passenger rail services should be replaced by bus services, as has been done in Western Australia, where bus transport has worked efficiently. In certain areas, the Western Australian Government pays a subsidy. The cost is little and the modern bus service provided is most effective. A similar system could be introduced in South Australia, with millions of dollars being saved.

Fewer people are now using suburban rail services, and somehow we must make these services more attractive. People living in Elizabeth and Christies Beach will not use the railway if it takes them longer to come to town by train than it takes them in their motor cars. If the trains are modernized and a reasonably fast service provided, people will use the railways. At present, I doubt whether people would catch trains if they were given free passes. Although I have a free pass, I seldom use the train, because I find my car is more convenient. We must provide a means of transport that is more suitable to people. Of course, only a part of the metropolitan area can be serviced by rail, as a railway line between the eastern and western suburbs is not economical. We badly need roads linking the northern and southern suburbs, and we need a fast rail service so that people can be transported to the city quickly. The Government is doing nothing towards providing these transport facilities. Arterial roads are being widened, as provided in the M.A.T.S. plan. However, as the M.A.T.S. plan indicated, arterial roads do not provide for an increase in the number of vehicles travelling on a route to nearly the same extent as is provided by a freeway. For the same expenditure of money, freeways enable many more vehicles to travel from one point to another. I believe that eventually there will be a freeway linking the northern and southern suburbs. At present, the South-Eastern Freeway reaches Glen Osmond, and then there is a gap of two or three miles before the Glenside Hospital and the next section is reached. This is impracticable. If the new town is to be built near Murray Bridge, we must have a three-lane highway into the city, not a two-lane highway that only a limited number of vehicles can use.

The Minister must have some ideas on which he can get the experts to work. I do not think one gets far by simply relying on experts to provide information. Recently, I had to see a lawyer friend. I find that if one goes to a lawyer and asks him for advice one gets nowhere. First, one must work out what one wants to do and then ask the lawyer whether it is legal; then one gets some service. This applies to many things. Ideas must be worked out and then the experts called in. This is where the present system is bogging down. The Minister of Works for years has had a report on water rating, and he has still not divulged it. He has referred it to one group of experts, which has now referred it to another group of experts.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They are still working on it.

Mr. McANANEY: I think it has gone to the third committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It has to go to another one yet.

Mr. McANANEY: People may have expertise in a certain subject, but they do not always have wide enough vision to see how their knowledge fits into the total concept. The Railways Commissioner has shown that he is greatly concerned about the present situation. However, all we hear from the Minister of Roads and Transport about improving services is that, like a baby running to its mummy, we must go to the Commonwealth Government for a hand-out to save

us from the situation we have got into. More must be done by the State Ministers. These services must be made to pay. They must be put on a basis whereby they are able to compete with other forms of transport. The people who use the roads should pay for the roads; people who use railways should pay for them; and the people who use air transport should do the same. Let us take the case of the Overland, which used to be so popular. Probably the railways strike caused the big drop last year in the number of people using the Overland, as passengers were down by 20 per cent for a few months. Now more than $1,000,000 is being lost on this service. Bus transport is cheaper. If aircraft were subsidized to the same extent that the railways are subsidized, everyone would go by air. The Minister of Roads and Transport has done nothing in the past 2½ years. I hope he will soon disappear on to the back bench where he can rant as he did before. He did less harm there; he does nothing now.

I now wish to deal with the position relating to African daisy in the Hills. This is the biggest farce of all time. For a while, in many areas of the Hills people co-operated to keep African daisy under control. However, against the advice of councils, African daisy was then removed from the weeds schedule. After the Subordinate Legislation Committee had recommended that the regulation be disallowed it was included in the schedule again. I asked the Minister what he intended to do about his responsibilities as a Minister in regard to the noxious weeds in the Mitcham and Burnside area.

I am not picking on this Minister of Agriculture: I will pick on every Minister of Agriculture since the Weeds Act came into operation who has failed in his job and in his responsibilities in regard to weeds. The Minister of Agriculture is failing in his duty now, and he is the one that we should be attacking. In reply to my question, the Minister said that the Burnside and Mitcham councils had expert weeds officers and that African daisy was nothing to worry about. Now we have the serious position at Mount Osmond.

The Minister of Agriculture is the biggest liability that we have in South Australia at the moment in many ways, and that statement is accurate. He lives in the Never Never, where they think weeds are sheep feed. Weeds are not much trouble up there. Salvation Jane is the greatest feed that sheep have in the Never Never, but it is one of the biggest pests in the Adelaide Hills. The Minister has told us there is no need to worry about African daisy, but the grandfather and great-grandfather of all African daisy have come from the Mount Osmond and Leabrook Gardens areas. The weed is growing in its "beauty" on the hillside and the seed will blow over the hill next year, but that is where he has people plucking out African daisy.

We do not disagree with the motive about helping the Lions Club, but this problem must be tackled so that it can be solved. It took me 20 years to get rid of saffron thistle but, if we have the heart and willingness to eradicate weeds, such weeds can be eradicated. Many young people would go in and eradicate them, as some have done. However, we have a Minister of Agriculture who does not know what he is doing or what he intends to do and he has no policy on weeds or on carrying out his obligation under the Weeds Act. If he were in this House, and I had the opportunity, I would move a motion of no confidence in him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It would not be carried.

Mr. McANANEY: This is a numbers game and Government members must do as they are told. Since I became a member on October 1, 1963, I have not known one Labor Party member to vote against his Party.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, it seems that there are not enough numbers to fulfil the requirements for a quorum of the House.

*A quorum having been formed*:

Mr. McANANEY: I think the lack of quorum indicates the Government's attitude to Parliament this session. Rarely has the Government had more than three or four members in the House and this shows its lack of interest in affairs. The Government is not willing to listen to justified criticism, such as criticism of the railways and criticism regarding noxious weeds, and then try to show where our attitude is wrong. There has been an outcry about there being 200,000 unemployed in Australia in the next month or so. This has been the theme song since 1968, when the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier) said there would be 200,000 unemployed in a few months.

People have been screaming out about this unemployment figure, and that destroys confidence in the country and those who have large amounts of money in banks will not spend it. We have heard this outcry about unemployment for four years and the Government hopes that this unemployment figure will be reached so that it can get some advantage out of the

position. All that we want in South Australia is confidence in the future, not Jeremiahs screaming about unemployment.

The three Labor States have the highest unemployment. Until 1965 the annual population increase in South Australia for many years had been about 3 per cent, because industry was thriving and there was confidence in the State. By 1968 the increase had dropped to 1 per cent, but the position began to improve again between 1968 and 1970. However, in the last 2½ years the population increase has been only 1 per cent, and that is the lowest figure in any State except Tasmania.

Our increase hardly covers the population loss, and there is a lack of confidence here because this Government spends its time on social issues and hand-outs rather than encouraging and increasing development. Government activity planning in the Department of the Premier and of Development has not been successful in creating in South Australia the conditions that lower costs so that industry and people will be attracted here, as they were attracted for many years. The large increase in State taxation in the last two years has increased our costs considerably.

It is claimed that we control prices, but we compare unfavourably with the other States in regard to price increases in the last two and a half years. We must establish the conditions in which production will increase. All we have to do to find out the position is to examine statistics and the gross national product. The wage and interest components vary little as percentages. If production increases, every section of the community shares in it. Let us not have Father Christmas saying that he will increase the gross national product by 4 per cent or 6 per cent a year for the next few years, as he claimed last evening that he would do.

We could destroy our ability to export, and there is only a fine margin in our ability to export to South-East Asia. When I was in that area, the Trade Commissioner was late for an appointment with company representatives, and one of the companies involved was the Dunlop company. The gentleman in question was working out whether it would be possible for us to compete with Japan and Singapore in connection with polythene sheeting. The Chinese are pretty tough customers and will give an advantage to Australia if possible, because the Japanese stand over them to a degree. If we can embark on large-scale production, keeping our costs down, we will progress and improve our living standard immeasurably.

Every State has agreed to a scheme to control the production of eggs, and growers, in the main, are asking for this scheme. However, throughout this Parliament, when I have asked the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture whether a Bill will be introduced to give effect to such a scheme, the Minister has said, "No", adding that it will not be introduced until next session. How long can we continue to have a situation in which twice as many eggs are produced in the State as are consumed, costing the consumer about 45c a dozen (which is probably more than the cost of production), but in which half the eggs produced are exported at 7c a dozen? We have had a deplorable situation in which the Government has been either dilatory or has concentrated on introducing Bills of little importance to the State. I condemn the Minister of Agriculture for not fulfilling his obligations in this respect.

Although I realize that safeguards must be applied regarding the watershed areas in the Hills district, part of which I represent, in order to ensure that Adelaide receives a fresh water supply, I believe that common sense must prevail. No-one wants to see houses built in the hills face zone, but I think that, if it were permitted and if people who built there were told that they had to plant so many trees, one would hardly see houses and it would enhance the environment. I know that a terrific argument will develop in future between those interested in ecology and those interested in development but, again, if common sense prevails I think a difficult situation can be overcome. However, a minority always suffers great hardship as a result of land acquisition, and I think that the legislation on this matter must be widened in order to remedy the situation. Certain provisions recently enacted were rather vague, although I trust that they will be applied properly and will work well. Where people suffer as a result of land acquisition measures, one cannot expect them to bear a loss.

Reverting to the matter concerning public transport, I point out that I am impressed by everything I have heard about Dr. Scrafton, the Director of the Transport Planning and Development Branch, but, if he can penetrate the obstinacy of the Minister of Roads and Transport, he will be an even greater man than I think he is. However, I think he will have a difficult time convincing the Minister concerning the improvements that are really needed in South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I refer, first, to what I consider to be the appalling lack of consideration by certain Government departments for some of my constituents, as well as some of those of the member for Fisher and the member for Heysen, who live in the water catchment areas in the Adelaide Hills. There seems to be a conflict of interests between the department controlled by the Minister of Works and that controlled by the Minister of Environment and Conservation. In fact, from questioning that has taken place in the House, it seems that neither department knows what the other is doing, and certainly the people concerned do not know. There is a state of confusion, and these people are worried about their future. For some time, they have been working under the close supervision of the department administered by the Minister of Works. Regulations were proclaimed last year, dividing the watershed areas into zones 1 and 2, and these regulations considerably inhibited the activities of the primary producers concerned. However, the situation has recently been compounded and confused as a result of the attitude of the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The Minister of Works is, of course, primarily concerned with pollution control and, I think as late as about a month ago, he gave an assurance, under questioning, that it was not intended to change the policy on subdivision in the watershed areas (certainly not to his knowledge) and that the present regulations would continue indefinitely. However, a recent amendment to the Planning and Development Act severely cuts across this assurance and makes nonsense of what the Minister said. It seems that even the two Ministers do not know what has happened, and people are suffering as a result of the legislation and regulations that have been implemented. We have been considering a Bill concerning the amelioration of social conditions of people whose houses have been acquired by the Government, but apparently this amelioration does not extend to those whose very livelihood is endangered. We hear all sorts of pious utterance in this connection.

The member for Heysen recently attended a seminar that was addressed by some Government officers. No less a person than the Director of Planning said that the aim was to maintain prosperous rural production in the Adelaide Hills. I submit that it is becoming impossible for landholders to maintain prosperous rural production there, because they are hemmed in by Government regulations. I do not believe that people in authority understand what is involved in making a livelihood in this area; the landholders rely on their ability to diversify, but that ability is being denied them. Government departments should realize in what respects the people are being adversely affected. It has been put to the Government that the question of compensation should be considered, but the Government turned us down flatly. The Government replied that it was the luck of the draw: while some people might be adversely affected, others might be favourably affected. However, I am afraid that it is not as simple as that, because the very livelihood of the people depends on their receiving sympathetic consideration from the Government.

If the Government is willing to pass legislation to ameliorate social problems for people whose houses are acquired, it should consider legislating to help people whose very livelihood is endangered. Last evening the member for Heysen and I attended a meeting at which various producers in the Adelaide Hills were represented; the meeting was also attended by Mr. Payne, the President of the Mount Lofty Range Association. That association is primarily interested in conservation in the Adelaide Hills. Last week the Minister of Environment and Conservation said that perhaps we should have a look at the question of compensation; that was the first glimmer of light in connection with sympathetic consideration for these people. This aspect was reiterated last evening, although it was evident that Mr. Payne's interests did not exactly coincide with those of the primary producers. It is completely unrealistic to adopt the stance that the interests of the majority (the residents of the metropolitan area) must be served, to the detriment of the interests of the minority (the landholders in the watershed area). At the meeting Mr. Payne moved the following motion:

Any major planning legislation relating to the Mount Lofty Range be oriented to a healthy rural economy.

The motive behind that motion was to ensure that the rural nature of the Adelaide Hills should be maintained. The planning and development authorities seem to aim to keep the Adelaide Hills largely as they are. If the members of the Mount Lofty Range Association also desire this, it is reasonable to expect that it should not be done at the expense of the landholders in the Adelaide Hills. The combined effects of the activities of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the State Planning Authority have created an impossible

situation. There seems to be an increasing trend toward eroding the jurisdiction of councils. Last evening's meeting decided that the State Planning Authority should lay down guide lines and act in an advisory capacity, but that overall control should rest with the local government authority. Because councils are closest to the people and because they know local conditions best, they are able to make many of the necessary decisions. The Government appears to be slowly and surely eroding the jurisdiction of councils.

We are well aware of the centralization policies of the Australian Labor Party, and we are aware that that Party would largely sell out State jurisdiction, let alone local government jurisdiction. This is in direct contrast to my Party's attitude. The Labor Party seems to have very little interest in the idea of people owning their own property, whether it be rural property or urban property. However, my Party believes that people should be encouraged to own property. As a result of the increased charges levied by the Government, people are adversely affected not only in the watershed areas but also in urban areas. I believe that for half the time the Minister of Environment and Conservation does not know what is going on; it is time he went and talked to these people in the Adelaide Hills, so that he might become much more familiar with the situation.

It is the combined effect of these controls, the increases in charges, water rates, and taxes that are acting in this way to put these people slowly but surely out of business. Because they cannot sell their properties they cannot go out of business and they are becoming, in turn, part-time primary producers. I have raised these matters before, and I will continue to raise them as long as this type of injustice applies to these people.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I rise to complain at the hypocrisy of this Government regarding its attitude on industrial matters in South Australia, and its hypocritical attitude regarding the Commonwealth Government, and its habit of blaming the Commonwealth Government about all its own numerous failings. We have seen this Government exhibit a most unsatisfactory and unsympathetic attitude towards primary industry in South Australia, yet I believe that it is the Government's attitude towards secondary industry that deserves the greatest criticism.

Articles have appeared in today's press concerning Adelaide Steamship Industries Proprietary Limited and its investment in Adelaide Ship Construction. The Premier this afternoon praised in this House the situation where the company is now offering a share of its profit (I believe that 50 per cent has been stated in the article) to the men as an example of good industrial relations in South Australia. However, any person who has followed the case of Adelaide Ship Construction should know that it is the unions' attitude that has brought the company to its knees regarding tenders and orders that it no longer receives.

The hourly production at that shipyard is extremely low by Australian standards. Indeed, a New South Wales shipyard that is producing four ships a day without Commonwealth subsidy can undercut this South Australian operation, because of the unsympathetic and downright disruptive attitude of the unions whose members are involved in this industry in this State. All members can remember the situation last year when that company was seeking tenders and when it was faced with a lack of orders and the need to put men off if it did not get them. The company spared no effort to prepare and submit tenders, but the strikers at that yard picketed and prevented the staff from going about their business and preparing the necessary tenders. That most disgraceful exhibition was one of the most blatant in the shipbuilding industry.

As soon as Opposition members complained about such matters, Ministers opposite, especially the Premier, accused us of being anti-union. Apparently the unions are so sacred that no-one from this side may lift a finger or raise his voice in criticism of them. The Premier was so concerned about this situation that today he took the question I asked the Minister of Labor and Industry away from that Minister: he would not allow his junior Minister to reply. Despite my appeal to the Speaker by taking a point of order, I was prohibited from asking the Minister the question and the Minister was prevented from replying. The Premier was afraid that the Minister might give it all away, and he covered up in his usual fashion, solved the problems of Adelaide Ship Construction, and described the offer as something new in industrial relations. I have never heard anything more hypocritical than that in this House.

The Government has been the leader in introducing disruptive activities to the industrial front of this State. I refer to the Government's recent offer, on Ocober 13, regarding service pay and a further announcement on this matter. I believe that the final offer rose to $14 for

some categories of tradesman in the fourth year of Government service. What relationship has the $14 to private industry in this State? On examination, the average over-award payment in private industry in this State is far below the offer made by the Government to its workers. However, the Government does not care: it does not believe in private enterprise or competition on the industrial front. The Government believes that it should do as much as possible of the work offering. Despite the remarks by the member for Heysen concerning the deplorable lack of efficiency in the Railways Department of this State, the Government is not deterred from aiming to have as much work as possible done by Government departments. Yet nothing could be more harmful to industrial progress in South Australia than for this Government to offer over-award payments, which are in many cases twice as much as private industry offers and pays.

This Government is saying, "We do not worry about the competitive situation of South Australia compared with that of other States." In fact, in making its offer to Government workers, the Government says it has looked at the situation applying in other States, yet it has completely ignored the fact that South Australia is in a difficult situation and is competing for industry. The Government knows full well that we have to transport most of our goods to another State for sale and that this involves a long line of transport communication as an added cost to our sales in at least 80 per cent of instances.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Don't look at me like that.

Mr. HALL: I will not look at the Minister: he is not even capable of answering his own question. The Minister knows that South Australia has to export 80 per cent of its production and that this involves a long line of transport communication, and that to overcome this we have relied, ever since our industrial effort began, on a lower cost of production in South Australia. Yet the Minister's Government acts deliberately to destroy that advantage. The Government by its own action has proven not only that it does not care: it has proven recklessly that it does not care.

Unemployment has risen in this State to a level higher than that in most other States. This Labor Government has decided that it must put the blame on the Commonwealth Government. I refer to figures showing a comparison of unemployment level, and these, apart from being unfavourable to this Government, show (before the October adjustment) that New South Wales had 1.43; Victoria, 1.59; Queensland, 1.07; Western Australia (a fellow Labor Government) had 2.6 per cent of its work force unemployed; and this Government had 2.3 per cent of its work force unemployed, thereby sharing with the other Labor Government on the Australian mainland the honour of having brought to its people the highest level of unemployment in Australia.

*Members interjecting*:

Mr. HALL: I should now like to refer to the Australian Labor Party's election speech of May, 1970. That drab document, which was to lead us into an uncertain future, refers to the fact that unemployment in 1966-67 had risen to 2.3 per cent and states, "We cannot afford this stop-go industrial condition." That speech, referring to the Commonwealth situation, continued, "Yet the present Government has refused to take any steps to remedy the situation."

The Labor Party blamed the Liberal and Country League Government of 1968-70 for not doing anything to reduce the unemployment level below 2.3 per cent. However, the figures for September show that unemployment is 2.23 per cent. I wonder what the Minister has done in the interval. Obviously, whatever he has done has taken South Australia to the situation that existed in 1966-67, where over 2 per cent of the work force was unemployed. Coincidentally, that was the time of the previous Labor Government. Therefore, during the term of both Labor Governments, the percentage of unemployed has been over 2 per cent. I see that the Minister of Labour and Industry is leaving the Chamber; he may as well do that, because the Premier will not let him reply, even if he would like to do so.

Ironically, this Government blames the Commonwealth Government for what has happened. When we dissect these unemployment figures, we find that, in September, 1969, 4,530 people were unemployed in South Australia. At this time, there was a Liberal and Country League Government. In September, 1972, there were 12,051 people unemployed, which represents an increase of 166 per cent. That has been the benefit of a Labor Government in South Australia. Of the 4,530 people unemployed in September, 1969, 2,481, or 54.7 per cent of the total, were from the metropolitan area, whereas in September, 1972, of the 12,051 people unemployed, 8,550, or 70.9 per cent, were from the metropolitan area. Therefore, during the term of this Labor Government, which supposedly represents the industrial workers (at least that is its claim) the increase

in the number of unemployed persons in the metropolitan area has been 244 per cent. There is no way the Minister can answer this. This Government's unjustified criticism of the Commonwealth Government has been one of the unfairest pieces of ingratitude any State has ever perpetrated on the Commonwealth Government. The present Commonwealth Government has been the most generous since federation in its attitude to State Governments, and South Australia has fared better than most of the other States. This State put forward many cases to the Commonwealth Government, culminating in the case put by the former L.C.L. Government, which played a leading part in gaining for this State such a tremendous advantage in finanical resources. However, this Government has shown the basest ingratitude in blaming the Commonwealth Government for all the Labor Government's shortcomings.

To define the failure of this Government, one must look at its deliberate and reckless intention to lead the State into insolvency and bankruptcy, which it will do more quickly than its followers understand, by destroying South Australia's price and cost advantage over the Eastern States. This fact cannot be overemphasized. In the last year or so there has been a distinct lack of industrial newcomers to the State, the Premier having been able to attract only a few new industries. In its last election speech, this Government had the gall to say that no new industries had been brought into South Australia by the 1968-70 L.C.L. Government. However, during the next 12 months, this Government thrived on the results of the work of the previous L.C.L. Government, which had arranged for Nylex Corporation Limited and Wilkins Service Proprietary Limited (two major organizations) to come to this State. This Government gloried in saying that these industries were here, but they were here as a result of negotiations made by the previous Government. However, under this Government there has merely been a dose of unemployment.

It would seem that the Government is deliberately attempting to destroy the cost advantage of this State. By providing for long service leave entitlements that are 50 per cent above those available in the Eastern States, the Government has recklessly pursued its intentions. However, when one looks at members on the Government front bench, one cannot believe that they are really as silly as this. I do not believe the Minister of Education is below par; I believe he has good common sense. I believe that the three Ministers present (the Attorney-General, the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Works) would pass in an average crowd. I do not believe they would do these things of their own free will. There is only one answer to this question, and that is that they are not acting in their own right. Every conference which has occurred between the Houses about industrial matters has sharply revealed who are the masters of this Government: they are the silent members who sit behind the Ministers and who represent the industrial base of the Government. One can easily see that the Ministers are the puppets of the industrial Labour machine.

That would be funny, as the Attorney-General seems to find it, if that was all there was to it, but the dramatic consequences for South Australia are that we will continue to see industries go to other States and not come to South Australia. If the Government continues on its present course, what advantage will there be for industries to come here and manufacture articles for sale in markets in other States? That is a question no economist can answer, least of all the Minister of Education, who would consider himself to be an average economist. I suppose that all one can do is protest about this.

Mr. Brown: It's time.

Mr. HALL: Yes, it is with regard to this Government. The Government has had a deplorable attitude with regard to the Gepps Cross abattoir. I do not think this problem will be solved merely by the creation of the new corporation, unless the Government is determined to back it up. Basically the Government's attitude is to wreck our cost advantage, and this is deplorable. All that the Opposition can do is continually to point out what the Government is doing to our economy. When the previous Labor Government was in office in 1965-68 industries refused to come to South Australia. However, when we came to office in 1968 there was a dramatic change, with new industries coming here. The member for Unley can laugh, as he is good at doing, but he can read the record and see that what I say is correct. This Government wants to play Father Christmas. All members would want the people to get benefits, but the question is how to give them. This Government always goes for the icing on the cake rather than for what is under the icing. It destroys opportunity by trying to provide all amenities without having a sound industrial base.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I want to speak about the great problem of air pollution and the Government's failure to take positive action about it. Unless this Government rises from its complacency, South Australia will be confronted with smog. I realize the problems that we would have if we tried to control industry in this field. The job is a big one, but we must face up to it. I am referring particularly to the pollution from carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide emitted through the exhaust pipes of motor vehicles.

In the United States of America 60 per cent of the total air pollution is attributable to pollution from motor vehicles by way of carbon monoxide emission. Doubtless, this pollution is by far the biggest pollution problem in Australia. We have not the problem that Europe and other countries face, with heavy industries near cities, but the dangers of this pollution to health are well known. The eyes are affected by it, and people with heart conditions suffer badly because of the lack of oxygen. Diseases of the arteries are irritated and the lead content of petrol causes health problems. Similarly, bronchitis, pneumonia, pleurisy and asthma, as well as lung cancer, are aggravated by motor vehicle pollution. In the United Kingdom many deaths have occurred because of pollution.

Pollution was costing that country $400,000,000 a year (eight dollars a head of population) 18 years ago. In the same year the cost in America was $12,000,000,000, or $65 a head of population. We in Australia boast that we have not a problem, and the Jordan report, as well as the report of the Senate Select Committee, shows that the cost in Australia now is $5 a head of population. The Jordan report is one of the few that have been released to this House, because the Government is reluctant to release any reports. Fortunately, the Minister of Environment and Conservation released the Jordan report for us after he had introduced a Bill dealing with pollution. He told us that no information in the report related to the Bill that we were discussing, but I should have thought that the report would relate to any Bill dealing with pollution. In item 3, on page 126, the Jordan report states:

The emission limit of 4.5 per cent carbon monoxide in the exhaust of petrol-driven cars is too high. Control of other emissions should be instituted as rapidly as possible.

The Government would have realized long before the report was presented that we had that problem, and I criticize the Government for not having taken action. Item 5 of the report, on page 126, states:

The emission of dark smoke by diesel-engine vehicles should be controlled either by the application of the clean air regulations, 1969, to such vehicles or by means of other legislation.

The Government has not introduced any legislation.

Mr. Hopgood: Are you aware that the clean air regulations—

Mr. MATHWIN: I am aware of the regulations and that they relate to tall chimneys and to smoke from industry. Our position is not serious when compared to that in other countries and the member for Mawson would know, if he read the facts, that pollution in this State was mainly caused by exhaust fumes from petrol-driven cars and diesel engines. The Government has done nothing to solve the problem and I am trying to impress on the House how serious that is. Perhaps the Government is waiting to use what it intends as a plum during the next State election campaign so that it can get some votes.

The Government is well known for bending over backwards to over-protect the public in such matters as consumer protection. In the typical Socialist way, it wants to kill public incentive and make the people rely on directions as to what they can and cannot do. This is the Big Brother tactic that is typical of a Socialist Government in this country or elsewhere. As more and more cars use the roads, the pollution problem must increase. Many South Australian families have two cars and, if there are teenage children, perhaps more than two cars.

I have previously referred to pollution problems existing in European countries, especially in Turkey, where in Istanbul the pollution is shocking. The Minister of Roads and Transport tries to suggest that the dial-a-bus system is the great redeemer, but that would only add to our problems. Last week, when I asked the Minister of Environment and Conservation whether the Government would take any action regarding pollution caused by motor cars, he said:

I think—

only "I think"—

that the manufacturers will be asked to comply with the next requirement in 1974. In addition, as a result of the establishment of the Environment Ministers Council, in future the two groups will discuss this problem together. Although no legislation is contemplated this session, my department is considering the problem, hoping we can arrive at a proposal that will improve the position further.

That is all I got from the Minister. Indeed, he is pictured in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend next to a vehicle on the side of which is printed ". . . Public Health . . . Pollution . . . Section", this photograph having supposedly been taken in Rundle Street. However, the Minister said today that the photograph was taken last year at Port Adelaide. The accompanying report, headed "Pollution Hits City", states:

Pollution in Rundle Street is reaching danger level. The State Government is considering closing it to all vehicles.

Is this the best the Government can do? Will that solve Adelaide's pollution problem? This is just cods wallop! A report in last Monday's *News* is headed "Study Sought by Premier on Mall": we are used to studies, reports and boards initiated by the Government. Indeed, the Government has established so many boards to consider various problems that we need a darned good carpenter to keep them all in line! I suggest that the number on boards is well over 400.

Mr. Venning: And still rising.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. The *News* report states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) today ordered an urgent report into the feasibility of making sections of Rundle Street a pedestrian mall. His call follows reports that air pollution from car exhausts is reaching the danger level in Rundle Street. The Director of Public Health (Dr. P. S. Woodruff) said today he hoped to give a detailed report on the air pollution position in Rundle Street to the Health Minister (Mr. Shard) and the Minister of Environment and Conservation (Mr. Broomhill) later this week.

The longer the situation continues, the more of a comedy it becomes. Does anyone believe these statements? I think this is an excuse by the Premier to take advantage of the big business interests in Rundle Street, for I believe that creating a mall has nothing to do with pollution.

Mr. Keneally: It's coming out now.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the member for Stuart suggest that closing Rundle Street will solve Adelaide's pollution problem?

Mr. Keneally: What do you recommend?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Government should introduce legislation dealing with exhaust fumes emitted from cars.

Mrs. Byrne: Would you receive co-operation from the car manufacturers?

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Government introduced the legislation, it would have to receive co-operation. Indeed, this Government has got away with much legislation in the past. I refer now to the Premier's statement that he will bring people back to live within the city square mile. The Premier, who must be the most travelled man in this House, having visited America and Europe, will have seen the problems existing especially in the United Kingdom, where slum clearance programmes have been introduced, for instance, in Merseyside, Liverpool, involving about 140,000 people. Where slum clearance has taken place in the cities in question, once the authorities want to rebuild, as the Premier wants to do, and once they want the people to come back into the area, the people, having left the city, will not come back. The Governments and councils of those areas find it impossible to lure people back to city areas. The Premier, who has grand ideas for terrace houses (so that people can knock a nail in a wall and hang a picture on both sides), supports this type of living. He supports high-rise development, but this type of housing operates in Europe and is now described as tenement housing. The Premier knows from his own experience that he will not get people to come back to the city.

There is a problem in this State regarding air pollution, and it is time the Government roused itself and tackled the problem where it should be tackled so as to relieve those people aggravated by this problem, before it is too late. The Government must do something, but it will not solve the problem by closing one street, Rundle Street, in this city.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I rise regarding matters of concern to me which have been touched on by the member for Heysen and the member for Bragg. I refer first to the financial situation applying to the South Australian Railways. As a member of this House I, like other members, have raised with the Minister of Roads and Transport matters regarding the operations of the South Australian Railways, and on every occasion that I can recall the Minister has failed to answer questions and he has wasted most of his time in replying by trying to read into the questions an innuendo that was not there, or by being abusive. On most occasions he has been completely arrogant to members on this side.

Mr. Coumbe: And blamed the Commonwealth.

Mr. GUNN: True. The Prime Minister made announcements this evening about the railways and the Minister will no doubt have something to criticize about those announcements, but his criticism will not be logical. Last week I raised with the Minister of Roads

and Transport the matter of the road from Kevin to Penong. This road provides access to the gypsum works. I pointed out to the Minister that the gypsum works provide the South Australian Railways with one of its most lucrative forms of business, and I asked whether the eight miles of road could be upgraded to provide easier access for the men involved in blasting out the gypsum before it is loaded on railway trucks. In reply, the Minister tried to twist the question about to the effect that I was suggesting that the business now handled by the railways be handed over to road transport. I did not suggest that at all: that is the type of nonsense that the Minister keeps putting forward.

I refer to the Auditor-General's Report and the total railway deficit for the financial year ended June, 1972, of $19,500,000. That substantial deficit must be met by the taxpayers of this State. The report refers to the sum of $11,000,000 for work carried out and, if the Minister has the welfare of the people of South Australia at heart, he would take action to rectify this unsatisfactory state of affairs. I do not advocate the irresponsible closing of railway lines. Like all other members, I am aware of the economic importance of the Railways Department to this State: the railways opened up many of the primary-producing areas of South Australia, especially on Eyre Peninsula, where primary producers are always happy to support the railways. However, the railways must be prepared to move with the times and provide a service.

Mr. Vennings: At a comparable cost.

Mr. GUNN: True, and they must provide a service so that people will use them. I refer to what the Victorian Government has done regarding this matter. The Victorian Minister of Transport (Mr. Wilcox), established a committee to examine the railway system in that State. He appointed Sir Henry Bland to head that investigation and Sir Henry's subsequent recommendations have been of far-reaching significance. One of the most important recommendations was that the railways should become a corporate structure and that the controlling board be composed of people with business experience in transport and business administration so that the railways could be run in a more economic fashion.

I am not criticizing the South Australian Railways Commissioner or his officers. However, this Government has seen fit to appoint a committee of experts to administer the Gepps Cross abattoir and I ask why the same principle should not be applied to running the railways. I hope that the Minister will study the Ministerial statement made by Mr. Wilcox. I refer to an earlier question I asked the Deputy Premier regarding the Government's considering the adoption of the realistic and enlightened approach that the Queensland Government and the Commonwealth Government have adopted regarding problems caused by Commonwealth estate duties and State succession duties. The Minister's reply was, "Where are we going to make this up?" If we were to save half the deficit incurred on the railways, we would be going a long way towards making it up. There are several areas in this State (not only rural areas) where funds for housing could be made available far more cheaply if instrumentalities such as the railways and the like were running more efficiently. L.C.L. policy is that the basis of family life is that every person should own his own home, but that is not the policy of this Government. Being Socialists, its members do not believe in free enterprise or in the individual. Therefore, it is easy to understand why they have scant regard for the increase in housing costs in this State.

Mrs. Byrne: Who is making a profit out of it?

Mr. Crimes: Who gets the gravy?

Mr. GUNN: I suggest that members examine the taxation measures introduced by this Government that have increased the costs of new houses in South Australia. The members who have interjected are trying to imply that everyone in business in this State is a crook and a rogue. That is the attitude of the Attorney-General, and I think this is a despicable slur to place on these people. This great country has been built on the efforts of people involved in free enterprise. The basis of post-war reconstruction carried on by the Menzies Government and now by the McMahon Government has been free enterprise and the right of the individual. This system has not been built on Socialism or on doctrinaire philosophy designed to control the individual so that he becomes one little cog in the bureaucratic wheel of Socialism.

Before I became a member, a great controversy was raging in the community about the adoption of the M.A.T.S. plan by the then Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. Murray Hill). The impression that the then member for Edwardstown (Hon. G. T. Virgo) endeavoured to give people was that the M.A.T.S. plan consisted only of building several freeways in Adelaide. I believe that he deliberately misled the people in that way.

One of the first questions I asked when I became a member was about debit order work that councils in my district and in the Flinders District wished to carry out on behalf of the Highways Department. I asked the present Minister of Roads and Transport whether the continuation of the M.A.T.S. plan was having an effect on the debit order funding to be made available to these councils. In his typically abusive manner, the Minister said, "We are not proceeding with the M.A.T.S. plan, if you can get that into your head." To try to get itself out of a difficult position, the Government decided to have a feasibility study conducted by Dr. Breuning of Social Technology Systems Incorporated of Massachusetts. This rather Greek survey of the transport needs of South Australia comprises 29 pages, but it could easily have been fitted into five pages. When one first looks at its size one believes that one may learn something from it, but there is nothing in it to learn from.

Mr. Venning: What did it cost?

Mr. GUNN: I forget the cost, but it was substantial. One interesting point was that the Premier announced that Dr. Breuning was coming to South Australia, before Dr. Breuning knew himself. That is another example of the Premier's skulduggery, something that he has engaged in over the past 2½ years.

I have the privilege of having in my district the opal fields of this State. Over the last few months, I have made several approaches to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who has been most co-operative. I am pleased to see that action is to be taken with regard to the activities of illegal miners. I think that recorded figures show that opal mining is the second most important mining industry in South Australia. At present there is great confusion about the Government's decision in relation to back-filling of bulldozer tracks. Statements have been made by officers of the department, by the Minister, and by the Premier. At present people at Coober Pedy are confused. I have been told by people in the area that if back-filling is enforced it will largely cripple the industry. Figures have been given to me that show that about 50 per cent of production would be affected. As I have no way of checking these figures, I have to accept them on the advice of my constituents. I understand that officers of the department will go to Coober Pedy to investigate the situation, and I hope that my constituents will be satisfied with the outcome.

Although this matter is more a Commonwealth matter, I point out that the industry needs some restructuring. At present, the Commonwealth taxation system affects opal miners unsatisfactorily, as it penalizes miners who have worked hard. Often, miners work for 18 months or two years, hardly making a living. Then, if they are successful, they may find many opals. However, the additional tax is substantial. This tends to kill their incentive to continue or to declare the actual sums they receive. I hope that this Government will take the lead in making an approach to the progressive Commonwealth Government, which is always pleased to assist in these matters. In the last few weeks, one or two of my Senator friends and I have made approaches about this. The Government pays lip service to decentralization, but I do not believe it is sincere about this. However, Coober Pedy represents an opportunity for decentralization, as the centre is developing rapidly, and we want to see it continue to develop.

Recently there has been much controversy about the Port Lincoln abattoir. I am pleased to see that the Government has eventually got off its backside and done something about this, although it took the Government a long time to recognize that there was a problem. The Government allowed the situation to get out of hand. The export licence was in danger because funds were not made available. The Government can find $400,000 for overtime payment to persons employed on the Adelaide Festival Centre, yet we have much grumbling before the meat export industry can be helped.

Constituents at Murat Bay have approached me about the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that there is scope for two more abattoirs in South Australia, and these constituents want the Government to carry out a feasibility study into establishing an abattoir in the Ceduna-Thevenard area. We have a deep sea port at Thevenard, and the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line could be extended into good cattle country. I understand that an abattoir is to be built at Naracoorte and all my constituents ask for is a feasibility study into the establishment of an abattoir in the Ceduna-Thevenard area.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I refer particularly to the Gepps Cross abattoir, which for some time has cost the primary producers of South Australia millions of dollars. Despite the statement by the Minister of Agriculture that the new corporation will improve the abattoir, there is no guarantee that the problems will be solved. In a statement on a

recent *Country Hour* programme, the President of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated (Mr. John Kerin), in commenting on our abattoirs, said:

In the last 12 months the Government has been bombarded with pleas for assistance and demands for action. Pleas and demands that show no signs of abating. This despite the Government's announcement concerning meat marketing reform.

When dealing with the killing works at Port Lincoln, he said:

Port Lincoln was registered as an export abattoirs way back in 1929. Since then it's always been a major killing works, with emphasis on United Kingdom trade. No doubt it's played a vital role in developing the West Coast. At the moment 80 per cent of all stock slaughtered at Port Lincoln is exported. The value of the works to Eyre Peninsula would be hard to define. Yet, when Britain joins the European Economic Community next year, it looks like Port Lincoln will no longer be able to export stock.

Since Mr. Kerin made those comments, the Government has announced that it will upgrade the Port Lincoln abattoir by spending more than $200,000. That is only a small sum compared to what is required. We have had trouble at Gepps Cross for a long time. Last year the Premier did not accept my invitation to go to the abattoir and see the problems there. I do not think he knew where the abattoir was located. Now, after much pressure, the Minister has brought forward the proposal to establish the new corporation. We understood that last year, when a wage appeal was negotiated, an additional shift would be introduced, to operate from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

When the wage was agreed to, the payment was made retrospective for about seven months, costing about $250,000, and this money was used to meet the wage increase instead of to provide a new meat hall, which would have been completed by the end of this year. Work on that new hall has not yet been continued. Although a large number of stock is available to be treated at the abattoir, one sheep and lamb chain is not working, and that shows that every effort has not been made to solve the problem.

Mr. Kerin said that much of the killing at the abattoir was done at overtime rates. Before Easter this year the abattoir had been working on overtime and in the past financial year the cost was $1,700,000. In the previous year, the cost was $1,600,000, and in the past six years $5,000,000 has been paid in overtime alone. This money could have been spent in providing facilities to solve our problems. I hope that the new corporation improves the situation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It would need a miracle!

Mr. VENNING: Yes, I agree. I am fearful about the complications of legislation already introduced, and to be introduced, dealing with meat marketing. Many people fear a large increase in costs to country people, because their supplies will have to be drawn from places such as Port Pirie and Peterborough. Butchers throughout the State who have upgraded their own private facilities will be faced with the possibility that under future legislation they will have to draw their supplies from elsewhere. I am also concerned about certain complications regarding the abattoir situation: the new organization will include no primary producer representation, although the unions will be represented.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Rocky River that he is not in order in debating a Bill that has already been dealt with in this House.

Mr. VENNING: It is only as a result of new information—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot continue in that vein.

Mr. VENNING: A scandalous situation has existed that has cost producers millions of dollars. It is time the Government was more realistic in determining its priorities on expenditure. I should have thought that a Labor Government would try to contain prices and that it would have some control over the price structure. True, we have the benefit of the Prices Branch, which under this Government and former Liberal Governments I have supported to the hilt, but the Government has allowed costs to increase. Indeed, under legislation enacted by this Government, costs will continue to increase. I refer also to the increased taxation, including stamp duty, levied in respect of transactions involving the transfer of land from father to son, as well as to increase stamp duty on the purchase of a new motor vehicle.

Various increases have occurred, even though prior to the last election the Government went to the people with a mild policy on taxation.

Water rates have been increased throughout the State, and country dwellers have lost an advantage that they previously had under a sympathetic Government. The member for Glenelg, who referred to the increased number of boards set up by the Government, suggested that more than 400 people were on these tribunals. The number is rising continually, and it is frustrating to find, when one approaches a Minister on a matter, that a board is handling that matter and that the Minister is awaiting

its recommendation. I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Conservation about two months ago for a decision on a matter involving a coastal area in part of my district, but the board set up to consider coast protection is waiting for an engineer to advise what should be done. That indicates how the Government is failing in its responsibility to make decisions. Having welcomed the opportunity to express concern about various matters affecting my district, I hope that the Government will note my remarks.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I wish to refer to certain matters regarding the finances of the State and especially to matters I have raised with the Treasurer. Unfortunately, the Treasurer is absent this evening, and I always feel guilty about raising matters with his Deputy. I was concerned last month when I learned that in the September quarter of 1972 the Adelaide consumer price index rose 1.6 per cent compared to 1.4 per cent average increase for the six capitals. The Treasurer explained that this was because of the price of meat in South Australia but, no matter whose fault the trend is, the Government has made little attempt to arrest the inflationary trend in this State. However, the Government is not concerned about the inflationary trend, for it realizes that it can capitalize on it. I think this was evident last evening when we heard the policy speech of the Commonwealth Leader of the Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the business of the House.

Mr. BECKER: Since 1968-69, taxes in this State have risen by slightly more than 50 per cent, and by about 17 per cent a year in just over three years. We cannot blame the Government for this but, if it were sincere and concerned about inflation, it would be curbing it: it would set a minimum price for consumer items and also set a maximum wage. In other words, it would reverse the situation. So, if we are to curb inflation, we must reverse the whole situation, but there is no Government in the Commonwealth that has ever been game to tackle the matter.

When I asked the Premier what was being done by the Government in this respect, he glossed over the matter. We cannot blame him because, as the Treasurer of the State, he wants to collect the maximum amount of revenue. Of course, nowadays the people are paying more in taxes and charges than they have ever before paid, but their wage increases have not been proportionately as great. What is the Government doing about it? It is doing nothing, because until now it has been able to get away with it. I also asked the Premier whether he would consider appointing assistant Ministers, but this idea was laughed off as horseplay; however, it was not intended to be horseplay. I sincerely believe that, while some Ministers are not competent, there are other Ministers whose portfolios are extremely complex. This State should be run in accordance with business principles, and we must therefore have competent, experienced people in control. We do not want a Premier who is gallivanting here, there and everywhere. In my work I have been accustomed to a system whereby, if the leader is away for a week and if another person performs his duties, that person is paid the leader's salary. Consequently, I have always felt some sympathy for the Deputy Premier; the responsibility often seems to fall on his shoulders. On November 8, in reply to my question about assistant Ministers, the Premier said:

> However, it must be acknowledged that my Cabinet carries a heavier work load than any other Cabinet in Australia. It has more work to do because of the programme we have been accomplishing at a record rate. I pay a tribute to members opposite for the assistance they have given the Government recently in accomplishing that programme, because their attention has often been elsewhere.

Of course, we know that the Premier was being facetious. Whenever the Government has introduced poor legislation, the Opposition has debated it thoroughly. There are always difficulties in any political Party. The present Government has not been able to cover up its difficulties entirely. We know the situation that exists, but unfortunately the Labor Party has a structure that can cover up almost the whole thing. We know there is an organization called the New Left, and it is a damn sight more dangerous to the Labor Party than the Liberal Movement will ever be to the Liberal Party. Ever since the present Government has been in power, South Australia has submitted applications to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. On page 79 of its thirty-ninth report, the Commonwealth Grants Commission states:

> South Australia's per capita revenue from lotteries for 1970-71 was slightly above Victoria's and well below that of New South Wales. South Australian ticket sales per capita were below Victoria's but this was offset by South Australia's prize money being a lower percentage of the gross proceeds of ticket sales than in the standard States.

So, it can be argued that we are not obtaining as much revenue from lotteries as was expected by some people. Ticket sales by the Lotteries

Commission in the financial year ended June 30, 1971, totalled $6,000,000, while for the following financial year they totalled $6,200,000. The surplus of the Lotteries Commission for the year ended June 30, 1971, was $1,864,000, while for the following financial year it was $1,900,000; so, there was only a slight increase. We have asked some embarrassing questions about the Totalizator Agency Board, but we have found it difficult to get replies from the Chief Secretary. On page 79 of its thirty-ninth report, the Grants Commission also states:

In South Australia a Totalizator Agency Board system for off-course betting has operated since 1967, but its betting turnover per capita is less than half that of the standard States and much lower than those of Queensland and Western Australia. The Commonwealth Treasury has suggested that, "presumably due to much later introduction of the off-course Totalizator Agency Board in South Australia, the tax base is very much less, possibly because there are relatively fewer agencies and possibly also because the public is less 'used to' the Totalizator Agency Board".

So, when we are accused of making statements about starting price betting, let us remember that the facts are spelt out by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. No matter what it is today, the T.A.B. was established to assist the racing industry in this State. The trouble is that past Governments, whether Liberal or Labor, have taken too much capital from the T.A.B. and have not allowed it to become sufficiently established to assist the industry. The T.A.B. is not represented throughout the State and S.P. bookmaking still continues at an unprecedented rate that will never be curbed. However, Government and T.A.B. administrators should make an effort in this respect. Those are my two main grievances. The Government has not accepted the challange: it has done nothing to curb inflation.

Motion carried.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 8. Page 2849.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, but I am not completely happy with the reasons given and the decisions reached by the Government as given to us. The Treasurer, in presenting the review of the financial situation to this time, has conveniently swept under the carpet the projected deficit for 1972-73 that has already been surpassed by virtue of the type of additional activity into which the Government has entered since the acceptance of its Budget about two months ago.

On that occasion the Treasurer indicated that $7,000,000 had been put aside for possible increases in wages and salaries during the financial year. He indicated that that figure was considered adequate for the provisions to be made, yet on this one occasion a sum of about $8,000,000 is required to cover over-award and service payments in addition to the amount provided for this purpose earlier in this financial year. We also have the situation as pointed out by the Treasurer in the information given to the House, that the figure is expected to be $5,300,000 for the balance of the year. These additional sums are made available, but if their granting further erodes the advantages this State has offered over a long period in enabling local producers to compete in the consumer durable market, this State will be the worse for the experiment.

A peculiar situation unfolds in the light of this method of making over-award and service payments: there has been a reduction in the margins existing between the rates paid to tradesmen and those paid to non-tradesmen. The Treasurer said the second method offered to the Trades and Labor Council, which was accepted by the council, was designed to cost about the same in total, but that it would have the effect of narrowing the margin between tradesmen and non-tradesmen. Payments differed as between first year, second year, third year and subsequent years, and the consequent difference in entitlement between tradesmen and non-tradesmen is a mere $1.50. What advantage is there in undertaking apprenticeship? What advantage is there in a person undertaking further education after leaving school when, after taking into account the difficulties involved in obtaining tradesmen's qualifications and the skills involved, the difference between the tradesmen and non-tradesmen is only $1.50?

The South Australian Labor Government has been promoted in this State as a modern Robin Hood, taking from the rich and giving to the poor. The Government has said that it is intended that everyone will finish up with an equal slice of the cake, but there must be some consideration of effort made through undertaking additional education and acquiring the skills in gaining a tradesman's qualifications.

Regarding the sum made available for urban unemployment relief, the Treasurer has had much to say regarding this State being affected adversely compared to the Eastern States because of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government in not making available specifically

funds for urban unemployment relief. He has made this point on several occasions: that the peculiarities of the large regional towns in other States have allowed them to obtain from the rural unemployment relief scheme a greater percentage of funds. This, however, is not borne out by a close scrutiny of the detail. The allocation to this State has been proportionate to this State's population and to the type of distribution existing in virtually all financial matters in this respect.

I now refer to the statement made by the Prime Minister after the Premiers' Conference, that the matter of metropolitan unemployment was discussed and that additional funds had been made available by the Commonwealth Government to the States at that conference specifically for unemployment relief. The Treasurer indicates that this is the situation, because he has now specifically made such funds available for the relief of unemployment, and this relief has obviously come from the money made available by the Commonwealth Government.

The point I wish to make regarding the Premier's announcement is that, almost simultaneously with the creation of the scheme, the Minister of Education has forwarded to school committees and headmasters a recommendation that they apply through their local council for assistance in respect of permanent works and the statement that the funds available to local councils for the relief of unemployment will give relief to unemployment through the projects they promote. One cannot deny that several projects in country areas under the Commonwealth rural relief scheme have been to the advantage of schools. However, the schools were not instructed by the Minister of Education to apply to the councils for use of the funds. This was an arrangement that developed as a result of a total consideration of the needs of the area by the council, including some of these projects in rural areas. I firmly believe that the Government is giving with one hand and taking away with the other by promoting projects in schools through the unemployment fund. In fact, when challenged about this, in reply to a question the Minister said recently that obviously and naturally it was the council's responsibility to consider urgently the schools in its area. I believe that the tying of the hands of councils, as suggested by the Minister, is not the true position. The South Australian community will come to appreciate the full import of this situation.

Additional funds will be made available for drought relief. Unfortunately, in common with other States, this State needs these additional funds. As the Treasurer said in his Ministerial statement this afternoon, the Commonwealth has made more money available for relief in this area. All members will welcome that announcement. The reality of the situation is being faced, although we hope that the position will change soon. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

> Advances will be made at the rate of interest normally charged by the State Bank for carry-on finance, but in appropriate cases where that rate may be shown to involve great hardship, the Minister will be prepared to exercise his authority to grant some rebate of interest.

From what I have heard from my colleagues who have investigated problems, particularly in the Mallee area, several applicants for relief may want this sort of compassion, so I ask the Treasurer to exercise the necessary compassion so that these people can continue on their farms. The Treasurer has said that this opportunity is being taken to bring this Bill before the House now, as it is most unlikely that Parliament will meet again until late in the financial year. Certainly on that occasion the Appropriation Bill will be brought forward by a Government of a different complexion. I support the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, support the Bill. I believe that a budget should be the subject of review periodically. A State Budget should be reviewed quarterly, and probably be subject to half-yearly alteration. The affairs of the State must be run on a businesslike basis. At present, we have probably the greatest inflationary growth rate for at least a decade. In this Bill we are asked to approve expenditure of $6,150,000. It is surprising to note that of that sum $4,000,000 will be charged to revenue this financial year and $1,300,000 on other accounts, including Loan Account, the roads funds, and the Forestry Fund. Therefore, we find that $1,300,000 will be charged with long-term repayments. I assume that the $4,000,000 this financial year will be added to the proposed Budget deficit. Therefore, where we were told just over two months ago that the Government would budget for a deficit of $7,518,000, now we find that the deficit will be about $11,518,000.

There is no guarantee that this deficit will not become even higher. We know that the Government will not increase its revenue, because this is an election year. Therefore, we find that the State is going further into debt at a rate we have not witnessed for many

years. As a State election will be held before the end of this financial year, certain promises will undoubtedly be made that will further add to the deficit. I would not like to be in the situation of having to follow the present Government on to the Treasury benches, because I would not wish to clear up the present mess.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You needn't worry about that.

Mr. BECKER: One should never underestimate one's opposition. I believe that the situation has been reached where South Australian taxpayers must ask themselves how any Government can justify an increase in State taxation at a rate of 17 per cent when the average wage and salary increase has been only 11 per cent. How long can this situation be expected to continue? We are asked to approve the appropriation of an additional $6,000,000. No State Government can justify pouring money into the South Australian Railways, yet we have an appropriation to the Railways Department of about $1,500,000. If there is a change in the Commonwealth Government, where will the new Government get the money that it has promised to spend in the policy speech last evening? It is time to take stock of the position. We must agree to authorize this money, but I do so reluctantly, because it is time we had a competent Administration in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is repeating remarks that he made previously. He is engaging in tedious repetition.

Mr. BECKER: On behalf of the taxpayers, I object to continually budgeting for such deficits.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Hospitals, $840,000; Treasurer, Miscellaneous, $240,000; Lands, $50,000—passed.

Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous, $2,300,000.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Works say what this large amount will be spent on?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Minister of Lands controls drought relief and the unemployment relief fund. The Government intends to make advances to councils in the drought-stricken areas so that they can do extra work. The Government also makes money available in metropolitan areas for unemployment relief. This money is made available through the Minister of Lands. The Leader has said that the Commonwealth Government makes money available to this State for drought relief, but the Commonwealth Government has made no money available to the State to the present time and the State Government must spend from its own resources $1,500,000 before it is eligible for any grant from the Commonwealth Government. If the Leader reads the statement made this afternoon, the position should be obvious to him.

Dr. Eastick: What about social service benefits?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suppose the Leader thinks we should take them over, too. The Minister of Lands is having this money made available to him so that he can provide unemployment relief in the metropolitan area, for which the Commonwealth Government has not provided money. At present about 800 people are employed through these funds. The amount appropriated also covers payments to councils in drought-stricken areas for work projects.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, $515,000; Public Buildings, $345,000; Education, $65,000; Agriculture, $27,000; Produce, $48,000; Marine and Harbors, $75,000—passed.

Railways, $1,570,000.

Mr. McANANEY: Will this sum be in addition to the amount of about $25,400,000 already provided?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that this will be for service pay. The Leader has said that this Government has been far too generous in this respect to its employees and that we should have given more consideration to the amount made available to them. I ask the Leader what is the position in Victoria and New South Wales. If he knew, he would know that the Government could not avoid its responsibilities in this matter. Does the Leader think that the State Government should incite State-wide industrial trouble, because it was not willing to do the same as has been done by the standard States? He did not refer to that matter this evening. Did he think that we did this of our own volition? Of course we did not, because we followed the lead.

Dr. Eastick: Who started it in 1965?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We did, and I am pleased that we did. We are now following the standard States, and the Leader should have said this, but tried to paint the picture that we were doing it on our own. The Leader knows that is not true.

Line passed.

Community Welfare, $75,000—passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Power to issue money other than Revenue or money received from the Commonwealth."

Mr. BECKER: Does this clause authorize the Government to raise money by way of bank overdraft to enable the State to carry on from time to time?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is the normal provision in this type of Act. If the money is paid to the State by the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State is insufficient to make payments, moneys may be issued to make good the deficiency out of Loan funds or other public funds or out of moneys raised by bank overdraft.

Mr. BECKER: The Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June, 1972, states:

To finance expenditure during periods in which there was a lag in receipts on Consolidated Revenue Account, the State raised $20,000,000 by Treasury bills, which were repaid within the financial year.

Can the Deputy Premier indicate how much the State may have to borrow to meet working capital, and how much is that likely to cost the State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I cannot, but I will find out and let the honourable member know.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 and 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## LAND ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ARBITRATION)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 11 to 20 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 2. Page 2—After clause 3 insert new clause 3a as follows:

3a. *Enactment of s. 3a of principal Act*—The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 3 thereof:

3a. *Rights to long service leave of certain workers not affected*—Nothing in this Act shall be held to confer on a worker, whose service was terminated before the commencement of the Long Service Leave Act Amendment Act, 1972, any right to or in relation to long service leave, in respect of that service, that did not exist at the time at which that service was terminated.

No. 3. Page 5—After clause 7 insert new clause 8 as follows:

8. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 13—Employment during leave*—Section 13 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by inserting after the passage 'or by any other person' the passage ', in substitution for the employment in relation to which his right to long service leave accrued';

and

(*b*) by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(2) An employer shall not knowingly employ a worker for hire or reward in any employment in which, pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, the worker is prohibited from engaging.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 3 be agreed to.

The effect of amendment No. 1 is to delete from the Bill the proposed new definition of regular part-time worker and the amendment to the definition of worker. After the Bill had been passed by this Chamber, His Honour Judge Bleby, President of the Industrial Commission, gave judgment in a claim made under the Long Service Leave Act for pro rata long service leave that caused the Government to reconsider the position regarding part-time workers. Judge Bleby decided that the Act as it now stands is not limited to full-time employees. The Government considers that, in the light of this decision, there is now no need to include the definition of regular part-time employment in the Act, nor is there any need to amend the definition of worker. I am therefore willing to accept the amendment.

Amendment No. 2 includes another clause to make clear that the Bill does not apply to a worker who has terminated his employment before the amending Act comes into operation. As this gives effect to the Government's intention, I am willing to accept the amendment. Amendment No. 3, which deals with the prohibition of employment of a worker during long service leave, was inserted in the Bill

at the instigation of the Government as a result of the judgment of His Honour Judge Bleby to which I have just referred. The intention of the amendment is to enable an employee who undertakes part-time work, in addition to his normal full-time occupation, to be able to continue to work in his part-time job while he is on long service leave from his main employment. Also, if he becomes entitled to and is granted long service leave in respect of regular part-time employment, it will enable him to continue in his full-time employment while on long service leave from his part-time work. This will remove what could otherwise have been a stumbling block to the granting of long service leave to some part-time employees.

Motion carried.

## ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ALCOHOL)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 8. Page 2882.)

Clause 9—"Compulsory blood tests."

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

In new section 47i (4), to strike out, "by whom the death is certified to take a sample of blood from the body of the deceased in accordance with this section" and insert "who certifies the cause of death, or reports the death to a coroner—

(*a*) to take a sample of blood from the body of the deceased in accordance with this section;

or

(*b*) to notify a coroner as soon as practicable that, in view of the circumstances in which the death of the deceased occurred, a sample of blood should be taken from his body under this section.";

and to insert the following new subsection:

(4a) Where a coroner receives a notification under subsection (4) of this section, he may authorize and direct a pathologist to take a sample of blood from the body of the deceased in accordance with this section.

The amendments are in line with the recommendations of the *ad hoc* committee that reported so well on this legislation. To ask a doctor in a busy casualty section to take a blood sample from a body that is dead on arrival is quite impracticable. Further, there are technical difficulties in taking a blood sample from which an accurate estimate of the blood alcohol content can be obtained, if a patient has been dead for any length of time. For those reasons, these amendments are necessary.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## OMBUDSMAN BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 5 and 6 (clause 3)—Leave out "in the exercise of judicial powers" and insert "while discharging or purporting to discharge any responsibilities of a judicial nature vested in him, or any responsibilities which he has in connection with the execution of judicial process".

No. 2. Page 6, line 8 (clause 10)—Leave out "neither House of Parliament presents".

No. 3. Page 6, line 10 (clause 10)—After "from office" insert "has not been presented by both Houses of Parliament".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These amendments were moved by the Government in the Legislative Council, and they really consist of two sets; the first is an amendment to make clear that the jurisdiction of the ombudsman does not extend to the exercise of judicial powers and functions. It had been suggested that the words used in the Bill as it left this place might leave some doubt about that and, consequently, the new form of words has been inserted. Amendments Nos. 2 and 3 make clear that the ombudsman can be removed only on an address of both Houses of Parliament; the original draft might have been open to the construction that the ombudsman could be removed on an address of only one House of Parliament.

Motion carried.

## CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 2701.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill, subject to the amendments that have been foreshadowed. It is gratifying to be able to support adult franchise, which I have advocated in this House for a number of years. It is also gratifying that the Party I represent has seen the light and has supported adult franchise. There are other things on which we must still move, such as the election of Cabinet by members, instead of the mid-Victorian way of electing a Leader and allowing him to be a sort of semi-dictator and to select his Cabinet. This is another move that my Party should make, if it is to have a forward outlook and a true, democratic attitude. I am pleased to see that no change

is proposed to the provisions relating to voluntary enrolment and voting, as I think this is essential, especially with regard to the Legislative Council. Those who do not have the energy or desire to enrol should not be forced to vote. If and when the amendments are dealt with, I will have something to say about them. I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The debate on the Bill has ranged over a considerable field. This is strange, considering the simplicity of the terms of the Bill, which has been put before the House for the specific purpose of directing the attention of members to a single issue, namely, the franchise that should exist for the Upper House. The Bill is confined entirely to providing that the franchise for the Upper House should be identical to the franchise for the Lower House. The Bill has been framed in that way to give members of this House the opportunity (and indeed to impose on them the responsibility) of declaring themselves unequivocally as to whether or not they favour adult franchise. It is useless to attempt to divert this debate by discussing other matters relating to compulsory or voluntary voting, the day on which the elections should be held, or the districts for the Upper House. The only issue concerning this House is the franchise for the Legislative Council.

Every member, when he votes on the second reading of the Bill, will be voting on the issue of whether or not he favours adult franchise for the Legislative Council. It is time members of this House faced the responsibility of deciding whether they are willing to oppose a simple proposition for adult franchise. Other matters that have been raised in this debate were debated earlier this session when another Bill was before the House. This evening we are concerned only with the question of adult franchise, as that is the only provision in the Bill. I ask members this evening to decide in favour of adult franchise, and to send this Bill to the other place with the unanimous vote of this House demanding that the people of the State be given equal rights with regard to the franchise of both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Will you accept the contingent motion?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, but we still deal with that in due course. The issue dealt with in the Bill is adult franchise, and that is the issue on which members are asked to vote.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act and provides for an alteration of the Constitution of the Parliament, its second reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Order 298, I now count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question "That this Bill be now read a second time". As I hear no dissentient voice and as the Bill has been passed with the requisite statutory majority, it may now be further proceeded with.

Bill read a second time.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the number, election, term and retirement and the districts of members of the Legislative Council, settlement of deadlocks, count of votes at Legislative Council elections and House of Assembly districts.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Dunstan.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

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

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How can you oppose it now when you supported it previously? Be consistent for a change.

Mr. Gunn: The Minister should be the last one to talk about being consistent.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I oppose the Bill and despise the Government, which is simply trying to turn the Upper House into a body as closely similar to this Chamber as is possible. The Government's attitude is illogical, and is not adopted in other parts of the world. The Government has refused even

to consider the constructive proposals that have been put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and has thrown them out by weight of numbers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Two members cannot be on their feet at the one time; the honourable member for Alexandra must resume his seat. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that in the third reading debate a member can debate only the nature of the Bill as it has come out of Committee and cannot refer back to decisions taken by the Committee or the House in regard to other matters that might otherwise have been in the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the Minister's point of order. The honourable member for Alexandra must confine his remarks to the Bill as it came out of Committee. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Bill as it came out of Committee is so far removed from common sense and from even what the Australian Labor Party has moved in the Commonwealth Parliament that I think it makes nonsense of the legislation. Proportional representation is obviously a good thing to have in the Upper House if it can be fairly applied.

Mr. Burdon: "If"!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The interjection implies that it might not be fairly applied, but no-one has said that. The Attorney-General did not give the House a chance to discuss the Bill, but used his majority to suppress any discussion on the legislation. I think that the legislation—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's a reflection on the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not reflect on a decision of this Chamber and must refrain from continuing to speak in that way. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I take it I can say that I think the Bill is a rotten and silly one and an inane one born out of cynicism. I oppose it.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the remarks of the member for Alexandra. I believe we have again witnessed the high-handed attitude and arrogance of the Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre must confine his remarks to the Bill as it came out of Committee. He must not continue in that vein. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I am always happy to comply with your impartial rulings, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That takes care—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must cease interjecting. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: The Bill as it came out of Committee is completely unacceptable to me. I supported the second reading, but I do not support the Bill as it now stands, because it is nothing more than a farce. The Government has introduced this measure with no regard for the future of the Upper House. The Government's course of action is an attempt to try to abolish the Upper House. I believe the Attorney-General has shown little consideration if he wants to reach a compromise and to have the franchise amended. I oppose the third reading.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, and provides for an alteration of the Constitution of Parliament, its third reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority, and in accordance with Standing Order No. 298 I will now count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question "That this Bill be now read a third time". There being a dissentient voice, it will be necessary to divide the House.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

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

The SPEAKER: There being 25 Ayes and 19 Noes, a majority of six for the Ayes, I declare the motion to be carried with an absolute majority.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 8. Page 2880.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I think it is a tragedy that, at this hour and after introducing the Bill only last Wednesday, the Government should continue the debate now.

The Hon. L. J. King: We didn't waste about six hours today.

Mr. WARDLE: Are Opposition members to be denied the right to a grievance debate? Perhaps Government members may say that the grievance debate continued rather longer than had been expected. However, I should hope that they would not deny us the right to that debate. *Hansard*, over a long period of time, contains many classic examples of what the Minister who is now retiring from the Chamber was saying, namely, that when things are different they are never the same. I want to clear up the point that the Opposition has the right to express itself.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No-one said you didn't have that right.

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister of Local Government will admit that copies of this Bill were in short supply, and this caused a problem, because I had to ask the staff of the House to post a copy of the Bill to me on Friday evening so that I would have an extra copy. I, as a member who has come from the country this morning, without having had time to discuss the measure with my colleagues, consider that this legislation is far too important and too far reaching to be brought on and concluded in half an hour or an hour. I should like to discuss many provisions fully, but this would be impossible.

The two particular points that I want to mention are long service leave for employees and minimum rates, because I consider that they stand out as being by far the most important of all the changes made. It disturbs me that the Minister should introduce a Bill on these two issues before introducing the new Local Government Bill. I realize that the preparation of the new Bill is a mammoth task, but it is disappointing that some issues are being dealt with in dribs and drabs. I should have thought it preferable to defer major issues, such as the two that I have mentioned. I understood from the Minister's comments that it would be possible to introduce the new Bill during the next 12 months. If that is not so, I hope the Minister will say, when he replies to this debate, how long he considers it will take to prepare the new legislation.

The matter of long service leave is dealt with in clause 13, which amends section 157 of the Act and refers to officers of councils having the opportunity to obtain superannuation rights. I am not opposing the matter of superannuation: I want to make that clear. I, as a former council officer, have benefited from superannuation.

New subsection (11) of section 157 provides that an officer will not lose credit for the years of service that he has given when he goes from one council to another. I appreciate that provision and I am sure that all local government officers in the State will appreciate their years of service mounting up. Eventually, they may receive credit for serving in, perhaps, two or three councils over a period of eight or 10 years. The Minister knows quite well that, generally speaking, in country areas clerks begin their service to local government in small country councils. After three or four years they move to a slightly larger council, and after several years they move to a council much closer to the metropolitan area, perhaps to one of the larger country towns; finally, they move into the metropolitan area and assume the responsibility of the town clerkship of a corporate town or city.

As they have gone along and gathered experience, having passed through some of the superannuation schemes, they nevertheless have not received the benefit of those schemes. What I dislike about what the Minister has presented to the House is that it appears to be setting up 130 little superannuation schemes. I think this is detestable. It is not showing the sort of vision local government officers deserve. It is by no means adequate for the situation. Surely, if it is possible to have a superannuation scheme throughout the State for, say, police officers, it is possible to have one State-wide superannuation scheme for local government officers.

There is no reason why a superannuation fund for local government officers cannot be set up, guaranteed perhaps for the first eight years or 10 years by a proportion of rate revenue from councils, as well as contributions by all local government officers and employees. This would be a much simpler system of administration than having 130 small units. When a local government officer moves from one council to another and becomes due for superannuation, all the councils he has served are expected to make some contribution to the fund. There are varying degrees

of payment for service within councils, varying from one council to another, increases in salaries take place from time to time, and all these finer details will have to be worked out in the service of a local government officer when it comes to superannuation. It must be worked out for each council for which the officer has worked.

This is one of the clumsiest situations I can imagine when compared with the establishment of one superannuation fund for local government officers with councils contributing in a proportion of 60/40, 50/50, or 70/30, paying into and establishing one State-wide fund. It is terribly disappointing to find that, when a superannuation scheme for local government officers comes to South Australia, in my opinion as a former local government officer it is so piecemeal and so inadequate.

I believe wholeheartedly in a pension fund. It is sadly needed, because some local government officers in this State are not covered by their council under a fund. Some have a very poor fund, and some are not getting any great benefit from their superanuation fund. On the other hand, some councils are generous. In my own instance the council was paying 60 per cent of the contribution and employees were required to pay 40 per cent. This was a generous gesture by that council. When an employee pays less than 50 per cent of the contribution the council is becoming more generous as its contribution increases and that of the employee decreases.

It is true that some local government areas provide generously for their officers. I do not believe in this tremendous variety and variation between councils in the provision of superannuation. This fund could be set up on a State-wide basis with officers contributing a certain amount (perhaps according to their salary), with councils contributing a certain sum for each employee, and the whole fund being covered and guaranteed by rate income until it had sufficient equity to become viable.

This State could be proud of such a unit, and it would grow and develop into a magnificent fund for every person employed in local government. I dislike the fact that the scheme depends on the Minister. It is the Minister who shall approve of the scheme and it is to the Minister that the scheme shall be put up. This should be a basic scheme managed and controlled by Parliament, broad enough, big enough, wide enough, and comprehensive enough to include superannuation for the hundreds of local government officers in South Australia.

Virtually it is a pension scheme and such a scheme, in my opinion, should not be piecemeal in 130 bits and pieces. If it is a pension scheme for a wide field of hundreds of employees it should be a scheme that everyone could be proud of and it should be established by Parliament, which makes decisions concerning it, and not 130 bits and pieces for the Minister to have a shot at where he thinks this is adequate, that is adequate, that is not good enough, that is fair enough, and so on.

Having dealt with clause 13 of the Bill, I turn now to clause 30, which relates to section 214 of the principal Act and the matters of minimum rating and rating in general. While councils were happy to clutch at the minimum rating some years ago, that system is being used and abused out of all proportion. Many councils are setting a minimum rate in one fell swoop. I have heard of one council where 80 per cent of the assessments are covered by one resolution to adopt a minimum rating of about $50, $60 or more.

To me, this defeats the whole purpose of an assessment of land values and annual values. The adoption of the minimum rate is too easy a method to use. The purpose of the assessment method surely is to place a value on the piece of land, whether it be a piece of poor land, a stony outcrop, a section of land that is subject to flooding, or whether it be a piece of land that has any defect at all from the point of view of supporting a business or a house.

[*Midnight*]

Surely, the purpose of having an assessment is to give land the value that it has on the market. So we assess the value that a piece of land would attract on the market as a possible house or business site. It is obvious then that, when a council accepts a resolution to adopt a minimum rate (perhaps of $50), everything right across the board is subject to that minimum rate of $50. The land involved could be rubbishy; it could be flat clay and quite unsuitable for building on. It might be a stony outcrop, again unsuitable, or an odd shaped piece of land. In fact, there are thousands of pieces of land throughout South Australia at present that the owners would dearly like to hand back to local government if it would not cost them money to transfer them.

Many people in this State are most irate about councils because of the size of the

minimum rate being applied. The introduction into this Bill of the possibility of having different systems within the same area is good. I like the idea of land values and annual values within the one council area, because there are areas suitable for either method of assessment. I have no objection to that but I do object to the word "zone" in new section 214 (3). This cuts up and creates small sections of land within an area, as I see it. It appears to me that the word "zone" could mean that there might be 10 zones within a ward. In fact, it would not be impossible to see General Motors-Holden's a complete industrial zone within a city—presumably within the boundaries of the Woodville City Council.

If it is possible by the use of the word "zone" to make a separate rate for each zone and that area is one zone, it is possible to impose a rate on General Motors-Holden's that is inconsistent, out of keeping and not in line with any other rate imposed on any other portion of the city of Woodville. The council could say, "Here is a balance sheet that shows a profit of $18,500,000. These people can afford to pay a substantial rate." So, because that company could be a zone, it would appear to me to be possible to put a separate rate on it, and this would defeat the whole purpose of having an assessment. Surely the purpose of an assessment is to group like with like, a community of interest in the one area—an industrial area of a certain type of factory or a housing area of a certain quality of housing. Surely the purpose of the two methods of assessment that the Minister has introduced into this Bill is to select an area within a ward; but, when it comes to a zone, it is cutting the ability of the council to apply its rate into too many small pieces.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You say that a council has not the ability to do it?

Mr. WARDLE: That is completely ridiculous. I refer the Minister to new section 214 (5), which provides:

"zone" means a zone established by regulation under the Building Act, or the Planning and Development Act.

There may be half a dozen shops in a domestic area that are, under this measure, a zone. If so, those half a dozen shops could be subject to a different rate. It is contrary to the general method of assessment, because the ability to assess an area is surely being able to give an advantage to some areas—areas that can be classified as similar to one another and areas completely different from other areas. So I draw attention to the use of the word "zone". Without that word, the description of the property in new subsection (3) would be clearer.

I come now to clause 31, which amends section 228 of the principal Act and deals with minimum rate. New section 228 (1a) provides:

Different minimum amounts may be fixed under subsection (1) of this section in respect of different parts of the municipality.

There is no adequate explanation of what a "part" consists of. The use of the word "parts" is entirely out of keeping with the spirit of an assessment, which is to assess areas; and these are generally fairly large areas within a ward or council area. Perhaps many councils see their ability to assess wards as quite small when it comes to the use of the two systems of assessing within the one council area. I appreciate the fact that it will now be possible, when this Bill is passed, to use the two different systems of valuation within the one council area. I am not so sure that perhaps many councils will get around to dividing up a ward into many sections. It is the ability to assess perhaps the central area of a city or town, in its business section, on one principle and to assess the outer housing areas on another principle. It will be sufficient for most councils to have that ability under this measure but, when we get inside a ward and start cutting up a ward into areas, then, even with our ability to cut up a zone within wards, that completely takes away the value that some of this legislation will give to local government assessments.

I have not had time to study the Bill in detail; there are many clauses of which I approve wholeheartedly. To my mind, the superannuation scheme is completely inadequate. It is a great shame that we should present to this House a most unsatisfactory system of providing superannuation for local government officers. I close by saying that I think the use of several words in the clause dealing with minimum rating and assessments completely spoils what could be, and will be to some degree, some valuable additions to the ability of local government to manage its own affairs. Apart from those two provisions, I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join with my colleague in supporting this Bill in principle, and add my complaints about the lack of time we have had to consider this important measure. It is most unfortunate that more copies of the Bill were not available, because the Minister understands that several members have to leave Adelaide on Thursday evening or early

Friday morning and, if they wish to study a document over the weekend, it should be available, because documents cannot always be forwarded by post. I endorse the remarks of the member for Murray when he referred to the Local Government Act. I had hoped that the Minister would introduce a completely new Act, because it is long overdue. The present Act is unwieldy, consisting of many amendments, and, if the Bill was reprinted, that would be a step in the right direction. However, I hope that the Minister will indicate when a new Local Government Act will be introduced.

Clause 4 gives councils power to appoint the Auditor-General to act as their auditor. I do not oppose this clause, but I wonder whether the cost to councils will increase. Will they be charged a normal auditing fee or will it be at a reduced rate? I hope that the rate will be reduced, because councils are finding increased costs a considerable burden. Clause 10 refers to a course of events in which the candidates for election to a council receive an equal number of votes. Recently, there have been one or two instances in my district in which two candidates polled the same number of votes.

This placed the returning officer (who is usually the town clerk) in a most unfortunate position. A coin had to be tossed to decide who should be elected, and this is a most unsatisfactory situation. The person seeking re-election should be given the right to continue for a further period, and I am pleased that this provision has been included. At one election much ill feeling was caused toward the returning officer when he was forced to make a decision in these circumstances. Clause 17 refers to whether a council can split a ward in relation to the system of rating used, and I am pleased to see this provision included, because in my district in certain council areas the rates vary conceivably. Intensive farming is carried on in some areas, but a few miles away the country is suitable only for grazing.

However, the council is forced to use the same system, so that large grazing properties are forced to bear a high rate. In the area of the district council of which I was a member for several years, injustices and hardships were forced on many graziers and, because of the economic situation at the time, this burden was almost impossible for them to carry. The Bill also gives councils the right to introduce a new rating system, and I support this principle. The district council of which I was a member used the unimproved land value system of rating, and certain business organizations, which were as profitable as any rural property, had their rates reduced when the council changed from the annual rental value system. These organizations could pay more easily the rates that had to be paid by a farm with a much smaller turnover, so that I hope this provision will overcome some of the present anomalies. For some time I have been concerned with the minimum rate, because when a council declares a minimum rate for the whole area some injustices must occur.

In most country areas are situated several small towns in which are blocks on which the owner does not intend to build. Rather than pay the rates the owner returns these blocks to the Crown, so that the council is deprived of any income from rates. The powers given by this Bill will enable councils to apply rates far more realistically. I support what the member for Murray said about superannuation schemes for council officers. Perhaps a State-wide scheme would be more realistic and would encourage officers to remain in the employ of a district council longer than they do at present, and this would benefit the council they serve. One problem facing all councils is that of rising costs. All these schemes will be costly to ratepayers and the council, and this is the only limiting factor I see in regard to this matter. I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to clause 8, which amends section 105 of the principal Act by inserting a new subparagraph that allows an officer the chance of viewing a nomination paper and, if he finds an error, to correct it, so that the nomination is valid under the Act. I appreciate that it would not be intended by the Minister that the officer would have the chance to make a correction beyond the time of the closing of the nomination at 12 noon on the second Friday in May. However, the clause does not indicate that the officer would be prevented from allowing the alteration of the nomination form beyond the closing time. Is this intended or was this point considered by the Minister when preparing the Bill?

Clause 54 refers to section 536 of the principal Act, whereby it is an offence to keep cattle or swine within certain areas. The clause clearly states that the prohibition is extended to cover an area within 100 m of the borders of a township. People who have kept swine and cattle on the boundaries of country municipalities have created major problems. Another nuisance is the keeping of dogs in boarding kennels or in greyhound

hoists, machinery, the safeguarding of machinery, which is covered in detail in the Industrial Code, and also the prohibition of the manufacture and sale in South Australia of certain types of machinery with dangerous parts. For instance, set screws or keys sticking out of rotating shafts could catch in a person's clothing, rendering them liable to a work injury. A matter that has crept into the situation over the past couple of years concerns the incidence of young men with very long hair. It has been found necessary for employers to insist that such young men wear either a protective hat or a snood similar to that worn by girls in the spinning mills years ago.

A subject which has not previously been touched on in the Industrial Code, and about which there is no legislation, is the stacking of material. Since the operation of forklift trucks we have now, with pallets and palletization of materials, stacks which may be 15ft. or 20ft. high. These could get a bump from a forklift truck and collapse or fall over, crushing anyone underneath. No regulations whatever have governed this matter. The matter of men working alone in a factory is mentioned, as is overcrowding, with too many men or women working within a confined space, also protective equipment which must be supplied to workmen, safeguarding of structures, and certificates of competency for riggers. Imagine being in a factory with an overhead crane moving along, with a couple of tons of steel in a sling. This often happens. Unless it was correctly rigged, the load could slip in the chain and land on someone working below. This must be corrected.

Of great interest to the committee was the subject of safety in banks. We have heard much lately about hold-ups and the safety of tellers and other people working in banks, and further investigation is proceeding. Safety supervisors are referred to in the Safety Construction Act, but these provisions must be spelled out more fully in this Bill.

Under the general heading of "Health", the committee looked at matters covering lighting and manual lifting. Under the provisions of the Industrial Code, a woman must not lift more than a specified weight, and a woman under 21 years of age must lift a lesser weight; seats had to be provided for women in certain circumstances. The whole question of first-aid and medical facilities is mentioned, as is the medical examination of employees.

Noise is another problem that is new to the Industrial Code, and anyone who has been in factories engaged in certain processes would know of the hazards caused by noise. I am well aware of this, because I suffer from what is commonly called boilermaker's ears, resulting from many years spent in a series of very noisy factories. The committee decided that the best things to do in several of these cases, including noise, was to adopt the Australian Standards Association standard on this, and the medical profession has now come up with a recommended standard number of decibels in this regard. The recommended standard for a factory is far less than one would find in a discotheque. I am afraid that many of our young people who go to hear music in only two volumes (either full on or full off) will have hearing troubles within a few years.

Mr. Wright: Did you take evidence in a discotheque?

Mr. COUMBE: I have been to discotheques and remained for as long as I could bear it. Noise is an important factor in industry. It is a problem. I recall that, when I was in the Army and using ordnance pieces (or "guns", as they are called), we were given special protective equipment for the ears. The common one was the little plug and the other one was the big ear muff. Unfortunately, some men do not like wearing ear muffs because of perspiration or because, if someone yells a warning, they cannot hear it. As there are problems, this matter will have to be looked at carefully.

Under the heading "Welfare" in the report, we see the subheadings of sanitary conveniences, sitting accommodation, ventilation and temperature, dining rooms, drinking water, washing facilities and change rooms, restrictions relating to females and minors, and Factory and Industrial Welfare Board. There is no doubt that this type of legislation must be updated and continue to be revised because we are experiencing today a rapid technology change, quite apart from automation. There are many technology changes occurring where processes that have been going on for many years are changing rapidly and radically. Irradiating substances is one I may mention in passing. It is important that the regulations and the legislation be kept up to date to deal with the new techniques being developed.

A completely new industry may be coming to South Australia soon, which has some sort of process that has not been seen here before and which is not covered by legislation. We must have readily and easily adaptable legislation to cover such an occurrence. There is

a strong case to be made (in fact, it is essential) for the whole of the inspectorate of the Department of Labour and Industry to be strengthened, not only numerically but also in academic and practical qualifications. Recently, as I understand it, there was only one graduate in the whole inspectorate of the department. That is not good enough. The graduate is a Bachelor of Engineering. Obviously, if the purposes of this Bill are to be achieved as we wish them to be, the inspectorate must be upgraded in these respects; we shall need more inspectors, trained both practically and academically, apart from the fact that any plans must be submitted to the department, which needs at least a diplomate to handle them. Those are some general remarks I make on this report, which members have and which I know they have studied avidly.

The Minister referred to the report of the Robens committee, which Barbara Castle, a Minister in the United Kingdom, in 1970 set up under Lord Robens. It was interesting to see some of that committee's recommendations. Incidentally, that report did not come out until three months after the Select Committee of this House had made its own report. Many of the recommendations of the Robens committee are in line with those of our Select Committee although, being, of course, a national report, it went further and covered a wider range of subjects.

I turn now to the Bill itself, which is wide in its terms. A skeletal type of Bill, it will rely heavily on regulations. One has only to look at the schedule to see the types of matter that will be referred to by regulation. These matters are all-embracing. The Bill is the result of the Select Committee's report. The committee took evidence from a wide spectrum of industry and commerce in this State—from employer-employee organizations, from private people, from Government departments, and from a few other sources.

Mr. Harrison: And it came down with a very good report.

Mr. COUMBE: Thank you. First, the legislation binds the Crown, as I believe it should, because we are talking here about Government departments—for instance, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department, the Mines Department and the Highways Department. Why should not the men employed by those departments be covered as men in private industry are? We are talking about their safety, their health and their welfare. They should be covered. Some of the definition clauses have been taken straight out of the Industrial Code or the Construction Safety Act. I notice that the word "constructor" has been changed. In the Construction Safety Act the phrase "principal constructor" is used. We are seeking here to provide that, when a building is being undertaken (either an excavation or the erection of a building) someone must ultimately be responsible. Obviously, the principal contractor cannot always be on the job; he may be miles away. He may be attending to two, three, or four buildings. If he is a cottage builder he may be handling several sites. He may be in a big construction business in which he is erecting several large buildings. He may be out of the State for the day. The important thing is to see that on the site someone is responsible for implementing and observing the provisions of this legislation. That is what I think is meant by the wording in the Bill and the fact that "principal" has been struck out from the term "principal constructor".

"Industrial premises" has an interesting definition, as follows:

> any building, structure or place that is for the time being declared by proclamation to be industrial premises for the purposes of this Act.

That means something in which, I suppose, some industrial process is taking place. That is the only way I can read it: either something is being made or processed, and I believe that is what is meant by industrial premises. It does not mean a private garage workshop. The member for Florey may have in his garage a small grindstone, but I do not think the provision would apply to him, or to the member for Mallee on his farm in that select part of the State, because they would not be manufacturing in the workshop. The member for Mallee may be repairing a plough share, but perhaps if he were constructing a new tow-bar for his tractor his workshop might be liable to be proclaimed an industrial premise. However, if the garage at Keith were manufacturing tow-bars, I think that would be defined as an industrial premise. In the old Act it was limited to a factory or a warehouse, but what about an office? I suppose something is being produced in an office, but I do not know whether a bank is an industrial premise.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you describe Parliament as a factory?

Mr. COUMBE: We turn out the greatest volume of paper work that one could imagine.

In the definition of "occupier" in relation to industrial premises, it refers to a body, whether corporate or unincorporate. I wonder whether a self-employed person will be caught under this provision: I believe he will be. The definition of "work injury" is almost the same as that contained in other legislation, but it is spelt out differently in this Bill. I would like to have seen safety supervisors included in the definition clause. They are referred to in the schedule, but I make this helpful suggestion, because these supervisors in many cases play a valuable part concerning safety and are referred to in the Construction Safety Act. The Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board is to be appointed to replace the present board, which has not seemed to work effectively. This permanent board shall consist of seven members who can be paid fees.

The permanent head of the department (Secretary for Labour and Industry) shall be the Chairman, and six other members shall be appointed, one being nominated by the South Australian Employers Federation Incorporated, one by the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated, one by the Master Builders' Association of South Australia Incorporated, and three nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. As the permanent head, as Chairman, may be on leave, absent overseas or in another State, I suggest to the Minister that he should include a provision that the Chairman shall be the permanent head, or his representative, or his deputy. The office of a member of the board may become vacant for several reasons. I draw the Minister's attention to paragraphs (*f*) and (*g*) of clause 10. What does "any other offence" in paragraph (*g*) mean? If a person were convicted of driving a motor vehicle at 40 miles an hour, surely this provision would not apply. It is provided that members of the board may investigate certain matters, and I believe that one of the first major jobs of the board will be to prepare regulations to be introduced in order to make this Bill effective.

Members of the board may go into any place and inspect it. Clause 19 (2) states that an inspector may be accompanied by such other persons as to him seem necessary or desirable in the circumstances of an inspection. Perhaps he may need to have an inspector of the Public Health Department or a specialist accompany him, but the Minister might elaborate on that point. Some people may object to clause 19 (3) (*a*), which permits an inspector to inspect and take copies of any books, papers, documents, etc., which in his opinion may "disclose information as to whether this Act is being complied with". I understand that a similar provision was included in the Industrial Code. I also draw the Minister's attention to paragraph (*c*) of the same subclause. If a beam fails and if the inspector removes that beam, it would cause the collapse of another part of the building. So, I hope the inspector will use his discretion. When the King Street bridge near Melbourne collapsed, it was found that the steel was faulty. I agree with the idea of the registration of industrial premises; that has been the practice for many years. Clause 24 (2) provides:

A person shall not occupy any industrial premises unless those industrial premises are for the time being registered in accordance with this Act.

I believe that it would be better if the provision was as follows:

No owner or occupier shall occupy any industrial premises . . .

We must remember that the term "a person" includes a watchman. Clause 25 provides:

Every person who becomes the occupier of industrial premises registered, or deemed to be registered, under section 24 of this Act shall, forthwith on becoming the occupier of those premises, give notice to the permanent head in the prescribed form accompanied by the prescribed particulars.

What does the word "forthwith" mean? I suppose it means "straight away". This could create problems, because obviously we do not want someone occupying premises if he is not authorized to do so. I therefore believe that "forthwith" should be struck out and "within 14 days" inserted. The Attorney-General had a provision like this in his credit legislation. As the Bill stands, if a person wants to start occupying premises this morning, he must give notice this morning. I believe that a 14-day period is reasonable, particularly when we consider the time needed for notices to come from remote parts of the State. Division III of the Bill is headed "Work injuries and accidents". I point out that the term "accidents" is not defined in this Bill or in any other Act. Clause 27 (4) provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (2) of this section, whenever a work injury occurs as a result of electric shock or as a result of a person being overcome by any gas, vapour, dust or fumes, the employer of the injured person shall, irrespective of the period of incapacity, forthwith advise an inspector and send or cause to be sent written notice of the work injury to the permanent head within 24 hours . . .

The requirement that the inspector be informed "forthwith" is a little difficult, particularly in remote areas. I therefore suggest that, instead of "forthwith", the words "immediately the accident is known" should be inserted. Clause 28, dealing with reports of certain accidents, is taken from the Construction Safety Act and the Industrial Code. It provides that, if any load-bearing part of any scaffolding or shoring is broken, distorted or damaged, it must be reported and must not be touched, so that the inspector may look at it. Whilst the inspector should see why the beam has collapsed, we should have a subclause providing that it is a defence if it can be proved that action was taken in an emergency to avert the danger of a further collapse of scaffolding. Perhaps the shoring may be propping up the wall of an adjacent five-storey building; if something fails in the shoring, the proper thing to do is to get some other shoring and put it up. If that is not done, the wall may collapse and perhaps cause a fatal accident. I hope the Minister will consider my suggestion, which has merit. Clause 29 provides:

Every employer in any industry, every occupier of industrial premises and every constructor in relation to any construction work shall—

(*a*) do all things as are necessary to ensure that the provisions of this Act are complied with; and

(*b*) take all reasonable precautions to ensure the health and safety of workers employed or engaged in that industry . . .

That provision is very important. If the employer does not obey it, he may be fined $200. Clause 30, on the other side of the coin, provides:

A worker shall not by any act or omission render less effective any action taken by a person for the purposes of giving effect to section 29 of this Act.

So, clause 30 prevents a worker from doing something that would create danger in a workshop; of course, if a worker did that, he would be working against the interests of his fellow workers. The penalty for a breach of clause 29 is $200, whereas the penalty for a breach of clause 30 is only $10. However, I believe that the offences are equally important. We are looking for co-operation between the management and the work force. If the employers are obliged to carry out safety precautions, surely the workers should be obliged not to hinder those precautions. If an employer says that nothing is to be left on a certain track and if other people put material on that track, they should be culpable.

During the next few years, there will be a stream of regulations that we will have to scrutinize carefully. Each of the industries concerned will have to be covered by regulations, and possibly certain regulations may embrace more than one industry. The Subordinate Legislation Committee and members of this House will have to see that these regulations are couched in the correct terms. One of the first jobs of the board to be set up under the Bill will be to deal with these regulations.

This Bill represents the second half of the new industrial legislation. This matter has been under consideration now for 18 months, and other minor legislation to deal with bakehouses, and lifts and hoists, is still to be introduced. I only hope that the Bill, which contains some important principles, will lead to better relationships with regard to safety in industry. Undoubtedly some problems will have to be solved. I have already referred to mines and to the Mines and Works Inspection Act. Another problem concerns the liaison that will have to take place between the Public Health Department and the Labour and Industry Department. One or two other specific activities will have to be considered. Obviously, unless the provisions of the Bill are correctly policed, they will not work properly. Therefore, the Minister will have to see that he has an adequate and properly trained inspectorate under his control. It will be impossible to inspect certain facilities in the far-flung areas of the State. I hope that the Bill, which can be improved by amendment, will receive the support it deserves. Having heard the evidence given to the Select Committee by representatives of industry and commerce, I trust that their hopes will be borne out by the Bill, which I commend to members.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support this Bill, which is generally a good Bill. Unfortunately, as it was understood that the Bill would not be discussed until tomorrow, some members who may have wished to speak will not have time now to study it. The Select Committee, of which the Minister, the member for Playford, the member for Spence, the member for Torrens and I were members, met on 23 occasions over a period of more than 12 months. During that time, we interviewed 55 witnesses from 25 organizations and nine Government departments. During our investigations we visited Port Pirie where we inspected the works of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited. This inspection revealed many aspects of industry which I had not seen before

and which I greatly appreciated. This industrial legislation is in two principal parts, the first part of which we completed only today after much consideration in both Houses. This Bill is the second major part of the legislation, which can only be described as massive. This is to be expected, as we are dealing with a wide and varied field.

Many regulations to supplement the legislation will be introduced later. The schedule has 40 items. Therefore, members of the House will be required to consider these matters carefully when the time arrives. Under the heading "Recommendations for Amendments to Present Safety, Health and Welfare Provisions", the Select Committee recommended provisions requiring employers in all industries to which the safety laws are applied to keep a record of all accidents to their employees at work involving lost time of more than 24 hours. That provision is essential. The committee also took evidence about fire prevention, making the following recommendation:

Provision should be made along similar lines to that which applies to first-aid, viz. that where a certain number of persons are employed at any time (the number to be determined in regulations) the employer is to ensure that someone trained in the operation of fire extinguishers provided should be among those employees.

Regarding the safe working of machinery, the committee made the following recommendation:

The definition of machinery at present in the Industrial Code is such that it excludes certain types of machinery such as forklift trucks and portable power driven equipment.

Another minor part of the whole legislation that is still to be introduced (it will probably be introduced before Parliament prorogues) will deal with this matter. In this regard, the committee also recommended:

At present most provisions in the Industrial Code dealing with safety of machinery apply only in factories as presently defined. These deal with such matters as the fencing and safeguarding of dangerous machinery, the prohibition of the use of dangerous machinery, cleared spaces in the vicinity of machinery, cleaning of machinery, etc.

The committee further recommended:

We further consider that this provision should apply wherever machinery is used, that is, including warehouses, universities and schools, Government institutions (for example, prisons) except by self-employed persons. This will ensure that those places where extensive machinery is installed and used but which are not factories in accordance with the Industrial Code at present will have to comply with safety legislation.

This important matter is covered in the Bill. Another matter brought to the committee's attention was manual lifting by females. The Code provides that the maximum weight to be lifted by females under 18 years of age in factories, shops and offices is 25 lb., whereas the maximum weight to be lifted by females over 18 years of age is 35 lb. This provision should be repeated and made to apply to all industries. I compliment the member for Torrens on his contribution to the debate. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Although the committee recommended that it should regulate the safety, health and welfare of all employed persons in South Australia, the Bill excludes from its scope mines as defined in the Mining Act, which in simple terms means mines and quarries.

Clause 5 provides:

Nothing in this Act shall apply to or in relation to any mine as defined for the purposes of the Mining Act, 1971.

This matter was considered by the Select Committee, and I believe it would be better to include also the Mines and Works Inspection Act in clause 5, because that would give the legislation a wider field in which to operate than one merely of administration. Work in or in connection with excavating, shaft sinking or tunnelling, as defined in clause 7 (1) (*c*) could well apply to mines and mining. Work in or in connection with the placing, laying or maintenance of pipes or cables whether such pipes or cables are placed or laid above or below ground level, as defined in clause 7 (1) (*g*), could well apply to oil drilling, whether offshore or on land. A board will be set up, but that is only to be expected here. However, the number of boards we have appointed during the past few years makes me wonder how far we will go in setting up boards and committees. The board will be under the Minister's direction. The permanent head shall be the Chairman of the board, and six other members will be appointed by the Governor. The board shall consist of seven members, including the Chairman, of whom four shall constitute a quorum. Clause 18 provides that the "Governor may appoint any suitable person to be an inspector of industrial safety under this Act". The Bill does not lay down what qualifications such an inspector must hold, but I imagine that he would need to have certain qualifications. Clause 19 (1) provides for the powers of entry, etc., of inspectors. Clause 20 (3) provides:

There shall be an appeal to the Minister against any requirement of any inspector under this section, and any such appeal shall be lodged in writing at the office of the Minister within 48 hours of the making of the requirement by the inspector.

In some parts of the State it would be impossible for people to forward a notice of appeal in writing to the office of the Minister within 48 hours. I should like the Minister to explain how anyone could control or bind a former employee in terms of clause 21 (1). I refer now to clause 23 (2). It seems to me that in some parts of the State this matter would come within the jurisdiction of councils, and in others it would be under the jurisdiction of the State Planning Authority. However, that provision requires that the approval must be given by the permanent head, who is the Chairman of the board.

Subclause (3) of that clause also prescribes that an application for approval must be accompanied by the prescribed fee, but no indication is given of how the fee will be arrived at, and how much it will be. A company such as Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited could well be slugged for thousands of dollars. This fee could be large in some cases, and I should like the Minister to give information about the matter when he replies to the debate.

Clause 29 provides a penalty of $200 for an employer who does not comply with the requirements set out, and I have no argument about that. However, as the member for Torrens has done, I also draw attention to the penalty of $10 provided in clause 30 for a worker who renders less effective any action taken by a person for the purposes of giving effect to clause 29. The responsibilities on the employer and the employee are similar and the possibilities of what can happen in each case are similar. Therefore, I consider that the penalties also should be similar. That is a most important point, and I hope the Minister will reply to it.

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): I do not intend to speak at any length, being conscious how tired you, Mr. Speaker, and all other members are. I commend the Bill and the members of the Select Committee whose work has resulted in its preparation. I think it can be described as a machinery Bill, and the real and practical benefits will flow from the regulations that ultimately will be promulgated. I am confident that the trade union movement in South Australia will appreciate the provisions of the Bill and what will result from it for the benefit of the safety, health and welfare of union members.

I think that the trade unions, realizing the value of the measure, will co-operate fully in relation to its operation. That the unions were interested in the Bill was shown by the useful representations they made to the Select Committee. The unions will await with anxiety the regulations to be introduced. One provision that I do not think other members have mentioned, although they have made a fairly good examination of the Bill, is that which dovetails the measure to a certain extent with the requirements of Acts dealing with pollution and conservation. That provision gives protection to persons near industrial premises or construction works. Put simply, it means that it will not be possible to remove hazards to employees in industrial premises merely by visiting them on other people and other areas. There has been already a comment in the press on the contents of this Bill, and it appeared in the *Advertiser* editorial on November 9, as follows:

> Nevertheless, the regulations will be awaited with deep interest. The regulations are likely to require in various cases the provision of additional safeguards and facilities. This will mean extra costs. South Australia may well be giving a lead to other States with these proposals but it is essential to ensure that our industries do not lose their competitive power. Because the cost that weighs on industry through the occurrence of ill health and accidents in industry will be considerably reduced, and because of the tremendous number of accidents that are at present occurring and the reduction in this number which we hope for as a result of the Bill and its regulations, I believe that ultimately, when what is intended is smoothly working, a considerable decrease in costs to industry will result.

I commend all members of the Select Committee. I can say, I believe with perfect truth, that never on any occasion was there any evidence of Party-political difference during the deliberations of the committee. Nor, indeed, to any extent was Party-political difference revealed by the people who appeared before the committee as witnesses. There was a common purpose on the part of all members of the committee, and that purpose has been reflected in a manner that is a tribute to the work of the committee. It is my pleasure to support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the second reading. I wish to speak only to the clause that refers to the Mining Act and, by doing so, leaves the Mines and Works Inspection Act, the Petroleum Act, and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act within the limits of the Bill. Clause 5 provides:

> Nothing in this Act shall apply to or in relation to any mine as defined for the purposes of the Mining Act, 1971.

The definition of "mine" in that Act is as follows:

"mine" means any place in which mining operations are carried out:

The definition of "mining operations" is as follows:

"mining" or "mining operations" means all operations carried on in the course of prospecting or mining for minerals or quarrying and includes operations by means of which minerals are recovered from the sea or a natural water supply; "to mine" has a corresponding meaning:

The Mines and Works Inspection Act should be exempt from this legislation and the control of safety and welfare of employees in that area of endeavour should stay where it lies at the moment, with the inspectors of the Mines Department. The Mines and Works Inspection Act has a broader definition of "mine", as follows:

"mine" means any place in, on, or under which any mining operation has been or is being carried on, and includes works:

The definition of "works" is as follows:

"works" means any battery, crushing plant, ore concentrating works, cyanide or chlorination works, leaching plant, smelting or metal refining works, or other works wherein operations are carried on for the treatment of the products of any mining operation.

In other words, the Mines and Works Inspection Act covers also the processing plants associated with the mines, as defined in the Mines Act. If there were doubts about the efficiency of the inspectors in the Mines Department, I could understand the approach of the Minister and the Government in trying to include in this legislation all the workmen now covered under the Mines Act, the Mines and Works Inspection Act, the Petroleum Act, and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act.

However, let us compare the accident rate in the mining industry, where, until now, the Mines Department inspectors have carried out their duties, with that of other operations. According to the Select Committee's report, during 1970-71, the quarrying and mining industry, with 3,200 employees, had 97 accidents involving a week or more of lost time (a rate of 33 a thousand). In the manufacture of cement, bricks, and so on, 4,700 employees were employed, with 187 accidents (a rate of 40 a thousand). In the founding and engineering section of industry, 49,600 employees were engaged, and there were 1,590 accidents, representing 32 for every 1,000 employees. That is practically identical to the rate in the mining industry. In the food, drink and tobacco industry there were 17,700 employees and 847 accidents, representing about 47 for each 1,000 employees, which was a much worse rate than in the mining industry.

However, the Minister, by this legislation, wants to take the responsibility for the safety and welfare of employees in the mining industry from the Mines Department inspectors and place it with the inspectors of the Labour and Industry Department, but even the food, drink and tobacco manufacturing industry has a much higher rate of accidents than the mining industry. In the sawmilling and wood products industry, 5,500 employees were engaged and 260 accidents occurred, representing about 46 for every 1,000 employees. The figures I have given are for the 1970-71 year. The record of the mine and quarry operators, whose works are inspected by officers of the Mines Department, has been quite good. It is better than that in most other areas of manufacture that the Minister of Labour and Industry controls.

The member for Torrens has said that in the Labour and Industry Department there is only one graduate. I believe that every inspector in the Mines Department who inspects mines and the operation of the Mines and Works Inspection Act, the Mining Act, the Petroleum Act and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act is a graduate. I shall be surprised if the Minister can mention one that is not. Why reduce the standard of the inspector who is protecting the workers by taking away control from the Mines Department?

Let us look at another aspect. How does the mine operator, the proprietor, fare? Is he answerable to two lots of inspectors? Do the inspectors have different interpretations? The Minister cannot say that the legislation clearly states that the Labour and Industry Department inspectors will inspect only the plants and processing of the material that is mined, because that is not stated in the Bill. One cannot even be sure that it is intended; but, even if it is intended, I would not accept it, because we would get a poorer standard of inspection from officers of the Minister's department than we would from the Mines Department. The past record of the Mines Department inspectors is such that it would be unwise to alter the situation. What was the Minister's intention in relation to the Petroleum Act and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act? Did he intend inspectors from the Labour and Industry Department to inspect plants operating under those Acts or had it not even entered his head that so far the Mines Department inspectors had looked after

this field satisfactorily? I know that, if one moves amendments later, the attitude of the Government usually is that it will not accept even sane amendments, yet it can be proved that the record of the Mines Department is satisfactory.

If the Government was concerned for the welfare of workers, any discussions it had with the proprietors or the Mines Department officers would show that the conferences held biannually by the chief inspectors of the Mines Department in each State of Australia would show that a uniform standard was maintained throughout Australia. Will this now put us out of balance with the other States? The Mines Department officers representing the various States meet regularly and upgrade standards when necessary and desirable. If the Government wishes to recommend that the standards be upgraded, it knows it will happen, under the present administration.

The member for Glenelg referred to the definition of "construction work", part of which is "work in or in connection with excavating, shaft sinking or tunnelling". Surely tunnelling is a specialized type of mining. Surely the people to inspect that type of work should be Mines Department inspectors. Why have Labour and Industry Department inspectors? This applies in particular to shafting where, of all places, Mines Department inspectors are needed. Excavation could be put in the same category. I cannot understand why that definition is included in the Bill when we know that the inspectors in other fields have carried out their duties satisfactorily.

I strongly object to clause 5 because it does not exempt the other three Acts to which I have referred, apart from the Mining Act. Also, the definition of "construction work" in paragraph (*c*) of clause 7 (1) should not be included in the Bill. I shall endeavour later to seek the Government's co-operation in having those two provisions altered—one of them amended and one struck out. Generally, the Bill is a move in the right direction in offering safety protection for the welfare of the workers. I see nothing against that. It is important that that protection be offered. However, to downgrade the protection offered by this Bill, as is done by the two provisions to which I have referred, is not consistent with the stated intention of the Government.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Briefly, I support the Bill. I record the interest I found in being a member of the Select Committee that inquired into this matter and brought down a report on which this Bill was founded. All that needs to have been said generally has already been said by previous speakers. Therefore, I shall confine my remarks to the worries expressed by the member for Fisher. One would be pardoned for thinking that he had an extensive brief for the Mines Department. One almost wept listening to him, thinking that in some way the powers and functions of the Mines Department were to be interfered with. The record on that should be set straight. There are some people in the Mines Department, the Public Health Department and other Government departments who, although being expert in their own fields, have a primitive concept of industry safety. The plain fact of the matter is that it does not matter whether one is in the Mines Department, the Public Health Department, the Labour and Industry Department or any other department: one's object is to get safety in industry.

Mr. Evans: They achieve that.

Mr.McRAE: Yes; I will come to that in a minute. Therefore, we should all be working to that end, without thinking about our individual positions or empires. However, primitive notions about industrial safety are still held. The committee unanimously recommended that the Mines and Works Inspection Act be repealed, but that has not happened. So, if this Bill is passed in this House, it will stand side by side with the Mines and Works Inspection Act. That is undesirable, because, as the member for Fisher has said, the definition of "work" in the Mines and Works Inspection Act is so wide that it covers not only the works that are immediately ancillary to a mine but also large industrial treatment plants like those of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited. It is inappropriate that the Mines and Works Inspection Act should cover certain areas of the B.H.P. plant at Whyalla or the B.H.A.S. establishment at Port Pirie, because there is a ridiculous confusion as a result of the primitive notion to which I have referred.

There are large maps on the wall (and we saw them) on which blue lines indicate the field of activities of the inspectors of the Labour and Industry Department and the red lines indicate the field of activities of Mines Department inspectors. These people, excellent in their own way, are duplicating each others work, and that is an unsatisfactory situation. To alleviate the fears raised by the member for Fisher we have allowed a certain time for the

primitive concepts to be eradicated and to enable these people to become more sophisticated and, frankly, less childish. It is intended that there will be a continued dual jurisdiction. The Construction Safety Act is repealed, the Mining Act is not affected, and the Mines and Works Inspection Act remains operating, so there is a dual coverage. I hope it will not continue forever, because I think it is absurd and somewhat primitive and childish. However, to put the honourable member's mind at rest, I point out that I understand that administrative arrangements have been made by which it is hoped that the pettifogging fights between Government departments can be resolved in the next couple of years.

Mr. Evans: What about tunnelling?

Mr. McRAE: That refers to construction work on large city buildings where shafting is required in relation to digging under adjacent walls and tunnelling for the same purposes. It does not refer to mining.

Mr. Evans: If a tunnel is put through the Hills, which Act does it come under?

Mr. McRAE: The Mining Act, without a doubt. The minor bickering among petty officials in Government departments, which is unfortunate, is being prevented. If we leave the situation without stirring the possum, these people may become more sophisticated as time goes on. I hope they do. Because of the late hour, I shall restrict my remarks. This is an excellent Bill and a great step forward, and this will be realized in future. It is a pity that it may me marred by civil service pettifogging bickering. I assure the member for Fisher that he has nothing to fear, and that if his brief is to look after inspectors of the Mines Department, their powers are not being interfered with.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I thoroughly agree with the member for Playford that it is a great shame, because of the hour, that we are debating this significant issue in less depth and giving it less consideration than it deserves. It says much for the Ministers who have been on the front bench for the last hour or so that they have given this Bill and other matters their attention, more or less; rather less than more, I judge. One person particularly has been conspicuous by his absence: I refer to the Minister of Works, at whose whim we are now sitting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot pursue that line at this hour of the morning.

Dr. TONKIN: That is the point I am making: at this hour of the morning, as you, Mr. Speaker, said. Without transgressing Standing Orders I intend to say how much I regret that the Minister seems to be in a fit of pique because the Opposition had the temerity to speak at length in an earlier debate. This is total arrogance. Having said that, I give due credit to those Ministers who have been in the House during this debate. I support this significant Bill, and it is a shame that it is being debated at this hour. It is a necessary measure, but I believe it scratches the surface only, and I sincerely hope that in future a more detailed examination of the various factors relating to industrial health, welfare and safety will be made. That is not in any way detracting from the work done by the Select Committee, and I congratulate the members of that committee on the report.

It does little credit to the efforts of those members who formed the Select Committee to find the matter now being discussed in these circumstances. Because of the hour, I refer to one item only, that is, the matter of medical and nursing attention. "Work injury" is defined in clause 5, and clause 29 provides that all reasonable precautions should be taken to ensure the health and safety of workers. Clause 31 provides that the constructor shall, at the request of workers, permit them to elect one of their number to be a workers' safety representative for the purposes of this Act. I thoroughly agree with these provisions, because they are necessary. I am reminded that only a few years ago this State and this country had one of the worst records of industrial eye injury of any country in the world, largely because there was so little communication between safety experts, workers, and management that workers did not realize the dangers they could encounter.

I remember a case that has been quoted many times of a patient of mine who lost an eye because of an industrial eye injury. His successor was given the necessary protection of safety goggles, but within five weeks, because he was subjected to ridicule from his fellow workmen, he stopped wearing his safety goggles. He began first to push them on to his forehead, and then forgot to wear them. He, too, lost an eye. It did not take much persuasion to convince the next person on the job that he should be wearing protective goggles. There is a great need for participation by the workers in the safety committee. There must be the widest possible discussion

and co-operation; this will be in the community's interest, because people who suffer eye injuries ultimately become a charge on the State. I am disturbed by the absence of any reference to occupational health nursing.

Mr. Coumbe: It was mentioned in the evidence to the Select Committee.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, but I am disappointed that there is no specific mention of such nursing in the Bill. The role of the occupational health nurse is extremely valuable. The submission that was made to the Select Committee was extremely full, and I hope members will look at it. It is desirable that a nurse engaged in industry should have had instruction in industrial law, social law and administration, industrial psychology, industrial safety, hygiene, record keeping, health education, and the administration and organization of an industrial health unit. All those aspects of instruction should be provided, in addition to the nurse's general nursing training. This education is provided by the Australian College of Nursing in Melbourne, and it can also be provided on a part-time basis when a nurse is already engaged in occupational nursing.

The role of the first-aid worker in industry is basically to render immediate first-aid at the site of the incident or to help the occupational health nurse on a full-time or part-time basis. One must expect the first-aid worker to have done an approved first-aid course—probably that conducted by the St. John Ambulance Brigade. Obviously, where there are special risks (for example, in connection with gas or chemical contamination) the first-aid worker should be given further instruction so that appropriate measures can be taken to meet the dangers involved.

Ideally, the occupational health service in large concerns should be under the direction of a company physician who may be employed on a full-time or part-time basis. A few industries employ full-time physicians. When an occupational health nurse is employed, she is directly responsible to the physician and, where a full-time physician is not employed, she should be responsible to a part-time physician or a departmental doctor. The nurse will be responsible for the daily administration of the occupational health unit, and she will carry a fairly heavy load of responsibility when a doctor is not present. Provided she has been adequately trained, she can advise the management and the workers on health, welfare and safety, and she should therefore be granted appropriate managerial status and privileges. Any decisions she makes on a professional matter should be based on factual information, and her professional independence must be given due recognition.

She must be responsible for the notification of sickness and absence, the notification of health risks in work places, the notification of the use of hazardous materials, the notification of a change in the location of such materials, the transportation of sick and injured people to the health unit and to home or hospital, and the ordering of medical supplies. She must, in fact, be willing to participate in refresher courses and management-worker conferences, and she must do everything she can to maintain a high standard of industrial safety. She should, of course, have a say in everything concerned with health, welfare and safety at work. The nurse should have access to all work places, and she should observe professional secrecy in connection with the technical information and medical information that she may receive.

I shall not go further in my advocacy of the employment of nurses in industry, except to say that I believe that the worker deserves the services of a trained industrial nurse, wherever that is possible. It is one thing to suggest that a first-aid officer is adequate. I believe that first-aid officers perform a useful service, but there are some things they cannot do. Believing that an occupational health nurse can fill the gap, I am disappointed that there is no specific mention of such a person in the Bill. I am pleased that evidence was given to the Select Committee on behalf of such nurses, and I look forward to the day when occupational health nurses are employed far more widely. I regret that we are debating such an important issue at this hour, as a result of an attitude of the Minister opposite.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We want business through this House, and we will get it through.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has made my point for me. I am pleased that he has come in and done that.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Earlier, you wasted 44 minutes of the time of this House.

Dr. TONKIN: I have not sat down yet, and I do not intend to do so. I do the best I can.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must not interject, because it is out of order. If I hear another interjection from the front bench, I shall name someone.

Dr. TONKIN: I thank you, Sir, for your courtesy, which is more than I received from members opposite. If the Minister thinks that perhaps I have wasted the time of the House, I am sorry. I do not think I have done so.

I believe I have discharged my duty as a member conscientiously. Because I may have debated matters that do not suit the Minister's frame of mind or attitude at present, I do not think he has any right to say what he has said by way of interjection. I have before me about 14 foolscap pages of closely typed material about occupational health nurses. I am almost inclined to read it, but I am afraid that petty-minded members opposite would probably take this out on members of the nursing profession, as we had an indication of this type of thing earlier today. In supporting the Bill, I hope that provision for occupational health nurses will be considered in future.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

## RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Section 253b of the Bankruptcy Act of the Commonwealth provides for the "declaration" of any State law that provides for the giving of financial assistance to certain farmers for the purpose of discharging all or any of their debts. The Commonwealth Act further provides that, if bankruptcy proceedings are taken against a farmer who is receiving protection from procedings for debts under such a "declared State Law", those bankruptcy proceedings may be "stayed".

The Government has been advised by the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth that, in its present form, the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972, cannot be declared under the Bankruptcy Act. The grounds on which this advice is based is that the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act does not provide expressly for the giving of financial assistance for the purposes of discharging all or some of the debts of farmers. In fact, financial assistance, of the kind referred to, may be given pursuant to the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, and the effect of this short Bill is to make it explicit that this purpose is included amongst its purposes.

It is the understanding of the Government that, if the principal Act is amended in the manner proposed, it will be possible to "declare" it under the Bankruptcy Act and the farmers of this State will be afforded the additional protections adverted to above. Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends the long title to the principal Act to make the relevant purpose quite explicit.

Clause 4 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act by, in effect, providing that the Act will relate to a specific agreement that is the agreement relating to rural reconstruction entered into on June 4, 1971, between this State and the Commonwealth. Clause 5 is consequential on clause 4 and is intended to recognize that there is now in existence a specific agreement.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This Bill provides for the recognition of diplomas in physiotherapy granted by the South Australian Institute of Technology. The standard of these diplomas is considered to be equal to that of the diploma of physiotherapy of the University of Adelaide which has in the past been the academic qualification required for registration as a physiotherapist. The first diplomas of the institute will be granted at the end of the current academic year. Within a very short period of time the institute diplomas will become the only diplomas issued, as the University of Adelaide proposes to discontinue courses in physiotherapy.

The provisions for temporary registration with the Physiotherapists Board are removed by the Bill. This form of registration, which covers the period between becoming eligible for the grant of a diploma and the conferring of the diploma, has been a source of unnecessary cost and inconvenience to all parties concerned. A person now becomes eligible for registration as a fully qualified physiotherapist as soon as the diploma course is completed. The restriction upon the maximum fee that may be prescribed for registration has also been removed. The fee will in future be fixed by regulation without statutory restriction. This avoids the necessity of amending the Act where an increase in fees is needed to defray the expenses of the board.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends section 39 of the principal Act by providing that a person holding or entitled to hold a diploma in physiotherapy, bestowed by either the South Australian Institute of Technology or the University of Adelaide, is eligible for registration by the board. Clause 4 repeals section 39b of the principal Act. This section provided for temporary registration of physiotherapists. Clause 5 amends section 42 of the principal Act by removing the restriction on the maximum fee payable to the board on registration.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 3 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 15, at 2 p.m.