

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 19, 1973

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant).

The Clerk (Mr. A. F. R. Dodd) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

At 11.5 a.m., in compliance with summons, the House proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a Commission was read appointing the Hon. John Jefferson Bray (Chief Justice) to be a Commissioner for the opening of Parliament.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The House being again in its own Chamber, at 11.10 a.m. His Honour Mr. Justice Bray attended and produced a Commission from His Excellency the Governor appointing him to be a Commissioner to administer to members the Oath of Allegiance or receive an Affirmation in lieu thereof. The Commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of 47 members.

The Oath of Allegiance required by law was administered to and subscribed by all members except Mr. Duncan, who made an Affirmation.

The Commissioner retired.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I remind the House that it is now necessary to proceed to elect a Speaker. I move:

That Mr. J. R. Ryan do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Dr. EASTJCK (Leader of the Opposition) seconded the motion.

Mr. RYAN (Price): In compliance with Standing Orders and in accordance with the traditions of Parliament, I humbly submit myself to the will of the House.

There being no other nomination, Mr. Ryan was declared elected.

Mr. Ryan was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of the motion.

The SPEAKER (The Hon. J. R. Ryan): Standing here on the upper step, which is the traditional approach to the Chair, I thank the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and acknowledge the confidence that has been placed in me. I express my gratitude to members for the honour conferred in the call to this high office. Confidence in the fairness of the Speaker is an indispensable condition of the successful working of Parliamentary procedure and, therefore, I shall at all times endeavour to give the utmost protection to members' rights, collectively and individually. The majority gets the decision, and the minority must be given its rights. The assistance and wholehearted support of all members on both sides are required to maintain the prestige and dignity of the Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is with a great sense of pride and satisfaction that I speak on behalf, I am sure, of all members of the House in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker. You have been a member for many years; you have gained the friendship and respect of every member of the House; and you have served as Chairman of Committees and as Deputy Speaker, and in those positions you have had, I believe, the support and respect of everyone for the way you have conducted the business

of the House and for upholding Standing Orders and the rights of members.

I am certain that, as Speaker of this House, you will continue to serve the members as you have previously served them as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker, and that you will show members and the people of this State the kind of lead that a Speaker should show in maintaining fairness and effective service and work within the Chamber. On behalf of all members I congratulate you.

Dr. EASTICK: I support the Premier's remarks and, on behalf of my colleagues, I welcome you, Mr. Speaker, to this the most important position in the House. We on this side look forward to participating in the working of the House under your guidance, appreciating the fact that you will, as you have indicated, give all members the chance to be heard and that you will bring to your office the highest traditions of that office. In a lighter vein, I suspect that the reticence you showed a few moments ago to accept my hand to assist you to the Chair was flavoured by a most recent experience when the bulldog grip descended on a certain black and white bird.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): Mr. Speaker, I tender my congratulations to you on your election to this office, and I know that you will, with great wit and diligence, perform the duties of Speaker as you have performed your other duties in the House. I certainly believe that your work will be recognized because of those two qualities that you will bring to it. I offer my congratulations, too, in the knowledge that you have said in your introductory speech that you will give due weight to members, collectively and individually. I speak in this House as a member of a new Party which must speak for itself and which is not spoken for by anyone else. In that capacity, therefore, I offer you full co-operation from this part of the House in observing Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I sincerely thank the honourable Premier, the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Goyder, as well as all other members of the House, for electing me to the highest office that the Parliament can offer to one of its members. There have been many Speakers in the past, all of whom have set a precedent which I sincerely hope I shall be able to live up to, and I reiterate that during the life of this Forty-first Parliament I will do my utmost to treat all members equally.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to have the Speaker presented to him at 12.20 p.m. today.

[Sitting suspended from 11.37 a.m. to 12.10 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: It is now my intention to proceed to Government House to present myself as Speaker to His Excellency the Governor, and I invite members to accompany me.

At 12.11 p.m., attended by a deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

On the House reassembling at 12.25 p.m.:

The SPEAKER: Accompanied by a deputation of members, I proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting myself to His Excellency the Governor and informed His Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the House by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day proceeded to the election of Speaker and had done me the honour of election to that high office. In compliance with the other provisions of the same section, I presented myself to His Excellency as the Speaker and, in the name and on behalf of the House, laid claim to members' undoubted rights and

privileges, and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all their proceedings; whereupon His Excellency was pleased to reply as follows:

I congratulate the members of the House of Assembly on their choice of a Speaker. I readily assure you, Mr. Speaker, of my confirmation of all the constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly, the proceedings of which will always receive my most favourable consideration.

[Sitting suspended from 12.28 to 2.15 p.m.]

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER

A summons was received from His Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of the House in the Legislative Council Chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The House having returned to its own Chamber, the Speaker resumed the Chair at 2.36 p.m. and read prayers.

COMMISSION OF OATHS

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from the Governor a commission under the hand of His Excellency and the public seal of the State empowering me to administer the Oath of Allegiance or receive the Affirmation necessary to be taken by members of the House of Assembly.

DEATH OF HON. R. E. HURST

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

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the recent untimely death of the Hon. Reginald Edwin Hurst, former member for Semaphore and Speaker of this House, and place on record its appreciation of his meritorious public service; and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased gentleman, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Many of us here knew Mr. Hurst over a long period from before the time he entered the House. All those of us who knew him regarded him as a friend. His service to the public of South Australia was determined and continued. He was a man of determined views, of dedication, and of very real piety. He gave devoted service to the people of his district, amongst whom he was very much beloved. He gave his service to this House, always endeavouring to carry out his view of what was the best in the service of the State. It was most untimely, unfortunate, and sad that his loss should have occurred in the way and at the time it did. He was taken very early in the life of public service that he could have given to the people of the State. I am sure that every one of us expresses his very great regret at his passing and at the personal loss to us, and expresses our real sympathy and concern for members of his family, who have suffered so great and grievous a loss.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion and what the Premier has said. As he says, it is unfortunate for this House that we have lost the services of the late Speaker in the circumstances in which we have lost them. Although we differed in political belief, members on this side were pleased to be called his friends. It is regrettable that he was spared for less than 10 years of service to the House. I believe that the greatest tribute that can be paid to any man (a tribute that cannot be purchased) is of the type that was afforded to the late Speaker on the occasion of his funeral service. This tribute came not only from the people of his church, with which he was closely associated, but also from the people of the district, who turned out in their hundreds to line the roadway along the route that the

vehicles took to the cemetery. This clearly indicated that here was a man who had identified with his district, who was respected for the service he had given, and who would be missed in the work he had undertaken on behalf of those people. We, too, Mr. Speaker, mourn the loss of your predecessor, and we wholeheartedly support the motion.

The SPEAKER: I should also like to express my deep regret at the passing of our former colleague, the late Reg Hurst. I endorse the remarks of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. As the late Reg Hurst and I represented neighbouring districts, we got to know one another extremely well, and in that capacity I knew the work he did for his district and for the people he represented. As Deputy Speaker for three years, I learned of the valuable work he performed as Speaker of the House. I can only repeat what other honourable members have said, namely, that this State is at a loss without the services of the late Reg Hurst, and we mourn his passing.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.45 to 2.55 p.m.]

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

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

That Mr. A. R. Burdon be Chairman of Committees of the whole House during the present Parliament.

Motion carried.

APPRECIATION OF SERVICES OF MR. G. D. COMBE

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

That Mr. Speaker be requested to convey to Mr. Gordon Desmond Combe, M.C., former Clerk of this House, an expression of members' grateful acknowledgment of the distinguished service he rendered to the House over the 20 years in which he held office as Clerk and that the House place on record its appreciation of the advice and assistance he was at all times willing to render to all members in the discharge of their duties.

We in the House all need to rely very heavily on the Clerk and his staff. It would be impossible for the conduct of the House to proceed without our having their expert advice and assistance constantly, not only to the Speaker but to all members. During my time here (I think the member for Ross Smith and I are the longest serving members of this House)—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The father of the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fathers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We don't know what that makes the House!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During that time Mr. Combe was the Clerk of the House, and I know of no Parliament in Australia or elsewhere that has been as fortunate as ours in having the services of so distinguished and effective a Clerk. In the course of his duties he not only advised us but also produced a history, *Responsible Government in South Australia*, which has been of great service to members and to the public. Through the publications for which he was responsible he was able to assist members of the public so they could appreciate the way in which this House operated. It was with universal acclaim that his appointment to his present post was greeted. He was appointed the Parliamentary Commissioner who would act independently and with a knowledge of the workings of Parliament and the Public Service of this State to ensure that each citizen was able

to obtain effective justice from the Administration of the State, and no better appointment could have been made.

Although I am sure that we are all grateful to Mr. Combe for accepting that post, we have suffered a loss in this House in that he has gone to the post of Ombudsman. However, his association with the House will be continuing, because of his special position and relationship to the House in the position he has taken. I have much pleasure in moving the motion to place on record our appreciation of his great services to this House and the public of this State.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I have pleasure in supporting this motion regarding the services of Mr. Gordon Combe to this House. I have noted that he has been variously described as a family man, a Military Cross winner, a sportsman, and a person who was interested in and advanced in the Army and who, before his appointment as Ombudsman, was the friend and guide of people coming into this House. One term that I have not heard used, but which I will use, is the term gentleman. On behalf of members on this side, I congratulate him on his elevation to a position that has been made possible by the persistence of the member for Fisher. I recognize that it is a position the creation of which caused concern to several people for some time, but it was created as a result of Parliament's decision. The person appointed has been acclaimed by all as being worthy of the position, and I know that he will be able to bring to this office value and justice to the people of South Australia. I do not hesitate to support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): As the longest serving member of the Opposition side (I hesitate to say that I am the father of the Opposition), I wholeheartedly support the motion. Mr. Combe had been the Clerk of this House during the whole of my membership of it, and he guided our proceedings during all that time except for one short dramatic session in 1970, when the present Clerk (Mr. Dodd) capably acted in his place whilst he was overseas. Certainly, our loss is the gain of the community, and if Mr. Combe is as helpful to members of the public as he was to members of this House, we, as a community, will be very well served indeed. I am confident he will be all that we expect him to be as the first South Australian Ombudsman and, on behalf of the member for Goyder, the other member of my Party, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which I have obtained a copy, which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be printed.

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:

Blackwood High School (Additions),
 Braeview Primary School,
 Elizabeth Downs East Primary School,
 Gepps Cross Senior Special School,
 Ingle Farm High School,
 Kilkenny Primary School (Replacement),
 Magill Demonstration School (Additions),
 Mitchell Park Co-educational High School (Additions),
 Motor Vehicles Department Building,

Murray Bridge Primary School (Replacement),
 Naracoorte High School (Additional Accommodation),
 Pimpala Primary School,
 Port Augusta High School (Augusta Park),
 Port Augusta Technical College (Stage II),
 Port Pirie High School (Additional Accommodation),
 Roofing of Storage Tank at Highbury,
 Rostrevor High School,
 Taperoo High School (Additions),
 West Lakes Primary School.
 Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer give an unqualified assurance that, from the funds raised in this State and from money expected from the Commonwealth Government, this Government will be financially able to proceed without delay with major projects previously legislated for by this House or promised by the Government as part of its normal works programme? Last year the Opposition supported the Government in formulating initial plans to establish the new town of Monarto. Obviously, even in its early stages, a vast sum will be needed to establish this project as a viable development area. At the top of Spencer Gulf, a major works programme will be required from the Government as part of the industrial complex which will be developed by private enterprise at Redcliffs and which the Treasurer has taken great pride in promoting, almost as a Government programme.

These are but two projects that will require the Government to expend vast sums in providing services. This is the basis of a fear shared by my colleagues and me that, because flamboyant promises and pronouncements must be backed up with dollars and cents, the Government may have serious difficulties because of the state of the Treasury. Therefore, we wish to know whether the Government has the ready cash for projects such as those at Monarto and Redcliffs or whether these and other major projects will be delayed or held over because the Treasury cannot cope, under its present revenue resources.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should have thought that, given the information which has already come to the Leader and which completely disposes of the flamboyant advertisements he inserted in the newspapers at the last election, he would be loath to raise this question now.

Dr. Eastick: Is that why we haven't any accounts for the month?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader will get the accounts this evening, and they will show that the prospective deficit on revenue for this year will be less than \$5,500,000.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He said \$15,000,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He doesn't know what he's talking about.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is more, the Leader knows perfectly well that there is more than enough money in the Loan Account to cover that sum.

Mr. Coumbe: Ha, ha!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why the honourable member is laughing, because this matter was adverted to specifically when the Budget and Revenue Estimates were introduced last year. In fact, members opposite condemned me for keeping Loan money back to cover the deficit. The utter inconsistency that has been displayed by the Opposition on the subject of finance in

South Australia amazes anyone who does not know the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The actual fact (and these figures have already been made available to the Leader) is that this year there will be a Budget surplus, in effect.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Aren't you disappointed!

Mr. Millhouse: What does "in effect" mean?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will tell the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member is quiet for a few moments, I will do so. In Victoria and some other States the Loan and Revenue Budgets are taken together. The Victorian Liberal Treasurer has pointed out that this is a proper way to deal with the finances of the State, in that it then reveals the true cash position.

Mr. Venning: What about South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will come back to South Australia at the request of the member for Rocky River. If he read and remembered statements by Liberal Treasurers behind whom he served at one stage (Sir Glen Pearson was one of them), he would recall that they said that, in fact, the two sets of Estimates, Loan and Revenue, must be considered together to get the effect. If we take both the Loan and Revenue Budgets together, the effect is that we have a cash surplus this year.

Dr. Tonkin: Why have we?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because we have had some better trading results than we expected. The only reason why we budgeted in the way in which we did originally was that it was at the request of the then Liberal Commonwealth Treasurer, who had asked us not to put in the Budget the amount of prospective wage increases. We have met those prospective wage increases without help from the Commonwealth Government and we still have got a cash surplus.

Dr. Eastick: What about all your projects?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know that the Leader wants to get on to the cash situation. I will come to the projects. The Leader has mentioned two projects, Monarto and Redcliffs, asking me for details of our future finances. A submission has been made to the Cities Commission for Commonwealth Government support for the initial expenditure at Monarto of \$14,600,000, and I assure the Leader that there has been a recommendation to the Commonwealth Government that it should support that amount.

Dr. Eastick: When?

Mr. Venning: How?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When we commence our acquisitions in the area, which will be very soon, we expect to have assistance from the Commonwealth Government on those acquisitions and, in fact, I have assurances from the Minister that we will get support from the Commonwealth Government on those.

Dr. Eastick: He has not had assurances from the Commonwealth Treasurer, though, has he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, he has. I, too, have assurances from the Commonwealth Treasurer, and I point out that those assurances, during the past six months, have provided money very effectively for South Australia. We also expect assistance from the Commonwealth Government in relation to the Redcliffs project, and that Government has been kept fully informed of the projected developments there. We expect to be able, from our own resources, from the assistance that the Commonwealth Government

provides, and from the enormous investment that will be made by a consortia with which an indenture will be signed and put before this House, to meet the requirements for Redcliffs without any cut-back in the already committed programmes of development in the State, and on that matter I give the Leader the assurance that he has sought.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Treasurer say what is the present position of the Loan Account in this State? He has mentioned mainly the Revenue Account. Did he say that he had not transferred any moneys from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account, and can he give us an assurance on this matter? Further, can he say whether there has been any delay in letting tenders for the capital works that were outlined in the Loan Estimates programme put before this House last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not transferred from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account. The honourable member would realize that, in funding a deficit in that way, we would be running into the penal provisions under the Financial Agreement. We have not done that. In fact, an amount of about \$10,000,000 was held in the Loan Account, as the honourable member would remember. Some of that money has been spent, because we have run over the Loan Estimates, particularly in regard to school buildings.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: On Loan works.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It was on Loan works, on avenues of expenditure authorized by the lines, but we have exceeded the provision in the Loan Account. From memory, I think the school-building programme will have reached about \$30,500,000, which, as the honourable member will remember, is much more than the amount originally provided on the Estimates. However, some of that \$10,000,000 still remains in the Loan Account. Actually, on Loan Account trading we did a little better than had been forecast in the Estimates.

MOTOR MECHANICS

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry consider introducing legislation regarding the registration of motor mechanics? Many of my constituents have complained to me that vehicles that they have entrusted to the care of supposed mechanics at some service stations have not been treated in a skillful way, and this has caused additional expense. To be a qualified mechanic, a person must serve a term of apprenticeship, and such people as these who are working in garages are highly qualified mechanics. However, many people who are operating as mechanics in same service stations in the metropolitan area are not skilled mechanics and they have damaged the mechanical portions of vehicles rather than repaired them. I ask the Minister whether he will seriously consider introducing legislation such as that which deals with the registration of plumbers and electricians.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will seriously consider the honourable member's request. I would appreciate and be grateful for any further information that the honourable member may have.

SINK HOLE COMMITTEE

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Works say when he expects to have a report from the sink hole committee? On May 28, 1973, four scuba divers died in a tragedy in what is known as a sink hole in the district of Millicent, which is represented by the Minister. This sink hole is known throughout Australia. Four young lives were lost, causing much apprehension in the community. I should like the Minister, if he can, to say when he expects to

receive a report from the committee that he established. I must say that he established the committee post haste, on the morning after the tragedy.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member knows, I established this committee on May 28 and I asked the Deputy Commissioner of Police, the Chairman of the committee, which is representative of several bodies interested in scuba diving and similar activities throughout this State, to report to me within two months of the time when the committee was appointed. Therefore, I expect (and I have no reason to believe that the report will be late) to receive it by the end of July this year. I know that much activity has taken place since this committee was formed, and that several meetings have been held and many submissions have been made by bodies interested in this sport throughout this State and, I believe, from other States as well. I believe that in the week commencing July 9 a visit will be made by the committee to Mount Gambier, where members of the committee will not only inspect the sink hole in which the four unfortunate people lost their lives but will also inspect other sink holes in the area.

The Deputy Police Commissioner already has a comprehensive report in his possession which shows every known sink hole in this area and which was prepared as a result of an earlier tragedy. That information will greatly assist the committee in its investigations. I expect a report from the Deputy Commissioner by the end of July. However, if the committee recommends that further investigation into the total question is needed, I will not hesitate to extend the time over which the committee can receive representations and further investigate the serious problem regarding this sport, concerning sink holes throughout South Australia. I emphasize that the terms of reference of the committee do not restrict its investigations to the South-East alone, but apply to sink holes anywhere in South Australia.

MEDICAL FEES

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to take legislative or administrative action against the medical profession to control fees charged by medical practitioners? The Premier recently announced that the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch would investigate fees charged by medical practitioners at a time when the profession and the public are becoming alarmed at the intimidatory tactics of the Commonwealth Labor Government against doctors.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: Two points causing concern are the recommended registration of specialists and a recommendation that it be unlawful for a person to insure against medical costs additional to those covered by the intended national health scheme. As many people believe that the Premier is assisting to implement nationalized health services, I put the question to him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The medical profession, or at least the Australian Medical Association, announced that there would be an increase in the recommended fees to be charged in South Australia by the profession which exceeded the increase to be applied in other parts of Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I suppose the honourable member supports those increases.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Apparently he does. On the face of it, given changes in costs in South Australia, this appeared to have little justification, and a preliminary report to me by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, who, following previous increases in fees

charged by the A.M.A., had been asked to keep a constant watch on medical fees, recommended that there was a clear case for further investigation in detail. I accepted that recommendation. I directed that an investigation in detail of the intended increase in fees be undertaken by the Commissioner. I spoke to him yesterday; he said that the investigation was proceeding and he believed that the Australian Medical Association would co-operate, although quite frankly it is not co-operating very quickly. However, the association is claiming time to assemble material to present to the Commissioner. That investigation will proceed. If it is found that the intended increase in fees is not justified, given the returns' to the profession and changes in the cost structure, the medical profession will be informed that the Government does not accept an increase in fees of this kind and requests it to comply with whatever fee is recommended as the proper fee by the Commissioner.

If that was not complied with, then under the Prices Act the Government would gazette medical services as declared services and fix a maximum fee, the exceeding of which would be an offence, as the honourable member knows. That is the position. I believe it is a proper one. I will say to the honourable member that, so far from this being a nationalization of medicine, in fact it is a proper protection of the public and, what is more, I have had very many medical practitioners approach me and say they believe the Government has taken entirely the proper course in this matter.

INDUSTRIAL HEARINGS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry obtain for me or, better still, give me immediate assurances that the State Industrial Commission, and, for that matter, the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, will immediately hold industrial hearings in the older part of the courthouse at Whyalla when the renovations have been completed? Renovations are well in hand and I am anxious that as soon as possible industrial hearings dealing with industrial problems in Whyalla be held on neutral ground—that is, an industrial court.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to learn of the progress being made in renovating the old courthouse at Whyalla. I will have discussions with the Minister of Works and find out exactly how long it will be before the renovation is completed, but I am pleased to tell the honourable member that we intend to utilize those rooms when they are completed.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture say for what future period primary producers in South Australia may expect to enjoy the super-phosphate subsidy of \$12 a ton? In the light of the current pressures on that important and, I may say, unfortunate element of the community, there is a need not only to maintain but also to consider increasing that subsidy.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it the honourable member realizes that this is a Commonwealth matter and he would have been competent to contact his Commonwealth member, who would have directed his question in the Budget session of the Commonwealth Parliament either to the Minister for Primary Industry (Senator Wriedt) or to the Treasurer (Mr. Crean) and who could have obtained this information for the honourable member no doubt as quickly as the Minister of Agriculture will be able to. If there is to be any alteration to this particular matter, I should imagine that it would be contained in the Commonwealth Budget, which the honourable member would know

is due to be brought down in August. Although I agree with him that the primary producing section of our community is important and vital, I do not quite understand what he meant by referring to it as an "unfortunate" section of the community. I take it he meant it literally when he called it "unfortunate" but I am proud to represent many primary producers who do not think they are unfortunate. They are very good people; they are most competent and are pleased to be primary producers. However, I will refer the question to my colleague.

SEMAPHORE BY-ELECTION

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Premier give the House the position as regards the movement in Labor support in the Semaphore electoral district by comparing the voting figures at the last general election and at the recent by-election? This question arises from certain trumpetings made by some Opposition spokesmen in that by-election, which are not borne out by a mature consideration of the figures.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry to dash the hopes of the Leader of the Opposition in that he has not yet made an analysis of the position at Semaphore, but I do have this to tell him. At the general election there were three candidates; 3,729 people voted for the Liberal candidate (Mr. Howarth), 11,472 voted for Mr. Hurst and 576 for Mr. Waye; there were 701 informal votes, and the total votes were 16,478. Mr. Hurst secured 72.7 per cent of the total formal votes. At the by-election, Mr. Howarth secured 3,877 votes, Mr. Olson secured 9,949, and there were 540 informal votes, the total votes being 14,366. Mr. Olson secured 72 per cent of the votes. So there was a decrease in the Australian Labor Party vote of .7 per cent, but I do not think that, in the circumstances of a by-election where there would not be as large a turnout as at a general election, anyone could gain much satisfaction from that. The support for the Government remains as overwhelming in South Australia as it ever did.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture. Does the Government intend to move both the research and the administration sections of the Agriculture Department, which are at present located in the Adelaide metropolitan area, to the proposed city of Monarto? Furthermore, is it correct that the departmental heads have been asked to show reason why such a move of the department should not take place?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We must take into account the fact that the honourable member, as an ex-member of the Agriculture Department, has many valuable contacts.

Members interjecting:

A member: Remember he represents the farmers of Burnside!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can say to the honourable member that, as a member of Cabinet, I know that the matter is under consideration and certainly no finality has yet been reached; but I will refer the matter to my colleague and get a considered reply for the honourable member.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to continue the per capita grants to independent schools that were operating when Labor was elected to Government in this State? This scheme was operating but the Labor Government introduced in addition a needs scheme, and it would be

true to say that some parents of children attending independent schools were alarmed (to put it mildly) about what they read in the press this week concerning the Commonwealth Government's attitude in this matter. Apparently, Mr. Beazley, the Minister's mentor or his counterpart in the Commonwealth Parliament, gave an undertaking that the grants would continue, but the Commonwealth Government has now seen fit to repudiate this statement, as it intends to remove the per capita grant from some schools, and the Prime Minister has stated that there will be active discrimination against some schools. The Cook committee, which reported on the needs of independent schools in South Australia, indicated that schools declared by some Government spokesmen to be wealthy are in a difficult position, and it will be hard for them to raise funds, even though they have considerable capital assets.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The stated policy of this Government has been quite clear on this matter. It was repeated at the last State election, and there has been no change since then. The grant of \$10 for each pupil at primary level and \$20 at secondary level that applied during the period of the Liberal Government would continue, with additional moneys being made available. That is the present policy, but in addition we agreed that the total sum would rise to 20 per cent of the cost of operating Government schools in 1976. In case anyone should have a false impression of the action of the Commonwealth Government in the last week, I point out that the Commonwealth Government, in accepting the recommendations of the Interim Schools Committee of the Australian Schools Commission, is agreeing to a significant increase in the amount of assistance to independent schools that would have been available under the old formula.

More than 90 per cent of independent schools will receive increased support as a consequence of the actions of the Interim Schools Committee and the Commonwealth Government. Concerning category A schools, which, apparently, are to be phased out, I understand that they total only 140 schools throughout the Commonwealth out of about 9,000 Government and non-government schools. Because of the relatively smaller proportion of students attending non-government schools in this State compared to the number attending in other States, I would be surprised if more than eight to ten schools were in category A in this State. I am sure that the honourable member would appreciate that any school in category C or above (and I think that totals another eight categories) will receive more than it would have received under the old arrangements, and I am sure that he, as a loyal supporter of non-government schools (if for no other reason) would be happy with that fact.

COUNTRY RAILWAYS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport report on the progress of negotiations between his department and the Commonwealth Department of Transport to link Adelaide with the standard gauge system, and also on the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line? I would not be disappointed if he also said something about when the Commonwealth Government will take over country railway services in South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations concerning the standard gauge line are progressing, perhaps not as quickly as we would desire, but we have now reached the stage where only what one could describe as minor matters need to be resolved. As soon as these matters are resolved, I expect that the Commonwealth Minister and I will report to the Prime Minister and the Premier respectively, with

the result that an agreement can be signed between the heads of the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government. The position concerning the Tarcoola to Alice Springs line has reached the point where, following negotiations between the Commonwealth Minister and me, I am sure we have resolved the problem which, regrettably, was not capable of being resolved before the recent Commonwealth election.

Mr. Gunn: That would be your fault.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member may say that, but the difference between the member for Eyre and me is that I regard South Australia as of great importance but he is willing to give it away. This Government is not willing to do that. As a result of discussions I have had with the present Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Jones), I believe we have now reached the position where the Tarcoola to Alice Springs line can soon be built.

Mr. Gunn: Give us the date.

Dr. Eastick: Are you sure?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, I am not sure, and the statements by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eyre, who said "Give us the date", are just as ridiculous as they are. These negotiations have been proceeding—

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has reflected on the Leader of the Opposition and me, and I ask for a complete withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: What is the objection raised?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister reflected on our character in his reply, and I ask for a complete withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member repeat the words used that he considers are objectionable?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister implied that we were ridiculous.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry if the honourable member for Eyre is a little sensitive.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister was giving an answer to a question asked by the honourable member for Stuart, and that is the answer that will be given by the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government have now reached such a stage that I believe that they will be finalized in the foreseeable future. I hope, in the not too distant future, to inform members (particularly the member for Stuart, who is vitally concerned with the project) that the negotiations have been successfully concluded.

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Transport say on what ground a report was issued suggesting the closure of sections of the railway system on Eyre Peninsula? Was it the cost of upgrading, the cost of additional rolling stock, or a problem of administration? About two years ago a report was issued stating that the railway system on Eyre Peninsula was the only division in the department that covered its expenses. Bearing this in mind, as well as the fact that considerably increased tonnages of super-phosphate are being carried this year, how can the Minister justify a suggestion that lines should be closed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Let me make plain to the honourable member at the outset that I am not seeking to justify the closure of any line. The only Government that has ever closed lines in South Australia has been the Liberal and Country League Government.

Mr. Gunn: That was quite responsible, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of the report made two years ago to which the honourable member refers. As he has not named the report, he does not give me much opportunity of checking the veracity of his statement.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What does that mean?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Kavel would like me to explain the meaning, I am willing to do so outside the House. The situation is that some time ago the Government commissioned a committee to inquire into the operations of the South Australian Railways. If the member for Flinders had taken the trouble to read the report—

Mr. Gunn: You make one available.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have referred to interjections several times this afternoon, and at this stage I warn the honourable member for Eyre. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I repeat that some time ago the Government commissioned a committee to inquire into the operations of the South Australian Railways. If the member for Flinders or any other honourable member opposite had taken the trouble to read the report, he would have seen that the committee made certain recommendations whether there should be further investigations. That is virtually where the committee's report starts and finishes. At present, the South Australian Railways Advisory Board, which this Government established, is looking at certain matters, and the Railways Commissioner and his staff are looking at various aspects of the report. In due course, recommendations will be made to me and, where necessary, I will take them to Cabinet to be determined.

INFLATION

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Treasurer communicated to the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer his purported concern about the rapidly increasing rate of inflation in Australia? Further, can he say what steps, if any, are being considered to relieve the current alarming and worsening situation? In his unsatisfactory reply to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer implied that most of the State activities he had announced would depend on a grant of further Commonwealth funds. It seems to me that Commonwealth funds will not be worth very much if this appalling rate of galloping inflation continues. The people of this State are seriously concerned at the rate of inflation; they see evidence of it daily and they deserve consideration. If the Treasurer is so concerned about the future of this State, he should be willing to do something to convince his Commonwealth colleagues that they should reduce the rate of inflation, which has been spiralling ever since the present Labor Government took office in Canberra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Apparently the honourable member's attention has for some time been turned elsewhere than to the Commonwealth scene, because it is only a short time since the Premiers were called to Canberra for a special Premiers' Conference on measures to cope with inflation. At that conference the Prime Minister outlined certain initiatives that had already been taken by the Commonwealth Government, and they were given considerable publicity. They were not only budgetary matters: they were matters relating to revaluation, foreign exchange, the proceedings before the Tariff Board, and the initiatives that had been taken in a whole series of areas. The two

reevaluation decisions were particularly significant in the total armoury in relation to inflation. The States were asked to co-operate in various areas, one of which was the prices justification area. The Commonwealth Government, following the Rocla pipes case, has already instituted under its companies power a prices justification body. It has set up a Select Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament and introduced legislation for a prices justification tribunal, the Chairman of which is to be a judge from this State. The 20 major companies in Australia are required to justify any price movements before that tribunal. The States were asked to co-operate in a prices justification system covering many of the remaining areas of the economy. It so happened that at Canberra, while this State was perfectly willing to co-operate in such a measure, the Liberal Premier of New South Wales and the Country Party and Liberal-supported Premier of Queensland were not willing to co-operate; in fact, they have done nothing in this area. I pointed out, as I have pointed out on many occasions at Premiers' Conferences, that all the States need to be in a prices justification system if it is to work effectively and that South Australia's scheme could operate much more effectively if other States controlled their manufacturers' and wholesalers' prices as we control such prices here.

Mr. McAnaney: What about controlling over-award payments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will not get anyone to take action against over-award payments unless the people seeking over-award payments are convinced that other people have to justify what they do.

The SPEAKER: Order! During Question Time members have the opportunity to ask questions. I will not permit interjections that continually seek further information on a question. The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following the Premiers' Conference in Canberra, a series of working parties was set up, each of which would deal with an initiative that the Prime Minister had outlined and on which he sought co-operation. The parties have been working and are expected to report to the Premiers' Conference in Canberra next week.

DUTHY STREET

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Transport provide information on further safety measures to be implemented in Duthy Street? Over the years Duthy Street has been known as one of the most accident-prone streets in the metropolitan area. A section of the street divides the Mitcham District from the Bragg District. There has been much speculation by people in the area about proposals before the Road Traffic Board and the Unley City Council.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board, having done an extensive exercise on Duthy Street, has submitted its report to the Unley City Council. I am hoping that, as a result of the exercise and the report, action will be taken very soon. The basis of the report is a proposal to convert many four-way intersections to "T" junctions. The Road Traffic Board contends (and I agree with its contention) that there will be a great reduction in the potential danger to traffic if the four-way intersections are converted to "T" junctions. Subject to the council's approval, there will be dramatic changes in the geometry of intersections and junctions along Duthy Street, in the interests of road safety.

CLEARWAYS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether clearways have been successful and, if they have been successful, whether the Government intends to establish further clearways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The introduction of clearways has certainly been significantly successful. I believe that, with the passage of time, it will be necessary to extend their operation markedly. At this stage there are no specific areas that I am willing to refer to, other than to say that I expect that eventually some clearways will operate for 24 hours a day.

STOCKPORT ROAD

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether Main Road No. 112 between Hamley Bridge and Stockport is to be realigned and reconstructed soon? If it is not, will he assure me that the upgrading of this main road will be urgently considered? Many parents are becoming concerned about the condition of this road, which is a school bus route over which children are conveyed to the Riverton High School. Because of the dusty nature and the poor condition of the rubble on the road, it is at present considered a dangerous traffic hazard.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

HILTON BRIDGE

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Transport tell the House what is the present planning of his department in regard to replacing the Hilton bridge with a new modern bridge that will adequately cope with traffic at all peak periods? In the first instance, I realize that the bridge is a leftover of a Liberal Government of 32 years but, nevertheless, I believe that something positive must be done to correct the present situation. One finds a complete bottleneck at the bridge between 8 o'clock and 9 o'clock most mornings, when it is almost impossible for traffic to move, and the same applies between 4 o'clock and 5.30 in the afternoon. I have found the situation to be much worse than that about which people have been complaining, thanks to my good friend the Deputy Premier for allowing me to open an office in the district.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WRIGHT: No-one can argue about that: it was the Deputy Premier's idea; he has given us an opportunity to open offices in our districts, and everyone ought to appreciate this. Indeed, no-one can deny that it is another progressive move by the Labor Government, and I congratulate the Deputy Premier on it. Nevertheless, the situation has been brought home strongly to me by people in the area who, again, thanks to the Deputy Premier, are regularly calling into my office and complaining about the Hilton bridge. I should appreciate the Minister's comments on this matter so that I can explain the situation to my constituents.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. Indeed, having tried to visit his office in peak periods, I have found difficulty in doing so, because of the congestion at the Hilton bridge. In fact, on one occasion, because of this situation I was late in keeping an appointment to see him. I cannot give the honourable member any specific information on the time table at present, other than to make the general observation that reconstruction of the Hilton bridge is actively being considered. I will seek more specific information and bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier use his good offices in discussions with the Commonwealth Government and with members of his own Cabinet to ensure that adequate funds are provided in the coming year for primary-producing industries? It is heartening to hear the Premier say this afternoon that his financial balances will be much better than expected but, to quote the member for Bragg, the Commonwealth is running into galloping inflation and, of course, there was the press report yesterday, quoting the remarks of a person who should know, that it could be at the rate of 12 per cent this year. I believe that inflation is increasing at present by about 8 per cent and, of course, one of the major methods of controlling inflation is to increase productivity. The rural industries, including the fishing and mining industries, are all suffering from an inability to invest in capital equipment. Will the Premier assure the House that adequate funds for this purpose will be made available to the vital industries concerned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly put forward to the Commonwealth Government, as I have done previously, the case for various sectors of primary industry. Certainly, in relation to some of those industries, I have written recently to the Commonwealth Government. However, I point out that at present not all primary industries are depressed; they are not uniformly impoverished. Indeed, in some industries prices have escalated at a rate much greater than 12 per cent a year.

Mr. Coumbe: They've contributed to your revenues, too.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I really would like to be able to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: I have instructed the House previously that a member has the right to ask one question at a time, and the Minister concerned has the right, and will receive that right, to reply. Interjections are out of order, and I will rule out of order any answer to an interjection during Question Time. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where there is a clear case for Commonwealth assistance, I will certainly take up the matter of obtaining any assistance that we can get from the Commonwealth Government for a needy sector of rural industry.

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands how many applications have been made by fruitgrowers for assistance under the Rural Industries Assistance Act, how many applications have been approved, and how many have been rejected? In recent weeks, several growers have told me that they have applied under this Act for financial assistance. As all these applications have been rejected, it appears that it is extremely difficult for fruitgrowers to obtain assistance under this Act.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to raise the matter with my colleague, to obtain the information the honourable member seeks, and to let him have it as soon as possible.

FIREARMS ACT

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether amendments are proposed to the Firearms Act this year to require the taking out of annual gun licences? I believe that, as a result of the passage of certain legislation last year, some confusion exists in the minds of members of the public concerning the present requirements in this area. I have noticed an article in the *Chronicle* stating that many primary producers in this State were in a quandary about the regulations, and so on, and that this was causing them considerable confusion.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I hope that the honourable member does not hold me responsible for the quandary in the minds of the people in country areas. There should be no confusion: the rights of the property owner are clear, as I have pointed out in answering similar questions previously. Legislation now being prepared to solve the problem to which the honourable member has referred will be introduced some time this year.

MONARTO

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier, as Minister of Development, say whether an extensive study of the whole of the State was carried out for a new town site prior to the selection of the Monarto site and, if it was, what other sites showed a potential for such a venture? Further, could the reports of those investigations be made available to the House and to the public at large? When giving the second reading explanation of the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act Amendment Bill, the Premier said:

The Government is determined that the future city dwellers of this State should not be condemned to living in a metropolitan area characterized by congestion, noise, and smog, with the tiring long journeys to and from work and those other evils that are so widely apparent in large cities throughout the world.

Last month I received a letter from the Minister of Transport stating that it was necessary to build a four-lane highway to connect the main freeway from the upper ranges around Crafers with southern industry so that people could commute from Monarto to the southern industrial areas. I believe that no Opposition member ever really accepted that we were building Monarto as a commuter town and not as a satellite city, which now appears to be the intention. When one studies the only report available to the Opposition (the Monarto report), one sees clearly that no extensive studies had been carried out by the Agriculture Department, the Meteorological Bureau or the Engineering and Water Supply Department on any sites other than the Monarto site, whereas this afternoon the Premier said that the Commonwealth Government's Cities Commission had suggested that a grant of \$14,000,000 be made available to start a city at Monarto. If Monarto is the wrong site for a commuter city, this would be a waste of public money. It is not what was originally intended. If it is the wrong site, we should say so now. Can the Premier say how far the study of other sites was taken, what the other sites were, and whether the material given to the department could be made available to the people of the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member has given voice to some misconceptions and I suggest that he look back at the history of this matter. Monarto is being established as a submetropolitan city. As the Cities Commission has pointed out, there are two bases for the establishment of new cities. One is the establishment of a submetropolitan city that aims at taking the overflow from an industrial base in an existing metropolis. The reason for the establishment of Monarto is contained in a recommendation in the original planning report for Adelaide, reinforced by the Environment Committee's report, that the population of metropolitan Adelaide should be fewer than 1,000,000. In these circumstances, there will be developments on the Adelaide industrial supply base, given the fact that we have the third manufacturing complex in Australia and a wide range of manufactured goods. In order to strengthen our economy, we can expect greater diversity and industries being established on that industrial supply base. The site of a submetropolitan city using that industrial supply base

is determined by the fact that, in order to build up industry using the manufacturers' supplies, one must be within a limited distance of those supplies or costs could escalate to a sum whereby it would no longer be economically possible to use the industrial supply base.

In these circumstances, an examination was made by the State Planning Authority and, to get a site which provided water and which was reasonably located geographically and physically so that it would provide transport to Eastern States markets and access to the Adelaide industrial supply base and the port, there was only one region in which it could be reasonably established and which met those conditions. That was the region originally specified to the House in the legislation that was put before the House for the acquisition of land and freezing of land prices within a certain distance of the Murray Bridge post office. The whole of that region (and the honourable member was present when the explanation was made) was the basis for the legislation, which was welcomed by the Opposition. Indeed, another member of the honourable member's Party raised some cheers at that stage of the proceedings, and I think he was quite right.

The criteria established the region in which Monarto could be sited. The question then was the examination within the region to find which site within that total region was the appropriate site for the town. That report has been published and made available, and the whole of the region was examined. When the region was examined there was one really suitable site, namely, the site we have chosen for Monarto. When the site was chosen a further examination was made, as a result of which we enlarged the designated site from the original recommended area, and further studies were then undertaken regarding the parameters that should be established to enable development to take place. It is untrue to say that Monarto is to be established merely as a commuter city.

The Government has had a series of studies undertaken and, in addition, the Commonwealth Government has had a feasibility study undertaken by Pak-Poy and Associates. That voluminous report, which has been presented to the Commonwealth Government, entirely supports the establishment of the town at Monarto. It was the basis of that study that led to the Commonwealth Government's decision to put Monarto well up on the list of the regional cities to be assisted by the Commonwealth Department of Urban and Regional Development. Indeed, in our proposals to the Commonwealth Government, we are ahead of any other State in Australia, because we have done our work ahead of the other States and have done it far more thoroughly. The studies are continuing on the basis of establishing viable employment bases within Monarto itself: Monarto is not being established as a commuter city for Adelaide. Indeed, the reason that we have to have road transport through the area is that we must ensure that we have a proper basis of transport not only for the population but for industry.

An important qualification economically for Monarto will be that it has ready access by road and rail transport to the port of Adelaide and to the manufacturing supplies in the metropolis. That is the basis of the establishment of Monarto. It was not ill thought out but properly thought out. I believe that it will be a significant development not only for us but for the whole of Australia.

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation please expedite a reply to my correspondence of January 26 last regarding the position of people living on the boundary of the proposed new city of Monarto but within the area prescribed? This matter has an important

bearing on the future of elderly people residing in homes on the boundary. It is important to their peace of mind and to their future, and it would be helpful if I could receive that information.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Some inquiries have been received regarding people in a similar situation, part of their property being within the area and part of it outside. In all cases the situation has been discussed with the people raising the matter, and generally the problem has been resolved to their satisfaction. I am sorry if there has been some approach from the honourable member that has not been acknowledged or dealt with at this stage. I will take this matter up to ascertain what went wrong.

WEST LAKES BOULEVARD

Mr. HARRISON: What reaction has the Minister of Transport or his departmental officers had to the announcement of the approval of West Lakes Boulevard?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Generally, from what I can gather, there has been a reasonably favourable reaction and acceptance of the necessity to provide the boulevard to service the West Lakes area. Following the announcement, I think last week, of the final decision taken by the Government, a few inquiries have been directed to my office and to the Highways Department. However, not many properties are involved. Generally speaking, it appears that the Government's assurance that people will not be prejudiced because of this development has been readily accepted by the public.

PLANNING REGULATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he has considered submissions made to him by the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated and the Stockowners Association of South Australia about regulations, such as the Eyre planning regulations and those which apply on Kangaroo Island? The Eyre planning regulations have caused great concern to a number of constituents living in my district and in the Flinders District. The main problem in relation to these regulations seems to be that the State Planning Authority does not have available to it any representative of the Stockowners Association, the United Farmers and Graziers, or of landholders. Will the Minister urgently consider this matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assume that the honourable member is asking me whether I would consider appointing to the State Planning Authority a person with some knowledge of the rural industry. This matter was raised with me by the organizations to which the honourable member has referred. I believe that at some stage the matter should be fairly seriously considered. When any changes are contemplated in the State Planning Authority, I assure the honourable member that the matter will be considered.

ISOLATION SWITCHES

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works confer with the Electricity Trust with a view to having an isolation switch placed on every transformer pole connecting power to farmhouses and buildings? It has been brought to my notice that not all transformer poles have isolation switches installed. As the Minister will know, some houses have the meter box either inside the house or under the verandah. At a recent house fire in my district, as the meter box was located inside the building, it was not possible to disconnect the power until the maintenance man from the Electricity Trust arrived, the result being that, despite the efforts of the local emergency fire service, considerable damage was done

to the building. I understand that it would cost about \$15 a service to install an isolation switch at the transformer pole, the overall cost for the whole State being about \$120,000, which is not a very big price to pay when it is considered that, on today's values, this would represent the cost of only about five dwellings.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to raise the matter with the Electricity Trust to see whether the honourable member's proposal is feasible. I take it that the honourable member suggests that the cost for each service would be only \$15. I wonder whether he would think it reasonable to suggest that those who desire to have this isolation switch installed should pay for the service themselves. I will check the matter for the honourable member.

CYCLE TRACKS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the Government's policy with regard to providing cycle tracks on main roads which are to be constructed or which are programmed to be reconstructed? Last session, when I asked the Minister a similar question about providing a cycle track on Brighton Road (which was then, and still is, being reconstructed), the Minister said that, with regard to Brighton Road and other roads, the matter would be considered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The department of the Director-General of Transport is currently looking at the problem of accommodating bicycles on roadways. There is a real problem here, even though this might cause some amusement to the honourable member for Bragg. I am pleased that we are able to amuse him, because there is not very much nowadays that does amuse him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Director-General of Transport and his staff are investigating this matter, together with other matters relating to public transport, but at this stage there has been no final determination.

TRACTOR LICENCES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Transport familiar with the new driving licence classifications, particularly those relating to tractors, to be introduced on July 1, 1973? I understand the Minister has made certain confusing statements regarding the driving of farm tractors, which are not referred to in the new classification list as motor vehicles except that they fall under the comprehensive weight provisions. Is the Minister aware that, if I own and drive a tractor and do not own a truck, no provision is made for a driving test except on a truck, and that, if I had a tractor weighing over 35cwt. but did not own a truck of over 35cwt., I would have to obtain a special permit and would have to go to the police station to pass some mythical test of my competence to drive this vehicle, namely, a tractor? Does the Minister appreciate that if I can obtain a licence to drive a tractor I need not pass a test on a motor truck or motor vehicle for which presumably the test was designed? In view of these anomalies, and in an effort to straighten them out, I ask that farm tractors used for hauling farm machinery and not for road work be included in classification 1 (formerly classification A), so that in future there will be no problem in obtaining a licence to drive a farm tractor engaged in hauling farm machinery from one property to another or from one side of the road to another. These anomalies will bear investigation. Would the Minister consider my request to place farm tractors in a separate category?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure how well the member for Mallee has researched this question. From the explanation given, I suggest he has not researched it very well. Nor do I think the member for Rocky River has researched it very well, or he would not give his approval by way of "Hear, hear". A tractor is no different from any other vehicle, depending upon weight. If a person is capable of driving a vehicle of less than 35cwt. there is no problem in driving a tractor of that weight. If the tractor weighs over 35cwt., or if it is hauling a vehicle and the aggregate weight is over 35cwt., this Government says that that person should be competent to drive it.

Mr. Nankivell: How does he prove that he is competent?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what applies on the Pinnaroo line, but I think the provisions there would be adequate. If the member for Mallee is saying that the provisions enforced by the police in that area are inadequate, then let him say so and not interject by innuendo. We have attempted to categorize the driving licences in the simplest possible form. Frankly, this State must get away from the practice of continually handing out special dispensations to primary producers. Those people are not a category by themselves; they are people in the State of South Australia. I have had this question referred to me previously, and I have also been asked a question regarding persons of 16 years of age being unable to drive tractors from farm to farm across a road because of the age qualification. People should look at the age qualifications applying in every other State. Already in South Australia these lads have a considerable benefit and I do not believe that benefit should be extended further.

COMMERCIAL VEHICLES

Mr. VENNING: Does the Minister of Transport consider that primary industry is adequately represented on the commercial road transport committee set up by the Minister to investigate hours of driving, loading, braking, and speeds of commercial vehicles? The Minister will recall that among the 14 or 15 people on the committee there was no representation of primary industry or primary producers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not true.

Mr. VENNING: At the request of the United Farmers and Graziers a nomination was accepted by the Minister. Does the Minister consider that representation of this important industry is adequate and is he presupposing the effect of the committee regarding action being taken for renewal of registration of primary producer vehicles in respect of weight and capacity?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer to the first question is "Yes" and to the second "No".

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what steps have been taken by his department regarding flammable nightwear? Recently much publicity has been given to this subject, and I understand that the Labour and Industry Department, through the Minister, has considered, with other State Ministers, the introduction of uniform legislation for the labelling of each garment. I should like the Minister to consider, in relation to this legislation, having the warning placed on the material in two or three foreign languages as well as English, because we know that many migrant parents have difficulty in understanding the English language.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to tell the honourable member that I expect that agreement will be reached at the conference of State Labour Ministers, to be held on July 5, for uniform legislation requiring children's

nightclothes to be labelled to show the degree of flammability of the materials. Labour Ministers have been trying for years to obtain uniform legislation. In fact, a first draft of uniform legislation had been prepared in 1967 and considered by all State Ministers. It was prepared on the basis of the British flammability standard, but was not proceeded with when it was discovered that the British standard was not appropriate. There are vital differences in temperature and humidity between the two countries. I understand that the member for Glenelg was contemplating introducing legislation along the lines of the British standard, and I tell him that that was considered and rejected because of the difference in temperature between the two countries. The State Ministers then sought the assistance of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the Standards Association of Australia to determine standards of flammability appropriate to Australian conditions. This proved a very difficult task but the Standards Association of Australia has now produced a satisfactory method of determining flammability, so it seems certain that uniform legislation will be agreed to and implemented this year. Cabinet has already approved of the legislation being drafted and introduced as soon as agreement is reached on uniform legislation. I will consider the matter of labelling in different languages.

TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Transport say in which metropolitan areas he has released land, now being held for transportation corridors, for the construction of transportable houses? I should like to know whether there has been any final decision and whether negotiations have been made for the release of land held by the Minister for future transportation purposes having regard to comment about the possibility of construction of this kind in the Smithfield area on a transportation corridor, the northernmost extremity of which at present is being made available for open sale. In other words, the inference could be drawn that this transportation corridor will not be used as a transportation corridor in the long term and that any houses constructed along its course at present may become a permanent feature rather than short term, as has been suggested in the original announcement on the project. In the light of this background information, I ask the Minister whether he can release the information for which I have asked.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Only one area is concerned, and that is the Smithfield area, to which the Leader has referred. However, the area has not been used for housing. It is being used as an experimental area and the housing is certainly not of a permanent kind.

PENSIONER BUS CONCESSIONS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether his department has further considered granting pensioner concessions on country bus services and, if it has, to what extent? The Minister is well aware that I have raised this matter with him many times, and it is true to say that country pensioners are at a distinct disadvantage in this regard compared to those living in the metropolitan area. On many occasions I have made representations to the Minister about the burden imposed on country pensioners in this matter, and I should be interested to get information from him about the position.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think it would be fair and reasonable to say that, because of the persistence of the member for Whyalla and, perhaps, one or two other members, the Premier included in the policy speech of the Australian Labor Party at the last State election a promise

that, if we were re-elected, we would provide concessions to pensioners on country bus services. In keeping with the normal practice of this Government and the A.L.P., we are honouring that promise. The promise given was that the concessions would apply from the beginning of July, and they will apply from then. Negotiations have proceeded to the extent that agreement has been reached between the Bus Proprietors Association and the Government on the terms, and the concession will apply for pensioners on country bus services from July 1, in accordance with the policy speech that the Premier enunciated.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Local Government say what procedure will be adopted when the Royal Commission that has been appointed to inquire into local government boundaries brings down its report? I ask particularly whether this Parliament will have the opportunity to debate the findings before they are implemented. More important, in my opinion, will the Minister say whether an opportunity will be given for ratepayers to express their views before any amalgamations or alterations of their council areas take place?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall deal in the reverse order with the three questions that the honourable member has asked. He has asked whether ratepayers will be given the opportunity to express their opinions, and the reply is, "Yes, they have already been invited to do so." Advertisements have been inserted in newspapers, stating the terms of reference of the Royal Commission, and inviting ratepayers, councils and anyone else, regardless of whether that person is a ratepayer in accordance with the terms of the restricted Local Government Act (that has no bearing at all). Anyone who is interested and who cares to make submissions is invited to do so, including the member for Torrens.

Mr. Coumbe: I was referring to when the findings have been given.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure how a ratepayer or anyone can have a say after the case is completed. He asked whether Parliament would debate the report. The report will be presented in this House, and it must be debated because, if the Royal Commission recommends that there be an alteration to boundaries, there must be an alteration to the Act, and that can be done only by a Bill in this House. He also asked what would be the procedure. The reply I have just given about whether there will be a debate already covers that point.

VICTOR HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he considers that the proposed establishment of a multi-million dollar tourist complex at Victor Harbor will, in his opinion, unduly disturb the environment of that community and, if he does, in what regard it will do so?

The SPEAKER: Order! I wish to put the new honourable member on the right track. Any member can ask a question seeking information, but he cannot seek an opinion. The honourable Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know nothing of the proposal to establish a casino in that area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He said "a multi-million dollar complex".

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know nothing of a proposal to establish a multi-million dollar complex. If any such complexes are contemplated anywhere in this

State, the effect of such plans on the environment would be considered by my department before any approval was given.

HERPETARIUM

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether any firm commitment or decision has been entered into concerning the establishment of a herpetarium and nocturnal house? The Minister is aware that the herpetology group of the Field Naturalists Society of South Australia has for some time been interested in the establishment of a herpetarium and nocturnal house to foster the growth of their special interests. I know that the Minister is interested in this matter. Last November he informed me that discussions had been held with the herpetology group to consider various locations for such a venture, Cleland Conservation Park and Para Wirra recreation park being suggested as suitable areas.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am grateful to the honourable member for this question and for raising the matter last year, because even some of my learned colleagues were able to gain some knowledge as a result of her asking it. When the honourable member raised this subject during the last session, I pointed out that discussions were being held between the National Parks and Wildlife Service and interested groups. I am not aware of any firm decision having been made. I think I would have heard had a decision been made, but I will check on the current position and inform the honourable member.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S VISIT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say what results, if any, have come or are likely to come from the visit by him, in company with the Solicitor-General, to the United Kingdom concerning the constitutional position of this State? I understand that until last Saturday the Attorney was in England, or he had been in England for several weeks, apparently to lobby in opposition to the intentions of the Commonwealth Government as expressed by the Commonwealth Attorney-General, Senator Murphy, on his visit to England last January to tidy up the relics of the colonial past. I hope the Attorney-General succeeded in his quest, but his statement and the report of his visit and that of the Premiers and Attorneys-General of other States leads me to doubt his success.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member seems to be under some misconception regarding the purpose of my visit and that of the Solicitor-General to London when he describes the purpose as being to lobby in opposition to moves by the Commonwealth Attorney-General to tidy up the relics of the colonial past. On the contrary, I assure the honourable member that there is no-one more assiduous than I in endeavouring to tidy up the relics of our colonial past. I support (and, indeed, the South Australian Government supports) the objects of the Commonwealth Government in endeavouring to tidy up the relics of our colonial past, and in endeavouring to promote the status of the Australian nation as an independent nation in the modern world in the eyes of the world. The purpose of the visit to London was to try to clarify certain matters that had arisen from proposals by the Commonwealth Government. One of the purposes was to try to clarify the legal situation arising from a Bill introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament concerning offshore areas, because it seems to us that the passing of that Bill would create areas of legal confusion in the administration of those offshore areas.

It is important to the State that these matters be clarified so that State administration is not embarrassed by legal uncertainty. Our view was that simply to allow legal questions to arise one by one in specific cases that had to be decided in court might well result in a considerable period of uncertainty. The avenue we chose to resolve this uncertainty was to petition the Queen that there should be a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the whole question under section 4 of the Judicial Committees Act with a view to obtaining an advisory opinion from the Judicial Committee as to the legal question. Whether that reference will be made is at present being considered by the British Government, and I cannot inform the honourable member at this stage what the outcome might be.

The other constitutional question that occupied us on this visit arises from the Bill introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament to abolish appeals to the Privy Council from State courts. The honourable member will know that the Bill introduced places this matter on two bases. The first is an assertion of Commonwealth constitutional power to enact legislation abolishing appeals to the Privy Council: the self-operating provisions of the Bill, as the Prime Minister described them in his second reading speech.

The other is a provision requesting and consenting to the enacting of legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom for the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council. In this regard I want to make clear that it is the policy of the South Australian Government that appeals from State courts to the Privy Council should be abolished. That was made perfectly clear to the United Kingdom Government during the course of my visit.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a reversal of form.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not quite understand what the honourable member means by "reversal of form" but, if the implication is that I have ever suggested that I supported having appeals to the Privy Council, I can only say that the honourable member can examine my public record, not only whilst I have been in this Parliament but also for 20 years before that in the legal profession, and he will not find a word to support that. I can cite many occasions over the years when I have consistently advocated the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council.

Mr. Millhouse: Have a look at what the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: The question that arose in this context was the implication in the second limb of the Bill as to the power of the United Kingdom Parliament to legislate with respect to State matters at the request of the Commonwealth Parliament, and I made clear to the British Government, as did other Ministers, too, that in our view the place where the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council should be tackled was Australia. Indeed, for some considerable time I have been engaged on a project, in consultation with other Attorneys-General, for the abolition of the application of the Statute of Westminster to the State of South Australia, which would enable this Parliament to deal with the matter by passing an Act abolishing appeals to the Privy Council. The Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs indicated that he would take into consideration the representations made by the States in arriving at any decision on that matter. So, once again, I cannot inform the honourable member of any definite outcome; I can only tell him that the purpose of the visit was achieved, in that we made clear in London that the States had a right to be consulted by the British Government before any legislation was enacted at the request of the Commonwealth Parliament. I think it is important to be

clear about the purpose of the visit, which was simply to indicate that the States had certain constitutional functions and a right to take part in discussions where those constitutional functions were likely to be affected.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry give the House the present unemployment figures, as a recent Commonwealth release indicated a fall in national unemployment figures?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have a report stating that at the end of May, 1973, the number of persons unemployed in South Australia was 9,501, which is 1,370 less than the number a year earlier. This represents a reduction of about 13 per cent from May, 1972, to May, 1973, in the number of persons registered for employment. The number receiving unemployment benefits (3,561) was 1,016, or 22 per cent, less than a year earlier. The other important figure to look at when considering the unemployment situation is the number of vacancies available. The figures for vacancies show that, compared to a year earlier, the number of positions available has more than doubled—from 2,395 at the end of May, 1972, to 5,074 at the end of May, 1973.

In looking at occupational groups, it is clearly evident that there is an acute shortage of skilled tradesmen, as has been the case for most of the post-war period. For example, in skilled building and construction there are 161 registered applicants for jobs and 336 notified vacancies; in skilled metal and electrical there are 329 unemployed, while there are 776 vacancies. These occupational areas are key areas in any further economic expansion. In other occupational groups there are large excesses of persons registered over the number of vacancies: for example, rural—291 registered, which is about five times the number of vacancies (59); clerical and administrative—2,615 unemployed, 627 vacancies (mainly females); unskilled manual—2,492 unemployed and 706 vacancies.

The unemployment relief schemes at the end of May, 1973, provided employment for 3,766 persons (2,007 in the metropolitan area and 1,759 in country areas, including the Northern Territory). Between April and May, the number employed under the schemes outside the metropolitan area increased by 451, which more than accounted for the total decrease in the number unemployed in these areas. It is evident that these schemes form a very necessary function in overcoming unemployment in the short term. However, the figures reveal that to reduce unemployment further there is need for a more positive manpower policy to ensure that labour is more mobile and can be equipped with the required skills. The Commonwealth Government is making important moves in this area, and this Government has done likewise through its revamping of further education, and it will continue to do so following consideration of the training needs survey published earlier this year.

STIRLING SEWERAGE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works give a guarantee that no nuisance will be caused to the neighbouring home owners when the proposed Stirling main street sewage treatment scheme becomes operative? The project that the Minister is to put into operation is to take the sewage from the Stirling main street to a plant at the end of the main street, near a residential area. The Minister stated that the effluent from the works would be crystal clear and there would be no health risk; it would be discharged into the drinking water of Adelaide. The property

owners are concerned that there may be some obnoxious smell from the area and also there may be some noise offensive to them as home owners.

I wrote to the Minister on May 16 and asked him for details of any sewerage project for the area. On May 29 he replied and said a project was to go before the Public Works Committee and that it would be commenced in the latter part of the 1973-74 financial year. On June 4 I sent a letter to the Minister about the small project now to take place in the Stirling main street, asking whether it was true or false that it would become operative. On June 6 the Minister made a public statement saying it would become operative, but at no time since I received that information has the Minister said it was the case, even though I had written to him on May 16. He wrote to me on June 5, and on June 7 I received the letter in which he said that he had received my letter of June 4, but still he did not have the courtesy to say that the work was to be done. I ask whether there is any risk to the property owners concerned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I very much regret any discourtesy to the honourable member in this matter; it was not intentional. I make that perfectly clear to the honourable member in his bleatings. As has been pointed out already, this scheme is only temporary; he is fully aware of that. I cannot give him a categorical guarantee at this stage that some nuisance will not be caused as a result of this installation, but I assure him that everything possible will be done to see that it does not occur. If it is not possible to prevent that, everything will be done to minimize the nuisance, but I will check with the department to ascertain whether any nuisance is likely to be caused. As stated in the press release, the treated effluent will be crystal clear, will be chlorinated, and will present no health risk to people who drink the water. The flow will go through the Aldgate Creek into the Mount Bold reservoir. I repeat that no discourtesy was meant or designed towards the honourable member, and I will ascertain why he was not notified in May about this scheme or whether he had asked if any major works were to be carried out.

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders provide that on opening day questions will be allowed for a period of two hours. Today questions commenced at 3.11 p.m. and it is now 5.11 p.m., so two hours has elapsed and Question Time is now finished.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which is in the same form as a measure introduced into this House in 1971 and which then failed to become

law, is also in the same form as a Bill which was intro-

duced into this House last year, passed by the majority as required by the Constitution of this State, and then

defeated in another place on the last day of the last

session of Parliament. Since that time a general election has intervened, and this Government considers it has the clearest possible mandate for its introduction once more. It is, as honourable members will be well aware, intended to widen the field from which Legislative Council electors may be drawn from the narrow confines of land and

leaseholders and their spouses to the broad field of House of Assembly electors. In short, it is to provide for full adult franchise in Legislative Council elections.

Since its inception, the Constitution Act has provided that, notwithstanding the vastly wider provisions of that Act embracing House of Assembly electors, no person shall be entitled to vote at a Legislative Council election unless he or she owns or leases land in this State or is the tenant of a dwellinghouse in this State. Apart from the addition, in 1943, of servicemen actively engaged in war, and the addition, in 1969, of electors' spouses, the field of Legislative Council electors has not been altered. It is still the opinion of this Government that property qualifications are artificial and outmoded as conditions attaching to any franchise, and that it is desirable to amend the Constitution Act so as to entitle all House of Assembly electors to vote at a Legislative Council election.

As was said each time the earlier measure was introduced, I believe that, in this day and age, it is scarcely necessary to address to this Chamber argument in favour of the proposition that all the adult residents of this State should have an equal say in the Government of the State and in the election of their Parliamentary representatives. This restricted franchise for the Legislative Council has its origin in a society in which there was a notion that ownership and occupation of property gave to the owner and, in some limited instances, to the occupier a special stake in the country, so that those persons, it was said, had the right to exercise political control over policies of Government. As the years have passed, the emphasis has shifted from property to persons. The tone and outlook of society has gradually altered and become more democratic.

That being the case, at this point in history it is quite remarkable that we still have a franchise for one of the Houses of Parliament of this State that is restricted to persons who qualify in one way or another in relation to property (that is, whether they be owners or occupiers of property, or the spouses of the owners or occupiers of property), and to those who qualify as servicemen and ex-servicemen. Therefore, it is again submitted that the only proper franchise and the only proper method of electing members of Parliament is the vote of all the people of the State expressed in a way that gives to them an equal say in the make-up of the Parliament that makes the laws for them.

For this reason I look forward, when the vote is taken on the Bill, to a degree of unanimity in this House, for I find it difficult to believe that any member of this House who professes faith in democracy, which is at the very basis of the society in which we live, could possibly support the continuance of a restricted and privileged franchise that has the effect of giving one section of citizens of the State political privileges that the rest do not enjoy. The people of this State have spoken, and it now remains for this House to give effect to their clearly expressed desires.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 fixes the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 repeals section 20 of the principal Act which deals with the qualifications of Legislative Council electors. New section 20 enacted by this clause provides that a person who is entitled to vote at a House of Assembly election shall be qualified to have his name placed on the Legislative Council electoral roll and shall be entitled to vote at a Legislative Council election.

Clause 4 repeals sections 20a, 21 and 22 of the principal Act. Section 20a includes servicemen on active service as Council electors. Sections 21 and 22 set out various

disqualifications for Council voting. These three sections are redundant, as they appear in almost identical form in sections 33 and 33a relating to House of Assembly elections.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION AND ELECTORAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (COUNCIL ELECTIONS)

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, and the Electoral Act, 1939, as amended, and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill carries out the policy of the Government announced at the elections of providing one vote one value in elections in the Legislative Council. Originally the Legislative Council was elected at large in the State and without districts, and therefore there was, at any rate within the terms of the limited suffrage, one vote one value as between entitled electors. The districting of the Legislative Council and the provision of districts unequal in numbers of voters destroyed the original principle of the South Australian Constitution. Now with the clear mandate of the Government for the provision of adult suffrage, dealt with already in another measure reintroduced to this House, it is necessary for us to ensure that each adult elector has an equal and effective say in the legislation which he has to obey and which so vitally affects his life.

In providing for an election in the State at large the present number of the Legislative Council would require the election of 10 members from the whole State each general election. If we retained the present system for the voting for the Legislative Council then in fact, of course, there would be a position, such as existed in the Senate prior to the introduction of proportional representation voting, that the winning group would take all seats. The Government does not believe that that would be effectively representative of the people of the State. Therefore, it has examined various methods of ensuring that the multiple-member election would reflect the views of citizens in ensuring the election of representatives of points of view with clearly substantial support. The difficulty of the Senate system of proportional representation voting is that the ballot-paper for the election of five representatives is complicated. The average citizen finds voting for the Senate at times complex, and always tiresome. It would be very much more so where a larger number of representatives were to be elected, for the ballot-paper would rarely contain less than 30 names, all required to be numbered from one to 30.

What is more, with a larger grouping the sample counting method used for the Senate would be unsatisfactory and it would be necessary to count the preferences of every ballot-paper. This produces a situation which would be sheerly unworkable. The Government has therefore proposed in this measure a very much more simple method, using a proportional representation system common to most countries using that form of voting. This will mean voting once for groups of candidates nominated on a Party list. We have taken note of the fact that some members of some of the Parties opposite have urged that some form of proportional representation be used in the elections for the Upper House, and since the method proposed by the Government can achieve the Government's policy of one vote one value, then we believe that it is proper for us to accept the view that proportional representation should be the form of voting.

There are two features of the legislation which are necessary results of introducing this form of voting. In the first place it will be necessary to have a larger number of members elected each election as otherwise (since proportional representation tends mathematically to minimize the results in representation and differences in voting strengths in contrast to the single-member electorate system, which tends to exaggerate the differences) we would not have a majority elected by a majority of voters. We must have 11 members elected each election or we would undoubtedly produce a dead-locked Upper House. What is more, it would be necessary, in order to ensure that a majority could obtain constitutional changes hereafter, that the President of the Legislative Council be enabled to concur and so provide a constitutional majority as required by section 8 of the Constitution at the second and third readings of any Bill. It seems proper that that obtain also for the House of Assembly rather than a situation obtain as at present, where on occasion, although a majority of the whole number of members of the House seeks particular constitutional change, if the Speaker is one of those members he cannot at times be counted to obtain the constitutional majority.

I shall now explain the Bill in more detail. The matter encompassed by this Bill, which proposes the amendment of the Constitution Act and the Electoral Act, may be summarized as follows: (a) it proposes the constitution of the whole State as a single Legislative Council electoral district; (b) it proposes that this electoral district shall, eventually, return 22 members; (c) it proposes that elections for members for this single electoral district will be conducted on a system of proportional representation known as the "list" system; (d) it proposes that Legislative Council by-elections will not be held to fill casual vacancies in that House but those vacancies will be filled in a manner similar to the manner of filling casual vacancies in the Australian Senate; and (e) it proposes some further changes which will be outlined in my comments on the clauses of the Bill.

Quite aside from the signal importance to the people of this State of the substantial changes proposed by this measure, it has another unusual characteristic in that, in other circumstances, the changes proposed here would be encompassed by two separate pieces of legislation. The reason for combining the amendments into one single Bill is to ensure that members will have an opportunity of considering the changes as a whole, untrammelled by the restrictions that might otherwise be placed upon them in the application of the relevant Standing Orders of this House.

Clauses 1 to 4 are formal. Clause 5 repeals section 11 of the Constitution Act and enacts a new section in its place. Section 11 of that Act is the section which provides for the composition of the Legislative Council and proposed new section 11 provides, in effect, that until the next periodical election (as defined) of members of the Legislative Council, the House will consist of 20 members. After that election the House will consist of 21 members and after the second periodical election the House will consist of 22 members. The reason for this "stepped" increase in the number of members in the House is to ensure that the terms of office of the present sitting members of the Legislative Council are not disturbed; that is, every member of that House will be entitled to serve out his present term in full. However, this graduated increase in the number of members of the Legislative Council is subject to the possibility that the Legislative Council may be dissolved on a double dissolution, in which case the new Legislative

Council will consist of 22 members on and from that dissolution.

Clause 6 amends section 13 of the Constitution Act and provides for a changed method of filling casual vacancies that may occur in the Legislative Council. The method proposed is not dissimilar to that provided for by section 15 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act for the filling of casual vacancies in the Australian Senate. However, a member chosen to fill a casual vacancy under the scheme proposed will serve out the full portion of the unexpired term of his predecessor. In the case of the filling of casual vacancies in the Senate the member chosen holds office only until the next election for the House of Representatives. Members who have studied the various systems of proportional representation will no doubt be aware that some scheme for the filling of casual vacancies of the kind here proposed is an almost essential element in the operation of the system. If casual vacancies were filled by by-election, proportional representation just simply could not be applied, since proportional representation requires more than one candidate to be elected and by-elections on the occurrence of a casual vacancy, in the nature of things, provide for the election of only one candidate. Finally, it is assumed that in relation to the choosing of members to fill casual vacancies the long observed convention in relation to the choosing of members of the Senate will be observed, so that the person chosen to fill the casual vacancy will, so far as possible, be a person of the same political complexion as his predecessor.

Clause 7 amends section 14 of the Constitution Act which provides for the periodic retirement of the members of the Legislative Council. The amendment proposed here does not alter the principle expressed in section 14 but merely recognizes the fact that under the changes now proposed one-half of the members of the Council shall retire at each general election assuming, of course, that they have completed the minimum term of service set out in section 13 of the Constitution Act. Clause 8 repeals and re-enacts section 15 of the Constitution Act which appeared to be originally inserted to guard against the somewhat remote possibility that more than half the number of members of the Legislative Council would have completed a period of service greater than the minimum term. The effect of this provision is to provide for an order of retirement as between members, and the provision has been re-enacted from an abundance of caution.

Clause 9 repeals section 18 of the Constitution Act which deals with the issue of writs for casual vacancies in the Legislative Council and is consequential upon the adoption of the proposed new method of filling casual vacancies in that House. Clause 10 repeals section 19 of the Constitution Act and enacts a new section in its place. The effect of this new section is to constitute the Slate as a single Legislative Council electoral district. I would draw members' attention to proposed subclauses (3) and (4), which are intended to make it clear that the present members of the Legislative Council will continue in office until the expiration of their minimum term of service.

Clause 11 amends section 26 of the Constitution Act, and the reason for it will be found in an examination of section 8 of that Act. This is the section that deals with the so-called constitutional majority. For convenience I set out this section in full:

8. The Parliament may, from time to time, by any Act, repeal, alter, or vary all or any of the provisions of this Act, and substitute others in lieu thereof: Provided that—

- (a) it shall not be lawful to present to the Governor, for His Majesty's assent, any Bill by which an alteration in the constitution of the Legislative Council or House of Assembly is made, unless the second and third readings of that Bill have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly respectively;
- (b) every such Bill which has been so passed shall be reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure thereon.

Members will be aware that the effect of this provision has been considerably modified by the enactment of section 10a of the Constitution Act, which, in its terms, entrenches many of the provisions of the Constitution Act. The words in this section I have just quoted in full to which I invite members' particular attention are:

Unless the second and third readings of that Bill have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly respectively.

When one turns to section 26 of the Constitution Act one finds that whenever the votes cast on a matter in the Legislative Council are not equal, one member, the President or member presiding, is by operation of section 26 deprived of his right to express his concurrence or, as the case may be, his non-concurrence in the passing of the second or third reading of a Bill. The only time he gets a vote is when the votes in the House are equal. This seems fundamentally wrong, since it can be hardly argued that by reason of holding office as President, the President is no less a member of the Legislative Council. Accordingly, it is intended that the President or member presiding will be afforded an opportunity, if he wishes, to express his concurrence or non-concurrence in the passing of a second or third reading of a Bill in any case where he is not called on to exercise his casting vote.

I would make it clear to members that this right will not affect the power of the Council to pass or reject the measure, since that power is clearly set out in section 26(2) of the Constitution Act. It will have effect only where the concurrence of the President, or member presiding, is necessary to enable the lawful presentation of the kind of Bill referred to in section 8 of the Constitution Act to the Governor for reservation for Her Majesty's assent.

Clause 12 effects the same kind of amendment in relation to the Speaker of the House of Assembly as is provided for in relation to the President of the Legislative Council by clause 11. Clause 13 inserts the second schedule to the Constitution Act in place of the present second schedule and is intended to cover the situation that will occur until the next periodical election of the Legislative Council. The somewhat cryptic passage in Part II of the proposed new second schedule is intended to give full effect to section 41 (3) of the Constitution Act which contains a reference to the proper number of members representing an electoral district. The proper number in this case will be 22.

Clause 14 is formal. Clause 15 amends section 19 of the Electoral Act by striking out two redundant subsections. Clause 16 amends section 50 of the Electoral Act and is consequential on the proposal to fill casual vacancies in the membership of the Legislative Council in the manner adverted to above. Clause 17 amends section 65 of the Electoral Act and is the first clause which relates directly to the proposed new method of electing candidates to the Legislative Council. It may be of some assistance to members if at this stage I outline these proposals.

A candidate may if he wishes be included in a group of two or more candidates, but a candidate who does not wish to be included in a group will be deemed to be a group comprised of himself alone. Voting under the proposed scheme will be by groups and not by individual candidates. Amongst the reasons for this is that, in an election that requires 11 persons to be elected, a plethora of candidates may be expected and it is likely that the requirement that an elector shall mark a number in the square beside the name of each candidate, when we may expect, say, 30 such candidates, will result in an unacceptably high proportion of informal ballot-papers.

Clause 18 amends section 71 of the Electoral Act and provides, in effect, that a candidate included in or comprising a group which does not obtain about 4 per cent of the total votes cast will lose his deposit. Clause 19 amends section 96 of the Electoral Act which deals with the printing of ballot-papers and provides that each group will be identified by a letter and that the order of groups printed on the ballot-papers from left to right will be determined by lot, but that groups including two or more persons will be placed in order on the left of those groups comprising a single candidate.

Clause 20 amends section 113 of the Electoral Act and provides for the method of voting at an election for the Legislative Council. At this stage, I would draw the attention of members to the fact that, although on the face of it, it appears that a system of preferential voting is to be used, it is really a system of allotting proportion, that is, quotas without preferences, since preference counting will be pointless. It is not the "winner-take-all" system, which is what the preferential guise of present voting for the Upper House really is. I make no apology for the provision in this form, since it appears to the Government that the marking of ballot-papers for the Legislative Council by a cross would only serve to confuse the electors who, in this State, are well used to voting by numbers, but voting by numbers does not indicate preferences; it means an outright vote for a Party group to obtain a quota.

Clause 21, which amends section 123 of the Electoral Act, serves to reinforce the remarks I have just made, in that a Legislative Council ballot-paper will be informal if it has no vote indicated on it or it does not indicate a voter's first preference for one group. Clause 22 amends section 125 of the Electoral Act and deals with the scrutiny of votes. Paragraphs (a) to (h) of this clause are amendments consequential on the proposal that voting in the Legislative Council elections will be for groups rather than for individual candidates. Paragraph (i) of this clause merely sets out in substantially similar form to that which already exists the method of filling a vacancy for a House of Assembly seat. Paragraph (j) inserts a number of new paragraphs in section 126, and it may be convenient if I deal with these new paragraphs *seriatim*.

New paragraph (6) enables "ties" between candidates for election for the House of Assembly to be resolved and is in the same form as already exists in the principal Act. Paragraph (7) provides for the exclusion of two or more candidates in the House of Assembly scrutiny at the same time and again merely re-enacts an existing provision. Paragraph (8) provides for the convenient resolution of elections for the House of Assembly where one candidate has a clear absolute majority and again re-enacts an existing provision. Paragraph (9) provides for the election of members of the Legislative Council by groups, and the scrutiny is there to be carried out in the following manner:

- (a) the votes for any group that does not obtain "the prescribed number of votes, that is, the prescribed number of votes for retaining the deposit, are totally excluded from further scrutiny. With 11 candidates to be elected, the prescribed number of votes would be about 4 per cent of the total formal votes cast;
- (b) from the ballot-papers remaining the returning officer for the district determines the quota, and with 11 candidates to be elected this quota would be about 8 per cent of the total of the votes remaining after the exclusion referred to in paragraph (a);
- (c) the number of first preference votes received by each group is then expressed as whole quotas and, if necessary, a fraction of a quota;
- (d) the number of members to be elected from a group shall be determined in the first instance by the number of whole quotas obtained by that group, and the order of election as between members of a group shall be determined by their position on the ballot-paper in that group;
- (e) if the application of this principal does not result in the required number of members being elected, a group which has the largest fraction of a quota shall have a member elected from it and, if necessary, the group with the next largest fraction of a quota shall have a member elected from it and so on.

It is conceded that there is a very remote possibility that a group may obtain more quotas or more quotas and a fraction than there are members to be elected from that group. In this unlikely event, the extra quotas or fraction will be disregarded for the purposes of electing a member. Paragraphs (10) and (11) provide for the resolution of ties as between groups. Paragraph (12) is formal and paragraph (13) is a definition provision. Clause 23 amends the fourth schedule to the Electoral Act and is, I feel, self-explanatory.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure (No. 2) for the financial year 1972-73 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), 1973.

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the year ending on June 30, 1973, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In moving the second reading, I submit for members' consideration Supplementary Estimates totalling \$3,020,000. In presenting Supplementary Estimates during November of last year, I said that it was too early for trends on Revenue Account to have become established, and for this reason I refrained from predicting a possible result for the full year. I am now able to provide some information about these matters and, while I must caution members that fairly large fluctuations are quite possible even at this late stage of the fiscal year, it may be helpful if I summarize the situation as it appears at present before dealing in detail with the Supplementary Estimates now before the House.

REVENUE BUDGET 1972-73

On August 31 last, I presented to the House a Revenue Budget which provided for a deficit of \$7,500,000. The costs associated with decisions taken subsequently on over-award and service pay increases, metropolitan employment producing works, and drought relief (upon which I commented fully when submitting Supplementary Estimates last November), led to the possibility that, in the absence of other factors, the full year's deficit could be as high as \$13,500,000.

All departments were directed to implement stringent economies, consistent with continued efficient operation, and to defer expenditures where possible, and during the latter part of the year the results of these measures have become apparent. The indications are presently that savings in general departmental operation may total more than \$3,000,000. The previously worrying situation has also been relieved by some unexpected increases in receipts, particularly in stamp duties and water rates. A complete analysis of the reasons for the higher returns from stamp duty is not yet available, but it is known that a very high volume of property conveyance transactions has had a major effect, and this may produce about \$5,000,000 more than the amount expected when the Budget was compiled. The long summer season contributed to significant excess water consumption, and rate revenues now seem likely to be about \$2,000,000 higher than the estimate I presented previously. These, together with other smaller increases, are expected to bring total receipts to a figure about \$8,500,000 above the original estimate.

I have referred to only two major factors affecting the expenditure side of the Budget: that is, the additional commitments entered into last November, and the general departmental economies which seem to have been achieved following Cabinet direction. There have been a number of other factors, including wage and salary decisions more costly than earlier expected, and increased financial assistance to people suffering hardship. Part of the increased expenditures are now being authorized by Supplementary Estimates and part in other ways. Overall it seems that increased commitments, offset by some savings, may lead to a net increase of about \$6,500,000 above the original estimate of payments. An increase of about \$6,500,000 in expenditures and an increase of about \$8,500,000 in receipts would mean a reduction of about \$2,000,000 in the estimate of deficit, from \$7,500,000 expected in August last to about \$5,500,000 expected now. It is possible that this latest estimate could be bettered; indeed all the signs are that it is even probable.

APPROPRIATION

It is some time since explanations were given in relation to the appropriation authorities available to the Government, and it may be useful if I repeat these now, particularly as this year it has been necessary to seek supplementary appropriations twice despite an expected overall improvement on the original Budget. Early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act (supported by Estimates of Expenditure). If these allocations should prove insufficient there are three other sources of authority for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a Supplementary Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3(2) and (3): The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs due to any award, order or determination of a wage fixing body, and

to meet any unforeseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water through the four major mains. This special authority is being called on this year to cover part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations, with a small part of these wage increases being met from within the original appropriations. It appears at this time that a small excess may be incurred in respect of pumping costs, and this will be covered in full by the special authority contained in section 3 of the Act.

Governor's Appropriation Fund: Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a particular year. Of this amount one-third is available, if required, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. As the amount appropriated by the main Appropriation Act rises from year to year, so the extra authority provided by the Governor's Appropriation Fund rises but, even after allowing for the automatic increase inherent in this provision, it is still to be expected that there will be the necessity for Supplementary Estimates from time to time to cover the larger departmental excesses.

The main explanation for this recurrent requirement lies in the fact that, whilst additional expenditures may be financed out of additional revenues with no net adverse impact on the Budget, authority is required none the less to appropriate these revenues. Also, the appropriation procedures do not permit variations in payments above and below departmental estimates to be offset against one another. If one department appears likely to spend more than the amount provided at the beginning of the year the Government must rely on other sources of appropriation authority, irrespective of the fact that another department may be under-spent by the same or a greater amount. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations, but on the present outlook the total so available is unlikely to be sufficient to provide for all the larger excesses, particularly those involving grants in respect of academic salary increases.

Supplementary Estimates: Accordingly, the Government has decided to introduce Supplementary Estimates to cover estimated excess expenditure in three major areas of the Budget, and so to ensure that sufficient appropriation authority remains within the fund to meet any unforeseen expenditures during the remainder of the year. The proposals for additional appropriation are as follows:

	\$
Public Buildings Department.....	500,000
Minister of Education—Miscellaneous	1,620,000
Department for Community Welfare.....	900,000
	\$3,020,000

DETAILS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Public Buildings Department—Maintenance of buildings: The major factor contributing to over-expenditure on maintenance and other costs associated with school and hospital buildings appears to have been rises in the price levels of materials. The volume of work carried out in the maintenance programme has been greater than originally expected. The Supplementary Estimates include provision for additional appropriation of \$500,000.

Minister of Education—Miscellaneous, Academic salaries: The recent report to the Commonwealth Minister for Education of the Inquiry into Academic Salaries in Univer-

sities, commonly known as "the Campbell Report", has now been accepted by both the Commonwealth and this Government. The report proposes increases in the salaries of academic staff ranging from 21 per cent to 24 per cent to be implemented with retrospectivity to January 1, 1973. The increases are to flow on to staff of colleges of advanced education, including the teachers' colleges, some from January 1, 1973, and some from July 1, 1973. The annual gross impact of the proposals upon the Revenue Budget is likely to be more than \$4,000,000. The major part of this sum will be attributable to the University of Adelaide, Flinders University of South Australia, and the South Australian Institute of Technology, and it is the increase in the recurrent grants to these institutions to cover the proposed additional salary payments for the six months to June, 1973, and the effect of the recent national wage decision, for which the Government is seeking appropriation authority totalling \$1,620,000 in Supplementary Estimates. The Commonwealth will make its normal contribution of just over one-third of the costs, and this contribution will be taken to the credit of Revenue Account when received.

Community Welfare Department—Financial assistance: An upward trend in the number of applications for assistance under various welfare arrangements has been observed over a period of several years and is probably due in part to the Government's policy of decentralizing the welfare function, thus bringing this type of help within the reach of a larger number of people. The cost of financial assistance has been further increased in the current year, however, by increases in Commonwealth pension entitlements, which, as a matter of policy, the South Australian Government follows where comparability exists between Commonwealth and State assistance schemes. Part of these costs is recouped from the Commonwealth. Over-expenditure in this area of the Budget is expected to be about \$900,000 in 1972-73 and this amount is provided in the Supplementary Estimates.

As to the clauses of the Bill, they give the same kind of authority as in the past. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$3,020,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum for the purposes set out in the schedule. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds, or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1972. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1974.

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That I have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the general revenue, the sum of \$110,000,000 to the Public Service for the year ending on June 30, 1974.

Mr. Hall having risen in his place:

The SPEAKER: I tell the honourable member for Goyder that, under Standing Orders, the speaking time for

the Leader of the Opposition or an honourable member deputed by the Leader of the Opposition is unlimited. I take it that the honourable member for Goyder is speaking without having been deputed by the Leader of the Opposition?

Dr. Eastick: That is so.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I make clear at the outset that I have had no communication with the Leader of the Opposition about my speaking in this House and that I do not intend to. I say that, of course, in all humility to you, Mr. Speaker, but also to make clear to the House that I represent a Party that is quite separate from the one represented by the Leader of the Opposition, which does not speak for us in any way.

I wish to raise a matter of grievance. It concerns an activity of the Premier during the election campaign and the projected future policy of the Government about a particular industrial development known popularly or unpopularly, depending on one's outlook, and located at Redcliffs. This matter has its beginnings, as far as I am concerned, at the time when I went overseas in the year 1968-69 and talked to chemical companies about the establishment of a petro-chemical works in South Australia. Since those negotiations began in those days, they have continued through the term of office of the Government that I was involved in and, obviously, into the term of office of the Government that the Premier now leads.

However, we were somewhat surprised during the election campaign to find that the Premier, in his election policy speech, announced that the site at Redcliffs, as he then named it, was at an advanced stage, and those projections were so advanced that he came back to the State and said that the plant could be operating from Port Pirie in 1975. The Premier went on to say during that campaign that he had a letter of intent, and I understand that he went on a television programme in some sort of confrontation, producing a letter that he pointed to as being a letter of intent.

This is one part of my grievance, and I want to repeat what I said publicly then, namely, that the Premier was not telling the truth, and that he did not have a letter of intent. The public of South Australia was misled seriously by the Premier in that election campaign by that untruth, because I knew he did not have a letter of intent. That knowledge was reported in the news media in a statement from one of the company spokesmen with whom the Premier had been dealing. In the *Advertiser* during that campaign a statement by the spokesman for the Dow Chemical Company was reported. The report states:

The Dow Chemical Company confirmed yesterday that it is involved in negotiations for a petro-chemical industry in South Australia. But a final commitment by Dow to go ahead with the industry at Redcliffs, 17 miles south of Port Augusta, was still a matter of months away, Dow's chief of corporate products (Mr. Richard Bechtold) said yesterday.

Our negotiations with the State Government and with Delhi International Oil Corporation and Santos Ltd., developers of the Cooper Basin gas field, have been going along quite satisfactorily, he said.

"As far as I am aware there are no outstanding obstacles which would prevent us from making a final commitment, but we are not at that point yet."

Despite that, the Premier went to the public of South Australia saying that he had a letter of intent and that the deal was sewn up. I do not know whether he has had a letter of intent since, but at that time he waved around a document that no-one was able to read publicly. I understand he offered it privately but not to the public of South Australia and I believe that he did not have a letter of intent then, although he told the public of South Australia

that he did. The elections were held and the result is well known and very pleasing to the Government sitting opposite.

The next approach that I had on this matter was from the fisheries interests in South Australia, who came to me in a frantic state of concern about the Premier's duplicity in this matter, and they produced evidence that showed that, to say the least, he had been using fabrications in his references to this matter. The people who approached me represented the Western Prawn Boat Owners Association, which I understand has as its members all the prawn boat owners who operate in Spencer Gulf. Their concern was for the whole prawn fishing industry in South Australia and it was on the basis that the area of water in the northern extremity of that gulf was unique, in that it surged up and back in a constriction with an effective three-mile width to any significant depth and with a further extension of 70 miles.

Tests taken by at least one fisherman on behalf of the Fisheries Department have shown that there is little interchange of water in that surge. In fact, the water stays there week after week and month after month and any pollutants placed in the water will produce continual contamination. From that fact and the fact that it has now been proved that at some stage of the early life of the prawn it stays for some time in the mangroves (and the mangroves there are estimated to provide 90 per cent of the stock of prawns in the gulf) one can understand that fishermen were concerned at the prospect that they had unearthed. Page 3 of the *Whyalla News* of February 28 contains a report of a statement by the Premier at Whyalla. The report states:

Speaking at Whyalla on Monday night, Mr. Dunstan said the Department of Fisheries had been consulted during investigations into the industrial complex and had given the all clear.

The Premier said during the election campaign that the Fisheries Department was consulted. Apparently, it was a case of "So, we are not concerned." What was the result of that statement?

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

Mr. HALL: As far as I know, and as far as the representations that have been made to me show, the fishing industry is not being difficult in the sense that it is opposing an industry: indeed, it is concerned at the way the Premier, in the name of the Government, has refused to be truthful about the matter. He has promised a proper study of the situation before the petro-chemical plant is established and the criticism the industry makes is based on certain letters to which I now refer. The first letter was written by a well-known West Coast fisherman to Dr. Grant Inglis (Director of Environment and Conservation). The letter states:

We are very concerned about this type of plant being established right in the middle of this very important eastern shore. From the investigations we have made concerning this type of plant in other parts of the world we have very good reason to be worried. The juvenile prawns—

Members interjecting :

Mr. HALL: I hope that the rather active group of people alongside me do not call themselves that. The letter states:

The juvenile prawns which thrive in the shallows and mud flats, as well as the mangroves, will always be in danger of the "accidental spills" which occur from time to time. I won't go into detail on the pollution of the waters concerned, but we know that there are laws in certain States of the United States of America which prohibit new plants of this type being built on coastlines and river foreshores.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The letter continues:

Even applications to build a "clean plant" in the State of Delaware, U.S.A., have been refused, and the ones specified are oil refineries, petro-chemical complexes, steel-mills, off-shore bulk-transfer terminals and paper mills.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you prepared to table that letter?

Mr. HALL: If the Minister of Education is too lazy to read through the *Hansard* reports tomorrow I shall give him a copy. I suggest that the letter will be in *Hansard*—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In full detail?

Mr. HALL: If the Minister wants the "Dear Sir" and the "Yours faithfully" he can have that, too.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about—

Mr. HALL: The letter to which I have just referred was written on March 14. On March 29, Mr. Scriven (Director of Industrial Development) replied and included the following paragraph in his letter:

While negotiations are well advanced, final details of the processors and the quantities of products which will be manufactured are unknown—

after the election; after the letter of intent which the Premier brandished around the State but which he would not let anyone read except in confidence—

but when they are determined they will be incorporated in the environmental impact statement. Preliminary indications are that the only likely source of pollution is in the return to the sea of sea water used for cooling purposes, and in this regard the Director of Fisheries will be closely consulted.

I stress the phrase "will be closely consulted". The next letter to which I refer was written to Mr. Scriven by Mr. Puglisi, representing the Western Prawn Boat Owners Association, as follows:

Thank you for your reply to our letter of March 24. It appears that our letter was misunderstood, as the information we asked for did not come to hand. Possibly this was due to my error in quoting the Premier's statement in Whyalla which I was referring to. It should have read February 26, 1973, not March 3, 1973, as was written. The Premier said, "The Department of Fisheries has been consulted during investigations into the industrial complex and has given the all-clear." What we asked for was a summary of the Department of Fisheries section of the investigation, which gave "the all-clear", not a summary of the complete investigation. We also wanted further information on the Japanese methods which would be adopted.

The writer then refers to the hatching process in respect of prawns. That request for a copy of the Fisheries Department report to which the Premier had referred was replied to, in a fashion, by the Director of Industrial Development on April 13, as follows:

Despite an exhaustive search I have been unable to locate the statement attributed to the Premier in Whyalla—

it was in the *Whyalla News* for everyone to see, yet he says he was unable to locate it—

but as I have already informed you the studies on environment at Port Augusta have revolved about the only possible type of pollution to the sea and that is a rise in ambient temperature through the discharge of cooling water. Even this type of pollution will be eliminated if a study reveals that it could be harmful to fish life in the waters of the gulf, and the provision of cooling towers can easily obviate the problem.

I again refer to the phrase "if a study reveals". The letter ends with the following paragraph:

As I stated in my previous letter, a comprehensive ecological survey of the waters in northern Spencer Gulf will be made well before construction of the proposed plant is commenced, and I would be pleased to have the opportunity to discuss these matters on any occasion when you or members of your organization are in Adelaide.

That was April 13, a month after the election and even longer since the Premier said the all-clear had been given. The international situation also is not good and is not one with which we can, as a background, embark on the establishment of this type of petro-chemical industry, thereby risking the pollution of the waters of the gulf. I refer to the current situation on the American continent where, in the United States of America and Canada, the Dow Chemical Company is being sued for tens of millions of dollars for alleged pollution of the waters of the rivers into which it discharges its cooling water. The writ to which I refer has been taken out by the Ontario Attorney-General.

I now refer to the situation applying in Japan and to a paragraph of the April 2, 1973, edition of *Newsweek*, headed "The Twisted Face of Minamata". This article deals with mercury pollution and the problem of people dying through eating mercury-polluted fish. The article refers generally to pollution in Japan, as follows:

As public outrage over pollution has mounted, industry has been making belated efforts to control the damage caused by its waste materials. The Government has pushed through a series of laws designed to control air, water and soil contamination. Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka has devised a multi-billion-dollar scheme to "remodel" Japan by dispersing industry from polluted urban areas to the countryside. But so far the measures have been far from effective, and the Tanaka Government has set its sights on a continuing growth rate of 10 per cent a year—a rate that is incompatible with a serious effort to control pollution.

The article points out that the only real solution is to move Japanese industry abroad to countries where raw materials are available. Only then can "we hope for an improvement in the quality of our life". During the election campaign the Premier sent one of his top officers to Japan to encourage this industry to come to South Australia, because he was under criticism. The point is that Japan apparently has a policy, if this article is to be believed, of placing its industry abroad because it will pollute Japan. The Premier said the Fisheries Department gave the all-clear before the election of April 13, and the Director of Industrial Development said a study would be made. Who was telling the truth: the Director or the Premier? I suspect, from my knowledge of the Public Service, that it was the Premier who is telling the untruth.

The situation became even more interesting when I raised this issue publicly and the Premier insisted that the all-clear had been given. Yet, on the morning of the day on which the Premier was insisting that the all-clear had been given, the Deputy Premier, the member for Millicent, who is deeply involved in the fishing industry in the area and in whose district the President of the fisheries council lives, came out with the promise of a study. We read:

Mr. Dunstan said the Fisheries Department had been consulted during investigations into the industrial complex and had given the all-clear. There would be no effluent poured into the gulf.

That was a promise made as late as May 31. If this is to be a grievance debate, this is a real grievance: the South Australian public has been misled for electoral purposes. Further, an industry that supports many people in this State may be jeopardized because of the Premier's failure to study the environmental factors and the results of these international lawsuits which indicate that there could be a pollution problem from this type of industry.

This type of election activity was parallel to the one in which the Premier spoke of the Australian Council of Trade Unions housing plan. How long it took in that campaign to drag out even a little of the Government's intention in relation to that sorry plan of favouritism! In the end, just before the election, we got the news that the

A.C.T.U. would be getting certain blocks for \$500 each, but what have we heard since? The Premier moved on to the next gimmick; he had forgotten the A.C.T.U. plan regarding cheap land south of Adelaide and had moved into the area of land price control. It reads wonderfully: that the Government will have a watchdog to act on South Australian land prices. What will it do? It will do a number of things, in broad terms. The report says that the South Australian Government already undertakes a policy for Mr. Whitlam—and heaven help South Australia if it does! It will do these things: it will acquire land for urban redevelopment and will provide means for Government intervention in land auctions. I applaud any move that is sensible and fair to reduce the price of land in this State. The greatest factor in keeping land prices down for housing in the past has been a surplus of blocks of land in the metropolitan area and one of the factors that have created a shortage is the Government's attitude to planning and its policy in having a planning department in operation.

I was talking to a person just north of Elizabeth last week who told me that it took him 2½ years from the time he first lodged his application to the time he got the land on the market. Labor policy has reduced the number of blocks, and now the Premier seeks to intervene in respect of sale prices. He says he will move on the auction system, and even as late as yesterday he said that the threat he had made was working; that, if the land was sold at a price which was to be subsequently assessed as being too high, his proposed legislation would be retrospective. Yet, all this time the Government has been selling its own land at the same profiteering rate it accuses other people of charging. There is a well-known block on Anzac Highway that was sold at auction for a figure many times as great as the figure the Government gave for it some years ago. If the legislation is to be retrospective, will the Government make it retrospective also in the case of Government auctions? What sort of lead is this to a vital industry in this State? Where does land development stand? Land should be obtainable at the lowest possible prices. The Government lets the major inhibitions on land development proceed by regulating the provision of services, by failing to make enough blocks available on the edge of the city, which it now apparently rushes into, and by making artificial controls which will breed black marketing in this State. However, that is subsidiary to the criticism that, while it attacks the private sector, it auctions its own land at a big price, the greatest piece of hypocrisy in a Government that is famed for hypocrisy.

I suppose there will be other opportunities to discuss the many failures of this Government, which is joining with the Commonwealth Labor Government to create one of the most drastic inflationary spirals that Australia has ever seen. I suppose this Government will increase this inflationary spiral while cracking down on other sectors of the economy without adjusting its own expenditures, as the Commonwealth Government is threatening to do. The two things that stand out in my mind are, first, the way the Government handled its electioneering and, secondly, its failure to meet its obligations to the environment in respect of the Redcliffs plant and its hypocrisy in relation to the control of land prices.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): It is now more than six months since Parliament last met and, from what we have heard this afternoon in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor and what has been bruited abroad in the last few weeks anyway, this is going to be a short session and there will not be much opportunity for members of this place to

raise matters of any description. I guess it will be a month or more before the next session begins. One would think, therefore, that in the time that has elapsed since the House last met all members would have come across so many matters to be raised at the first opportunity in this House that everyone (certainly on this side of the House) would have wanted to speak in a grievance debate.

Dr. Tonkin: We've hardly had a chance.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The newly elevated member for Bragg occupies proudly a position on the front bench and he says we have hardly had time. I was absolutely amazed this afternoon when the Liberal and Country League let go altogether the first opportunity for a grievance debate in this place. It was the first opportunity for that, yet not one L.C.L. member moved or said a thing.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first opportunity that the Opposition or any member had was when the Premier introduced the Appropriation Bill; not one member in this place did a thing. It was left to the member for Goyder at the second opportunity, when the Supply Bill was introduced, to raise a matter of grievance. May I say that I do not blame members on the Government side for not airing grievances. They are, of course, in a rather different position: they are inhibited, to an extent, from representing their constituents in this place by making public complaints about the Government. However, there is no member on this side of the House, to whichever Party he happens to belong, who is inhibited in that way, and one can only assume that the L.C.L. part of the Opposition is sleeping soundly.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: May I say that I have a number of matters that I should like to raise, but I shall limit the number to three on this occasion. The first matter concerns the Minister of Education, and I am sorry that he is not here. The other two matters concern the Attorney-General, and I am glad to see that he is here. The first matter concerns superannuation for female schoolteachers. I have been approached by some schoolteachers in the Education Department, most of whom live in the eastern suburbs, in the Bragg District and the Davenport District. They have been in touch with me concerning an injustice they believe they are suffering; it is the matter of their age of retirement. I refer particularly to the *Education Gazette* of May 23 of this year, in which the Minister of Education sets out section 25 of the Education Act concerning the age of retirement for teachers. In the explanatory note that followed he says:

Female teachers under the age of 45 years on August 27, 1973, who are contributing to the South Australian Superannuation Fund for retirement at age 55 will not be able to retire at that age. These teachers, however, will not be permitted to reduce fortnightly contributions by reversion to a lower scale commensurate with longer teaching service but will be required to continue contributions at the higher rate until they attain the age of 55. Their contributions would then cease, but their pension would not commence until their retirement became effective at age 60 or thereafter, as required by section 25(1) of the Education Act.

The ladies who have been in touch with me have planned their superannuation and their working life on the expectation that they can retire at a certain age. They now find that arbitrarily those plans have been upset, and the rights that they believed they previously had to retire have been taken away from them. On June 5, I wrote to the Minister of Education, as follows:

Dear Mr. Minister, I have been approached on behalf of a number of women teachers who are most irate at the

notification in the *Education Gazette* for the 23rd May under the heading "Retirement of Teachers".

I then explained the situation, and I concluded my letter as follows:

If these are the facts, then I support them strongly in their protest and ask if the matter may be reviewed.

I wrote the letter a fortnight ago and it would have been in the Minister's office on the following day, but I have not even had the courtesy of an acknowledgment. I take this, the first opportunity, to raise this matter on behalf of the women concerned and to ask the Minister for an explanation and a justification of the action that has been taken.

Mr. Venning: It has not been taken.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been taken. The honourable member for Alexandra will learn in this House to follow an argument that is put.

Mr. Payne: You mean "the member for Rocky River"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg pardon of the member for Alexandra. The member for Rocky River will never learn. I turn now to a matter that concerns the Attorney-General, but I raise it not necessarily by way of criticism of him. I think it was last year or the year before that we passed through Parliament the Mock Auctions Act. In his report for 1972 the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs says:

The Mock Auctions Act, 1972, met with spectacular and instant success.

It has been drawn to my attention by a group of students in the law school of the university who are members of the Consumer Protection Society in that university that, in fact, some very unfortunate and undesirable practices have again sprung up in this same field. These practices illustrate the difficulty that Parliament always has in legislating to prohibit a specific evil and to cover the whole field. Perhaps I can best explain the matter by reading the following extracts from the letter, dated June 4, that I have received from one of the members of the Adelaide University Consumer Protection Society:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Adelaide University Consumer Protection Society which, as you may be aware, has been organizing a campaign to inform the public of the risks involved in dealing with a store known as Rundle Sales. As you are no doubt well aware, this store uses substantially the same technique as did Crazy Sales—the retail store that was forced to close as a result of the Mock Auctions Act, 1972.

Conversations between members of the society and the people running the shop resulted in some changes in the procedures at their auction sales. A later extract from the letter is as follows:

However, we are still of the opinion that it is not in the public interest to allow this style of retailing to continue and we would like to enlist your aid in finding some legislative means of putting an end to it. Recently you made mention of the fact that in your opinion pyramid selling could be effectively choked by refusing to license the "hawkers" at the bottom of the pyramid. Our question is whether or not you think this method of control could be extended to all retailers.

I have replied to the society saying that I think this would be extremely difficult if, in fact, desirable. The letter from the society also states:

Our view is that if all retailers were required to be licensed or registered, then the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch could be given the power to recommend the deregistration of unfair traders. We feel that such a step would introduce far more effective control of retail trading practices than exists under present consumer protection legislation. Well drafted legislation may prove to be "instant and spectacular" as the Prices Commissioner has noted of the Mock Auctions Act. However, the subsequent

history of that legislation makes it plain that all such legislation runs the risk not of being instantly effective but of being effective only for an instant.

I raise this matter and ask the Attorney-General whether he is aware of what is going on. I must confess that I was not aware of this before it was drawn to my attention. If the Attorney-General has been aware of it, what does he intend to do about it? If he has not been aware of it, will he inquire to see whether, in fact, the situation is as set out in the letter and as I believe it to be from conversations with members of the society who have come to see me about it? Will the Attorney-General then do something about it?

The third matter that I want to raise is of far deeper significance to the life of this country. I refer to the extraordinary reply the Attorney-General gave me today about his recent visit to the United Kingdom. His reply was extraordinary because it was lame and because it showed (to me, at any rate) that nothing at all had been achieved by the visit. The constitutional situation of the States of Australia is one of the most significant political issues in this country at present. Most people, I am afraid, see this simply as a question of the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council, which they regard as a legal anachronism. Personally, I hope that those appeals remain but, whether they do or not, it is completely wrong for anyone to think that that is all that is involved in the present controversy. It is far deeper than that: the controversy goes to the very base of our system of Government in Australia.

Perhaps I can illustrate that as well as in any other way by quoting a letter to the *Times* written by Mr. Robert Jackson of All Souls College, Oxford, which appeared on May 24, 1973. I shall quote only a few paragraphs of it, because it sums up the situation better than I have seen it summed up anywhere else. The letter, which is headed "Constitutional tussle in Australia", states:

The gathering in London next week of the Premiers and representatives of the six Australian States should bring home to the British public the full seriousness of the constitutional battle which has now broken out between the Australian State Governments and the Commonwealth Government in Canberra.

Of course, the Attorney-General was our representative amongst that group. The letter continues:

Five months ago, when the new Commonwealth Government raised with London the question of the abolition of appeals from Australia to the Privy Council, together with a number of further constitutional questions, the British response was summed up in the headline over a *Times* leader on the subject—*de minimis non curat Britannia*. But by now it should be apparent that these are not, after all, issues of minimal importance, and that—however anachronistic the arrangement may now appear—this country has a direct responsibility for their satisfactory resolution. What should be our attitude?

The essence of the situation in which we have been placed is that Mr. Whitlam's Government is seeking to win the agreement of the British Parliament to the revision of the bargain underlying the Australian Constitution. The nature of this bargain was summed up by a former Labor Foreign Minister, Dr. Evatt, when he declared as judge of the High Court of Australia that "for all purposes of self-government in Australia, sovereignty is distributed between the Commonwealth and the States".

Mr. Jackson goes on to point out that the British Government was a party to the bargain that led to the Federation of the then Australian colonies. His letter continues:

This is the issue raised by Canberra's project for the abolition of Australian appeals to the Privy Council. The Judicial Committee Act of 1833—

the Attorney-General referred to that this afternoon in his reply to me—

is part of the area reserved to the States. The question with which we have been confronted by Mr. Whitlam is therefore whether British Ministers will agree to place before the British Parliament legislation which would interfere with the reserved powers of the States without their consent. If this procedure is adopted—

and I ask my friends in the Liberal and Country League to note this—

in relation to appeals to the Privy Council there would be no reason of principle to resist the removal at Canberra's request of many other Imperial Acts which still constitute part of the area of law reserved to the States. The end of the road would be the repeal of the Constitution Act itself and perhaps the disappearance of the federal system in Australia.

That is the issue with which we are confronted, and I hope that members will agree that it is an issue which is fundamental and of extreme importance. It is an issue which apparently in the first six months of the life of the Commonwealth Labor Government has caused a split between it and some State Labor Governments.

Mr. Payne: Wishful thinking, mate!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about wishful thinking. There have been many comments by State Ministers of the same Party as that of the member for Mitchell to that effect.

Mr. Payne: You have had a lot of experience of splits over there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I don't dodge that one for a moment. I could also tell the member for Mitchell to read this morning's *Advertiser* and *Australian* about his Party's situation in New South Wales. That is not the issue we are debating, however: we are debating the issue of the constitutional question and the difference of opinion between the Commonwealth Labor Government and some State Labor Governments. It is, of course, centralism versus federalism. The irony of the situation is that the Australian Labor Party's policy is centralism. Government members were amazed when I opened their rule book a few minutes ago, but I wanted to check and I find that the pledge which they sign as candidates binds them to their Commonwealth platform as much as to their State platform. Further, their Commonwealth platform includes the aim of abolition of the States.

What are we going to see here on this issue? How genuine is the Government of this State in fighting this issue? The real test of the genuineness, the sincerity, of the opposition that has been put up by the Attorney-General in London, in concert with the Attorneys-General and Premiers of the other States, would be within the Party itself. We all know that, and I say it irrespective of the Party to which we belong. The only real way members of this Government can bring any effective pressure to bear is by talking to their colleagues from South Australia in the Commonwealth Parliament and putting the squeeze on them at the time of preselection or in some other way. That is the only way they will get anywhere. I was extremely disappointed that apparently the Labor Party shied away from the issue at its annual conference on the weekend before last. I may be wrong, but that was the newspaper report of the conference.

It makes me wonder whether that is not just shadow sparring, with no real meaning in it. That is the background to the question I asked the Attorney-General this afternoon and the reply he gave me.

Mr. Hall: The pollution of the gulf waters is indirectly bound up with this matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. Who is to control the waters of the gulf? Is it a State or Commonwealth responsibility? Can the Premier just shrug his shoulders and

say, "That is not for me. That is for Canberra"? Can Canberra do the same? Whose responsibility is it? To whom do the people look for a remedy? When I asked the Attorney-General this afternoon whether there had been any Jesuits from his trip, and quoted again from the *Times* (not from that letter but from an article) that Senator Murphy, the Attorney-General and his Commonwealth colleague, had been there in January to tidy up the last relics of colonialism, or whatever the phrase was, he hastily clutched at that and went on to try to correct me by saying:

The purpose of the visit to London was to try to clarify certain matters that had arisen from proposals by the Commonwealth Government. One of the purposes was to try to clarify the legal situation arising from a Bill introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament concerning offshore areas, because it seems to us that the passing of that Bill would create areas of legal confusion in the administration of those offshore areas.

The member for Mitchell said that there had been no split between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government on this matter.

Mr. Payne: I didn't say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that were so, why was it necessary for the Attorney to go to London? Why could he not get on the telephone and speak to his colleague in Canberra or, better still, go there and see him? Why go 12,000 miles? Of course there is a split on the matter. Let us face the matter honestly. What on earth does the Attorney-General mean by the gobbledegook he brought out this afternoon? It means nothing at all. He continued (and this is irony on irony):

The avenue we chose to resolve this uncertainty was to petition the Queen that there should be a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the whole question under section 4 of the Judicial Committees Act with a view to obtaining an advisory opinion from the Judicial Committee . . .

Fair enough: I have no objection to the State's getting an advisory opinion from the Judicial Committee. Of course, he then has to give the game away and admit they got nowhere, because he stated:

Whether that reference will be made is at present being considered by the British Government, and I cannot inform the honourable member at this stage what the outcome might be.

In other words, Sir Alec Douglas-Home was not willing to say anything. If he says "No", the State has failed entirely.

Mr. Hall: He might have said something rude.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He might have, too, but we will not hear about that.

The Hon. L. J. King: That would give you some satisfaction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney is now trying to interject. This afternoon he rushed over my interjections fairly fast, but I will come to that later. Having said that the States went there to get an advisory opinion from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, he went on to say:

The other constitutional question that occupied us on this visit arises from the Bill introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament to abolish appeals to the Privy Council from State courts.

He went on to explain that. He then continued:

In this regard I want to make it clear that it is the policy of the South Australian Government that appeals from State courts to the Privy Council should be abolished. That was made perfectly clear to the United Kingdom Government during the course of my visit.

Apparently what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. The Attorney is willing to go to the Judicial Committee to get an advisory opinion that will suit the

Government and him, but nevertheless he and the Government want to abolish appeals from the State courts to the Judicial Committee. What on earth is this nonsense! Are Government members and the Attorney-General suffering from some sort of split personality so that they will use the Privy Council when it suits them but they are jolly sure that no-one else will use it, because it is an outworn relic of colonialism? If anything is an outworn relic of colonialism, it is asking for an advisory opinion of the Judicial Committee pursuant to an Act of 1833. This really did not come out in the reply the Attorney-General gave to me this afternoon.

Mr. Hall: Surely he didn't say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He did indeed.

Mr. Hall: What hypocrisy!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My friend uses the word, and I adopt it. At that stage I interjected that this was rather a reversal of form, but the Attorney rushed on to give his own position on this and to say that he had always advocated the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council. I am afraid that I did not get another look in, because you, Mr. Speaker, no doubt very properly stopped me in midstream in my second interjection. I got as far as saying:

Have a look at what the Premier—

What I had in mind (and I have an opportunity now to explain this) was that I asked the Premier, when he was Attorney-General in 1967, I think, and when the Commonwealth Parliament passed the Act abolishing certain appeals to the Privy Council, whether the then State Government intended to abolish appeals, and the answer was one word—"No". Now, apparently, they have changed their minds if we are to believe the Attorney, and we have not heard the Premier on this: he is silent. If that is not a reversal of form, I do not know what is. My view is that the visit of the Attorney-General to London has been a complete failure. In any case whatever was attempted there could have been achieved in a well-written letter. The position could have been put to the United Kingdom Government without all the nonsense we have had of this visit, and the expense to the people of the State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I hope you say that to the Liberal Premiers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Be that as it may, that is only a small part of my complaint about this. My real point is to ask where members opposite really stand on this issue. Are they genuine in championing State rights against their own Commonwealth colleagues and the platform of their Party, or is it in fact all a sham, because they know the people of the State do not want to be dominated entirely from a centre in the Eastern part of Australia? What is the answer to this? Sooner or later the Premier, the Attorney and all members of the Australian Labor Party in this place and elsewhere will have to stand up and be counted on this issue, and we will know whether or not they are genuine. I hope they will fight this issue. I will back them as far as I can on the matter because I believe there is still a place for the federal system in the life of this nation, and that there will be for several decades to come. I think it would be a disaster for the State if it were to be circumvented in the ways which undoubtedly the Commonwealth Government would like to circumvent it.

Mr. Nankivell: As in the area of local government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. If this matter is to be discussed as it must be, the appropriate place to discuss it is at the Constitutional Convention to be held in September. If the Commonwealth Government had any regard for the proprieties of Government, it would not have acted

as it has; it would have waited for the matter to be thrashed out here in Australia at that convention.

That is all I want to say. I must admit that when I started speaking there was much hilarity in the House. I am sorry about that; I do not think that the present situation on our side calls for hilarity. I am glad I have been able to make the three points I have made. I hope that the Minister of Education will give me a reply, if not in this debate then in the next day or so, on the question of the women teachers who believe they have been unjustly treated. I hope that the Attorney will say that something is to be done about the business in Rundle Street. I hope that we will hear something more intelligible than we heard from the Attorney this afternoon on the constitutional situation that faces us all.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): My grievance is mainly with regard to pollution. I do not wish to become involved in Party issues, as has been suggested, whether they be issues within a Party or between Parties. My sole purpose is to represent the interests of my district. The member for Goyder referred this evening to the matter of Redcliffs and how this concerned prawn fishermen, who are primarily based at Port Lincoln. He referred to several State-wide matters that will be drastically affected by the proposed plant. However, he omitted one point that I think should be brought to light, and that is the question of whence the fresh water will come. I understand that 7,000,000gall. of fresh water a day will be required. Although I am only making an assumption, I think it would be reasonable to expect that this water would come from the Murray River. If that is the case, the salinity problem will increase, and the quality of the water reticulated to the people of Adelaide will be affected. I think this matter is worthy of deep consideration at all times.

Referring back to Port Lincoln, the prawn industry is directly involved in engaging 180 people in the processing plant, the value of which is \$1,500,000. Each year about \$250,000 is paid in Port Lincoln in wages. The total value of the industry is about \$2,500,000, so it can be seen that we are not dealing with a small dinghy and a fishing line. It is a major industry that has been threatened by a proposed petro-chemical plant, and I consider that one industry is being substituted for and at the expense of another.

Not only are the prawn fishermen so directly involved but we also have smaller fishermen, scale fishermen, based at Whyalla, Cowell, and several of the smaller ports along the Spencer Gulf region. Every fisherman there is concerned because, as has been pointed out, the waters of the gulf are relatively stable, not being influenced by ocean currents. The only movement of the water is tidal movement up and back and, generally speaking, the prevailing winds tend to hold all floating pollutants at the head of the gulf.

There is serious concern about what would happen in the event of any accidental spillage or when something is pumped into the sea, and this is aggravated by the fact that the northern portions of the gulf are shallows. These are the breeding and nursery grounds for the juvenile prawn. An aerial photograph contained in the pollution survey released by the Engineering and Water Supply Department shows the upper reaches of the gulf, and we can see that only an extremely small area of that region is deep water suitable for shipping. It is mainly mud flats, which have proved to be the ideal breeding grounds for prawn.

I am rather amazed that members of other Parties and from other districts (and I refer to all Parties) have not voiced their opinion on this matter, because it not only affects fishermen in Whyalla and Port Pirie and in the

districts of Rocky River, Goyder, Gouger, Stuart and Pirie but it also places in jeopardy the tourist potential of all the gulf regions. We must be able to fix a sum as being the value of the gulf when we are referring to the tourist potential of that area.

I call on the Government to withdraw the proposal or, failing that, to insert a clause in the contract for the establishment of the industry providing for a special fund to be established with sufficient capital to return, in interest, sufficient to compensate the industry for any damage that may occur. This is only a precautionary measure and I think it is justified in dealing with an industry of such magnitude. Soon after the Redcliffs issue was brought to light on television, the Engineering and Water Supply Department survey report, termed the Spencer Gulf Pollution Survey, was submitted. What the member for Goyder has said tends to suggest that the timing of that report was an escape route for the Premier regarding his earlier statements.

This report was thrown back and, I consider, aimed at Port Lincoln, perhaps rightly so, because Port Lincoln was named as the most polluted harbor in the Spencer Gulf region, and when we consider this and the situation at Redcliffs, I think we can understand that reference. The chief reason for the pollution at Port Lincoln was that effluent was being discharged from the Government Produce Department into Proper Bay and raw sewage was being discharged at Billy Light Point, also into Proper Bay. Proper Bay is a landlocked area, not affected by ocean currents, and generally winds tend to hold pollutants in that area. Most of the fishermen live or work near the area and are fully conversant with the situation, and they say that what has been said about Redcliffs is fully justified.

The Port Lincoln issue of pollution raises some doubt, because there are other factors, such as wheat dust, the loading of ships, and dust from the loading of rock phosphate. However, generally speaking, the major pollutant is effluent discharge from the Government Produce Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. These are Government instrumentalities, and, therefore, the Government has a responsibility to the people of Port Lincoln to try to do something about the position. At this stage, I do not consider that it is acute, but every day new installations are being added to the deep drainage and, consequently, the position is becoming worse. At present 60 per cent of Port Lincoln is connected to deep drainage.

I do not agree that Port Lincoln is the most polluted harbor in Spencer Gulf. I cannot appreciate that, because all the pollutants pumped into the sea, except a few detergents, are organic. Whyalla has had a cyanide problem, and at present 1,000 tons of zinc is being pumped into the sea at Port Pirie. I do not think anyone has found a dead fish at Port Lincoln and I do not think anyone can say that Port Lincoln is the most polluted harbor in the Spencer Gulf region, but the problem has been brought to light from the survey and I hope that the Government will be able to do something about it. I repeat my call to the Government on the Redcliffs issue. I ask it to withdraw the proposal or, as I have said, failing that, to insert a clause that will protect the industry, because I can see no point in just substituting one industry for another.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I should like to refer briefly to the two matters raised by the member for Mitcham, and I regret that he is not in the House to hear my remarks. The honourable member has raised again the matter that he raised in a question this afternoon about

the constitutional questions that have arisen, and he has been kind enough to read back much of the reply that I gave this afternoon. I thank him for that, because it has enabled me to hear what I said this afternoon and to confirm the impression I had at the time that I was explaining my position and that of the Government quite clearly. It seems unnecessary to add much to what I said. However, the honourable member raised some points with which I should like to deal.

I want to make quite clear (as I said this afternoon) that it is the policy of the Government that appeals to the Privy Council should be abolished, and the Government proposes to take action by seeking to have applied to South Australia the Statute of Westminster so as to put this Parliament in a position to have that policy carried into effect. I was not in the House when the question was asked of the Premier and, doubtless, the Premier can speak for himself, but I should have thought there was a fairly clear distinction (I do not find it difficult to appreciate) between a policy to do something and an intention to do it at the time. When we ask someone, "Do you intend to introduce a measure?" and the reply is "No", that is a reference to the present intention of the Government, not to a long-term policy on appeals to the Privy Council. However, the honourable member may take it that it is the Government's policy to abolish appeals to the Privy Council, and it is the Government's intention to do whatever is in its power to bring about that result. True, the real issue that led to the visit to London was not an appeal to the Privy Council. Indeed, if that had been the issue, I would not have been there, because the South Australian Government agrees with the policy of the Commonwealth Government that appeals to the Privy Council from State courts should be abolished. The real question involved is whether it is appropriate in 1973 for the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass laws applying in South Australia, at the request of the Commonwealth Government. The purpose of the visit was to impress on the United Kingdom Government that it would be inappropriate for the United Kingdom Parliament to legislate for South Australia without the consent of the South Australian Parliament.

The honourable member seemed to find some inconsistency between a policy in favour of abolishing appeals from State courts to the Privy Council and the action of the State Government in lending its support to the Tasmania and Queensland petitions seeking an advisory opinion from the Privy Council on the offshore area question, but I do not understand why that is so. The policy of the Government relates, as I said in my reply to the honourable member, to appeals from State courts to the Privy Council. The fact is that there exists in the Privy Council a jurisdiction which is not an appellate jurisdiction but which arises under section 4 of the Judicial Committees Act, and it was this which was invoked by the Tasmanian petition.

Indeed, the Privy Council is the only judicial body capable of giving an advisory opinion, that is, an opinion that deals in a comprehensive and definitive way with all the legal questions that arise from the Commonwealth Government's assertion of sovereignty in the offshore area. If the High Court of Australia possessed such a jurisdiction, doubtless Tasmania, with South Australia's support, would have gone to the High Court of Australia. However, the High Court does not possess a jurisdiction to give an advisory opinion, and the only way in which these legal issues could be settled in the High Court would be through a series of cases, taking each point as it arose on

the facts arising from a case in which the various and complex points would be settled one by one, and in the meantime the confusion to which I referred in my reply would continue. Indeed, that situation has occurred in the United States of America, where a series of cases, the tide lands cases, have continued since 1947.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that exactly what the Commonwealth Government wants to do?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Those cases are still continuing, and they have not resolved the situation.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that what the Commonwealth Government wants to do?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member would listen to me—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He is getting very testy on this.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that exactly what the Commonwealth Government wants to do?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member—

Mr. Millhouse: He will not answer.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member would be good enough to listen to me, to allow the Commonwealth Government to speak for itself and to allow me to speak for the State Government, we might get somewhere in this debate. The honourable member gave some excellent advice to members on this side earlier this evening about making contact with their Commonwealth colleagues. If the honourable member has any Commonwealth colleagues (and I am not sure about that), he should contact them and suggest that they ask about that somewhere else. As to what has happened in the United Kingdom, the position is clear. The purpose of the visit to the United Kingdom was achieved so far as it could be achieved at that stage. The decision regarding the reference of the petition to the Privy Council is one for the United Kingdom Government and it will have to consider its position and make its decision. Regarding the second matter, it is for the United Kingdom Government to decide whether it accepts the view that it is at this time inappropriate to legislate in a State matter.

Regarding the mock auctions mentioned by the honourable member, I am aware of the situation he has described. He has stated the matter with substantial correctness in the letter which he read. This matter was brought to my attention soon after this business revived its activities in South Australia. I have received a preliminary report from the police about this matter and am now having investigated the possibility of devising legislation to deal with the evil in its new and altered form.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened with interest to comments made by the leader of the Liberal Movement.

Mr. Jennings: You must have been the only one.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I listened with interest, because he had a few things to say about me personally: about my truthfulness, credibility and actions in relation to the Redcliffs project. On the whole matter of the Redcliffs project the honourable member has acted from the basest of political motives: he has acted against the interests of this State. He is endeavouring to prevent, by this political action, the development of a project that will be vital to the employment base of South Australia. What is more, he is doing it at the very time when negotiations for the finality of this project are proceeding in South Australia. The Managing Director of Mitsubishi is here and discussions are proceeding among the producers, the Government and Mitsubishi, as well as with Dow Chemicals, at this moment. This project is vital to South

Australia to ensure that we have a secure employment base and use our resources intelligently.

Mr. Mathwin: What about pollution?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with pollution in a moment. I want just to get to the basis of this project and what has happened about it. The leader in not uncharacteristic form—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The leader of what?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Liberal Movement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Goyder damns this project, but apparently he claims that he was its progenitor. He said it started with his going overseas on the salesmanship trip about which he gained great publicity but from which we appeared to have produced very little.

Mr. Hall: That is not so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He claims that at that stage of proceedings he had started the work for a petrochemical plant, but that is not so. When the member for Goyder went overseas there was absolutely no viable basis for a petrochemical plant in South Australia. There was no feed-stock.

Mr. Payne: He is untruthful.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say that: please do not put words in my mouth. I am saying exactly what the position is in this matter. The time at which it became possible to negotiate for the development of a petrochemical plant using ethane feed-stock, a basic chlor-alkali plant that would give South Australia the major and only caustic soda plant for Australia providing the material for the treatment of bauxite in Australia, and replacing the importation of about 400,000 tons of caustic soda was when this State achieved the contract to sell dry gas to New South Wales. It was only at that point that it became economically viable to extract the wet gas as part of that process and make available in South Australia the ethane feed-stock that would justify a liquids pipeline to Adelaide or to Redcliffs. That is when it happened. The negotiations with New South Wales were not conducted under the honourable member's government: they were conducted by the Labor government.

Mr. Hall: That is not so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is so. The whole negotiations in relation to the Moomba-Gidgealpa field had completely broken down when we took office.

Mr. Hall: That is not so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was only when Sir Henry Bolte and B.H.P.-Esso demanded an impossible price at the city gate in Sydney that the negotiations were revived in relation to Gidgealpa-Moomba. Sir Henry Bolte said we would never get the negotiations through because we could not supply the gas at the price, and it was because of the approach of the South Australian Government that the price was met. The member for Torrens, from his own knowledge, knows the nature of the negotiations and the development of the work through the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia.

It was at that stage that it became possible to negotiate for a petrochemical plant, and the negotiations proceeded. At the outset of the negotiations, the Department of the Premier and of Development and the Mines Department were directed by me that in all discussions the environmental aspects of the establishment of any plant must be clear so that there would be no environmental difficulty or ecological damage and that that would be the requirement from the outset; and this was to be made clear at the outset to any negotiating parties. In fact, the negotiations

proceeded on that basis. I was supported by the Environment and Conservation Department on the basis of what it foresaw as the overall requirements of the plant. The details of the plant were not known but the general process was known, the general questions of whether there would be any effluent provided were known and the questions of what would happen about cooling water were known. I was informed that there would be no difficulty and that all the requirements of the Government could and would be met by the company.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you produce that report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with that in a moment; I will produce something else for the honourable member now. At the time of the last elections there had been advanced negotiations with the Dow Chemical Company for this project. They had reached such an advanced stage that, if I had not made an announcement at that stage, the honourable member and his associates would have accused me of secret negotiations, secret government, not disclosing something which had occurred and which it was vital that the people of South Australia should know about.

Mr. Millhouse: That is nonsense.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader today again in the House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier should address the honourable member as the member for Goyder.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry; I apologize to the honourable member. The member for Goyder today in the House said that, when I announced that I had a letter of intent from the Dow Chemical Company, I did not tell the truth, that I deliberately misled the people of South Australia and that no such letter of intent existed. I will read it to the honourable member and will then table it. It is dated February 2, 1973, and is signed by the Managing Director of Dow Chemical (Australia) Limited, Mr. Goodchild. The letter states:

Dear Mr. Premier, we greatly enjoyed our discussions with you last Tuesday, January 30, and appreciated very much your kind hospitality afforded us at dinner that evening. We believe the exchange of views regarding the development of a petro-chemical industry at Redcliffs in South Australia enabled all the interested parties to have a better appreciation of each other's views. It is our belief that an excellent opportunity exists to develop a world-scale petro-chemical complex at Redcliffs that is capable of competing with other world-scale manufacturing centres, not only at time of startup but as a continuing expanding operation. Based on the past conversations we have had with members of your Government, we understand that the South Australian Government is prepared to supply electricity and steam to the plants at world competitive prices. It is also prepared to supply and install both port, infrastructure facilities and fresh water.

The Delhi-Santos group have given us verbal assurances of their expectation of supplying sufficient quantities of gas, ethane and salt from Lake Torrens, although some additional proving work is necessary before maximum quantities can be committed. It is anticipated that satisfactory contractual arrangements will be completed for these raw materials.

We envisage that a project of this type with all of the ramifications involved will lead to a total capital investment by all parties concerned of in excess of \$300,000,000, and as such considerable negotiation, planning and discussion is required. We can now assure you of our intention to proceed to plan and construct facilities at Redcliffs that will consume at least 130,000 to 170,000 metric tons of ethane annually, with the expectation that this consumption will be 420,000 metric tons. Because of the complexity of negotiations, particularly with overseas customers, we request that this matter be kept confidential until a mutually agreed announcement can be made. We would appreciate confirmation from you that our project meets with the approval and has the support of you and your Government. I table that letter.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How about that!

Mr. Hall: That is not a legally binding document.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When has a letter of intent ever been a legally binding document? The honourable member knows that very well. He knows perfectly well that a legally binding document would occur only after an indenture had been completed, signed and ratified by an Act of this Parliament. The member for Goyder himself has, as I cited at the time, on many occasions made announcements of projects in the State about which he had no legally binding agreement. Let him deny that if he can.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Or even a letter of intent.

Mr. Hall: I never said I did have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member announced the projects. I announced this one because it was important for the people of South Australia to know about it. The honourable member has said I did not have a letter of intent, but I have it and I had it at the time. I did not publish it at that time in detail because the Dow Chemical Company asked me not to reveal its name whilst negotiations were proceeding overseas for the tying up of the necessary markets for ethylene dichloride, a by-product of the plant. That was the first of the leader's attacks on this project vital to South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: Who?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Apologize to the Leader.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have reached the stage of regarding the honourable member as the leader of a certain—

Mr. Nankivell: Be careful!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether it is a group, a fragment or a fraction. Certainly I realize that the group has now been fractionated, and perhaps I should revise the term. For the rest, the honourable member has now talked about the pollution situation. I was certainly informed, at the time of the original report to me upon the general outline of what would happen in relation to environmental aspects of this plant, that the fisheries aspect was covered. In fact, as soon as the honourable member raised the question of what had happened to this report, I asked for it. I cannot find it. Very strangely, there is a docket, but it is missing. I am just wondering exactly what has happened, and I am a little interested to know. There is a docket listed in the index, but no-one can discover it. What is more, of course, I notice that the honourable member has been getting some information from somewhere.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We might get the C.I.A. on to it!

Mr. Hall: It is in your departmental files—not the report, but the approaches made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I got the following minute from the Director of my department when I said, "Find me the file":

I can vaguely remember a minute, some time during 1972, on the proposed petro-chemical industry and possible effects on the marine life in the gulf. I think it would have been between April and September, but cannot be sure. I cannot clearly remember whether the communication referred to was a loose minute, notes of a conversation, or part of a docket.

My recollection is that the "piece of paper" contained a discussion on a petro-chemical complex, whether at Adelaide or Redcliffs, and indicated that such could have an effect on the marine life if pollutants or heated water were allowed to enter the gulf. The premise of the paper appeared to indicate that, were the industry to take water from the gulf (or the Murray), it would be necessary for the industry to

cool it (I think by cooling tanks) before returning it or putting it into the gulf. In other words, the paper said that with commonsense in using cooling tanks, etc., and proper controls during construction, there should be no problem.

I have, on several occasions (and so too has Mr. Scriven) told industry that in any construction they would need to consult at each stage with the Environment and Conservation Department. They have further been told this liaison would be necessary on their projected plans and proposals. In this respect where industry have said that large quantities of water would be used, it has been made clear that before water is returned or placed in the gulf, it would have to be cooled to the temperature existing in the gulf. Dow, Mitsubishi, Alcoa, Goodrich, etc., all understand their responsibilities, and quite frankly I consider any suggestion that the petro-chemical industry is indiscriminately going to pollute this area as ridiculous so long as industry follows the guidelines laid down for them.

Unfortunately the minute, docket, or note referred to in my first paragraph cannot be located, nor are we certain from whom it came. However, I am quite certain in my own mind that I have seen such a piece of paper.

I shall table that minute. That was where my information came from originally. I did not get another report from the Director of Fisheries until May of this year. Throughout the negotiations for this petro-chemical industry the industry has been required to meet the environmental demands of the Government. In this connection I think I should give the House the following statement, which has the agreement of the Department of Environment and Conservation:

The concept of a petro-chemical industry in South Australia has been developed over a number of years, and foremost in our minds has been the concern that the industry should have no adverse effect on the environment. There have been statements made on television in recent weeks about mercury poisoning and prosecutions launched by the Canadian Government against the Dow Chemical Company for breaches of environment regulations. Unfortunately the media has not seen fit to air the other side of the question. The Canadian plant in question was built in the 1930's and was based on the then accepted mercury cell technology. Environment controls introduced within recent years are understandably too strict to enable 40-year-old plants to comply with them. Of greater import is the fact that in those 40 years there have been enormous changes in technology, and it is significant that not one of the companies that has proposed the building of a plant in South Australia has suggested the use of mercury cells. Modern-day plants use diaphragm cells to produce caustic soda and chlorine. Such technology does not use mercury anywhere within the process.

Officers of the Department of the Premier and of Development are fully aware of the requirements which will be demanded of a plant of this nature, and the Director of the Industrial Development Division appeared before the Environmental Protection Council on April 9 to discuss the environmental aspects associated with the petro-chemical industry.

In March, discussions were held in Japan by the Director of the Department of the Premier and of Development in which the requirements of the South Australian Government were made known.

Those discussions were quite vital to this project. The trip to Japan by the Director of the Department of the Premier and of Development was requested by our agent in Japan, Mr. Price, who said it was urgently necessary for discussions to be held with Mitsubishi in Tokyo. I could not go, but the Director was due to go overseas; he had work to do in London, and I directed him to go to Tokyo on his way so as to conduct these negotiations. That was no panic move because of criticisms: it was in the course of continuing negotiations. Following the visit of Mr. Bakewell to Tokyo, the Managing Director of Mitsubishi is here at this moment.

Mr. Hall: Don't lose his report again, will you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member would do well to listen, instead of carrying on

with the kind of irresponsible allegations he has made in this House, to the detriment of the people of this State.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And to the detriment of the reputation of the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The statement continues:

A large Japanese company announced that it was prepared to enter into partnership, and it was at this stage that an indication was given that two major companies have stated their intentions regarding South Australia.

As a result of the vast amount of basic groundwork undertaken by interested companies at the site and the rumours being spread in the Port Augusta area, it was vital that the Government made known its support for the project. It is nonsense to say that such an announcement was premature and that as a result the project would be lost.

This was one of the allegations made about this matter. The statement continues:

While there is no particular magic about Redcliffs, it so happens that a number of factors combine to make it a viable location for such an industry. Companies which are interested in outlaying huge amounts of capital are aware of all other potential locations around the world.

Following the announcement, a top level discussion was held in Hong Kong, at which one of the officers of the Department of the Premier and of Development was present, and these discussions have continued with increasing involvement in Adelaide. Further detailed negotiations will take place later this month. In fact, several members of the various groups of companies are in Adelaide at present for negotiations with the producers and officers of the Department of the Premier and of Development. While in Adelaide, the representatives are holding discussions with various Government bodies, including the Environment and Conservation, Fisheries, and Engineering and Water Supply Departments.

All State Government departments with an interest in such an industry have been made aware of the nature of the activity which will occur at Redcliffs, and preliminary comments have been received on the scheme. In particular, the Director of Fisheries and the Director of the Department of Environment and Conservation have been given an opportunity to raise matters pertaining to the ecology and the environment.

Unfortunately, the mechanics of developing a site for a petro-chemical industry are not well understood, and it is appropriate that they are outlined now. It will be essential when final determinations of the scale of the industry have been made to commence a biological study. This type of study will commence before a sod is turned at the site and all parameters such as ambient sea water temperatures, tidal movements, chemical composition of gulf waters, and innumerable others will be measured.

These measurements will then be compared with the projected performance of the plant and will provide a documented standard for use during the life of the plant. The study will be an intensive and exhaustive one and will be in the interest of both the people of South Australia and the owners of the plant.

An officer of the Department of the Premier and of Development has had discussions with representatives of the Western Waters Prawn Boat Owners Association and constant contact will be maintained with people who have a vital interest in the ecology of Spencer Gulf. At the appropriate time, the Department of the Premier and of Development will arrange meetings between all parties with an interest in the environment at the site and the company which will build the plant.

In relation to environmental aspects of this industry the Government, in its days in office, has created a Department of Environment and Conservation and has formed the Environmental Protection Council. As well, the Government has accepted all the major recommendations of the Environment Committee, which was chaired by Professor Jordan. There can therefore be no question of our acceptance of responsibility in this area. Copies of the relevant correspondence on this subject are available and they can be tabled if requested.

I assure the member for Flinders that the way in which this matter will proceed is that, as the final details of the ongoing processes are developed, at each stage there will be an examination of those processes and any possibilities

of their effect on the environment of the area. In the indenture that will be necessary to be signed for the creation of this complex, full protection will be given to the environment and necessary penalties will be written in; but, frankly, the requirements of the building of the plant under the indenture will be such that there will be no foreseeable possibility of environmental pollution, and we are insistent on this. That is understood by the intending plant builders, who have told us that it is their policy, given the fact that Government now requires this environmental protection, and properly does so, to conform to standards that are markedly better than those specifically laid down by Governments, and they will do that in this case.

When the indenture has been signed it will come to this House to be ratified by an Act of Parliament and there will be a Select Committee of the House sitting on the indenture, taking evidence, and satisfying members that we have given full protection to the environment and fisheries in the building of the plant. It will be normal in the provision for the setting up of that Select Committee that the members whose districts are directly involved will sit on the committee; that is the practice of the House. So the member for Flinders will have an opportunity to go into this matter fully. I appreciate the concern he has expressed, which concern is shared by the Government, and I assure him that we will ensure that this plant is established with no danger to the fishing industry of his area.

Motion carried.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill provides for the appropriation of \$110,000,000 so that the Public Service of the State may be carried on in the early part of next financial year. As members know, the annual Appropriation Bill does not normally receive assent until the latter part of October and, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills, normally two such Bills each year, and without this Bill now before the House there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal revenue expenditure from July 1, 1973.

In each of the last two years the first Bill has been for \$60,000,000. In the normal course, with rising cost and wage levels, and with a corresponding increase in the monthly flow of expenditures, I would have introduced a Bill for about \$70,000,000 to \$75,000,000 to cover requirements during July and August, 1973, to be followed by a second Bill in August to cover requirements in September and October. However, this year the circumstances may be different. The Government intends to introduce legislation which it considers to be vital and, should it not be accepted by Parliament, the Government would seek a dissolution of both Houses. It is essential that the day-to-day activities of Government be carried on, and essential, of course, for appropriation to be available to allow that. Accordingly, I believe it would be prudent to introduce a first Supply Bill, which would give appropriation for about three months, to cover a period in which Parliament may not be sitting. This Bill is for \$110,000,000. It will still be necessary for a second Supply Bill to be submitted to cover the full period of the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

A short Bill for \$110,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the

Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1973-74, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the sums made available by Supply Bills within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1972-73. In accordance with normal procedures, members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1973-74 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill. I believe that the Treasurer has been particularly truthful about the circumstances relating to the increased sum involved. I appreciate that, although there may be an implied threat, it is a Bill of reality and on that basis I accept and support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Payments not to exceed last year's Estimates except in certain respects."

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier indicated that normally he would have asked for \$60,000,000 at this time but that, because of increased salaries, etc., the Bill could justifiably provide for \$70,000,000 to \$75,000,000, which would suggest an increase in salary commitments of about 25 per cent on what has prevailed in the past. Is this a realistic sum relative to the increases in costs of conducting the Public Service, or is it a 25 per cent increase, as has been intimated by the Treasurer, a guess in order to overcome all eventualities or to provide for an increase in the Public Service's strength? I relate this matter to his statements, not to the \$110,000,000 with which we are dealing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Several factors are involved. Some significant increases have taken place, at the request of the former Prime Minister (Mr. McMahon), for which we did not budget originally. In addition, we have just had the increase in academic salaries—a large bite indeed. At the moment, we have to pay the whole of that. Although we will recover this money from the Commonwealth in due course, in the meantime we have to pay it, and the increases are retrospective to January. It will be appreciated that this is a large sum in one go. It is quite unusual, and that is why there is an increase of the dimensions I have outlined.

Dr. EASTICK: It appears then that my suggestion of a 20 per cent to 25 per cent increase in the overall salaries and wages structure of the Public Service is not correct, as this sum is less than would be required for that. As the Premier has explained, the increase involved is for retrospective payments and salary adjustments.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

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

That three members of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the University of Adelaide as provided by the University of Adelaide Act, 1971.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Messrs. Dean Brown, Duncan, and Simmons were declared elected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are the voting figures available?

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld, because I have declared the honourable members who have been elected.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

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

That three members of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia as provided by the Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966.

Motion carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, is there any provision in Standing Orders that would permit the actual votes being made known to members?

The SPEAKER: It is not necessary and it has never been done as far as I am aware. I do not think it is necessary on this occasion.

A ballot having been held, Messrs. Hopgood, Payne, and Tonkin were declared elected.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

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

That a Standing Orders Committee be appointed consisting of the Speaker and Messrs. Arnold, King, McRae, and Russack.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I should like to see a ballot for this committee because I have in mind the meritorious and long service of my colleague the member for Mitcham, who sits on my left.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Orders, it will now be necessary to take a ballot.

While the bells were ringing:

The SPEAKER: So that I cannot be accused of soliciting votes I desire to point out that the Speaker is *ex officio* a member of the Standing Orders Committee, and it will therefore be necessary for members to vote only for the four other members required, by placing a cross against their names.

Mr. RODDA: If members have already voted for you, Mr. Speaker, will it be an informal vote?

The SPEAKER: No, it will be accepted on this occasion.

A ballot having been held, the Speaker and Messrs. Arnold, King, McRae, and Russack were declared elected.

Additional Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Library: The Speaker and Messrs. Chapman, Payne, and Simmons.

Printing: Messrs. Dean Brown, Crimes, Duncan, Russack, and Slater.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

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

That the House proceed to elect three persons, to be representatives of the House of Assembly on the Joint House Committee pursuant to section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, 1941.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the Assembly representatives be the Speaker and Messrs. Gunn, Langley, and Slater.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

That, pursuant to the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972, a Public Accounts Committee be appointed consisting of Mrs. Byrne and Messrs. Goldsworthy, Keneally, Nankivell, and Simmons.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

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

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present Parliament of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in accordance with Joint Standing Orders 19 to 31, and that the representatives of the House of Assembly on the said committee be Messrs. Mathwin, McRae, and Wells.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Langley, and Olson be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report tomorrow.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 20, at 2 p.m.