HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 15, 1973

THE SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: DAYLIGHT SAVING

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 55 persons, stating that daylight saving caused difficulties and inconvenience to the citizens of this State that outnumbered the advantages obtained therefrom, and praying that the House would take action to end its future use in South Australia.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: STIRLING SEWAGE PLANT

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 36 Stirling residents stating that the proposed sewage treatment plant to serve the Stirling main street and adjacent areas was to be situated in a zoned residential section of the town; that this plant would adversely affect the amenity of the area through obnoxious smells, unsightliness and noise; that the Stirling council had recently spent a large sum of money in providing for schoolchildren a footpath and bridge through and adjacent to the treatment plant site; that there would automatically be a big depreciation in the value of nearby houses concerning many of which wage earners and pensioners had been striving for years to repay mortgages, and to beautify; and that other larger areas of vacant land within reasonable distance could be used for this purpose. The petitioners prayed that the Minister of Works would request his department to construct this objectionable plant on a site less likely to affect the living conditions and value of houses of the people concerned.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

UNION OFFICIALS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is normal practice for union officials to travel with officers of the Labour and Industry Department in the course of departmental inspections? A report appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

> An organizer of the Australian Workers Union and an inspector of the South Australian Labour and Industry Department had been ordered off an Ardrossan grazing property, the Australian Workers Union said yesterday. The State Secretary of the Australian Workers Union (Mr. J. E. Dunford) said the incident had happened on Monday while the two men were investigating reported breaches of the State Pastoral Industry Award by farmers and graziers in the Ardrossan-Maitland area of Yorke Peninsula.

One accepts that the South Australian Pastoral Industry Award was varied (and the variation was gazetted in the South Australian *Government Gazette* of April 19, 1973) by inserting clause 74, which certainly gives the opportunity for officers of the department to undertake inspections. The inspectors also have other rights: there is no dispute about that. However, observers on Yorke Peninsula have stated that the inspecting party, comprising the union official and the inspector from the Minister's department, was travelling in the same car, and that that was a Government vehicle. I ask the Minister whether this latest incident shows not only that the Government has a policy of preference for trade unionists but also (and the member for Eyre referred to this matter last week) that the Government is condoning the use of Government vehicles and the entree of inspectors from the department in forcing people to become members of the union.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am afraid that I must tell the Leader that he has his lines crossed again and that his information is entirely wrong.

Dr. Eastick: No, it is not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: True, I have an inspector in the area investigating complaints and, as the Leader well knows, it is my department's policy and duty to police the Pastoral Industry Award, which is a State award. I also point out to the Leader that anything connected with the matter of with whom the inspector travels, or who accompanies him on his investigation, would not contravene any Act. As I have said, he was dealing with complaints and would need to know where to go. I point out to the Leader that the inspector is travelling not in a Government car but with the union organizer in an A.W.U. organizer's car. The inspector is there investigating complaints by the A.W.U. of breaches of the South Australian Pastoral Industry Award. I am expecting the inspector to return today, and I will have a full report, I hope by tomorrow, to give to the House.

HACKHAM RAILWAY LAND

Mr. HOPGOOD: At the risk of upsetting the *Advertiser,* I ask my question of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the absence of the Minister of Transport. Will the Minister ask his colleague to request the Railways Commissioner to consider placing a fenced walkway across the old railway land opposite the end of Michael Avenue at Hackham? Some time ago the South Australian Railways fenced this land. This action was necessary, because there is a steep cutting nearby and one child narrowly escaped injury when she fell from a part of this cutting. However, the fencing of this land has involved extensive detours for parents going shopping and older children going to school. It has been suggested to me that a fenced walkway across this part of the land would still provide security for the children and at the same time allow the short-cut to be used.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined and to tell the honourable member what is the outcome.

DOCTORS' FEES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier state the reasons for and the circumstances surrounding the visit yesterday of officers of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch to the rooms of Dr. Whiting? It was stated in the newspaper that neither Dr. Whiting nor his receptionist was aware of the reported visit yesterday by the officers concerned to the doctor's rooms. In itself, this is disturbing. Therefore, can the Premier say whether the visit was designed to ascertain whether a notice of fees higher than those recommended was being displayed or whether it was for the purpose of inspecting records?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Surely the answer to that question must be obvious to the honourable member. How could the officers go there and inspect records if they did not ask for them?

Mr. Coumbe: How would they—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that Dr. Whiting has challenged the Government on this matter, suggesting that we are not dinkum in saying that we will enforce the law. He has said that what we said about prosecuting those who breach the law has been a hollow

threat, and he has announced his intention of exceeding by a marked amount the fees recommended by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and specified in a prices order to him. It is the duty of this Government to carry out the provisions of the Prices Act. A visit to a place of business to ascertain whether there is any public notice in the place of what the doctor intends to do is a necessary part of an investigation to see whether there is evidence of a breach of the prices order.

Mr. Coumbe: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member expects that anyone who goes into his outer office should inform him that he is actually there.

Mr. Coumbe: I should hope so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why he should do so. This is an area to which the doctor invites the attendance of the public.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's right; it's a waiting room.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a public waiting room. If officers go in there, observe whether a notice is displayed that is evidence of an intention to breach the Prices Act, and leave again, I do not see what the doctor has to complain about. There is nothing improper on the part of the officers or of the Government. If Dr. Whiting is dinkum, he will not carry on, suggesting that we are not being dinkum in seeking in a perfectly normal way evidence of whether or not there is a breach of the Prices Act. I am amazed that the honourable member should ask such a question.

STATE INSURANCE

Mr. SLATER: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about an insurance policy taken out with the State Government Insurance Commission?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State Government Insurance Commission has stated that a burglary policy was taken out in the name of the committee of the club concerned in the sum of $1,500 for which a premium of $12.78 was charged. Three claims have been reported, amounting to $388.28, under that policy. In view of the past instances of burglary and the likelihood of further claims because of the situation of the building, the commission suspended cover pending additional protection to the property. The commission's loss adjuster has reported that the management committee was discussing additional protective measures, including the installation of a burglar alarm system as suggested by the commission, and as soon as the installation has been completed the policy will be reinstated. I understand it is normal practice for insurance companies either to cancel or to suspend cover in the circumstances stated. It is understood that the club had also sustained loss by burglary prior to insuring with the commission.

VANDALISM

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation consider having cheap targets placed near valuable highway signs? Anyone who travels along our highways knows that the Highways Department has gone to great trouble to provide adequate signs (and they are expensive) at junctions, corners, and many other places along the highways. These seem to be targets for vandals who have nothing better to do but shoot at highway signs, and the replacement of these signs must be a great expense to the Highways Department. In Tasmania I saw a simple sign, similar to the bottom of a 44-gallon drum, with the words "Please shoot me". There is some sense in this, and I therefore put the suggestion to the Minister.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It seems to be a defeatist attitude to cater to an irresponsible section of the community that does, regrettably, take the action to which the honourable member has referred. Nothing is sacred to this section of the community. Usually, national park signs are defaced in this same way. However, I believe that what we should be doing is considering whether or not the penalty for discharging a firearm in an illegal way, such as is imposed whenever signs are defaced, should be increased.

Mr. Nankivell: It's too hard to police.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True, it is difficult to police this because it is especially difficult to catch the offender, who generally commits this offence in a remote part of the country. Nevertheless, if the penalty were severe enough, it could perhaps have the effect that those people who were caught would be held up as examples to other sections of the community, and it might have the desired effect. I will certainly consider what the honourable member has said, but at first blush my reaction is that it would not be the right way to attempt to solve the problem.

TAPEROO CROSSING

Mr. OLSON: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on July 25 regarding a rail crossing at Taperoo?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The lenses used in flashing light signals on this system are the same as those used throughout Australia and the United States of America. These lenses have been designed with special optical characteristics to provide the best possible indications for road users approaching the crossings. The optical design provides a 30° wide horizontal spread and a 15° downward deflection of the main beam. The outside surface of the lens is kept plain in order to minimize the collection of dust, etc, which would adversely affect the light output. The lenses are shielded with hoods to reduce the effect of the sun, as far as practicable. Unfortunately, no special lenses that would solve the problem are available. However, it is stressed that the approach to each crossing has two pairs of lights visible. Both sets of lights are focused at different angles, and it is considered that this minimizes any interference from the sun at all times.

PAROLE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although my question would normally go to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary, it is of such importance that I direct it to the Premier. Pursuant to section 42g of the Prisons Act, will the Premier obtain from the Acting Chairman of the Parole Board and give to this House a report on the decision to release on parole Rupert Max Stuart? Section 42g of the Prisons Act, passed in 1969 as part of the scheme to establish the Parole Board, in subsection (2) provides:

> The board shall, whenever so required by the Minister and, in any case, at least once in every year, furnish the Minister with a written report on every prisoner serving a sentence of life imprisonment or of indeterminate duration.

Subsection (3) provides:

> The board shall, whenever so required by the Minister, furnish the Minister with a report on any matter in connection with the administration of this Part upon which the Minister may require a report.

It is pursuant to that provision that I ask the question. This morning it has been announced that Rupert Max Stuart is to be released on parole and, bearing in mind the controversy that has surrounded this man since the murder of Mary Olive Hattam in 1959, the decision to release him on his third application for parole is sure to cause further controversy. I say that I am not willing to agree to that order at this stage.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments cannot be made as an explanation of a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because of the intense interest that this decision will arouse, I ask the Premier to take the action I have requested in my question so that all members of the public may know the circumstances and factors that influenced the Parole Board in making its decision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I will discuss the matter with my colleague, I am certainly not prepared to give an unequivocal undertaking to the honourable member that any report to the Minister will be released publicly.

Mr. Millhouse: Open government!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of open government lies in the decision to release Stuart, but I point out to the honourable member that one of the issues involved in dealing with prisoners is their reformation and rehabilitation, and that, if the release of Stuart is to be successful, personal matters concerning him that may be discussed by the Parole Board may be inappropriate to be released publicly. They may not be matters of public comment or interest, and I am saddened by the honourable member's attitude and comments in this House.

RATE REBATES

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 7 about how rebates on council rates are to be obtained by pensioners eligible for such rebates?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department bills pensioners in the same way as it does other ratepayers. The colour of the account is different from that used for other ratepayers, as it is necessary to provide specific information on this form for the information of the pensioner concerned, and the different colour enables the correct form to be readily identified. The full rates are shown, less the remission allowed. The rebate allowance is shown on all ratepayers' accounts rendered for the first quarter of each rating year. The procedure adopted by councils in rendering accounts is a matter for each council concerned, and I have referred this part of the question to the Acting Minister of Local Government for consideration.

PLYMPTON MEDIAN STRIP

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the median strip now being built on Marion Road near the "T" junction of Mooringe Avenue, Plympton, is necessary? I refer to an article in this morning's *Advertiser* and the statements and actions of a councillor, Dr. R. Jennings. Is the Minister aware of the West Torrens council's decision, made at a special meeting last Monday evening, that the Highways Department be asked to defer this work until a compromise can be arranged to the satisfaction of residents and the council? Will the Minister have this matter investigated, and can he assure me that the Highways Department has not ridden roughshod over the council, as has been claimed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assure all members that the department has not ridden roughshod over the council, in this matter. Proposals for this work have been considered and actively discussed with the council and residents of the area for over 12 months, and at least four meetings have been held on the site with members of the council, at which the complexities of traffic patterns in this area have been discussed. The honourable member will know of the increase in traffic that has occurred during recent years on Marion Road and Mooringe Avenue and that there is a need to provide for control of traffic at the intersection. Much correspondence has passed between the department and the council, and there have been at least four on-site inspections and much discussion on the best way for the traffic to approach the intersection. I assure the House that this matter has been properly considered. I further understand that no firm objection was made by the council to the department once the final proposals were published. However, I have been told that a letter was delivered to the Highways Department at 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon, well after the work had been undertaken on the median strip. Although I believe that the action taken by the person concerned was irresponsible from the point of view both of his position on the council and of his standing within the community, I have spoken to the Acting Minister of Transport and the Highways Commissioner to ensure that they discuss this project with the council before further work is undertaken. The investigations I made this morning clearly indicate that the Highways Department has acted properly throughout the history of this project.

CANNERY FINANCE

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about financial assistance for South Australian canneries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Representations were made to the Australian Government by the Premier for the conversion from a loan to a straight-out grant of advances made to South Australian canneries in respect of the 1971-72 crop. This action was taken following earlier requests by the South Australian Government for assistance for the canneries on account of international currency realignment. On July 6, 1973 the Minister for Primary Industry replied that he proposed that payment of the first re-payment instalments of principal and interest be deferred until December 1, pending consideration of the submission for compensation for the effects of currency realignments. The Premier advised the Commonwealth Minister that this proposal was acceptable to him, and Jon Preserving Co-operative Limited and Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited have been informed accordingly.

DIPLOMACY

Mr. HALL: As the South Australian Government maintains what is called a trade commissioner in South-East Asia at the expense of the State Government, will the Premier take up the matter of the Prime Minister's disagreement with the Prime Minister of Singapore in order to have the effects of the argument diminished so that South Australian trade relations and exports to Singapore do not suffer as a result of the Prime Minister's petulance and impetuosity? On the front page of the *Financial Review* of August 9, a report headed "Multi-national Mania" states, in part:

Mr. Lee—

referring to Mr. Lee Kuan Yew—

attacked Australia's trade, transport and immigration policies, and dismissed the Whitlam concern about the operations of multi-national companies as being a luxury able to be engaged in only by rich countries. He drew Mr. Whitlam. The two men engaged in one of the most direct and abrasive exchanges of the whole conference so far, over the issue of the operations of Qantas.

I draw the attention of the Premier to the fact that the Prime Minister of Singapore, who I believe is a personal friend of his, has attacked the trade, transport and immigration policies of the Commonwealth Labor Government. I direct this question to the Premier, hoping that he may be able to intercede on behalf of his friend with the Australian Prime Minister in order to lessen the friction that may harm South Australia's trade and commerce prospects.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously asks his question with cynical, malicious and mischievous intent, and he intends to do nothing along the lines of what he has requested me to do in the various forms in which his question has been asked. Mr. Lee and Mr. Whitlam are long personal friends and associates of mine, and remain so.

Mr. Hall: You may believe—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of personal belief on my part, contrary to what the honourable member says. The facts of both those statements speak for themselves. True, there has been a difference between the Prime Minister of our country and Mr. Lee in relation to certain policies discussed at the Ottawa conference, but the matter of the foreign relations of this country concerning all those matters is one for the Australian Government.

Mr. Hall: We do have a trade commissioner—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not have a trade commissioner in Singapore: we have a commercial trade agent who has no diplomatic position whatever.

Mr. Millhouse: He's there to look after our—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He is not there to put to the Singaporean Government any matters in relation to diplomacy between this country and Singapore: he is there purely to discuss certain matters in supplementing the work of the Commonwealth Trade Commissioner in Singapore. I have no intention whatever of suggesting that he do anything as improper as discussing with the Singaporean Government the diplomatic relations of this country with Singapore. That is not his job, and it would not be accepted by the Singaporean Government any more than it should be accepted by the people of this State or by the Australian Government. Concerning the other parts of the honourable member's question, I am certain that Mr. Whitlam and Mr. Lee are perfectly capable of being frank with one another in a way that they both acknowledge and accept without any intervention on my part or without any endeavour on the part of the honourable member to stir or make mischief.

PORT AUGUSTA DEPOT

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Works say whether plans exist to build at Port Augusta an administration block for the Public Buildings Department? It has been suggested to me that such a building is to be constructed at Port Augusta, and I ask this question because of the obvious need that exists in this regard.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is planned to build a new district office at Port Augusta for the Public Buildings Department at a cost of about $215,000. This is part of a plan that has been decided on by this Government and by me, as Minister, to decentralize the functions of the Public Buildings Department, especially concerning minor works. During a visit to several schools in my own district last week, I was heartened to hear headmasters say that they were pleased indeed with the improvement that has already taken place in respect of minor works, which form a service provided by the Public Buildings Department. The honourable member would know that the depot in Port Augusta is at present located in the hospital grounds, and of course that is not satisfactory. However, this depot will now be relocated, and I think the new complex will consist of an administration block, staff facilities, workshops and stores. Present planning provides that work on the complex should be completed in sufficient time for it to be occupied by late 1974.

JUVENILE ASSESSMENT FACILITIES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare give me details of the present situation regarding juvenile assessment facilities?

The Hon. L. J. KING: During the 13-month period ended July 31, 1973, 1 001 children and young persons have been assessed. Of these, 309 males and 32 females have been assessed while still in the community, and 513 males and 147 females have been assessed while in custody. The new day assessment centre which will be established at Glandore will function exclusively as a non-residential facility. Care is taken at both Windana and Vaughan House in relation to the placement of children in various sections so that they will not be unduly influenced by others.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain an up-to-date report on the Modbury High School administration block, which has cracked substantially? The Minister will be aware that I have raised this matter with him previously, and I have also raised it over a long period with former Ministers of Education. Having been told that observations over a considerable period by the Commonwealth Scientific Industrial and Research Organization were necessary to gauge the effect of seasonal changes on the soil in the area and on the building itself, I believe that the Public Buildings Department expected to receive a report on the results. The danger factor has been brought to my attention, and it is obvious, from an inspection of the building last Friday with members of the school council, that there is still a slight movement. The whole building complex needs upgrading inside and outside, and the gutters need painting, etc. It is presumed, however, that this work will not be carried out, because of the cracking of the building. As a report is required on whether consideration of this matter is near completion, I ask the Minister this question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matter.

PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say whether arrangements are in hand to effect alterations to the woodwork centre at Penola High School in order to provide a metalwork room? For a long time there has been overcrowding in this area of the school, and the staff has been unable to give instruction in metalwork.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, there is an urgent need for work to be done in this area at Penola High School. The project is proceeding and, so that it may be expedited, I have authorized the Public Buildings

Department to waive the calling of public tenders and to seek private offers immediately from selected contractors. I hope that this work will be commenced by the beginning of the next school year and that the alterations being made to the woodwork room at Penola High School in order to provide a metalwork area will be completed before the end of the school year.

EYRE PENINSULA WEATHER STATION

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider having a weather station established on Lower Eyre Peninsula? The nearest weather station to the southern Eyre Peninsula region is at Kyancutta and it is considered that a station in this location cannot give residents in southern areas an accurate indication of weather and bush fire conditions. Because of the vastly differing meteorological conditions throughout the western zone, it would be desirable not only that this area be divided into three sections for fire ban forecasts, but also that a weather station be established to service the southern areas of the western agricultural zone. In the interests of fire protection, these views are being canvassed actively by members of the local Emergency Fire Services, who suggest that for practical reasons the ideal location for such a weather station would be Cummins.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take the matter up with my colleague and get a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

WEED SPRAYS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what is the present position regarding the available supply of hormone sprays in South Australia? Several constituents have told me that they are experiencing difficulty in obtaining suitable supplies of weed spray and, as we are getting into the late part of the year, these people are concerned about the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On July 9, 1973, in an Agriculture Department press release the Senior Weeds Officer warned that a critical situation was developing in the supply of 2,4-D and M.C.P.A. herbicides, which are used widely in South Australia as weed sprays in cereal crops. Growers were urged to use their supplies sparingly and under ideal conditions, in order to cover as large an area as possible. He recommended that, for crops still in the seedling stage, alternative materials (even if more costly) should be used. He did not recommend the delaying of spraying in the hope of obtaining 2,4-D later in the season. Advice on the best alternative spray was stated to be available from district agricultural advisers or regional weeds officers. I am advised that the supply situation has not improved, and it appears obvious that insufficient 2,4-D and M.C.P.A. will be available in South Australia this year. I am also informed that there is a world shortage of raw materials for the production of these herbicides. Therefore, the position does not seem to be too bright.

MANOAH

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier recommend to the Government that the property Manoah, at Upper Sturt, be acquired for Government purposes? This property was owned by the late Sir Josiah Symon, who was well known in the early history of the State. The property comprises a main building of about 36 rooms, as well as outbuildings and 44 acres (18 ha). The property is surrounded by about 260 housing allotments and it would be a pity if this property passed into the hands of developers when it could be a barrier and a green belt between housing areas. The property is to be auctioned on September 19. In last weekend's *Sunday Mail* one reads of a need for a house in which to dry out alcoholics, for want of a better term, and this site would be ideal, being away from all hotels, isolated to a certain extent, and having a pleasant environment. If it were not used for that purpose it could be used for other Government institutional purposes or recreational purposes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter, but I can make no promises.

FURTHER EDUCATION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education consider assisting not only mothers and fathers by way of further education but also their children? Assistance is given through further education, and I refer particularly to the teaching of music, the assistance given being about 50 per cent of the cost involved. In an instance in my district, the children tried to obtain assistance through the further education authorities there. However, when the matter was referred to Adelaide, it was knocked out. Will the Minister consider helping these children in the same way as their parents receive training and assistance.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the honourable member could well have told the parents, without raising the matter in this House, that an approach to the Further Education Department on behalf of children who are of school going age would be misdirected, as the Further Education Department has no responsibility for leisure classes or vocational classes for children at school. That is a responsibility of the Education Department, which has several teachers of instrumental music, some of whom are teaching in the country. I am sure that the honourable member appreciates that we cannot overcome overnight the difficulties that arise in getting competent staff in this area so that schools in country areas can be serviced properly. I will examine the present position, but I hope that the honourable member, for his part, will make clear to the people in his district that the teaching of children of school age is not the responsibility of the Further Education Department and that, if there is a case for teaching the playing of musical instruments to children of school age, this work should be undertaken through the Education Department.

QUEENSTOWN SHOPPING CENTRE

Mr. COUMBE: In relation to the Queenstown shopping site dispute, can the Premier say whether he has been informed of the reported decision of the Port Adelaide council to consider further legal action and (more importantly, in my view) to call a conference of the major parties involved in the dispute? If he has been, and in view of his earlier comments about this dispute, does the Premier believe that such a conference would have merit, and would he support the holding of such a conference?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have seen only newspaper reports: I have seen nothing else. I point out to the honourable member that some time ago I brought together the parties in the dispute. I formed a working party, under the chairmanship of the Port Adelaide council, in relation to the rehabilitation of the Port Adelaide shopping area. I obtained the then undertaking (for what it proved to be worth) of the Myer organization that it would involve itself in investment in the Port Adelaide redevelopment, and I made my offices available, undertaking to the Port Adelaide council that I would

introduce legislation as requested by it; this I did. I will await any official request to call the parties together, because frankly, after what has happened recently in the matter, the question whether the *bona fides* of all parties concerned can be accepted at such a conference will certainly have to exercise the mind of the Government. I do not know whether the honourable member is aware of the recent moves of the Port Adelaide council in relation to certain matters before the Supreme Court; if he were aware, I think he would have doubts also.

FIREWORKS

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the possible banning of fireworks?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states:

I can assure the honourable member that I share his concern and that of many parents and organizations at the injuries caused by the irresponsible use of fireworks. As a result of increasing concern by the public in recent years at the number and seriousness of accidents to children and also damage to property caused by misuse of fireworks, regulations under the Explosives Act, 1936-1972, that control the sale of fireworks have been tightened considerably. Fireworks may now be sold only by holders of current licences during a period restricted to a Saturday in June fixed by proclamation under the Explosives Act, and the five days preceding that Saturday.

The regulations also prohibit the sale of fireworks which, because of their composition or explosive power, are considered to be inherently dangerous. The most recent addition to the list of prohibited fireworks was in 1971 when bungers and bangers more than 45 mm (1¾ in.), jumping jacks, and similar fireworks, and those types of Jack in the box, mine of serpents, Guy Fawkes mine, gold mine and devil amongst the tailors that contain exploding components, and similar fireworks, were prohibited. However, I remain unconvinced that prohibiting sale of all fireworks to children will eliminate accidents. In fact, a total ban on the sale of fireworks, as advocated by the honourable member, may well encourage the home manufacture by children and others of extremely dangerous crackers from chemicals readily available in most homes.

The position regarding sale of fireworks to children will continue to be kept under review by my colleague, who assures me that, if further tightening of the law is considered necessary, he will recommend that course of action.

CHAFFEY IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Irrigation to my recent question about the rehabilitation of distribution facilities in the Chaffey District?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A copy of the report by the Public Works Committee on the rehabilitation of pumping and distribution facilities in the Chaffey irrigation area can be examined in the Parliamentary Library. The committee made its report in 1970, and the report is printed in the Parliamentary Papers for that year. Proposals for rehabilitation of pumping and distribution facilities in the other Government-controlled irrigation areas in the Chaffey District, namely, Berri, Cobdogla and Waikerie, have been referred to the committee for investigation and report. It is understood that the committee's report will be tabled soon. Inquiries for a copy of a report on rehabilitation of facilities within the Renmark irrigation district should be made to the Renmark Irrigation Trust.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POINT McLEAY RESERVE

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I refer to recent publicity in press and television concerning the Point McLeay Aboriginal Reserve. Important aspects were overlooked in this publicity. The State Government has expended large and increasing sums in the last few years on the Point McLeay Reserve and substantial improvements have occurred. There is virtually full employment on the reserve. There are 23 Aborigines employed on the farm, administration and outside projects.

The press report on Saturday quotes Mr. Rankine as saying that his people wanted to take over the farm as well as other services, and commence other industries. In fact, up to this point there has been no request by the council to take over the farm. The Chairman of Point McLeay council (Mr. Rankine) agrees with this and says that initially they want to take over village services only. For some time there have been plans to have a feasibility study done on possible industries for Point McLeay.

The impending transfer of exclusive responsibility for Aboriginal affairs to the Commonwealth Government means that that Government will assume responsibility for the development of means of employment at Point McLeay. The reports mentioned the main street being lined with rubble and drab, untidy weather-board houses, also brick walls being demolished, broken windows, and weeds in gutters of main buildings. Work on the sewerage scheme has resulted in earthworks giving an untidy appearance. The old fences have been demolished so that new fences can be erected. Some of the old weatherboard houses do, in fact, look dilapidated but, as they are due for replacement in the next financial year, any maintenance work has been kept to a minimum.

The community hall, featured in the publicity, is 110 years old and has not been used for many years. Recently, the young people on the reserve started painting out the old canteen building, which can be more appropriately used by residents for youth gatherings. There is another large hall which is recognized as the community hall. There has been difficulty in maintaining this because of vandalism, and windows are continually being replaced. This is a problem which the reserve council must solve. The village square covers an area much larger than is normal in a town of comparable size, and to keep it in a reasonable state is very costly. Immediate plans for developments on the reserve are as follows:

(1) The building of eight new houses in the next financial year. This will be in the hands of the housing society.

(2) The taking over of village services by the council as soon as incorporation is arranged. I approved the constitution of this council last week.

(3) The appointment of a clerk to assist the housing society and the council with correspondence, minutes, etc., following the resignation of the Superintendent at the close of business on August 17, 1973. At a meeting held on August 1, 1973, and attended by the council, the housing society, Mr. Buick, and the department's regional supervisor, the council and housing society said that they did not want the Superintendent replaced, and the appointment of a clerk would cover the situation until they were funded for a business manager and clerical support.

(4) The main street has recently been partly bituminized and curbed.

(5) The sewerage scheme is proceeding and being installed by a member of the building branch, with labour recruited from the reserve. Sufficient funds have been allowed on this year's budget for the completion of the project.

(6) A painter from the building branch is currently working on the reserve, and painting houses with local labour.

(7) Three new houses, which will replace three old residences, are in the latter stages of completion. Work has been somewhat delayed because of vandalism during the course of erection.

It is hoped that the Commonwealth will involve itself in development of the reserve. There has been continuous consultation between the council and the regional staff concerning future development.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House deplore the action of the Commonwealth Government in making available to this State for the financial year 1973-74 $20,000,000 less than requested by the Premier at the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council, and is of opinion that the South Australian Government should make fresh and vigorous representations to the Commonwealth to increase the moneys to be paid to South Australia to the amount originally requested.

As this is the first item of private members' business during the present session, I suggest that it is appropriate that it should be in the hands of a member of the Liberal Movement, because private members' business is traditionally the best opportunity that members on the Opposition side get to develop their policy and to emphasize the weaknesses of the Government. The fact that, on behalf of the Liberal Movement, I am moving this motion is appropriate because it is simply in conformity with what has been happening for the whole of this session and indeed with what happened during the short session in June. I have found (and my Leader, the member for Goyder, is of the same opinion) that it is not impossible to lead from the cross benches, especially in the total absence of any leadership from the front bench on this side. The genesis of this motion came from a question I asked of the Premier during the first week of the present session of Parliament. On July 24, I asked him whether he could say for how much more money he had asked for South Australia at the recent Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings, and he gave me, for once, a straight-out, short, concise answer, the very information I was seeking—"$20,000,000". I recall that there were on both sides a few sniggers from some members because of the brevity of the Premier's answer, but, from my point of view, that was precisely the information I had sought. So, whatever else may be contested in this motion, at least the amount by which we are short because of the refusal of the Commonwealth to meet our request cannot be in issue.

I was prompted to ask that question because of the reports in the newspapers of the meetings of the Loan Council and the Premiers a few weeks ago, and we in this House must, unfortunately, rely largely on newspaper reports for our information on what goes on at those meetings. Certainly, the Treasurer of this State each session does read and table a couple of statements, but they are so stereotyped, being prepared by officers of the Treasury, as really not to give this House very much information of significance. So, as I say, we are obliged to go to the newspapers for our information.

What do we find if we look at the *Advertiser* of June 29? We find on page I a heading, under a photograph of the Premier, his Deputy, and Mr. White, "S.A. needs marked assistance now". The article states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday: "South Australia needs marked assistance now." This was so although he "entirely welcomed" the Commonwealth's plan to involve itself in additional areas of responsibility which had been traditionally those of the States.

We shall have a chance to talk about that later. The article continues:

"Simply to maintain the present level of services with no expansion factor built in would involve a possible State deficit of more than $32,000,000 next year. General assistance grants need to be increased because we are at the limit of what can be done in the way of raising more State taxation."

This is the Premier talking—no-one else. The article continues:

South Australia had no revenue sources left except those which contributed most to cost-push inflation. This was the very thing the Premiers wanted to avoid. The South Australian Government expected a Budget deficit this year of $5,500,000, about $2,000,000 less than the estimate.

Although I cannot canvass it in detail, the Premier referred to this last Thursday in his statement on the Loan Estimates. That was the Premier's reaction as reported in the *Advertiser* on June 29 after he had been to, or while he was at, the Premiers' Conference. There is a little more in the lead story under "State cash talks deadlock", which was more general:

A major confrontation quickly developed behind closed doors when the six Premiers rejected the Commonwealth's initial offer as completely unacceptable. The conference broke up just before 11 p.m. with the conflict unresolved. The Commonwealth offer clearly set out that the financial assistance grants and the Loan programmes were reduced by amounts equal to the estimated saving to the States as a result of the Commonwealth's taking full responsibility for financing tertiary education from January 1, 1974.

The member for Goyder canvassed that matter last night. The article continues:

The States were told that the Commonwealth was of the firm view that it had no alternative but to leave it to the States to close prospective gaps between revenue and expenditure in ways they individually considered most appropriate. The Commonwealth did not intend—

and this is Mr. Whitlam talking—

to provide further revenue help later this year.

We had a muted comment from the Premier of South Australia:

Mr. Dunstan said "At this stage I am not happy."

That was the newspaper report of June 29. We had further reports of the conference in the paper of June 30, as follows:

Mr. Whitlam told the Premiers that all Governments would have to close their Budget deficits from their own resources.

There is a reminder further on in the article, as follows:

In last year's election campaign, Mr. Whitlam promised that no-one would pay increased tax rates—

those are the operative words—

He affirmed this promise at a press conference last week. But in recent weeks Federal Government spokesmen have made it clear the promise applied only to income tax. But Government sources said last night the $28,000,000 increase on the normal taxation reimbursement formula was the smallest supplementary grant yet given to the States.

It is worse, of course, than had been given by those wicked (according to the Labor Party) Commonwealth Governments which preceded the present one, which had been composed of members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party and which had been the target for so long of the vilification of members of the Government in this State. The article continues:

The South Australian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said afterwards that his relationships with the Commonwealth were "a bit strained".

He goes on to talk about pay-roll tax, and so on. So there is no doubt that, given political bias, which means

that the Premier tones down his criticism of the Commonwealth in the interests of his Party although against the interests of this State, he is not at all happy with the present situation.

Well, then, what can we, as members of this House, do about it? It appears that the Government, left to itself, for political reasons will do nothing. The problem is that members opposite cannot at one and the same time be good South Australians and good members of the Labor Party, because the objective of the Labor Party is a centralist objective: it is for the clothing of the Commonwealth Parliament with plenary powers for the abolition of the States and of the Senate, and of course one potent weapon (indeed, the most potent weapon) with which to achieve that objective is the power of the purse, which resides in the Commonwealth, which power the Commonwealth will use to the greatest possible extent.

I am sure we shall find when the Commonwealth Budget is delivered that the promise Mr. Whitlam made before the election was one of those half-truths which we expect nowadays from the Labor Party: there may not be any increases in taxation rates but I have no doubt that the people of Australia will be paying, in one way or another, far more in taxation through increased costs and charges than they are now. Of course, the Commonwealth is cynically leaving it to the States, through their Budgets, to raise a good part of the extra money needed.

The contrast between the attitude of the Premier now that there is a Labor Government in Canberra and the attitude that he adopted when there was a Liberal and Country Party Government in Canberra is marked. When I was preparing my speech I came across a pamphlet that he issued in 1970, part of which I quoted a little while ago, regarding State taxation and the finances of South Australia. The pamphlet says:

> When unusual (or even usual) wage increases happened in the past, the Commonwealth Government paid the States extra to help them out. This year—

that is, 1970—

> it didn't. It has taken all the extra income tax coming from the wage rises, paid its own extra wage costs, paid a small amount to the States under the existing wage increase formula (less than one-third of the States' extra cost) and then put millions of dollars profit into the Federal Treasury. It refused to help the States further. As a result every State in Australia is now suffering.

I do not know whether the Premier would be game to say that now, but he knows that it is truer now than it was in 1970. The pamphlet also says:

> What John Gorton has asked the States to do is reduce spending on schools, health and hospitals. Victoria therefore announced that despite increased school enrolments it will reduce its present temporary teaching staff and it won't appoint any more teachers or nurses. Queensland also has announced cuts in spending on education and health and hospitals. And that's the way they're all knuckling under!

The two non-Labor States at that time were picked out. The Premier used that as an excuse for the increase in taxation that he introduced in this State at that time, contrary to all his election propaganda of a few months earlier. That was his attitude then but, now that there is a Commonwealth Labor Government in Canberra and a State Labor Government in South Australia, what has happened to all the co-operation that we were led to expect there would be if there were Governments of the same political complexion at both levels? The answer is that there is co-operation, but that co-operation is only to achieve the object of the Labor Party, certainly not to improve the welfare of the people of this State.

Let me give a warning: if we get a centralist form of government in Australia, as the Labor Party wants, we will be ruled by the Melbourne-Sydney axis, because that is where the bulk of the population is and where the bulk of political influence will rest. Scant attention will be paid to the smaller States. We know this only too well, and members opposite know it, too. That is why I say that people cannot at one and the same time be good South Australians and good members of the Labor Party, because the interests of South Australia and of the Labor Party are in direct conflict. I do not want to say any more about the facts that support the motion. We know the size of the deficiency—a whopping $20,000,000—and we know that the Premier is unhappy about the situation. What should we do about it? I suggest that we should carry this motion, because I hope all members will deplore the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to give us more money. I hope that we will support a fresh approach by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government to make up the deficit before it is too late. That is all that this motion involves, and I commend it to members. I hope that, despite Party allegiances on both sides of the House, it will receive unanimous support.

Mr. HALL seconded the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

OFFSHORE RIGHTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

> That this House call on all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, and particularly the Senators, irrespective of their Party allegiance, to oppose by every means in their power the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill now before that Parliament.

This matter is akin to the matters I raised during the debate on the previous motion. It concerns the relationships between the central Government and the State Governments. I hope that neither this debate nor the earlier one will be long: I do not intend to put matters on the Notice Paper and leave them there for a long time. I hope members will be willing to vote on both motions, particularly this one (because of the urgency that I shall mention in a moment), either next Wednesday or, at the latest, two or three weeks from now. It is urgent that we should have a vote on this matter, because the Bills referred to in the motion are likely to be debated in the Senate in the next few weeks and, if we are to make our voice heard, our views should be expressed quickly. If there is on either side of the Chamber any attempt to delay a vote on this motion, the reason why will be patently obvious to all members: it will be simply to save embarrassment to those of one or other political persuasion.

The legislation embodied in the two Bills I have mentioned has had a stormy history in the Commonwealth Parliament and in Australian politics, going back for two or three years. The Bills spring from a desire by the Commonwealth Government to extend its legislative power over areas off the shores of Australia. The Commonwealth Government has desired to extend its power in this way not only as an assertion of nationalism but also because of the mineral wealth on the continental shelf which the Commonwealth wants to control and from which it hopes to profit. Previous Bills introduced by Liberal and Country Party Governments have foundered because of disagreements within those Parties. To realize that, one has only to think of the difficulties a former Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, had. Now, quite predictably, the Labor Government, which has the object of centralization anyway, has gone ahead with the Bills. Let me read the long title of

the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill. The long title of and the preamble to that Bill set out clearly what the Commonwealth Government is seeking. The long title is as follows:

A Bill for an Act relating to sovereignty in respect of certain waters of the sea and in respect of the airspace over, and the sea-bed and subsoil beneath, those waters and to sovereign rights in respect of the continental shelf and relating also to the recovery of minerals, other than petroleum, from the sea-bed and subsoil beneath those waters and from the continental shelf.

The preamble is as follows:

Whereas a belt of sea adjacent to the coast of Australia, known as the territorial sea, and the airspace over the territorial sea and the bed and subsoil of the territorial sea, are within the sovereignty of Australia:

And whereas Australia is a party to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone a copy of which in the English language is set out in schedule 1:

that has been put in to try to support the power of the Commonwealth to pass such legislation—

And whereas Australia as a coastal State has sovereign rights in respect of the continental shelf (that is to say, the sea-bed and subsoil of certain submarine areas adjacent to its coast but outside the area of the territorial sea) for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources:

And whereas Australia is a party to the Convention on the Continental Shelf a copy of which in the English language is set out in schedule 2:

Be it therefore enacted . . .

That is what the Commonwealth is after: it is after sovereignty over these areas for its own benefit. This sovereignty is being contested by all the States, and I am glad to say (and this is an exception to the general ride) that Party is put ahead of States rights, even by those States which have Labor Governments.

During the Parliamentary recess the Attorney-General and others went to London to petition the Queen for an opinion from the Privy Council regarding the validity of the action of the Commonwealth Government. During the first session of this Parliament I asked the Attorney-General what had resulted from his visit to London, and he replied, in part (it was a very long reply), as follows:

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, T. 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. Tt is important to the State that these matters be clarified so that State administration is not embarrassed by legal uncertainty.

Of course, the Attorney-General was wrong in referring only to one Bill: in fact, there are two Bills. He set out in that reply clearly, if at some length, the object of his visit, and that of others from other States, to London. Much has appeared in the press about this matter, and I refer to a report of comments by the Premier in the *Advertiser* on May 12, 1973, as follows:

The South Australian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said in Brisbane yesterday the States wanted the Privy Council to rule on Commonwealth-States conflict over offshore rights. Mr. Dunstan said it had to be determined what control over water below low-water mark was given to the States when the British Government established them. "This happened before Federation. Therefore we need the appropriate British Government decision," he said. Mr. Dunstan said endeavours to achieve agreement with Commonwealth co-operation had failed. "All approaches to determine offshore rights have been rejected by the Commonwealth." He said he started to seek Commonwealth co-operation when he was elected Premier, but without success. "The matter has to be resolved," he said.

The report goes on to quote Sir Robert Askin, and it is interesting that a day or two later the Leader of the Opposition in this House supported the Premier: "Eastick backs Dunstan", is the heading, and it is one that we are getting quite used to. That was the Premier's attitude in the middle of May. A few days later a report appeared in the *Australian* of a rift between the Premier and the Prime Minister on this matter, under the heading "Dunstan splits with Prime Minister on sea Jaw", as follows:

The Labor Premier of South Australia (Mr. Dunstan) yesterday disagreed with the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) on the States' appeal to the Privy Council. He rejected Mr. Whitlam's accusation that the appeal over the Federal offshore legislation breached Labor policy. Mr. Dunstan said his action did not bring him into conflict with the Labor Party policy. Mr. Whitlam at his press conference last week accused the Labor Premiers of South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania of breaching Labor policy in their approach with the non-Labor Premiers to the Privy Council.

The Prime Minister said the Premiers, who were at the Party's 1971 Federal conference—which decided the Commonwealth should legislate for the regulation and exploitation of offshore resources—knew they were defying Party policy. Mr. Dunstan said on the television programme *Federal File,* there was a disagreement between the Prime Minister and himself on the sensible way of proceeding, but there was no conflict with Labor Party policy. Mr. Dunstan said the Privy Council was the only court in the world which had the ability to give a ruling on the administration and control of offshore areas.

In the report the Premier goes on to point out, properly for once, that the High Court will not give advisory opinions. That is the situation we reached in May. What is the position we have now reached? The Bills are in the Senate, because of an about-turn by the Liberal Party, which had first of all decided to support the Bills. The Bills passed through the House of Representatives, of course, and it was then decided to hold them up in the Senate until the Budget session of the Commonwealth Parliament. They are lying there now, waiting to be debated and, as I have said, they are likely to be debated in the next few weeks.

The Attorney-General and others have been to London and we are, so far as I know, still awaiting the decision of the Privy Council (the only way, according to the Premier and his Government, that the matter can be properly resolved, and on this I agree with them). Most of us, including the Government, are bitterly opposed to the Bills in their present form. Why then should we as a House of the South Australian Parliament not act? Of course, there is no reason, and we should act in this matter. We should give Government members an opportunity to rebut what I have said a couple of times this afternoon: that it is impossible to be a good South Australian and a good member of the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Through this motion, I give members opposite an opportunity to rebut that, and I also give their colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament an opportunity to rebut it, and perhaps that is more significant. I am giving them the chance to support South Australia in the Commonwealth Parliament, instead of supporting only their

Party's interests. There are precedents for motions of this nature being moved in this House, and for motions primarily aimed at the Senators for South Australia. I have examined a couple of these motions, and it is interesting that they were both moved by members of the Labor Party in this place, during my time. In 1962 the late Mr. Walsh, when Leader of the Opposition, on August 23 moved this motion:

That South Australian Senators be requested to consider moving in the Senate the following further amendment to the motion that the Budget Papers be printed, namely: "but that the Government be requested to make provision for adequate funds to enable the standardization of the railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie to be carried out in conjunction with the State of South Australia".

At that time, this matter was very dear to the hearts of South Australians. The question was put and passed, according to the Votes and Proceedings of the House, and it was ordered that a copy of the resolution be forwarded forthwith by the Clerk of the House to each Senator for the State of South Australia. That motion was moved by the late Mr. Walsh in 1962. Coming a little closer to our time, the Premier, on August 19, 1970, moved the following motion without notice:

That this House calls on the members of the Commonwealth Parliament representing South Australia to take action in the Commonwealth Parliament to protect employment and development in South Australia from the impost on the sale of wines of 50c a gallon and from an increase of 2½ per cent in sales tax on motor vehicles and electrical goods which are proposed in the Commonwealth Budget and which will adversely affect South Australia far more than any other State.

So, I am in good company or, at least, I suppose most members would believe that I am in good company in moving my motion. There are precedents in the last 11 years, and both precedents referred to come from members of a Party opposite to mine; so I have some confidence in having my motion carried. What I want to do is to let South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament know that we are opposed to this legislation, because we think it is bad legislation that will lead, as the Premier has said repeatedly, to one appeal after another to the High Court of Australia; and that there is another and better way to work out this matter if only common sense and a desire to co-operate will prevail. I believe that, if my motion is carried, and if we can persuade our friends in the Commonwealth Parliament to act on it, there is a very good chance that the legislation will be defeated in the Senate. There is, as we know, a division of opinion among Commonwealth members on both sides of politics there about this legislation. As the Senate is fairly evenly divided, I believe that, if our Senators were to act together for once (and as we South Australians want them to act), the legislation would be defeated.

I know that the chances of their taking any notice of my motion are not good. There is only one way, as we know, really to bring pressure on members of Parliament, and that is to threaten their selection as candidates at the next election. If members of the Labor Party are really genuine in their desire to see this legislation defeated, my motion will simply be the first step and there will be pressure on their Commonwealth members, both in the House of Representatives and, more importantly, in the Senate, to vote against the two Bills by threatening them with the loss of their pre-selection. That would not be difficult to do in the Labor Party, because of the card-voting system it has.

As I have said deliberately to draw Government members out, my motion gives them the opportunity to show that their loyalty to their Party and to the State are not necessarily inconsistent. However, if they do not support my motion, it will be obvious that loyalty to the Party outweighs loyalty to the State. I hope that my friends on this side will give unanimous support to this motion, despite the differences of opinion within their own Party between those who support the legislation and those who do not support it. The Commonwealth members, by and large, have supported it, although there have been reports that Senator Laucke has opposed it. However, I hope that, in the interests of South Australia, they will support the motion, for I believe it is of great importance, not only on this matter but also for the future of our State, that we should present a united front on this side of the House and among all members of it. I commend the motion to honourable members.

Mr. HALL seconded the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DRINKING DRIVERS

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, an intensive campaign focused on accident prevention should be conducted throughout the community, with particular emphasis on education, and with facilities made available to enable people who have been drinking to relate personal alcohol intake to individual blood-alcohol level, and to be advised and warned against driving if a level above the legal limit is indicated.

The relationship between alcohol consumption and road accidents is now well known and well documented both by studies overseas and now, I am happy to say, in Australia. Legislative action has been taken in many countries (again, mostly overseas, but now in Australia) and this action, I believe, has had some deterrent effect. It is interesting to note that in Britain when the breathalyser legislation was introduced the rate of road accidents decreased for the first two years but that, after three years of its operation, the rate began to climb again at almost exactly the same level as previously. I believe that members of the public generally realize, as an accepted principle, that drinking drivers are likely to cause accidents but, for several reasons, some members of the public are unable or unwilling to relate personally to the problems of drinking and driving.

People who continue to drink and drive will be responsible for road accidents until they are made to realize their personal responsibilities towards the general public. If they persist in driving under the influence of alcohol, they must be detected and removed from roads until they recognize and respect their responsibilities. However, as it may be necessary for some such drivers to undergo treatment for alcoholism, facilities for treating them must be made available. I believe that every member of the community has the right to use our roads and highways, free from the dangers of injury or death presented by irresponsible members of the community who persist in drinking and driving. As I said earlier, many people do not relate or are unable to relate personally to drinking and driving, because they do not put themselves in the same category as members of the public generally. Many people in the community have the attitude "accidents cannot happen to me".

This was seen, and I am quite sure the Minister for Labour and Industry will know exactly what I am talking about, in the introduction of safety regulations in industry, where it is indeed difficult to persuade some employees to wear protective clothing and goggles. There is still the attitude, although it seems to be gradually

diminishing through education, "Accidents can happen to anyone else but they cannot happen to me because I have a charmed life".

Literature on this subject is voluminous and I do not intend to cover it all. There is, however, an excellent summary in the introduction to the 1970 report of the Victorian Joint Select Committee on Road Safety which I am going to read, because I believe it covers the situation in Australia pretty well. I will expand later on some of the features mentioned in the report. It states:

A large proportion of fatal and serious injury road traffic accidents involve drinking drivers. Authorities are now in general agreement that alcohol is a major factor in some 50 per cent of road accidents involving death and serious injury. Accidents which involve drivers with high blood alcohol levels (*e.g.,* over .08 per cent) are more severe in terms of injury, damage and expenses than accidents involving sober drivers. Professor R. Borkenstein finds that the probability of accident involvement increases rapidly at alcohol levels over .08 per cent and becomes extremely high at levels over .15 per cent. In the study carried out by Professor Borkenstein of Indiana University in 1962—

and this is regarded as the most authoritative study of its kind in the world—

drivers with an alcohol level of .06 per cent have an estimated probability of causing an accident double that of a sober driver. Drivers with .10 per cent B.A.L. are from six to seven times as likely to cause an accident as one with .00 per cent alcohol level. When the .15 per cent alcohol level is reached, the probability of causing an accident is estimated at more than 25 times the probability for that of a sober driver.

Further on the summary states:

It is apparent that an increasing B.A.L. results in a progressive impairment of driving performance. There is a substantial degree of impairment at .05 per cent. The effects of alcohol on driving are quite unrelated to previous drinking history. Heavy drinkers show as much impairment in driving performance as do light drinkers.

I believe that that is a significant fact that is all too often forgotten. Many people believe that drinking and driving accidents will not happen to them and that they can drink more than any other person and stay more in possession of their faculties. The danger is, however, that the more they drink the more they believe that they can go on drinking and the more sober they are than anyone else: it is a vicious circle, which must be overcome.

I do not believe that lowering the allowable blood-alcohol level in South Australia from 08 per cent to .05 per cent will have any significant effect in reducing road traffic accidents, because the measure is meaningless to motorists: it is impersonal, a figure, and something to which a motorist cannot relate personally. There is no baseline in a motorist's experience to enable him to relate that level to his own feelings or his own impairment of faculties, and I believe that is extremely important. An exact blood-alcohol level is of questionable significance in determining a person's ability to drive and in determining his likelihood to have an accident.

Inevitably, prosecutions involve blood-alcohol levels well above 08 per cent, which is the legal limit. There are many reported cases. A series of 527 cases analysed by the metropolitan police in London in 1962 showed that only 40 people who were charged had blood-alcohol levels above .15 per cent, while 166 had .15 to .2 per cent; and 293 of these cases came within the group of .2 to .3 per cent. There is no doubt at all that there is an increased risk of accident involvement associated with appreciable concentrations of alcohol in the blood, and this applies to drinking drivers and also (we tend to forget) to drinking pedestrians: pedestrians who are involved in fatal accidents quite frequently have significant blood-alcohol levels. Numerous studies have been carried out on people who have received treatment for alcoholism and on those who have been convicted of drunkenness or have appeared on a drunkenness charge. This group of people appears, on average, to be more than twice as likely to be involved in traffic accidents as are members of the general public, and in some studies it has been estimated that they are responsible for as many as 70 per cent of accidents in which alcohol is involved.

I think that members will be aware of the recent reports in Victoria from Dr. John Birrell, the Police Surgeon, which state that more than 62 per cent of fatalities occurring in road accidents have involved blood-alcohol levels in excess of the legal limit. Much work has been done in Sweden, and I think most members are aware of the position that obtains there: the limit has been brought down from 05 per cent to 035 per cent, and it is now an offence in Sweden to drive with any blood in the alcohol—any alcohol in the blood. The use of blood-alcohol-concentration evidence will corroborate evidence of abnormal driving and behaviour; it will show quite clearly how much blood alcohol there is in the body, but not necessarily give an indication of how much has been drunk, and this is quite important.

It can eliminate alcohol as a factor when the results are negative, and there may be some other factors. Blood alcohol levels of .1 per cent to 14 per cent usually show up quite distinctly if the driver is not a chronic alcoholic. These people, by their behaviour, are very frequently noticed and reported. This is one of the problems. A policeman may be fortunate enough to see someone, unsteady on his feet and under the influence, about to enter a car, or prepare to drive it, or he may find somebody slumped over the wheel of a car. Consequently, he may be able to prevent a serious accident. A policeman on patrol who sees erratic driving which suggests intoxication may stop the vehicle or call for the vehicle to be stopped, and in that way an accident can be prevented.

Unfortunately it is usually the case in South Australia at present that charges of driving under the influence arise out of accidents that have already occurred. In other words, a policeman attending the scene of an accident decides that one or both drivers may have been driving under the influence and suffering from the effects of alcohol; he calls for an investigation to be made, and a charge results. This is not a satisfactory situation. It is certainly satisfactory from the point of view of its deterrent effect, although even that statement may be open to question. It would be far more desirable if we could take action that would prevent accidents, and I think this is the course of action that should be taken by this Government.

Although most people acknowledge that drivers under the influence of drink are a cause of traffic accidents, this does not mean that one can readily or easily determine the role of alcohol in official statistics on the cause of road accidents. Official information depends on the extent of the activity of the law and the actual requirements of the law, and the attitude towards drivers under the influence of drink is determined to a certain extent by public opinion on drinking itself. This is a factor that must be considered, because it is most significant. The attitudes of the general community towards drinking as a social habit will determine the response of members of the community to requests such as "If you drink don't drive". This is one reason why such a request has been unsuccessful in having an

effect on people who drink. Many surveys have been undertaken into the effects of small quantities of alcohol on motorists and evidence shows that above .05 per cent (and certainly at .08 per cent) there is an increase in the number of faults, greater carelessness, and reduced ability to judge distances both in steering and braking. There seems to be a general deterioration of driving skill, although the confidence of a driver in his own ability unfortunately increases as he drinks more.

Legislation seems to vary from country to country, but the point I have made is that it is deterrent legislation at this stage. I believe that far more emphasis must be placed on prevention, but that the general preventive effect is the one that will be far more difficult to manage. Therefore, there are two kinds of legislation to be considered. Our present legal measures have helped to contain the number of road accidents caused by drivers under the influence of alcohol. However, much research needs to be done on this matter, and it must be done. I welcome the introduction of legislation passed in the last Parliament requiring that blood-alcohol estimates should be taken of all persons involved in road traffic accidents. It is only by adopting this practice that we can determine the situation as it applies in South Australia. I believe that the following factors are necessary and should apply in any campaign to reduce accidents caused by drunken driving. First, there must be scientifically secured evidence of the increase in the hazard of driving while impaired by alcohol, and this must be translated into a socially acceptable, understandable, and personally relatable form.

Secondly, a clear definition of the offence of driving whilst impaired by alcohol must be made so that it is understandable to every person, and it must be practicable. Asking drivers to respect the minimum blood-alcohol level without understanding it is similar to asking them to observe speed limits whilst driving without a speedometer fitted to the car. Thirdly, legislation must be effective so that it will tend to suppress the commission and repetition of the act, based on objective facts and not on emotion. Enforcement can do only part of the job, and a greater degree of voluntary co-operation must be gained from the driving public. For instance, it would not be difficult to say that probably only one in many thousands of speeding violations would result in an arrest or a charge. I think that would be fair comment.

Fourthly, a carefully conceived, systematically disseminated, and persistent public information programme should be introduced, based on facts understandable to every driver and intended to show that those who offend by drinking and driving are offending against society. It must be made clear to drinking drivers that they are indulging in anti-social activities. Fifthly, there must be a hard-hitting enforcement and prosecution system to deal with those offenders who, in spite of this systematic approach, still refuse to heed their responsibility to the society in which they live. All these factors are aimed basically at preventing the accidents that occur because of the consumption of alcohol, by persuading the drinking driver to remain off the road. This method concentrates on voluntary co-operation: if such a driver will not remain off the road, he must be removed in the interests of public safety.

Another factor has not been given enough attention. It has been said that anyone who consistently and repeatedly drives with blood-alcohol levels of more than .08 per cent is probably an alcoholic, although he may not recognize or may not wish to recognize that condition. I think that this statement is probably true. Very little attention has been paid to the drinking driver himself. Primarily, the emphasis has been on the impairing effects of alcohol rather than on the character of the driver who drinks it. The underlying assumption seems to be that drinking drivers constitute a random sample of the population with respect to their drinking habits, and it is assumed that the drinking driver charged is a casual drinker who has a misguided notion of his ability to withstand the effects of alcohol and his capacity to drive safely. That is why I think the slogan, "If you drive, don't drink", will not do much good. Once again the emphasis must be on education and on voluntary co-operation.

The very high blood-alcohol levels of some drivers involved in accidents as found in most surveys suggests that it is not the social drinker who is to blame. To reach a concentration of .15 per cent or more, the average person would have to consume at least 10oz. of whisky in about one hour. The incidence of chronic alcoholism is a factor not well enough recognized in relation to this problem. Surveys have shown that a large and significant proportion (compared to the general population figures) of people charged with impaired or drunken driving have been treated for alcoholism. This is a significant factor. Considering it from the other point of view, many identified chronic alcoholics, when compared to the general driving population, are involved in a significantly large number of accidents each year and for each mile (kilometre) driven.

Alcoholics constitute a high-risk group for traffic accidents, and this fact is important when we are considering driver education, because the personality of the chronic alcoholic is such that he will not take any notice of signs such as "Slow down", "Be careful", "Yield right of way" and other such exhortations. These simple suggestions are of little value, because of the personality involved in a chronic alcoholic. One would not expect the highway education slogans to influence effectively the behaviour of drivers whose abnormality and dependence on alcohol causes them to resist such appeals.

The problem of the drinking driver seems to be, in significant measure, a problem of treatment and preventive medicine, as well as a problem of legislation and education. I welcome the statement that the reinstatement of a driver's licence suspended for impaired driving may soon depend on a re-examination of his ability to drive. However, I think that in some cases this should go further and that, where people have had licences suspended for driving with a blood-alcohol level in excess of the limit, there should be a requirement that drivers should submit to a clinical assessment of their drinking behaviour and, if necessary, obtain treatment for alcoholism as a condition of licence reinstatement. In this respect, I am disappointed that the work that was suggested at the Elizabeth magistrates court was not carried through.

I undersand that this system applies in Tasmania, and it would be a most significant step forward in removing some of the hazards on our roads at present. Much can be learned from the relatives of alcoholics about their driving abilities. Where the patient himself insists that he has always been a careful driver, it is not uncommon to learn later from his wife that she has been afraid for years to go with him in his car after he has been drinking. Some say that among their most frightening experiences have been rides with their husbands and they are surprised that more serious accidents have not happened while their husbands have been under the influence of alcohol. Minor scrapes are apparently common and are often admitted by the alcoholics themselves.

When asked if it has ever occurred to them to give up driving in view of their heavy drinking, most patients confess freely that they have never considered the advice not

to mix drinking and driving, because they did not believe at the time that they had had a lot to drink. Their relatives, on the other hand, often go to any limits to prevent the alcoholic from driving. Hiding the ignition keys and letting down the tyres are two ruses commonly resorted to on such occasions. The danger in the case of an alcoholic driver is not always restricted to the time immediately after heavy drinking. There is a stage where, because of his chronic alcoholism, he will perform well, but such a person may be much less sure of himself in the morning when he drives off to work again, and it is because of the relatively low alcohol level at this time that he does not perform particularly well.

I refer members to remarks I have made in this House previously on the nature of drug dependence and the fact that people dependent on a drug to perform adequately (barely, admittedly, but adequately) only when they have in their bodies a certain blood level of that drug. Other risks are involved, and this is heightened in many chronic alcoholics because often (and this has been estimated to be in as many as 25 per cent of cases) these people also habitually take other drugs to excess, particularly barbiturates and amphetamines, as well as tranquillizers. This taking of drugs is, of course, symptomatic of their general personality problems. It is unfortunate that the practice of regularly driving under the influence of alcohol, which should be taken as an early sign of chronic alcoholism, is strenuously resisted as such by affected drivers since it is not in the nature of patients at this time to consider that they may be becoming chronic alcoholics.

Although the life of the alcoholic is beset with many risks to himself, the alcoholic car driver for many years habitually endangers the health and the lives of other people. Moreover, whereas alcoholism in its earlier stages chiefly affects the drinker's family, the alcoholic's erratic car driving manifests itself outside the home, on the public highway, and indeed, as a clinical sign, is much easier to recognize, particularly by relatives if they are on the lookout for it, as an early feature of alcoholism than are the other early signs such as the amnesias, the secret drinking, the preoccupation with alcohol and the guilt feelings arising, which are very frequently of marked significance. Most drinking drivers will commonly be found to have good basic personalities and will respond well to treatment, but it is important that the condition should be diagnosed early, and in this regard education and the ability to relate drinking habits to blood-alcohol levels, and therefore to driving performance, are most important. Not only will such activity diminish the risk of traffic accidents, but it may perform a useful service to individuals within the community by warning them of propensities which may seriously affect their future lives. Unfortunately, it is well known that most chronic alcoholics come for treatment only at a very late stage.

One other factor I must mention is the commonly held belief that some people can take in alcohol in larger quantities than others and yet remain unaffected by that excessive amount. Tolerance to alcohol may be either natural or acquired. Even in people of similar weight, age, and sex, the dose of a drug required to give the same effect varies considerably. Alcohol is no exception to this and, even at the same blood-alcohol levels, people may perform differently; performance has to be measured, in some cases most carefully, to detect the difference. These differences in response relate to personality structure but, in social drinking particularly, other factors must be taken into account, such as variations in body weight and speed of drinking. These will still further modify the apparent effect of the same dose of the same drink in different individuals.

The repeated use of alcohol, as with any other drug, leads to the development of acquired tolerance, so that doses larger than previously must be taken to produce the same effect. However, tolerance to alcohol is mainly a tissue tolerance, so that the tissues require larger doses than previously to modify their function. In other words, if the cells of the nervous system are bathed day after day in a dilute solution of alcohol, this will, after a time, become their normal environment, and relatively large increases in alcohol concentration will be required before its characteristic effects will be observed. It is thus clear that, at a given blood-alcohol level, the habitual heavy drinker will give less objective evidence of impairment of function than the occasional light drinker. However, not only is the heavy drinker capable of taking much more drink physically (that is, without literally vomiting): he increases his intake to the point at which he obtains the full effect of the alcohol. This, of course, is exactly what he has been drinking for: to try to achieve the level of euphoria which suits his personality problem. He is not drinking to achieve a certain blood-alcohol level. This is a simple fact often lost sight of. In other words, he will, by drinking excessive quantities of alcohol, find himself tolerant to the euphoric reaction, but his ability to co-ordinate and to drive adequately will be impaired just as much as that of any other person with the same blood-alcohol level.

There are two methods of estimating alcohol levels which are used in our community other than the exact one of estimating actual blood samples. These are both based on the concentration of alcohol in the alveolar air, which is the air remaining in close contact in the lungs with the blood. This is an extremely accurate method of detecting the blood-alcohol level. There are in use in the community some machines, used by the Police Department, known as breathalyser machines. They are based on something called Widmark's reaction principle, which is based again on the oxidation of chromo-sulphuric acid impregnated on a silica gel, and these are the crystals we hear about. The breathalyser test will give accurate estimates of blood-alcohol level. However, it is an expensive machine, the cost at present being about $1,000. Trained operators must be carefully instructed, and it takes some time to learn to use this machine adequately. Nevertheless, I believe that the officers of the Police Department operating these machines do an extremely good job. Because of its expense and its delicate nature, the breathalyser cannot be used as widely as one would like and an alcotest kit based on the same principle has been introduced and has been given some publicity recently. The cost of each of these kits is between 80c and $1, so it is a much more simple matter to budget financially for such a device. The alcotest gives an indication of whether there is a blood-alcohol level of over .01 per cent. It is when the alcotest is positive that the breathalyser is used to determine more accurately the blood-alcohol level. It is interesting to see reports from Spain that legislation has been introduced there recently to provide that alcotest kits must be carried in every registered motor vehicle on the roads and kept available for police officers to use if the car is stopped. However, I am not advocating that here.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not?

Dr. TONKIN: It is interesting to note that this has been introduced in Spain.

Mr. Millhouse: Why aren't you advocating it?

Dr. TONKIN: I am not advocating it, because there may be better ways to deal with the problem; I do not know. Perhaps I should have said that I was not advocating it at present.

Mr. Millhouse: Or not in this debate.

Dr. TONKIN: It may become necessary and we may have to examine the matter. However, I consider that, more particularly, the breathalyser should be used as part of the education programme.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you likely to move a motion on the other matter?

Dr. TONKIN: The use of the breathalyser is a relatively simple matter and, to bring home to the average driver the effects of his normal amount of drinking, he should be able to blow into the breathalyser and be given his blood-alcohol equivalent at that time. Then, if he has had 12 schooners of beer, or whatever he occasionally has on Friday evening or at some other time, he will know what his blood-alcohol level is when he thinks of getting into his car and driving home.

Mr. Coumbe: That's not a bad effort—12 schooners.

Dr. TONKIN: It is not an uncommon level, and it can happen. The whole point of the motion is that I consider that we must educate drivers and depend on their good sense and willingness to co-operate. Officers from the breathalyser squad could be sent to car parks, to roads outside hotels, to shopping centres, and throughout the community, where people could voluntarily have a blood-alcohol assessment made by breathalyser. Naturally, if they had blood-alcohol levels above the prescribed limit, they would be advised against driving arid I suppose that action could be taken if they persisted in driving.

The whole point of preventing road accidents is to keep the drinking driver off the road, not wait until he has had an accident and then prosecute him. That objective can be achieved by a campaign for co-operation and opportunity for people to relate their own personal drinking habits to the blood-alcohol level that those habits produce. Prevention is far better than cure. It is too late to charge someone after he has caused a fatal accident. Charging a person after he has caused serious injury to someone else will not help the injured person.

I sum up by saying that some people in the community still adopt the attitude that accidents cannot happen to them and that alcohol does not affect them as much as it affects everyone else. We know that people make such statements and adopt such attitudes. Some people take pride (and this is not always merely an Australian characteristic) in their ability to hold their liquor. This whole attitude must be changed by education, particularly by personal involvement in a programme to enable people to relate their intake of alcohol to their blood-alcohol level and to make them alive to their responsibilities as drivers. I ask all members to support the motion.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SURVEYORS ACT REGULATIONS

Order of the Day No. 4: Mr. McRae to move:

That the regulations under the Surveyors Act, 1935-1971, made on March 8, 1973, and laid on the table of this House on June 19, 1973, be disallowed.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I do not wish to proceed with this Notice of Motion, because a similar motion was passed by the Legislative Council yesterday after this matter came on as an item on the Notice Paper in the other place. Normally, I would have moved the motion in this House. Members have copies of the minutes of the proceedings of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and also of the recommendations stating that the regulations were an undue interference with private rights and that the by-law was unreasonable.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the matter.

Mr. McRAE: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to continue debating the matter. I did not intend to debate it and, if I gave that impression, I go on to say that the remarks that I have just made about this Notice of Motion can also be made about Notices of Motion Nos. 8 and 9.

INFLAMMABLE CLOTHING (LABELLING) BILL

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the labelling of inflammable clothing. Read a first time.

Mr. MATHWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

First, I refer to what the member for Mitcham said earlier when moving a motion, and I am pleased to have the honour and privilege to introduce the first private member's Bill this session. It gives me much pleasure to do this representing the back bench of the Opposition: indeed, I do it representing the whole Opposition, as a joint Opposition to this Government.

In moving that the Bill be read a second time, I ask for the full support of Government and Opposition members. This is a most important Bill and I hope that the debate will be conducted in a non-political way and that the discussions will be in the best interests of all concerned, and, indeed, with due regard given to the urgent need for this legislation.

I am sure the Minister, like other Ministers before him. realizes that it is imperative that people be made aware that some clothing they purchase is as similar to an incendiary bomb as possible. I draw that inference particularly in relation to nightwear and dressing gowns. Although this Bill is not confined only to that type of apparel, likewise it is not confined to any specific age group (for example, children under a certain age). I believe that, although children perhaps need more protection, the aged and infirm, too, need this consideration. As we all know, it is understood that as one gets older one's reaction is slower, and when one talks of flammable clothing, one is talking of more than a possibility of complete incineration in 45 seconds in the case of certain types of clothing.

For too long, the passing of uniform legislation on this subject has been put off. I suppose that reasons can be found for this, but I demand and expect the Minister to take positive action by supporting this Bill. In reply to a question I asked on June 27 of this year (and I have asked several others in previous years), the Minister said the Government intended to introduce legislation. He indicated that its basis would be three labels stating "low fire hazard", "designed to reduce fire hazard", and "warning—flammable garment—keep away from fire". Another label suggested would apply to the type of clothing that contains fibre that melts. I believe that a label should be large, printed in red or orange bold letters on a white background, and should state "warning—highly flammable".

I commend the Minister for publishing the latest booklet put out by the Labour and Industry Department and distributed by the Child and Home Safety Advisory Committee of the National Safety Council of South Australia, entitled *Safer Nightclothes for Children.* This booklet deals with the types of fabric, their flammability, and the designs and styles that are recommended to be used as night attire for children. I also commend the British Petroleum Australia Limited for distributing a

pamphlet entitled 45 *Second Horror,* which describes what can happen to any child in less than 45 seconds and advises parents not to let this happen to their child. Regarding fabrics used in clothing that is flammable, there are basically those that burn and those that melt. Wool, which is so important to us in Australia, is the best possible material, as it does not burn readily.

Fabrics having the highest flammability are cotton, wincey, winceyette, linen, rayon, acetate, and flannelette. I think that many other people would be surprised as I was to learn how flammable was flannelette, and I have had considerable experience in this field, having helped raise five children. When these fabrics catch fire, they burn rapidly with a high flame. Acetate not only burns with a high flame: it melts as well. In addition, garments made with a pile (brushed cotton) on the outside can easily flash alight if they are close to a source of heat. These fabrics can catch fire without warning, burning completely in 45 seconds to 47 seconds. Fibres that melt include acrylics, polyimides, polyesters, and other artificial fibres, such as chloro-fibres. Because of their danger, these are not recommended. Although they are mostly slow to ignite, if they are worn as an under-garment and catch fire the result is horrifying, since they melt on to the burnt flesh and skin. Moreover, they help keep other materials burning. If such underclothes catch fire and melt, once they go on to the skin they keep clothes worn on top of them alight.

It is important that the threads used in manufacturing these garments should also be considered. If thread is flammable, it will tend to act like a wick, setting alight the whole garment. Fancy trimmings and bows, which are used especially for female and older persons' night attire and for children's clothes, are a menace. More often than not, they are made of highly flammable material. I point out that four times as many females (of all ages) as males die from burns received when their clothing has caught fire. This is attributed to the fact that their clothes are more tissy and loose fitting, and are lighter.

Under the heading "Fabrics Which Melt", Australian Standard 1249/1972 states that if fabrics which melt come into contact with a flame they usually shrink away before they ignite. If they do ignite, melted drops fall off and may take the burning portion away from the main part of the fabric. The great danger lies in the possibility of molten material coming into contact with the body. This is very likely to occur if an over-garment catches alight when it is worn over nightclothes made from a fabric that melts. The molten material may then adhere to the body while still burning and add to the flames coming from the over-garment. In these conditions, extensive and severe burns may occur to the body. In such cases, deaths have occurred. The use of thermoplastic sewing thread in sewing non-thermoplastic material can cause similar circumstances to arise. Fabrics that melt can then cause hazards, so that care should be exercised in their use.

I have received from the Adelaide Children's Hospital statistics relating to children taken to the hospital in 1972-73 suffering from burns and scalds. Unfortunately the figures for burns and scalds are conjoined, but we still get some idea of the problem caused by clothes catching fire. In 1972-73, 445 children were taken to the hospital for burns and scalds. Of this number, 145 were admitted; this represents one child in every 2 500. The mortality rate amongst these children ranges from 2 per cent to 5 per cent. The figures showed that Greek children were more likely to be affected by these accidents. It is interesting that middle-income families are amongst those facing the greatest risk. In 74 per cent of these cases, the parents were present, so I am not alluding to working mothers. The age group most affected by this accident was one year to two years; next was four years to six years; and then two years to three years (the toddler group). As many as 81 per cent of the accidents were caused by fire and were self-inflicted. The following were the causes: matches (specifically concerning young children), 22 per cent; heaters or fires, 14 per cent; flammable liquid (kerosene, petrol, and that sort of thing), 22 per cent; electricity, 4 per cent; and (for the benefit of the member for Gilles) fireworks, 1 per cent.

Those who suffered were clad as follows: 70 per cent of those suffering deep burns were wearing clothing, and of those not wearing clothing only 30 per cent had deep burns; 82 per cent of those wearing cotton had deep burns, of which 52 per cent had greater than 10 per cent burns, which means that some of the children had both. Involved in accidents were 27 children wearing cotton, of whom 14 had widespread burns and 22 had deep burns. Three children in flannelette and orlon had third-degree burns. Of four children wearing polyimides (that is, brinyion) two had widespread burns and all four had third-degree burns.

If we look at the Victorian statistics of children in the Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, we see that there were 125 cases of clothing on fire, one-sixth of them being admitted after the clothes had caught fire. This means that one-sixth of the 125 cases were admitted. Of these, there were 11 deaths in five years (of children only) and the girls were more susceptible than the boys to having their clothing catch fire. Of the 125 cases, 93 were girls and 32 were boys.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why is that?

Mr. MATHWIN: Because of the light-weight nature of the girls' clothing. Of the 11 deaths from clothing catching alight, nine were girls and only two were boys. If we read from a Victorian pamphlet entitled *Safer from Fire,* we see:

> The Melbourne survey shows that children playing with matches contributed to 29 cases of clothes catching alight; 28 cases resulted from children being too close to an open fire; open fires without some kind of safety guard resulted in 23 children falling into the fire; nine cases (all girls) suffered burns after clothing caught alight from an electric radiator; and in one case a child was playing with a cigarette lighter.

If we think of the dangers to the older age group, it will be obvious to us all that there is just as much need for this legislation to cover the older people, for they are more susceptible in many ways to this type of accident. Many elderly people smoke, and in many cases smoke in bed. Their reactions are slower. They reach over the lighted gas-burner or lighted fire and a match may break or fly back; it is harder for them to keep warm in the winter, so they wrap up in more clothing and stand near the open fire and the electric radiator—and 47 seconds is all that is needed for an accident to happen. I should like now to quote from the *News* of March 7, 1973, as follows:

> According to Dr. A. M. Clark, Director of the burns unit in the Melbourne Royal Children's Hospital, laws covering fireproof clothing could be extended to cover clothing for all the aged. Dr. Clark said legislation in Australia would initially be softer than that in America where the Food and Drug Administration had moved a ban on sales of non-fire-proof clothing for children up to six.

He was speaking at a press conference before a seminar in Melbourne on burns and the management of burns victims. Two leading American experts on burns, Dr. Basil Pruitt and Dr. Charles Fox, attended the seminar. Dr. Pruitt, head of a military burns unit in San Antonio,

said American research showed an equal need for special fireproof clothing, especially night attire, for the aged.

Dr. Pruitt and Dr. Fox said there was a need in both America and Australia for more public education on burns. In America 75 per cent of all burns were caused by the misuse of petroleum products. If we turn to our own Australian Standards 1249/1972 on the design rules for children's nightclothes and look at page 2 of that booklet, in the preface we see in the second paragraph:

Although the standard is generally applicable to the design of clothes for children from 12 months to 14 years, the principles involved may be applied to age groups outside these limits. In general the need for safe nightclothes for children is necessary from the time they are able to move around until they are old enough to act sensibly in the presence of fire. Many of the principles are also applicable to night attire for elderly people, who are prone to overlook the dangers of clothing catching alight.

So, even under our own Australian Standards the committee is conscious that these matters should also be covered for aged people. I now refer to the *Australian* of Saturday, July 7, 1973, where we see, under the heading "Move to outlaw flammable clothes; warning labels 'not good enough'", the following article:

Consumer groups in Victoria want the manufacture of flammable garments banned. Mr. 1. Elliott, the General Secretary of the Citizens Action Federation, which represents 12 of the 14 consumer groups in the State, said yesterday plans merely to label garments were unacceptable. He said the labels worked out by the Standards Association were unclear and absurd. He said: "They should outlaw the manufacture of all flammable clothes, not just babies' nightwear. Steps should also be taken to control production of flammable textiles. In America they have legislation covering carpets, and when you consider we haven't even legislated for children's clothing, something is seriously wrong."

Mr. Elliott said manufacturers had a "moral responsibility" to protect the health and safety of people who patronized them. He said the federation planned to contact manufacturers and unions, and prepare submissions to Federal and State governments to see that stronger action was taken. A senior research scientist with the wool research laboratory at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (Dr. T. Pressley) said he saw the labels as a "first step. Otherwise, we might jump the wrong way. I think as a beginning they are enough, but I would not say they would be anything of an indefinite nature." .... Dr. Pressley said he wondered why cotton chenille flannel nightgowns for children existed when there were cheaper and safer garments available. He did not think that fabrics could be banned. "Cotton is such a useful fabric that we have to learn to live with it."

The Chairman of the State-run Consumer Affairs Council, Major-General A. Halstrom, said he thought legislation should be introduced making it mandatory to label flammable clothing. He said he felt it would be impossible for legislation to keep ahead of manufacturers, but that the regulations should be under constant review.

So, it seems that people of all groups are affected and that many industrial accidents happen if the people involved are wearing a cellulose type of material; in that case their chances are indeed slim in the event of an accident. Turning to the United Kingdom briefly, I would like to mention a survey that was conducted by the Birmingham Accidents Hospital's Burns Research Unit over a period of eight years. Out of 131 cases investigated where the fabrics were known, 100 of the garments first ignited were cotton (that is, 76 per cent) and 17 were winceyette or flannelette (that is, 13 per cent).

I believe that the matter of labels is very important. I believe that, if we are going to consider the labelling of this clothing, we should include all clothing. Further, we must be serious when we think about the type of label and the testing of the label. I refer to standard 1249/1972. We see here the testing for the fabric label: it involves testing in a solution at 60°C containing 5 grammes per litre of common soap and water. Now I maintain that 60°C is not hot enough. If we refer to Australian Standard 1248 we see the washing conditions for cotton and linen; the solution here is at a temperature of 80°C to 85°C in a washing time of 30 minutes, and the number of washes is three. Now, I would imagine that the labels should be able to withstand the same temperature and the same testing as the cotton and linen fabrics.

This Bill provides for the labelling of flammable clothing. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Act, and I draw members' attention to the definition of "the appointed day", which provides for different days to be fixed in respect of different classes of clothing. Clause 4 provides for the Governor to fix these appointed days and further provides that a day so appointed shall be not earlier than six months after the day on which notice of the proclamation appears in the *Gazette.* This will give retailers sufficient time to comply with the requirements of the Act. Clause 5 provides for a penalty for selling clothing not labelled in accordance with the Act. Clause 6 gives a wide regulating-making power to provide for the sorts of description or mark that must appear on clothing.

This type of legislation is not new. We are not setting any new law that is unheard of overseas or throughout the world, although I venture to say that our Australian standards are better than any others, but it has taken long enough to achieve this. In the United Kingdom the Fabrics (Misdescriptions) Act was introduced in the House of Commons on August 15, 1913—60 years ago. Under the regulation made by the Secretary of State, the fine in those days for the first offence was £10 ($20) and the fine for second and subsequent offences ranged from £50 ($100). In 1967 they increased this to £100 ($200) for the first offence, and then for other offences £400 ($800) upwards. They amended this in 1955 and 1957. They introduced the Night Dress Safety Regulations in 1967. These regulations emphasize the need for some warning for washing with soap powder, boiling or bleaching the garment, and they also forbid the use of any trimmings below the waist or the elbow.

The Americans, of course, have their rules and regulations under the Wool Products Labelling Act. Their Act covers a very wide range of clothing (that is, all clothing)—even linings and paddings and trimmings, and facings of garments. All furs must be marked. The Act covers carpets, yarns, curtains, table place mats, cushions, furniture covers, sleeping bags, belts, permanently knotted neck ties, garters, diaper liners (how on earth can they get them dry for long enough?) artists' canvas, tapestry cloth, anti-macassars, and shoe laces, and many others. So, the Americans have had this in for some time.

In presenting this Bill to the House, I again stress the urgent need for it. I hope the Bill will be debated and dealt with free from Party politics, with members considering the folly of putting off this matter, as has happened so often in the past. I am not placing any blame on the present Minister any more than on his predecessors. We cannot afford either financially or by the loss of life to leave it any longer, so let us here in South Australia lead the way with what I consider to be humane legislation. I commend the Bill to the House and ask members to approve it unanimously.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is simple.

Mr. Keneally: So is the mover.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I am a simple, plain man, and I do not pretend to be anything else, and I never have. The object of the Bill, as I said before the member for Stuart interrupted me, is to repeal the amendment to the Electoral Act passed in 1942, which made voting at South Australian elections for the House of Assembly compulsory. The Bill does not touch the question of enrolment, either for the House of Assembly, which has a common enrolment (and has for many years) with the Senate and the House of Representatives, or for the Legislative Council, which now, thanks to an amendment moved by Liberal and Country League members in the Upper House, will also have a common enrolment. The Bill affects only the question of voting. It is unnecessary for me to go over yet again the arguments, pro and con, about compulsory voting as opposed to voluntary voting. They have been trotted out. in this place on a number of occasions, and I quote only one authority, an authority whom I have for many years greatly respected, Herman Finer, *The Theory of Modern Government, Revised Edition,* who says in his chapter on compulsory voting:

What does all this show?—

the inquiry into the argument he has set out—

That it is possible to make people come to the polling booths and write a figure or make a cross on a piece of paper if they are threatened with the fine of a few shillings unless they do so. It enables the politician to say with conviction and demonstration that he represents a majority of the people. It makes it easier to get people to the poll. In some a political consciousness will be awakened. Notice, however, the substantial dangers: to vote under duress is no proof of the will to vote, capacity to vote, or right judgment. The politician may say he represents a majority of the people: but, in fact, 30 per cent or more have voted who do not care enough about politics to vote, let alone to inform themselves, except under duress. It is easier to get people to the poll. Is that for the good in politics? Is that not bound to make the task and therefore the efforts of political parties easier rather than harder? And there is a great deal to be said for imposing the greatest rather than the least strain on political parties. Finally, is it worth while to force a few into political paths at the cost of forcing the congenitally apathetic into giving an unavoidably ignorant and perhaps contemptibly cynical vote?

That is enough of the theory. To me, the central argument against compulsory voting, which we now have, is that it is quite undesirable to force people to vote. Voting is a democratic right, which the elector may or may not exercise, according to his wish. As I have said in this House on many occasions, the first time this matter ever occurred to me was when I was in the United States of America as a young man. I was reproached in many parts of that country for having come from a place that was not democratic.

On the first occasion I was surprised when this was said to me. I asked why, and they said, "You force people to go and vote and that is undemocratic." I then realized that people in the United States of America and people in other countries, when they think about Australia at all, regard us as the less democratic, because we oblige people to vote.

Mr. Max Brown: What about Watergate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla is on weak ground. He is trying to support compulsory voting in South Australia because of the Watergate scandal in the United States.

Mr. Keneally: All this was debated 20 years ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not follow the interjections of either of the two honourable members and, if the standard of debate is not going to be any better than the standard of the interjections, we are in for a very poor debate indeed. As honourable members opposite know, Australia is one of the few countries in the world, and one of the few Parliamentary democracies in the world, which obliges its citizens to vote. The only other two countries which do this that I know are Holland and Belgium. Czechoslovakia used to be counted, although it is hardly a Parliamentary democracy, but I suppose the Czechs themselves might try to claim it, in the upside-down Communist way. Voting is not compulsory in the United States of America or in the United Kingdom or in any of the major Parliamentary democracies in the world.

It is strange, indeed, that the argument announced in defence of compulsory voting by members of the Labor Party has so little appeal to people in other countries of the world. I am certain that arguments of pure reason were not the main force in the introduction of compulsory voting in any of the States or the Commonwealth, nor will arguments of pure reason prevail to get rid of compulsory voting. The real reason why compulsory voting was introduced was that the political Parties—and all members in this House are members of a Party—were lazy and the members were lazy and are lazy. Half the job of political Parties in most countries is to get people, first, to register, and, secondly, to go and vote. Because of the compulsory element in our system here, that half of the job is done for them, and the political Parties like that. We believe that the A.L.P. (as has been said many times) is against voluntary voting for reasons of self-interest: it believes that, if there is voluntary voting, it will suffer, the Party will suffer, and that what the Premier is so glad to call the wealthier Parties in politics (heaven knows, he cannot mean the Liberal Movement) will gain as a result, because they will be able to get the voter out more easily. That argument is as cynical as it is fallacious, yet it is the only argument the Premier ever trots out in favour of compulsory voting, ignoring altogether the principles of Liberalism which, from time to time, he finds it convenient to say he espouses regarding the freedom of the individual and the lack of compulsion on the individual.

I do not believe that compulsory voting makes for better Government, and I do not believe that the Attorney-General believes this either. Despite the protestations we might hear from him, we need remember only his inactivity at the time of the shopping hours referendum when about 50 000 electors in this State did not bother to vote at what was supposed to be a compulsory referendum. Indeed, hardly a handful of them were prosecuted for their failure, and we were never allowed to know by this exponent of open Government the reasons advanced and the reasons accepted for their not voting. No-one in their right senses would accept that about 98 per cent of the 50 000 people who did not vote at what was supposed to be a compulsory referendum had an excuse that was considered valid in the eyes of the law.

That is the position. It is rather interesting that we should be debating this matter after the voluntary poll in

the Southern by-election last Saturday. Certainly, members of the L.C.L. may feel less inclined to support voluntary voting now than they would have before, because of the lamentable failure of that Party to get its voters out.

Mr. Hall: I think it got all its votes: that is all it has.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps that is the answer; perhaps it got every vote it had, and there were not many of them. The honourable members here who are so worried about the situation are busy studying their newspapers now and are pretending not to listen to what I am saying. However, let me give them one grain of comfort: one of the good things about the result of the by-election is that everyone is pleased about it. The L.M. is pleased, to the point of being disappointed that we did not quite make it, because of the magnitude of our vote. The Leader of the L.C.L. in another place (Hon. Mr. DeGaris) said that he was pleased with the result and qualified "pleased" with really or rather, and the Leader of the L.C.L. Opposition in this House said that he was very pleased with the result.

Mr. Hall: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that he got 6 per cent more votes than he thought he would get.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The good thing is that everyone is pleased.

Mr. Burdon: We are, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The strange thing is that L.C.L. members in this House do not look pleased about it; they just are pleased, so they say.

Mr. Venning: It would make a cat laugh.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Rocky River, having threatened me with a biff on the nose earlier this afternoon, is now leaving the Chamber. I do not believe that the fact there was a 30 per cent poll in the Southern District, or in any by-election or election, invalidates the argument I have been putting in favour of voluntary voting. If a political Party is on its toes and is willing to do the job properly, it will get its vote out and be the better for it, as Mr. Finer said in the short quote I gave earlier. What is my reason for introducing the Bill this session? I have three reasons: first, as a Liberal I believe in voluntary voting, because I believe in the freedom of the individual either to exercise his right to vote or not, as he wishes. Secondly, the Leader of the L.C.L. in another place (Hon. Mr. DeGaris) has said that there would now be an opportunity, as he has fixed up the franchise for the Upper House (according to himself), to scrutinize the voting procedures in the Lower House. So that his followers in this place may have an opportunity to do that, I have introduced the Bill to give them the chance to debate it and say what they think of it.

The Hon. L. J. King: Do you think that they'll follow their federal council's view?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall canvass that point in a moment. Having mentioned the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I say that I personally am absolutely and entirely against the proposal, with which he appears to be flirting, of first past the post voting, and I do not link—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting away from the Bill now being considered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Am I? I want to keep that system as far away from the Bill as I possibly can, because I am absolutely against it, and I hope his followers in this place will be, too. Finally (and this is the final reason why I have introduced my Bill at this time), as I understand that the Leader of the Opposition in this place was defeated on the question of voluntary voting at the Federal council meeting of the Liberal Party of Australia, I want to make sure, by testing their vote, that L.C.L. members in this place have not changed their minds as a result of that defeat. However, I doubt that they have. I have read an article in their official newsletter under the heading, "Voluntary voting", written by the Hon. Mr. Story, which sets out fairly succinctly the reasons for supporting voluntary voting. I hope that on this matter, anyway, the L.C.L. will stick to what it has said in the past. On this Bill I therefore hope to have at least the support of all Opposition members. However, it is too much to hope, I suppose, that I will have much support from Government members, whatever their private opinions may be. If they voice opinions contrary to those of Caucus or their Commonwealth or State platform, they have had it. I do not expect that any one of them will do that. All I can hope is that, by introducing the Bill and briefly putting forward my arguments again, eventually the light will penetrate even into the A.L.P.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to declare the rights and liberties of the people of South Australia; to preserve, protect and render more effectual those rights and liberties; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is the same, with one or two minor amendments, as the Bill I introduced in the 1972 session of Parliament. Unfortunately, in that session there was no real debate on the Bill. I must congratulate the Government on the way in which debate and a vote were avoided on that occasion. What the Attorney-General did was typical of him. It was shrewd of him to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, but he ensured that the date which he inserted by which the committee was to report was one he knew would be after Parliament had prorogued, thus ensuring that the Bill never got back on the Notice Paper. At that time, it was obvious that even the calling together of the Select Committee was a slow process, thus taking some time for it to get under way.

Mr. Payne: Is that why you didn't attend the meetings?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I attended one meeting.

The Hon. L. J. King: You found it inconvenient to be at the meetings.

Mr. Payne: You missed one meeting and you were away from the other.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was obvious to me what was happening. If the member for Mitchell will promise to do better next time and get the Bill through the Select Committee and the House, I promise him that I will do better. As my speech, when explaining the Bill, is on pages 1275-80 of *Hansard* of September 13, 1972, I do not intend to go through it again or even to support my introducing this Bill by going through the reasons for it. I have talked to several groups outside Parliament and have found that the reason for its introduction and the Bill itself have, by and large, been acceptable to those to whom I have spoken. However, I have been requested by one organization to make significant amendments to it. I have not done so, because I suggest that the proper course for those who desire it amended is to make submissions to the Select Committee.

My one anxiety is that people will not stir themselves to put their views before this committee. The submissions that came in last time were not really as comprehensive as I had expected them to be, and I hope this time they will be better. I briefly refer to slight alterations between the Bill as it was introduced last time and this Bill. One

obvious change is the date, because we are now 12 months ahead. A slight amendment has been made to the definition of "Law of the State" and I have changed the word "counsel" in clause 5 to "legal practitioner". This is a drafting alteration, and there are a couple of drafting alterations in clause 4 (*g*) and clause 4 (*i*). Also, a slight drafting alteration has been made in clause 7.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is not many!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: An infinitesimally smaller number than one gets when the Minister introduces a Bill. I remind the Minister of the criticism of the Chief Justice in relation to the Planning and Development Act, for which he is responsible.

The Hon. L. J. King: On that suggestion there should be more amendments to Bills.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That matter, of course, is not under debate at present. However, I understand the Attorney-General is willing to support the second reading of my Bill so that a Select Committee can be set up immediately. Whatever the Bill's fate is to be this session, it will not have the same fate as it had last session.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I support the Bill to the second reading stage, so that a Select Committee may be appointed, inquire into the Bill, and report to the House. This was the procedure adopted in the last Parliament, but then finality was not reached. I suppose there was no real prospect of finality being reached in the time available in the last Parliament because, whatever prospect there was, was defeated by the fact that the member for Mitcham, who today has complained, did not find it convenient either to have meetings appointed on dates that were suggested to him or attend the meetings when dates were fixed.

Dr. Tonkin: He was too busy!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have no doubt he was.

Mr. Millhouse: When did you nominate the date for the meeting of the Select Committee?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member was given two dates for the meeting but indicated that neither date was convenient for him to be present. Finally, I was obliged to suggest to the Clerk that a date be fixed whether the honourable member agreed to it or not, and the date was so fixed. The meeting was held but the honourable member did not turn up. Now, he has the temerity to say today that the Bill of Rights Bill was not dealt with at that time because the Attorney-General, being subtle, clever, and shrewd, delayed the matter. The matter was not finalized in the last Parliament, and I hope that this time the member for Mitcham will show more resolution, desire, and sincerity to ensure that the matter is investigated and a report made to the House, so that members will have the chance to evaluate the arguments for and against the Bill. As I did last time, I support the second reading so that a Select Committee may be appointed.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. King, McRae, Millhouse, Payne and Russack; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; and that correspondence previously received by the Select Committee on the Bill of Rights, 1972, and the minutes of proceedings reported by that committee to this House on August 15, 1973, be referred to the committee; the committee to report on October 31.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the motion, but I desire to point out to the Attorney-General that, with the addition of bringing up of the papers and other details from the last Select Committee, the motion is in similar terms to the one he moved last year which included, at that stage, the date for the reporting of the Select Committee. The date had nothing to do with me, because the Attorney included the date knowing that it would be after the House rose. That is what I complained about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Legislative Council intimated that it agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation have power to adjourn from place to place.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced in order to amend the Fire Brigades Act, 1936-1958. Section 68 of that Act makes it an offence to tamper with any fire alarm or give a false alarm of fire. Last amended in 1942, this section prescribes, as alternatives to imprisonment, ranges of fines that are by present standards quite inadequate. For a first offence, a fine of not less than $4 or more than $20 may be imposed; for a subsequent offence, the range of fines is between $20 and $200. Both to the Fire Brigade and to the general public, the making of false alarms of fire is a common nuisance. From June, 1971, till July, 1972, for example, the brigade received 553 false alarms. Although the apprehension of offenders is difficult, some prosecutions are made, and it is hoped that the imposition of increased fines will have a real effect as a deterrent. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the minimum and maximum fines for both first and subsequent offences. The range for a first offence is from $20 to $500; for a subsequent offence, it is from $100 to $1,000.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill gives effect to an agreement between the Commissioner of Police and the Police Association of South Australia relating to the reorganization of the machinery for dealing with disciplinary inquiries within the force. One of the bodies, the Police Inquiry Committee, proposed to be the subject of a reorganization, is constituted by regulations under the Police Regulation Act and it would be inappropriate to discuss its reorganization in detail in this context. Suffice it to say that the changes proposed there will be effected by regulations which will, in the ordinary course of events, be subject to the scrutiny of this House.

However, since it is proposed that in future the Chairman of the Police Inquiry Committee shall be a special magistrate, it seems appropriate that the body to which appeals from this committee lie should be chaired by a local court judge in lieu of a special magistrate, as is the case at present. This then is the effect of this Bill. Clauses

1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 38 of the principal Act by substituting a local court judge as the Chairman of the Police Appeal Board in the place of a special magistrate. Clause 4 is a consequential amendment.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will no doubt recall that towards the end of the last session of the last Parliament an amendment to the Crown Lands Act was made to provide certain funds for the Lyrup Village Association to improve irrigation works. At that time funds to the extent of $138,000 were proposed to be made available, of which not more than $55,000 was to be by way of grant, the remainder to be by way of loan repayable in 40 equal annual instalments. In the event, when tenders were sought by the association for this work it was found that due to rising costs the total cost of the works should be of the order of $200,000. Accordingly, this short Bill seeks to amend the Crown Lands Act to increase the total sum available to $205,000 and to increase to $95,000 that portion that will be available by way of grant. Since this Bill is a hybrid Bill it will, in the ordinary course of events, be referred to a Select Committee of this House on the conclusion of the second reading debate.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I support the Bill. Unfortunately, when fixed sums of money are inserted in Bills this sort of situation can arise, as the Minister has said in his explanation. The situation I refer to is that escalating prices can exceed even what was considered to be the highest price, taking into account, I think, a 10 per cent escalation in costs at the time of the original submission. The Lyrup Village Association is appreciative of the Government's action to enable it to get on with the job of completing its pipelaying works before the beginning of the new irrigation season, if possible. I support the second reading in the hope that the matter will be quickly dispatched in its remaining stages.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Arnold, Corcoran, Crimes, Harrison, and Nankivell; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on August 28.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill effects two changes in the principal Act, the Prices Act, 1948, as amended. First, it slightly enlarges the class of "official persons" to whom the Commissioner can disclose information obtained in the course of the administration of the Prices Act. Section 7 of the Prices Act, quite properly, enjoins strict secrecy on the part of the Commissioner and his officers. The exceptions to the restriction on the communication of information are set out in subsection (4) of that section. These exceptions generally are intended to facilitate the administration of the Act and to enable offenders against the provisions of the Act to be prosecuted. However, at paragraph (*c*) of that subsection an exception is provided to enable information to be communicated to the authorities of other States involved in price control for the benefit of the administration of schemes of price control extant in those States.

At the time of the enactment of the principal Act in 1948 the Commonwealth Government had relinquished price control and hence was not mentioned in the exception contained in that paragraph. Now that the Commonwealth has again, to some extent, entered the field, with its Prices Justification Tribunal, it appears proper that it should be brought within the scope of the exemption. Accordingly, clause 2 of the Bill provides that appropriate information may be communicated to Commonwealth as well as State authorities. Secondly, it repeals section 53 of the principal Act. This section, amongst other things, provides that the principal Act will have an effective "life" only until January 1, 1974.

All honourable members will be aware that, since its enactment in 1948, this measure has been renewed from year to year by a series of measures in substantially the same form. However, by the Prices Act Amendment Acts of 1970 and 1971, quite significant amendments were made to the principal Act. The purposes of these amendments were to give the then Prices Commissioner a rather more formal role as the guardian of interests of the consumers of this State. This changed role was recognized in 1971, when the title of the Commissioner was changed to "The South Australian Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs".

All in all, there seems little doubt that there is something quite wrong in a situation where a fundamental part of the legislative framework of consumer protection in this State depends for its very existence on what is in effect an "annual act". This is, of course, quite aside from the fact that certain of the Commissioner's "price fixing" functions are likely to be with us for some time to come.

Accordingly, clause 3 repeals the provision limiting the life of the principal Act and replaces it by a provision suspending the operation of sections 34 to 42 inclusive of the principal Act. The operation of these sections, which imposed certain controls on dealings in land, has in fact been suspended since January 1, 1962. The effect of the substituted section is merely to continue this suspension.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

GIFT DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gift Duty Act, 1968-1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to make quite clear that the definition of Commissioner under the Gift Duty Act accords precisely with the definition of Commissioner under the Succession Duties Act. Honourable members will no doubt be aware that, by virtue of section 4 of the Gift Duties Act, the office of Commissioner under that Act is, in fact, vested in the Commissioner of Succession Duties appointed under the Succession Duties Act.

However, in the Succession Duties Act it is recognized that a number of the duties and functions of the Commissioner will, in fact, be performed in his name by his departmental officers; this is merely recognizing the practicalities of the administration of a substantial department of the Government. To ensure that this situation is reflected in the Gift Duties Act, it is proposed that this position will also be made clear in relation to that Act.

Accordingly, the operative clause of this Bill, clause 2, proposes the insertion of words providing for the recognition

of any officer who is performing any of the duties or functions of the Commissioner of Succession Duties and hence, by extension, of the Commissioner under the Gift Duties Act.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent-General Act, 1901-1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill he now read a second time.

In the past it has been customary to fix the salary of the Agent-General and his officers in the United Kingdom in pounds sterling. However, this method of salary fixation has, due to a decline in the value of the pound sterling in terms of the Australian dollar, caused an appreciable erosion in the salary of the Agent-General and his officers when expressed in terms of Australian dollars. Steps, which do not require legislation, have already been taken to express the salaries of the officers of the Agent-General in Australian dollars, and the purpose of this short Bill is to perform the same function in relation to the salary and expense allowance of the Agent-General.

It is simply not a question of converting the salary of the Agent-General as expressed in pounds sterling to Australian dollars using the present "Treasury" rate of $1.75 equalling £1 sterling, since this would result in a diminution of the Agent-General's salary (expressed as dollars) payable to him in terms of his original appointment. Accordingly, a rate of salary and expenses has been struck which, in all circumstances, seems to be an appropriate rate for the office of Agent-General.

When this new rate is converted to pounds sterling, at the exchange rate presently prevailing, it will be seen that the Agent-General will receive an apparent increase of £1,150 sterling in his salary and £1,020 sterling in his allowance, but in the circumstances this does not seem to be excessive since, having regard to the nature of his office, it is likely that the Agent-General will retain continuing financial commitments that must be met in Australian dollars.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing that a salary and expense allowance at the rate set out in that clause will be payable on and from the day on which the Act provided for by this Bill comes into operation.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act, 1946-1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As was foreshadowed in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor on the opening of this session of Parliament, the Government must increase its revenues if it is to avoid an even more substantial deficit on the Revenue Account than it is at present obliged to budget for. The alternative, which is to decrease the range and standard of services that the people of this State have a right to expect, is beyond contemplation. The method of increase in revenue provided for by this Bill has been selected because it can be shared generally by the whole community and it requires no increase in administrative costs for its collection.

Honourable members will recall that in 1971 provision was made, by an amendment to the principal Act (the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act), for the trust to contribute 3 per cent of its revenue, from the sale of electricity, to the general revenue of the State. Those contributions are made on a quarterly basis. The effect of this measure is to increase that contribution by 2 per cent to a total of 5 per cent, and the increased contribution will apply to the revenue accruing to the trust from the third quarter of this calendar year and from each succeeding quarter thereafter. There will thus be three quarterly payments to revenue at the increased rates during 1973-74. The operative clause of the Bill, clause 2, provides for this increase.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main objective is to give effect to an agreement reached at the Premiers' Conference on June 28 and June 29 of this year that pay-roll tax levied by the States should be increased by 1 per cent to 41 per cent in respect of taxable wages paid or payable on or after September 1 this year. To this extent, then, the Bill must be regarded as essentially a revenue-raising measure, and it is introduced consequent on the stated intention of the Government to ensure that its certain substantial revenue deficit is less than it otherwise would be. In addition, opportunity has been taken to deal with two other matters of some importance but necessarily of less import than the main objective of this measure adverted to here.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 9 of the principal Act and provides that, in respect of taxable wages paid or payable after September I, 1973, pay-roll tax will be payable at the rate of 41 per cent, in lieu of the previous rate of 31 per cent. Clause 3 amends section 12 of the principal Act. This section provides, amongst other things, that most Government departments shall be exempt from a liability to pay pay-roll tax on wages paid by them. When the power to levy pay-roll tax was transferred from the Commonwealth Government to the States in 1971 it was thought that an exemption for Government departments would save unnecessary book-keeping and administrative work.

However, with the benefit of hindsight, this exemption has in fact caused some problems, particularly where work is done by a Government department and the costs thereof have to be recovered from some outside body. In these circumstances it is usual to make a charge to cover the "notional pay-roll tax" that should properly be a component of the cost of the work performed by the department. Unless there is a clear liability for the department involved to pay pay-roll tax, some difficulty may arise in collecting this component of the cost. Accordingly, this clause proposes that on and from July 1, 1974, all Government departments will pay pay-roll tax on their taxable wages.

Clause 4 amends section 14 of the principal Act and is intended to deal with a difficulty that has arisen in connection with the transitional arrangements consequent on the assumption of taxing powers in this area by the State. Subsection (3) of this section provided that possession of a certificate of registration as an employer under the Commonwealth Act would entitle the holder of that certificate to be "deemed to be registered" as an employer

under the State Pay-roll Tax Act. However, although there was power in the Commonwealth to issue those certificates of registration, in fact none has been issued since 1957. Accordingly, the amendment proposed by this clause will ensure that mere registration under the Commonwealth Act will result in the employer's being deemed to be registered under the State Act. Clause 5 is an evidentiary provision.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Lotteries Act, 1966. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill arises from representations made by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia and the Auditor-General. Honourable members will be aware that section 15 of the principal Act, the State Lotteries Act, 1966, provides not only for a formal audit al the end of every month but also for the report of the Auditor-General on each such audit to be tabled in this House. It is the view of the Auditor-General that this requirement is no longer warranted, particularly when he has found the internal checks and controls operated by the commission "very satisfactory". In this view the Government concurs.

Accordingly, the amendments effected to section 15 of the principal Act provide for an annual audit and annual report rather than the monthly audit and report. However, I wish to make it clear that the overriding right of the Auditor-General, to make such inspections of the books and property of the commission as he sees fit, is still preserved and the Auditor-General will be free to exercise his powers in this matter as the circumstances dictate.

Mr. ALLEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act, 1940-1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to deal with a matter that has been brought to the attention of the Government by Their Honours the judges of the Supreme Court. Honourable members will be aware that the principal Act, the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act, 1940-1968, is intended to provide protection for certain classes of persons who, by reason of some mental or physical disability, are unable to manage their own affairs and, as such, the principal Act may be regarded as part of the historically based protective jurisdiction of our Supreme Court.

In actions for damages for personal injury it not infrequently happens that as a result of that injury the plaintiff may be rendered incapable of managing his affairs. In this case it has been usual for the judge presiding in the matter to suggest that those responsible for the interests of the plaintiff secure his position by applying under the principal Act for a protection order in favour of the estate of the plaintiff.

The adoption of such a suggestion by the plaintiff's advisers, however, involves the initiation of proceedings separate and distinct from the action for damages with concomitant delay and the possible incurring of additional expense. Since the facts on which such an application would be granted have in all likelihood emerged in the course of the action for damages, there seems considerable merit in providing for a procedure by which the protection order may be made on the motion of the court seized of the action for damages or on application to that court. This then is the substance of the matter covered by this Bill.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 is, in effect, consequential on clause 3. Clause 3 amends the principal Act by inserting a new section 8a which, at proposed subsection (1), provides for protection orders to be made on the court's own motion or on application in the circumstances set out therein. Proposed subsection (2) provides for intervention in the matter by interested parties. Proposed subsection (3) is, in effect, a type of transitional provision, and proposed subsection (4) spells out the definition of prescribed persons.

Clause 4 makes drafting amendments which merely recognize the existence of the Community Welfare Department, which has replaced the Social Welfare Department. Clauses 5 and 6 are amendments consequential on those effected by clause 3.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of amendments to Part III of the principal Act, the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1972. This Part deals with totalizators, and honourable members will no doubt be aware that it is through the licensing of totalizator operations that the principal statutory control over racing generally is exercised.

The proposed amendments have either been requested by, or have arisen from, discussions with those bodies which control the various aspects of racing in this State. The amendments, which fall into a number of groups, may be summarized as follows:

(*a*) One substantial group provides for the transfer of control over the granting of totalizator licences from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary. Already in this Part provisions exist requiring that certain actions of the Commissioner in relation to the grant of licences be approved of by the Chief Secretary, so it seems appropriate that the whole of the licensing function, which is not, in any sense of the term, a true police function, should be transferred to the Chief Secretary. This transfer of function which will involve no additional administrative expense is in line with the general policy of freeing the police from as many extraneous duties as possible.

(*b*) The second group is concerned with increasing the permitted flexibility in granting licences for meetings at the various racecourses throughout the State. The amendments proposed will permit the transfer of meetings between racecourses if the Chief Secretary is satisfied that a reasonable cause exists for doing so and the racing clubs concerned have agreed. At least two situations may give grounds for a transfer. The first is weather conditions that may inhibit travel to one racecourse yet permit travel to another.

(I suspect the draftsman of this portion of the report knows little about racing. One track may not be in a condition to allow racing to take place on it but another track may be.)

The second is a more cogent economic one where it may be to the considerable financial advantage of a country racing club to transfer one of its "feature" meetings to a more convenient location.

(*c*) The third group provides for an increase in the permitted number of trotting meetings in the metropolitan area and certain country areas and also provides for the transfer of meetings between country areas but not between the country and metropolitan areas. The reasons for providing for these transfers are much the same as those mentioned in connection with the transfers of horse-racing meetings.

(*d*) Finally, the fourth group of amendments is concerned with extending the deduction of the additional 1 per cent of the amount wagered for double, treble and jackpot betting to all such contingencies whether or not the Totalizator Agency Board is involved in the transaction. An amount represented by this 1 per cent is, as members will be aware, paid to the Racecourse Development Fund and its deduction will not only accord with present practice but will ultimately benefit the clubs concerned.

In addition, other minor and consequential amendments have been made to the principal Act and these will be adverted to during the discussions of the clauses of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clauses 3, 4 and 5 are amendments consequential on the vesting of responsibility for the issue of totalizator licences in the Chief Secretary rather than the Commissioner of Police. Clause 6 at paragraph (a) provides for the vesting of responsibility adverted to above and at paragraph (*b*) substitutes for a reference to the Governor a reference to the Chief Secretary, thus empowering the Chief Secretary to determine the disposition of profits derived at charitable meetings that should be paid to various charitable institutions. It now seems appropriate that this matter should be determined by the Chief Secretary. Paragraph (*c*) provides for the transfer of totalizator licences between racecourses and, as has been adverted to above, will enable the venue of meetings to be changed speedily in the event of inclement weather or in other contingencies and also "feature meetings" to be transferred from the country to more convenient locations. In fact, this amendment has been requested by the South Australian Jocky Club acting on behalf of the other clubs in this matter.

Clause 7 again deals with the transfer of control from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary and as a consequential amendment substitutes a new subsection (1*a*) in section 20. Clause 8 has been prepared after consultation with the Totalizator Agency Board and the trotting clubs concerned, and at paragraph (a) provides for the transfer of control over the issue of totalizator licences to the Chief Secretary. However, the most significant amendments made by this clause are, of course, the increase in numbers of trotting meetings that may be held in the various areas. The new maxima will be as follows: *(a)* in the metropolitan area, 53; (*b*) in the South-East, 26; and (*c*) in areas other than the metropolitan area, Eyre Peninsula, the South-East and the Murray area, 70. In addition, provision is made for transfers of meetings within the country areas but not from the country areas to the city. It is considered that this provision for transfer, which is set out in paragraph *(k)* of this clause, will, as has been mentioned, provide for unexpected contingencies and also assist in the more profitable operation of some meetings.

Clause 9 deals with the transfer of responsibility in this area from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, as do clauses 10 and 11. In addition, clause 9 provides that trotting meetings may be held on either days or nights in the metropolitan area. Clause 12 gives effect to the proposition relating to the "additional 1 per cent" adverted to at paragraph (*d*) in my introductory remarks to this measure. Clause 13 again provides for the transfer of control over the issue of totalizator licences from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, as do the remaining clauses of this Bill. Clause 15, besides providing for the transfer of control over the issue of totalizator licences from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, also recognizes the establishment of the South-Eastern Greyhound Racing Club Incorporated and provides for that club to hold not more than 50 meetings in each year at which the use of the totalizator will be permitted.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Police Act, 1936, and certain other Acts amending the same. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second lime.

This short Bill, which repeals the Police Act, 1936, and certain other Acts emending that Act, is introduced as a part of the law revision programme. Honourable members may be aware that, by the Police Regulation Act of 1952 and the Police Offences Act of 1953, the Police Act, 1936, was, for practical purposes, repealed, and this short Bill completes the process by repealing the Police Act, 1936, and repealing certain other Acts which amended that Act. The enactment of this Bill will relieve the editor of the proposed consolidation of the Statutes of the necessity of reprinting the Police Act, 1936, of which only certain formal portions at present remain on the Statute Book.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 *to* 7.30 *p.m.]*

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Pensions Act, 1971-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced following representations made by the Police Association, on behalf of contributors to the Police Pension Fund, to correct what is in their view an anomaly in the principal Act. In funds of this kind, pensions are calculated on an average salary, usually over a period of three years. In the provision relating to average salary in its present form the average annual salary which determines the pension payable will vary slightly, depending on when the contributor's last increase of salary occurred. If this increase occurred after his last "review day", as defined in the principal Act, the pension payable on his death or retirement will not be affected by that increase of salary.

Accordingly, this Bill introduces, as an element in the calculation of pensions, the salary that was payable to the contributor immediately before his death or retirement, notwithstanding the fact that that salary was payable after his last "review day". This will result in a slightly higher benefit in some cases being paid on the death or

retirement of the contributor, depending on when his last salary increase occurred. There is only one operative clause in the Bill, clause 2, which strikes out the definition of average annual salary and provides a method of calculation of that salary depending on whether or not three, two, one or no review days have occurred in relation to the contributor who has died or retired. In each case recognition is now given, for the purpose of calculating the benefit, to the salary payable to the contributor immediately before he retired or died.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROHIBITED AREAS (APPLICATION OF STATE LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prohibited Areas (Application of State Laws) Act, 1952. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. I. KING: I move:

That this Bill he now read a second time.

It is a law revision measure which amends the Prohibited Areas (Application of State Laws) Act, 1972, by substituting for a reference to the Police Act, 1936-1951, a reference to the Police Offences Act, 1953, as amended. Section 4 of the principal Act somewhat expands the meaning of the definition of "public place" in the Police Act, 1936-1951. The purpose of this expansion was to ensure that, in prohibited areas, the meaning of the term "public place" would not be read down because of the fact that, in such places, entry of members of the public could be restricted.

However, since the enactment of the principal Act, the Police Act, 1936-1951, has been substantially repealed and in fact the only operative section of that Act remaining on the Statute Book is the section which contains the definition of "public place". As a result, the reference in the principal Act to a "public place" as defined in the Police Act, 1936-1951, has become nugatory, since there are now no offences created by that Act to which the expanded definition could attach, and a specific reference to the Police Offences Act, 1953, is obviously the reference required if the intentions of Parliament as expressed in the principal Act are to be given effect to. This reference is effected by clause 2 (*b*) of the Bill. At the same time opportunity has been taken to make a formal amendment to the principal Act by clause 2 (*a*).

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill he now read a second time.

It is of a law revision nature and has been prepared by Mr. E. A. Ludovici, who is at present executing the office of Commissioner of Statute Revision. It is intended to correct certain anomalies detected by him in the course of preparing a consolidation of the principal Act, the Planning and Development Act, 1967-1972. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 2 of the principal Act which sets out the manner in which the Act is divided consequential on the enactment of section 18b in that Act.

Clauses 3 and 4 merely correct incorrect citation of the Local and District Criminal Courts Act and the Crown Lands Act respectively. Clause 5 is intended to ensure that full effect is given to an amendment to the principal Act included in the Planning and Development Act (No. 3), 1972, whereby it was provided that action to bring land within the scope of Part V of the principal Act would be by regulation instead of by proclamation, as was previously the case.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the execution by or on behalf of the State of an agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States of Australia in relation to housing, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It authorizes the Treasurer to execute on behalf of the State of South Australia a new housing agreement with the Commonwealth. The agreement authorized to be executed must be substantially in accordance with the form set out in the schedule to the Bill. The agreement provides that, in the five years commencing this financial year, the Commonwealth will make advances to the State at low interest rates for what are described as welfare housing purposes. The advances will be made for two purposes: (*a*) for allotment by the State to its housing authority for provision of housing in accordance with the agreement; and (*b*) for payment to an account at the State Treasury, which in the case of this State will be known as the Home Builders Account No. 3, for application by the State for mortgage lending to prospective house purchasers by way of loans through the State Bank of South Australia.

The agreement provides that not less than 20 per cent or more than 30 per cent of welfare housing advances shall be paid to the Home Builders Account but, when a State Minister so requests and where a State has made allocations to its Home Builders Account in the two preceding years which are in excess of 30 per cent, the Commonwealth Minister may approve an allocation to the Home Builders Account in excess of 30 per cent of the total of Commonwealth advances for a year. This is a special provision to deal with the position in South Australia, as, with a tradition of house ownership, this State has, for a number of years, diverted 50 per cent or more of the total funds provided for housing into the provision of funds, on attractive terms, for persons seeking to buy houses.

In the current financial year the State has secured a total of $32,750,000 for welfare housing purposes of which $17,250,000, or 52.7 per cent, will be available for mortgage loans through the State bank, and $15,500,000, or 47.3 per cent will be available to the South Australian Housing Trust. These amounts compare with $15,500,000 and $14,000,000, totalling $29,500,000, which were made available from State Loan funds to the State Bank and to the South Australian Housing Trust respectively during 1972-73.

Advances will be made available to the State during the five-year period of the agreement at a rate of interest of 4 per cent in respect of advances made to the Housing Trust, and at a rate of interest of 4½ per cent in respect of that part of the advances which will be paid to the Home Builders Account. The advances will be repayable with interest at these rates over a period of 53 years, commencing with the year after the year in which the advances are made. Advances made to the South Australian Housing Trust may be used (*a*) to meet the cost of acquisition and development of land for residential purposes; (*b*) to meet the cost of construction of dwellings; (*c*) to meet the cost of purchasing, upgrading, renovating and substantially improving existing dwellings; and (*d*) for provision of

bridging finance for community amenities which are not the responsibility of the Housing Trust.

The agreement requires that not less than 85 per cent of family houses built by the trust under this agreement are to be allocated to families where the average gross weekly income of the main breadwinner does not exceed 85 per cent of the average weekly earnings of an employed male in the State (or in Australia, whichever the State may elect) as published by the Commonwealth Statistician during the preceding December quarter. Where the family includes more than two children, this will be increased by $2 a week for each child beyond the second. Similar extensions are provided for aged couples and single aged persons. The State is required, moreover, to ensure that the total of family dwellings allocated by the Housing Trust during each of the years of the agreement to persons eligible under the needs test described shall be at least the equivalent of the total of family dwellings built with these special advances plus 25 per cent of the number of dwellings which are built under this or earlier agreements and which become available during the year for reallocation.

Whilst the agreement does not of itself spell out a maximum rent that is chargeable, the Commonwealth Minister for Housing has suggested that rents charged to families at the upper limit of the needs test should not exceed 22½ per cent of income and that the proportion of rent to income should decline as income reduces. The agreement also provides that, at least once in each financial year, the State housing authority should review its rentals and make adjustments when necessary. The Commonwealth Minister has taken the view that regular smaller rental reviews are preferable to infrequent and larger rental adjustments.

One of the more important aspects of Commonwealth housing policy relates to the building up of a stock of rental houses; thus, the agreement restricts to 30 per cent the percentage of family dwellings built with funds provided under this agreement which may be sold, either by direct sale or under agreement. Also, where such houses are sold, the purchasers must satisfy the needs test, and the interest charge to purchasers is limited to 5¾ per cent a year. A purchaser of such a house may not dispose of the house, other than to the Housing Trust for at least five years after the date of sale and, even subsequently, intending vendors will be required to give the Housing Trust first option to purchase at a fair market value.

As I indicated earlier, the special provisions in the agreement will enable this State to continue to divert over 50 per cent of these special funds to the Home Builders Account for advances to intending home purchasers through the State Bank. Here again, the funds passing through this Home Builders Account must be used for welfare purposes to benefit the more needy applicants. The needs test set for applicants for concessional interest rate housing loans, which in this State will carry an interest rate of 5½ per cent a year, is that those eligible will be families where the average gross income of the main breadwinner does not exceed 95 per cent of average weekly earnings plus $2 a week for each child beyond two. Average weekly earnings for these purposes means the average weekly earnings for each employed male unit in the State (or in Australia) during the December quarter preceding the date at which the loan is approved. The minimum deposit to be found by a borrower will be 3 per cent of the value of the land and house erected thereon.

The foregoing is, of course, a summary only of the conditions contained in the new agreement. Persons seeking to determine their eligibility to obtain houses from the Housing Trust or loans from the State Bank may obtain full details from those authorities. I think that it is appropriate for me to say that, whilst we welcome those low cost moneys as an addition to our funds for housing, this is not the complete picture. The Housing Trust has been in the housing business now for many years and, in addition to having a stock of rental houses passing through its hands for reallocation, it has a considerable circulating fund built up from borrowings outside the Commonwealth-State housing agreements which have been used in general in the house sales programmes of the trust. It is confidently expected that these funds will meet the requirements placed on the trust for rental and rental-purchase houses for allocation to persons in various areas who may not meet the needs test criteria that have been attached to these new Commonwealth funds. This is a matter I explained to the House the other day.

In the same way, whilst the concessional interest rate funds provided through the Home Builders Account must be reserved for persons who meet the needs test that has been set, the circulating funds that have been growing in the Treasury and in the State Bank as a result of interest margins and repayments of principal under earlier agreements and supplemented by appropriation of State Loan funds will provide the necessary funds to enable the State Bank to assist in catering for the mortgage loan requirements of persons who do not meet the needs criteria. There is a significant difference between the administration of housing funds in South Australia and those, for example, in Victoria. Honourable members will have seen that the Liberal Government in Victoria bitterly criticized this housing agreement on the basis that it would be thereby restricted in making houses available for sale to people in its area.

Mr. Evans: Did Mr. Tonkin accept it in Western Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Tonkin has signed the agreement.

Dr. Eastick: Are you sure the Victorians did not oppose it because of all the loopholes and tie-downs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only opposition to any clause of this agreement from Victoria was in relation to the proportion of money that could go for sale housing at concessional interest rates. The fact is that, whereas South Australia has been building from public funds, 21 per cent of total housing at a higher housing rate than Victoria in proportion to the population, Victoria under a Liberal Government has been building only 8 per cent of housing from public funds. Whereas we have provided, from generally borrowed Loan funds other than concessional interest moneys and from the revolving funds of the trust and the State Bank, considerable extra moneys beyond the concessional Commonwealth moneys for housing, Victoria has not.

Dr. Eastick: But it got more money overall for housing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It needed more money overall because, as I have said, South Australia has far exceeded the proportion of public moneys for housing compared to Victoria. It has had more than 2½ times the proportion of money for housing than Victoria has had. That has been a consistent policy of Government in South Australia. If money had been provided under Liberal Governments in Victoria from general State Loan funds and State banking funds for housing, as we have done, that State would have had no reason to cavil at the agreement that was offered to it. What in fact was offered Victoria was a very marked increase in housing funds because that State had done so badly previously in relation to housing.

Dr. Eastick: Because of our good stewardship a few months ago we were going to get more.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We did get more: we got close to the amount that we had the capacity to use, but in addition we were able to provide in the agreement that we were able to specify other than concessional interest rate moneys to this area. We have done it, but Victoria has not. South Australia has spent and is spending on public housing a record sum in proportion to its total public funds: more per capita than any other State. That remains the case.

Dr. Eastick: We are going to get fewer units, though. The increased percentage does not matter in the inflationary spiral.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to concessional interest money this may be true, but on the other hand concessional interest money is at more generous interest rates. We have been able to specify additional money beyond the concessional housing money, and there is a significant provision for money for housing at the moment in our general Loan programme.

As I have announced earlier, loans to those persons (persons who are going to the State Bank and outside the means test) will be made presently at a rate of 6½ per cent, compared to the 5½ per cent rate available to applicants who meet the needs test. Loans available after June 30, 1973, for both classes of applicant may be granted to a maximum amount of $12,500 compared to the limits of $10,000 for new dwellings and $9,000 for established dwellings that applied prior to that date.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides appropriate definitions in the measure. Clause 3 authorizes the execution and the carrying out of the agreement. Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to make loans to a lending authority of the State approved by the Minister and authorizes that authority to borrow the money. The Commonwealth Minister has already indicated that he will approve the State Bank as a "lending authority of the State" for this purpose. Clause 5 provides that any other moneys advanced to the State, other than moneys payable to the Home Builders Account, shall be paid to a special account at the Treasury and shall be paid from that account to the South Australian Housing Trust. Subclause (2) of this clause authorizes the Treasurer to use moneys paid to him by the trust, or moneys in the Home Builders Account, to meet interest obligations and principal repayments due to the Commonwealth under the agreement.

Clause 6 provides for the situation where, for any reason, payments to the State by the Commonwealth under the agreement may be delayed. This clause authorizes the Treasurer to make advances to the Home Builders Account to enable funds to continue to be available for mortgage lending. Since the Housing Trust has other sources of funds, a similar provision is not required to cover temporary advances to the trust. Clause 7 in substance will allow the State to anticipate the execution of the agreement, and indeed the passage of this Bill. In effect, it provides that moneys may be made available for housing purposes at any time in anticipation of the execution of the agreement and that any advances or repayments, referred to in this clause, will as it were be retrospectively validated.

Dr. Eastick: What about details of the bridging finance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will provide that during the debate. I make no apology for the inclusion of a clause of this nature since, in the view of the Government, the sooner money is made available in accordance with the terms of the agreement the better it will be for those in this State who are in need of suitable housing.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 14. Page 334.)

First schedule.

Highways and Local Government, $6,430,000.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Treasurer has said that expenditure of a considerable sum is associated with the new route of Eyre Highway and that, by an alteration of priorities, it will be possible to complete this project 12 months ahead of schedule. The new route will be markedly different from the old, and will provide a better road, but the rerouting will take the highway away from certain existing facilities, particularly the motel and service station complex at Ivy Tanks, where a person has provided facilities for passing motorists. The facilities, provided out of his own pocket, have been well used by passing traffic and suddenly the proprietor finds that his complex is some distance from the new road. He has made consistent applications to Ministers, including, I understand, the Acting Minister of Transport and Local Government, in an effort to obtain compensation or to have considered an application for an area of land on which to rebuild his business.

The member for Eyre has made representations to the department and to the Minister on his behalf, but I understand that this man is receiving neither consideration nor help from the Government. Can the Minister indicate the present situation? What help will be given to the proprietor of this business? Does the Government intend to recognize that it has taken away his business? The Government should consider ensuring that this man can relocate his business.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): This matter has been the subject of questions in the House, and the Minister of Transport said he would see whether any steps could be taken. Without obtaining information from the Minister's department, I cannot say whether any assistance can be provided. I shall give the Leader a reply as quickly as I can.

Mr. GUNN: This man has not been able to get assurances from several Government departments. He would like a suitable allotment provided for him, as the present property is redundant. When the highway is completed, not one motor car will pass the existing facilities in two years. I hope the Minister will consider this matter.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the provision for public parks and for the purchase of land for public parks and recreation areas, grants to local government authorities, etc. Last year $300,000 was allocated, of which $230,000 was spent. This year there is a drastic reduction to $30,000. There must be a good reason for this, because it seems to run counter to the Minister's much-publicized comments on his avowed policy of promoting, with councils, the idea of public parks. The committee is entitled to an explanation of why this provision has been reduced so drastically.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: During the last two years the Government has tried to increase the allocation to councils to establish public parks. Because councils were not able to meet the requirements it was decided that, rather than merely give assistance for the provision of parks, we would also give a subsidy to develop facilities associated with those parks. As a result, whereas previously the large sums made available from revenue each year were not called on by councils because they could not afford to purchase and establish parks, the Government has given greater assistance for public parks.

However, last year was unusual, in that there was a peak. Many cases for the establishment of public parks were

placed before the Minister of Local Government, with the result that, in addition to the $300,000 provided on the Revenue Estimates, the $300,000 referred to by the honourable member was made available in the Loan Estimates. As that peak has been passed, in this year's Loan Estimates the figure is reduced considerably, but the normal $300,000 would be made available for public parks in the Revenue Estimates.

Dr. EASTICK: The Treasurer has explained that, although the Commonwealth Government has promoted the Eyre Highway scheme to go ahead in a shorter period, that Government has not made any additional funds available to the State. It seems that it now accepts that he $2,500,000 made available by the previous Liberal and Country Party Government was adequate for the purpose. I cannot imagine that the Treasurer or the Minister did not try to renegotiate to have the sum increased. The Minister may be able to explain the position, as the Commonwealth Government intended to provide much greater sums of money for the States, particularly those States controlled by a Labor administration.

The amount allocated for the item "Other urban drainage" in 1972-73 was $1,500,000, of which only $452,163 was used in that year. Surely this highlights the plight that councils are in because of the marked increase in their costs for fire brigades, hospitals, and other services, and they have been unable to find money on a $1 for $1 basis at the commencement of these urban drainage projects. They have been unable to accept responsibility for drainage that, in many instances, is required because Housing Trust houses are located in poorly-drained areas, where massive works must be undertaken.

Further, many of these drainage problems have been associated with the building up of highways with a particularly high crown or a centre much higher than the surrounding land, resulting in flooding adjacent to the highways. The time has arrived for the Government to make funds available for these works on a better basis than the $1 for $1 basis. Most of the reasons why councils call on assistance for drainage work of this kind have been inspired by Government or Government instrumentalities. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether any consideration has been given, in the allocation of $1,500,000 for 1973-74, to advancing the money on a better basis than the $1 for $1 basis.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I should have thought that the principle of applying a $1 for $1 basis was reasonable in relation to schemes of this kind, because, while the Leader suggested that Government roadworks would have created the drainage problems, I should have thought that would take place only where there was considerable building development and a requirement for roads.

Dr. Eastick: Take the case of a main highway.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Leader has referred to a main highway, but I should have thought that, where drainage problems were created, they would be created not merely by the main highway but by the sealing of several roads in an area where there might be normal drainage and the sealing of the roads would make a difference. Where that situation occurs, a council would benefit by additional rates from the increased number of ratepayers involved. The Leader has made clear that he is talking primarily about major highway works that can create drainage problems within an area. Although I am not certain about the extent of this problem, I shall be happy to refer it to officers of the department, who are better equipped than I am to provide information on this matter.

I think it is clear that the Government would have much appreciated increased financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government towards the Eyre Highway project. All along, we have said that, as people from other States use this highway, it is of national importance, and accordingly additional assistance should be given to the State for this work. As the Government accepted a financial offer made by the previous Commonwealth Government, it has not been possible to increase now the sum earlier decided on. Although we have the present Commonwealth Government's co-operation in relation to payments of this money, regrettably we have not been able to have the sum provided increased.

Mr. MATHWIN: Although much of the vast sum provided for roads and bridges will go towards expenses with regard to the Eyre Highway, much money is still available for other work. In my district, a flyover is proposed for the Oaklands railway crossing at Morphett Road, the completion dates suggested for that work varying from 1975 to 1980.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It could be 1999.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. In the meantime, the condition of Morphett Road is bad indeed. Although I have asked many questions and made numerous telephone calls about the matter, I have found it difficult to obtain information. Work on Morphett Road cannot wait until the flyover project is completed, if that project is not to be finished, as the Minister says, until 1999. Has consideration been given to the temporary improvement of Morphett Road?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As the honourable member has said, this work is of major size and importance. I can recall the questions asked by the honourable member in recent months about this project, but I am afraid that I cannot add anything to the information already provided to him. I will obtain a report on the matter.

Mr. EVANS: Has the plan and design work been completed for any of the following projects that I understand the Highways Department is investigating, and is it expected that any of the projects will be completed before 1980? First, I refer to a major road leaving the South-Eastern Freeway about a quarter of a mile (.4 km) east of the Eagle on the Hill, near the lookout, and going from there to Waterfall Gully, the road to be a four-lane arterial road. Secondly, I believe that a road is being investigated that will leave the South-Eastern Freeway about half a mile (.8 km) above Measday Hill, and run along the southern side of the South-Eastern Freeway through Brownhill Creek and into Upper Mitcham, this road to be a four-lane arterial road. Thirdly, I refer to a road to run from the Waverley Ridge area at the end of Waverley Ridge along Sheoak Road into Florence Terrace and Gloucester Avenue, and then to Panorama, the road to be a four-lane arterial road.

Fourthly, I refer to a road that will run from the end of Waverley Ridge along the main Upper Sturt Road into Hawthomdene Drive and then to Shepherds Hill Road to the South Road junction, the road to be a four-lane arterial road. Fifthly, I refer to a road to run from Florence Terrace in a south-westerly direction along Lindsay Terrace and part of Upper Sturt Road, then into the Hawthorndene and Coromandel Valley area, the road to be a main arterial road. Sixthly, I should like to know whether the final route has been designed and planned for the scenic road that will pass through a major part of my district. As there have been about five routes suggested, property values have been affected adversely. Seventhly, is any work expected soon on Old Belair Road? Eighthly, will work

be commenced soon on the Blackwood-Belair road, with an overpass over the Glenalta railway crossing?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: At a later stage, I will give the honourable member as much information as I can.

Mr. MATHWIN: The sum provided for public parks has been decreased from actual payments of $230,000 last year to $30,000 this year.

Mr. Jennings: But you—

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Ross Smith, as deputy Minister of Transport, is interjecting out of his place. If I want to ask him a question, I will ask him direct. Considering this great decrease in the sum provided for public parks, how can the Minister expect councils to be able to obtain $1 for $1 subsidies if they wish to purchase property, given the present high prices? In the metropolitan area, if a council wished to acquire a property on which there was an old house it would have to pay between $30,000 and $60,000. In the Brighton council at present there is a move afoot to acquire a property that will cost over $100,000, but this allocation would not cover even that. It is a meagre amount that will do absolutely nothing. The Government might just as well have left the line completely blank so that people would know what the Government was doing. No council in the metropolitan area has a chance of securing any money under this line. Has this matter been considered seriously or is the small amount of money allocated to this line merely a farce?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the honourable member had been here, he would have heard me say that the normal allocation for public parks was about $300,000 a year, which is normally made available on the Revenue Estimates. Last year, as a result of a peak demand for assistance under this line, the Government doubled the normal allocation and made it almost $300,000. This year the normal amount of $300,000 made available to local government as a subsidy will continue as usual under the Revenue Estimates.

Mr. EVANS: Is it expected that moneys will be spent this year on acquiring more land on the routes for freeways, expressways or transport corridors, particularly those that may have had some relationship to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan proposed some years ago? We now have a difficult explanation of what those routes may be used for. Is it proposed to buy any more property and spend more money for that purpose?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I imagine there will be a continuing requirement to purchase properties and land in the areas referred to, in the various transport corridors, and that money will be made available from the Highways Fund.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Under the line dealing with roads and bridges, I refer particularly to the road link between Port Adelaide and Kingscote. It is clearly a road link between two parts of this State and distinctly comes under the Highways Department. Has provision been made by this Government to run that road link between those two places at a loss next year similar to the loss made this year? In answer to a question the other day, I was told that this road link cost this Government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This has nothing to do with the Loan Estimates.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thank you, Sir, for that reminder and seek permission to ask for information about that exercise. We were informed that within the area of roads and bridges—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can deal only with matters relating to the Highways Department, which is under discussion. I ask him to confine his questions to that matter.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the reminder of how I should keep in order within this line by confining my remarks to the Highways Department. To what extent does the Highways Department expect to upgrade this service and has it provided for a greater loss in the next 12 months than occurred last year, the loss being $250,000?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What the honourable member is discussing relates to money provided by the Highways Fund, not by Loan Estimates.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the explanation, but we on the island still regard it as a bridge.

Mr. WARDLE: How much money has been earmarked for the construction of the new Swanport bridge?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information about the significance of the letter that the Minister of Transport sent out when he circulated to all members of this House the programme of roadworks and bridgeworks to be undertaken under his direction during 1973-74. I appreciate that not all the work covered by the information that the Minister sent out comes within this line, but much of it does. The Minister sent out the following letter:

It is pointed out that, because of the many factors which can influence the commencing of any particular project or job, it is sometimes necessary to redirect resources. This may be particularly so bearing in mind the financial resources of the State. Therefore, this schedule should not be accepted too literally as being the fixed and unalterable determination of the department's works proposal for the financial year ending June 30, 1974.

This advice is different from other advice given in the past. Previously, a document has been sent out without any such qualifications. I have inquired of the Minister over a period in Question Time, by letter and by personal approach. Clearly, he indicated that this was the intention—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I rise on a point of order. The Loan Estimates are in respect of $4,000,000 for roads and bridges under this line, which relates to finance for the Eyre Highway project and nothing else. All other moneys in respect of roads and bridges come from the Highways Fund, and are not before this Committee.

Dr. EASTICK: I appreciate the point made by the Treasurer, but he himself told members that the Eyre Highway project was to be advanced by 12 months. The Commonwealth Government has granted permission for the spending of $2,500,000 of Commonwealth funds in a period that is one year less than that originally provided for. Obviously, the department's ability to finance the programmes to which it was previously committed will be influenced by a redirection of funds. For this reason, can the Minister representing the Minister of Transport say what degree of rescheduling has taken place as a result of the increased allocation for Eyre Highway? What areas of the State will be inconvenienced as a result?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Minister of Transport, in his normal courteous way, is always anxious to give members as much information as possible. I see no special significance in the letter to which the Leader referred. The Eyre Highway project will not affect the normal roadworks programme. Probably the Minister sent out the letter on the basis that, if there was any likelihood

of changes in priorities for any reason, members would not think that the document completely committed him.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. Regarding the subdivision of land in Saratoga Drive, Novar Gardens, the Cummins Park Community Association was under the impression that the Engineering and Water Supply Department would plant trees along the reserve between Saratoga Drive and the creek, to replace the trees that had been removed. The department has planted a few trees near Pine Avenue, but the planting has not continued along the bank of the creek. Can the Minister say whether the department will continue planting trees in that area?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be happy to take up the matter to see what can be done.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding the item "Other urban drainage", there will be contributions toward effluent drainage projects. Are those contributions to be the only contributions available for effluent schemes during 1973-74, or will additional funds be made available on another line? The sum of $150,000 allocated for effluent drainage works is not very great, considering the total number of projects of this nature required. If this is the only sum to be made available, what criteria are used to determine the priority of any project, and will this sum be adequate to provide the effluent schemes necessary for towns in a watershed area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Leader knows full well that until 18 months ago no money at all was made available to local government for this purpose. It is only due to this Government's policy that any money has been made available for this purpose: the money has been made available because the Government believes that in some townships it is absolutely vital to provide a satisfactory system of disposal of human waste. The policy provides that, where the cost of an individual connection is greater than $30, the Government subsidizes it. If the Leader considers various parts of the State, he will see that in many cases there will be no requirement at all for a subsidy, because it will be possible to install the scheme for less than $30 a connection. The highest cost so far of any such scheme applied to Mount Pleasant, where the cost was $44 a connection and the subsidy was $14 a connection. The Leader will see that the sum allocated can lead to a pretty substantial effort. There is a limit to the number of schemes that can be designed by the Public Health Department, which is responsible for these schemes. While the Local Government Department allocates the money to councils, the scheme involves a combined effort by the Public Health Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Local Government Department.

Dr. Eastick: What are the criteria for determining the priorities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The co-ordinating committee determines the priorities. Lyndoch and Williamstown, in which the Leader is interested, are two areas that are currently under discussion. Of course, some areas are more vital in connection with protecting the watershed than are other areas.

Line passed.

Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, $3,015,000.

Mr. RODDA: When the South-Eastern Drainage Act Amendment Bill was passed last year, some exclusions were made in connection with drainage near towns in the South-East. The Naracoorte council has experienced trouble in facing up to its responsibilities in connection with the takeover regarding the clearing of berms and access bridges to the properties adjacent to the Cave Valley drain. This has been under the control of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. I understand the Naracoorte council sent a deputation to the Minister to ensure that the board completed certain work before the council took over the responsibility. Will this work be done?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is the responsibility of the Minister of Lands. I believe that the line providing funds for the Eastern Division may include this work. As I am not certain, I will check with the Minister and let the honourable member know. Whilst there is a line provided, the facility is there if they had to provide more money.

Mr. ARNOLD: In referring to irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands, I notice that more than $1,000,000 is left over from the last financial year, because of the halt in work caused by consideration of having a fully pressurized system or a low-pressure system in the relocating of distribution systems in the irrigation areas of the Lands Department. As $1,840,000 is provided for the work this year, why is the $1,000,000 left over from last year not added to the estimate for this year's payments to catch up with the work that has been deferred? Otherwise, the whole programme will become 12 months behind schedule. It is for this reason that I earlier asked a question on this matter, the reply to which the Minister gave today. Can the Minister say why the funds not spent last year are not added to the funds available this year so that the deferred work can be caught up with?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not possible always to gear the physical involvement of a scheme to cater for the expenditure of an extra $1,000,000. I refer to the sheer ability to spend money effectively as having a direct bearing on how much can be spent in any one year. We would have to double or treble the number of gangs involved and the other logistical support required to do that. That is not good management and, if the honourable member ever had the experience of running a department, he would know that $1,000,000 is not just spent like that. It is good management to spend such funds in accordance with the resources available for construction of the scheme. True, delay occurred because of investigation into the system to be implemented, and that has had its effect but, just because we have lost time, we cannot throw in another $1,000,000. It does not happen like that. I suggest that this is a reasonable and sensible sum to be spent this year, being no greater than that which we can adequately handle. If we increased it, what would happen next year? What will we do with the forces we have marshalled to spend that sum? It is a matter of management but, as I am not the Minister responsible, I will check on the matter.

Mr. ARNOLD: I should like the Minister to have it investigated because, in consulting with the Minister of Lands, he will find that the necessary work has been carried out. From discussions I have had, I believe that progress on this project is largely dependent on the finance available; not on the planning or availability of materials. A decision has been made by the Public Works Committee to provide a low-pressure system, and the Minister will find that finance is the only barrier.

Mr. RODDA: The sum of $385,000 has been allocated for the purchase of machinery, plant, equipment and motor vehicles for the Survey Division of the Lands Department. What is planned by the expenditure of this money, especially in the light of the Minister's recent announcement about investigations into the water needs of the South-East? Are we running more water into the sea than is necessary

for the preservation of the Coorong? Already the ecology of the South-East has been upset. Does the Government intend to upgrade the Survey Division of the department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give details, but I believe the purchase is of machinery in connection with mapping rather than drainage. I think it is photogrammetric equipment, which is expensive. The division already has such equipment available to it. I imagine it would be that type of equipment, but I shall find out what is intended.

Line passed.

Woods and Forests, $3,300,000.

Dr. EASTICK: It has been clearly indicated that about 4 500 acres (1 820 ha) of forest was planted last year and that it is intended to plant about the same area this year. The Minister has said that there is an increasing deficiency in the production by the Woods and Forests Department for the State's needs, particularly in housing. Further, a considerable quantity of the State's production is committed for marketing outside this State. When the industry was being established, it was necessary to take on clients outside South Australia who required a long contract so that they could arrange for continuity of their work, and now we have the problem of the State constantly losing out to those commitments. The area of 4 500 acres (1 820 ha) is considerable, but we are progressively getting ourselves into a corner because the housing industry may be required to import large quantities of timber from other States and even from overseas at a cost which could be much higher than that of our own product. Could the Minister comment on any discussions that have taken place in this field in an effort to determine the future of the industry in this State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader's question is proper in the present circumstances. In building up the industry we have extended our markets throughout Australia in order to ensure that the milling operation is a viable proposition. Today we cannot satisfy the markets that have been established over the years, and this is the case with other private forests in the South-East with regard to timber and other associated products, such as panel board. We are short of timber in this State and it is rather tempting to say that we should supply only the South Australian market from our mills, but that would be a bad mistake in the long term. Although I do not know whether the Minister has discussed this matter with the Forestry Board, I consider it is well worth examining. One problem is the non-availability of land for new plantings, and such land as is available is becoming more costly. That, too, must be taken into account in looking at the total situation. I shall bring to the attention of my colleague the important points raised by the Leader and invite him to comment.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister has indicated that he considers the Leader's comments important. Is it intended to assist woodblock farming on private properties? In the Naracoorte and Penola districts some landholders have planted private forests and are now taking our their first thinnings. Given encouragement, these private forests could fulfil a need and improve the environment and ecology of the farm lands throughout the South-East. I do not want to canvass at this stage the general question of the appreciation of the value of a property caused by the planting of trees and the succession duties implications resulting therefrom.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: This aspect, too, should be examined. Assistance by means of supervision in the early stages of growth is given by the Woods and Forests Department to people wanting to plant part of their properties to pine. A previous Government amended the Succession Duties Act to provide relief in this area, but the matter of Commonwealth income taxation must be considered, too. Over, say, 40 years, there would be three or four occasions only when the farmer could realize on his plantings and the proceeds would be received in a certain year, unduly inflating his general income. The Commonwealth Government could help by relaxing the taxation laws so that receipts from the sale of timber could be spread over the whole period rather than being taken into account only in the year of receipt. We shall have to look more seriously at this matter than we have in the past because of the non-availability of forest land, particularly in the South-East.

Mr. EVANS: I am amazed at the little that has been allowed for the purchase of land for afforestation. In the 1969 Estimates, $415,000 was made available for land purchases, and there has been an inflationary trend since then which must be taken into consideration. In 1970-71 the sum was $678,000 during a Parliament when the present Minister was a Government member and at that time we saw a substantial increase in that area. In 1971-72 only $390,000 was made available to purchase more land, and this year only $200,000, or less than one-third of the amount made available two years ago, is provided.

This year the primary producers are getting a better return and the price of farm land has increased, so the $200,000 this year will buy much less land compared to what could be bought in 1970-71. In 1969-70 we allowed for the planting of 6 000 acres (2 428 ha) of new plantings and in 1971-72 we also allowed for a similar area of new plantings. In 1972-73, we were back to 4 500 acres (1 821 ha). I do not understand why the Government is reducing the amount of money available to buy new land for afforestation and reducing greatly the amount of land planted, when Australia faces the worst timber shortage it has had since 1949. There is a waiting time of up to six months for preserved posts for fencing for farmers and for housing timbers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has answered the question by saying there was an upsurge in the prices paid for rural produce, making rural land more difficult to obtain. We do not compulsorily acquire land for pine plantings and I hope the honourable member does not suggest that we should do that. Why would we provide money in the Estimates to purchase land when the land could not be purchased? I will make sure about the matter for the honourable member and let him know.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister also find out how much unplanted land the department owns at present, because I believe that it owns many thousands of hectares and I consider that plantings can be upgraded? If we cannot buy land, we should have more money to spend on planting, and we have virgin land available to plant.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain that information and also find out how much land was found, after it was purchased, to be unsuitable for planting. I will tell the honourable member how much land has been set aside for forest reserves. We must look after the ecology, and I often hear the honourable member complaining about that.

Mr. Evans: Accepted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member will be surprised at the position.

Mr. RODDA: Each year we allocate $25,000 to control Sirex wasp and I should like the Minister to say whether there is any cause for concern about it. The member for

Fisher is correct in saying that there has been enormous demand for fencing posts. The Mount Gambier and Wandilo suppliers have been taxed heavily and the vineyards have taken an enormous quantity of posts. As there is a waiting time for posts of about six months at present, I should like to know whether the timber treatment plant will be upgraded.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be aware that, thank God, Sirex wasp has never struck our forests. The amount of $25,000 is our share of a contribution to a fund also contributed to by other States. Sirex wasp has been found elsewhere in Australia and has been controlled. We are pleased to provide that amount towards the cost of eradication. Regarding the shortage of posts, I think the honourable member would agree that the demand for this product was heavy just before June 30, mainly because many people had a high income from wool or cattle and they wanted to spend some money to reduce their taxation. They bought timber for fencing work that otherwise they probably would not have been concerned about for a few years. I do not know whether the position has levelled out but I am pleased that there has been a heavy demand, because the product is excellent and can be used much more easily than the old type of stringy bark fencing posts, concrete posts, and so on. I will find out the position and let the honourable member know.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say whether there is any reason other than a shortage of funds why we received only $112,000 of the $200,000 to be made available by the Commonwealth Government in 1971-72, and can he also say whether there is every indication that we will get the $300,000 proposed for this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot tell the honourable member now, but I will find out for him.

Dr. EASTICK: We have dealt so far with pine forests, and I should like the Minister to give information about what other types of forestry the department is seeking to implement. The most recent edition of the *Riverland* has an article about a poplar plantation in the Yarrawonga area. Although this would be mainly for the match trade, I wonder whether such plantings have been considered along the reaches of the Murray River, bearing in mind the problem of supplying water. Conceivably, water may be available at the lakes. I acknowledge that hardwoods take much longer to grow than softwoods take. However, as the Minister has acknowledged the growing timber shortage, can he say what research is being done and what consultation is taking place amongst those in the timber industry to solve the problem?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I know of no investigation about this, I accept the point made by the Leader. I shall be happy to raise the matter with my colleague and get what information I can about any discussions that have taken place with regard to diversification in forestry. Apart from radiata pine and pinasta, many other forms of afforestation can take place profitably.

Mr. McANANEY: Is land near reservoirs suitable for the planting of pines, and will the Engineering and Water Supply Department accept such a programme? I understand that the reason why the Woods and Forests Department has not planted more trees is the difficulty of purchasing suitable land at a reasonable price.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During the last six weeks the Minister of Environment and Conservation, the Minister of Forests and I and our officers have met to consider this matter, and a committee comprising officers of the three departments has been set up to plan the planting of pine trees on reservoir reserves. Although I looked at this proposal with some trepidation, I think the trees can be planted in such a way that the balance of nature will not be destroyed. We must maintain natural growth as well as plant pines. However, as has been said, of necessity we must use all the land we can that is suitable for the planting of pines, and this matter is now being examined by the committee. Reservoir reserves will be involved in this scheme. As the honourable member knows, we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to acquire land so that we can create a half-mile (.8 km) buffer zone around metropolitan reservoirs.

Line passed.

Railways, $9,900,000.

Mr. COUMBE: I am concerned that of the $7,900,000 provided for railway accommodation last year only $5,217,944 was spent. I hope there is an explanation for this. On the face of it, it would seem that moneys voted were not spent in a vital area, in which much employment is provided. Last year the sum provided for work in the rolling stock branch (and this involves the Islington railway workshop in my district) was $4,260,000, whereas this year the sum has been decreased to $3,013,000. I realize that some purchases are involved in this sum. Although some new locomotives were purchased last year, none is provided for this year. In addition, the sums provided for freight vehicles, passenger vehicles, plant and machinery, service stock vehicles, etc., are less than were provided last year. The only exception is that a slight increase is provided for improvements to freight vehicles. Therefore, this reduction is directly connected with the Islington workshop, and I am concerned about employment there. I realize that in the future there will be some electrification of our railway system, and perhaps this is involved. On the other hand, the Minister has referred to the proposal of the Commonwealth to take over from the State certain country lines. Nothing official has yet been said about these matters in this Parliament.

I am concerned about this reduced allocation, because in his statement the Treasurer said that submissions had been made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance with regard to urban rail transport, and that a sum of $2,000,000 was expected (it had been half-promised). In other words, the Government is working on the assumption that this $2,000,000 will be provided. As I understand it, this sum will be spent almost entirely on work in connection with the Brighton to Christie Downs rail link. Of course, I agree that that project should go ahead, but I should have thought that extra rolling stock would be required; yet there is a marked reduction of $1,250,000 in the sum provided. Last year, $74,000 was provided for new locomotives, and we must take into account that no provision is made this year for new locomotives. The large reduction in this line deserves a considered explanation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): If $2,000,000 is forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government, it will be provided towards work on the Christie Downs extension, as a priority. If more than $2,000,000 is provided, as we hope it will be, the additional money will be expended elsewhere. There are two other major points referred to by the honourable member about which I cannot give him accurate information at the moment, other than to say that, while he points out that about $5,000,000 was the actual money spent last year (somewhat less than the vote for this line), the considerable increase in activities this year would

lead one to suspect that several projects were not finalized last year that are expected to be undertaken this year. I will provide the honourable member with additional information on that matter.

Attention was drawn, too, to the expenditure on rolling stock and freight vehicles, comparing last year with this year, and the effect that this would have on the activities of the departmental workshops. As I have not that information with me at the moment and because I believe a detailed reply is needed, I will get it for the honourable member.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the line dealing with building activities at railway stations. No detail of the programme is given in the Treasurer's speech, although much money is to be spent in that direction. Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation, on behalf of the Minister of Transport, say exactly what activities are contemplated in respect of the festival theatre, the Adelaide railway station and the Parliament House area? What is the commitment of the Railways Department in that respect?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister said that other moneys would be spent elsewhere if more than $2,000,000 was obtained from the Commonwealth Government. I presume he means it would be spent in the metropolitan area. Where exactly will that money be spent? Currently, Adelaide has the most inefficient and ineffective railway system in Australia. No less than 77 per cent of all the workers in Adelaide drive to work simply because there is no other acceptable transport system. In these Loan Estimates we are allocating $9,900,000 for railway accommodation, yet all this work will bring little benefit to the metropolitan railway system and, therefore, there will be no real advantage for the people of Adelaide except in one isolated area—Christie Downs. The recent Lees report on the operations of the South Australian Railways has been most critical in all areas of how the Government has spent the money. Obviously, there has been no change in policy, so past criticisms will continue in the future. The people of Adelaide do not use the metropolitan railway system because it is so costly, the services are slow and spasmodic, and most of the metropolitan area is not serviced by the railways or any other adequate public transport system.

The Minister should consider allocating some of the expected additional money to developing a fast and efficient rail system for the metropolitan area. Perhaps Adelaide needs an underground railway system, reaching out to all the suburbs and supplying the facilities that any modern city requires and that most other cities have at present.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

We are hopeful of getting more than $2,000,000 from the Australian Government—

in respect of the Christie Downs extension.

Mr. Dean Brown: How much more?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member and the Government will probably know shortly when the Commonwealth Government determines its priorities. If we do not get the extra money we shall have to continue with the same sort of disadvantages that were foisted upon us because railway projects had not received the priorities they should have over the past 30 years in this State. So all our transport facilities are suffering from being inadequate. No-one on the Government side says that the situation is perfect, but we hope that the priorities that the State Government places on the railway system will be recognized by the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer said:

We are hopeful of getting more than $2,000,000 from the Australian Government and, if those additional funds are forthcoming, the railways programme will be reviewed immediately to see what extra work can be done this year.

That refers to the railways generally—it does not specify the Christie Downs extension alone. It is when the Commonwealth makes the decision that we shall be able to assess the priorities, when finances are available. No doubt, the projects referred to by the honourable member, and in particular the Adelaide railway station and a proposed underground railway system, will receive their priorities.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the Minister, but that is no reflection upon him because he has a difficult job to do this evening. The Minister said "if" and the Treasurer said "if"—if we get the money. Assuming we do get the money, I refer again to the fact that this year $1,250,000 less is to be spent on capital works in the rolling stock branch than was provided last year. We are talking of getting about $2,000,000. Shall we get $1,250,000 extra or $2,000,000 extra, which will be used on some project like the one mentioned by the member for Davenport, or will it be spent at the Islington workshops? I am concerned about employment at Islington. Under the Revenue lines, by adjustment, some employment can be provided, but we need something to work on—capital works, whether passenger vehicles or freight vehicles and the like. I am not at all satisfied with the Minister's reply, because he has not said why the provision this year for rolling stock has been reduced by $1,250,000. If we are to establish a satisfactory public transport system, we must start from bedrock by building up the rolling stock. The Minister of Transport has recently referred to the electrification of the railway line to Christie Downs, and he has even said that double-decker carriages may be used on that line. When the line is operating, it will immediately generate the need for additional rolling stock.

Mr. MATHWIN: We have been told that the Government intends to electrify the railway line to Christie Downs. As the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac is to be duplicated, is the Government taking into consideration that it will be electrified soon afterwards?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I would certainly imagine that that would be so. If it is not, I will see that the honourable member is informed of the position.

Mr. GUNN: It appears that the Government intends to continue spending money on railway projects without getting good value for it. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said that $313,000 would be spent on new passenger vehicles and $858,000 on improvements to the existing stock. However, there is no point in spending those sums if the Government does not provide the facilities that will encourage the people to use the railways. Can the Minister say what plans the Government has to provide bulk handling facilities that will encourage farmers to use the railways?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That question has been asked several times recently, and the Minister of Transport has provided all the information requested.

Mr. Gunn: The Minister of Environment and Conservation has side-stepped the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Eyre to wait until he is called. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: I am amazed that there is no mention of an allocation for early planning for gauge standardization. The Minister of Transport has told us many times that he is negotiating with the Commonwealth authorities

on the matter and that a final decision will be made soon. Has the Government any intention of proceeding with the gauge standardization project?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That question is not relevant to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. RODDA: Provision is made for further upgrading the main Melbourne railway line. In railway station yards short shunts are giving rise to long waits. There are 1 500 000 cattle in the South-East, and an allowance of 30 per cent is made for bruising when stock are purchased. The Government has a golden opportunity to get some business for the railways by improving railway facilities. Can the Minister say whether the sum provided is a first instalment of a larger sum for establishing stock selling centres in the South-East where cattle can be congregated and then taken to Melbourne or Adelaide?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will check the details of the project to which the honourable member referred and let him know.

Mr. COUMBE: I should have thought that under the line "Railway accommodation" provision would be made for "Preliminary investigations". This heading appears under the Engineering and Water Supply, Public Buildings, Lands and several other departments. In the proper forward planning of metropolitan Adelaide and the provision of a rapid rail transit system and the underground railway, investigations must proceed and work must be done. Is this work included under other items? I suggest that this work be incorporated in future always under the heading "Preliminary investigations" so that members can comment on it under the capital works of the railways. In considering the railways we must look to the future and, hopefully, a better service.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will refer the point the honourable member has made to the Minister for his consideration. I should have thought that this sort of preliminary work might have been referred to and information provided on it in the Revenue Estimates.

Mr. BLACKER: It has been suggested in the press that certain parts of the railway system on Eyre Peninsula will be closed, and I am concerned also about the maintenance of the existing line. Will the workshops at Port Lincoln be maintained? Can the Minister give an assurance that employment at the workshops will be guaranteed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will certainly check whether there is any possibility of employment difficulty in the area and let the honourable member know.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I earlier sought information from the Minister representing the Minister of Transport, but I did not receive a reply to my question. If more than $2,000,000 is obtained from the Commonwealth Government, on what will it be spent? Has the Government a plan for an efficient railway system to serve metropolitan Adelaide? If it has, why cannot the Minister answer my question? The complete lack of a reply indicates that the Government has no overall plan for an adequate railway system in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the situation occurs that additional work will be undertaken in this field, the honourable member will be the first to know.

Mr. GUNN: Regarding the construction of buildings, the Lees committee report referred critically to a number of projects undertaken by the South Australian Railways. One example of this in my district was the building of new barracks at Minnipa at a cost of about $75,000. The committee's report states:

> Under-utilization of these quarters is apparent and on many occasions only half or three-quarters of the capacity of these barracks is used.

The committee went on to say that, because the Railways Department was in a serious financial position, it was not getting full value for money. What undertaking can the Minister give that this type of extravagant expenditure will not be further entered into? With better planning the Government could make sure it was getting better utilization of the limited funds available. I have referred to one project only, yet the Lees report instances many such examples of poor planning.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, $5,810,000.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Marine say what progress is being made in the reclamation of land at Birkenhead? Is this scheme proceeding satisfactorily? One item appearing last year, "Preliminary investigation, $85,000", does not appear this year. Does this indicate that the department is not now engaging in any preliminary investigations, design work or other work involving future planning? Why, for the first time that I can remember, has this line disappeared? Is it incorporated elsewhere in the Estimates?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine): I did not know that the preliminary investigations ever appeared in this vote, and I do not know why it has disappeared. Regarding the designing and future planning of the department, that is in good hands and is being looked after. As I am not certain what is meant by "preliminary design", I will find out what has previously been taken into account. Regarding the reclamation of land to which the honourable member has referred, this is proceeding extremely well. I pay a tribute to the present Director of Marine and Harbors, because I believe that it was largely at his instigation that this work has been proceeded with. Indeed, many members actually viewed this work when they recently went to Outer Harbor and Port Adelaide. As a result of the reclamation work, Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor are the envy of every other capital city port in Australia. More land is available at our port than probably all the other capital city ports would have together. It is a most valuable asset, and its existence is largely due to the foresight and initiative of the Director. It has been a splendid effort, the dredgings from the river being used to reclaim adjacent areas. Work is well ahead of schedule and we are selling land in this area to industry for as much as $12,000 or $13,000 an acre (0.4 ha). In other cases land is being leased to industry and this is contributing toward recovering the costs of the reclamation.

Mr. HALL: Funds are to be made available to develop further the bulk loading installation at Port Lincoln. However, there is nothing as yet in the Government's programme or in the forecasts of future planning for the possible development of a second super port at Wallaroo, Ardrossan, or elsewhere. What is the latest information the Minister has about the planning of what no doubt will be eventually one of the major ports in Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The situation is exactly as it was when I reported to the House on the recommendations of the special committee which comprised a representative of the Marine and Harbors Department (Mr. Moyses), a representative of the Agriculture Department (Mr. Walker), and another person, and which decided that Port Lincoln would be the first major port. It recommended to the Government that there was no present requirement for a second major port, and the Government accepted that recommendation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Provision is made for a roll-on-roll-off berth at Port Adelaide. Could the Minister say whether it

is for a new roll-on-roll-off berth or whether the existing berth is to be upgraded? If the expenditure is to upgrade the existing berth, can it be taken from that that the Government intends to continue with the *Troubridge* service linking the ports I mentioned earlier?

The Hon. *J.* D. CORCORAN: The expenditure is for a third berth to be used by two roll-on-roll-off ships being constructed for use by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited for South Australian steel traffic. It will be situated on the eastern side of the Port River just north of No. 27 grain berth. The B.H.P. has leased 10 acres for the establishment of a steel storage and handling depot.

Mr. VENNING: I am pleased that $450,000 is to be spent on the completion of the terminal at Outer Harbor. I agree with the Minister's comments about Mr. Sainsbury, the Director of Marine and Harbors. Whenever the bulk handling company has had occasion to go to the Marine and Harbors Department, it has received wonderful co-operation from the Director. While we have not always received what we have asked for, the Director has always come up with something satisfactory and suitable. I was delighted to hear the Minister's remarks about this officer. Can the Minister say what has been the total cost of the terminal building at Outer Harbor, which will be completed this year with the expenditure of $450,000?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The total completed cost will be $2,163,000, and I hope the project will be completed before the end of this year. The scheme consisted of the rebuilding of a cargo shed at No. 2 berth, Outer Harbor, with a modern passenger terminal on the first floor. The passenger terminal will consist of a large assembly area and a customs examination hall. We must provide facilities for customs, free of charge to the Commonwealth Government. There will be a cafeteria as well as various public amenities, and the terminal will provide a most attractive front door to the State and will, I hope, promote tourism.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister explained that work was well advanced on deepening and widening the navigation channel between the inner and outer harbors at Port Adelaide at a cost of $720,000. This will provide for a continuation of the programme in 1973-74. How long will this programme continue: what is the estimated total cost; and when will it be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The estimated cost of the work when completed will be $10,155,000. The scheme has been in hand for more than 10 years and. it is a continuing programme, comprising the deepening of the Port Adelaide river from 27ft. (8.23 m) low water to 30ft. (9.144 m) low water, widening to a minimum width of 500ft. (152.4 m). It also includes provision to enlarge a swinging basin at Outer Harbor for the largest vessels likely to enter the port. There is also provision for several new navigation lights and aids. All these facilities have been provided, except the widening work. The Imperial Chemical Industries company continually requires dredging and, when the new container berth is constructed, widening will be necessary. Almost continually there is a requirement for dredging in the area.

Mr. BLACKER: The bulk loading wharf at Port Lincoln extends a long distance out into the harbor and is in a rather vulnerable position regarding pollution from wheat dust. I should like to know whether the pollution problem will be overcome with money from the $2,550,000 allocated for the bulk loading installation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As far as I know, this problem has been or will be overcome. The cost of this port, when completed, will be $7,050,000. Unfortunately, the work has been delayed because of industrial trouble and, although I hoped that the facility would be ready for the next harvest, it will not now be ready then. I think the most significant thing about the facility is that it will be capable, with deepening work alongside it, to take vessels of up to 100 000 tons (101 600 t) dead weight in future. I do not think anyone can deny that Port Lincoln is one of the best natural harbors in South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister satisfied with the progress made with the West Lakes development? Further, will he explain the estimated payment of $10,000? I assume that that amount will be paid off the $180,000 as a repayment under the indenture Act, leaving $170,000 to be paid. Also, is the Minister responsible for the construction of the pipeline out to sea, in connection with the scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not responsible for the pipeline. It is financed and undertaken by the West Lakes authority. People have asked whether this construction, which looks like a jetty, will remain. It is not the type of structure that can remain, and it will be demolished when work is completed. Generally, the scheme has been most successful, considering the complexities involved. It is a tremendous undertaking and eventually will house about 20,000 people. There have been difficulties regarding the lake. I think the area is about 54 acres (22 ha) larger than was originally expected, and this has affected the planning. Then the football stadium was an addition, causing some problems. There have been several problems with residents.

Mr. Coumbe: Some with roadways.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, regarding West Lakes Boulevard. However, the authority is expert in handling matters, and I, as the Minister responsible for liaison between the Government and the authority, am most impressed. My relationship with the authority has been fairly demanding, because there have been many small problems involving two or three different Government departments. Therefore, I have had to spend more time than I expected in basing with departments and then dealing with the authority again.

I think the project is ahead of schedule. The authority is selling land that it did not think it would be selling at this stage, and I think those concerned are pleased with the progress they are making. Certainly, they are confident of the success of the whole scheme. I do not think any of the problems cannot be solved. Provision has been made in case the money is needed, rather than for a specific purpose.

Mr. RODDA: Is the provision of $120,000 for minor works made to rehabilitate, on a needs basis, the jetties around our coastline? Can the Minister say what rehabilitation is taking place, having regard to the tourist trade in those areas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The jetty at Franklin Harbor will be demolished and another provided in its place.

Mr. Gunn: Most commendable!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. After all, I think I saved the jetty at Tumby Bay. On that occasion I was merely applying a policy that had been in operation for about 40 years and had been followed by the Playford Government. It was that, when a jetty fell into disrepair, the length would be reduced to either 600ft. (182.9 m) or to a point where there was at least 6ft. (1.8 m) of water beneath it. I was applying that sensible and long-standing policy at Tumby Bay. The people objected to that. I thought of the rural unemployment relief scheme and decided that, if the people wanted to pay for the jetty,

they could keep it. I was not so lucky when the Corcoran raiders hit in the middle of the night. That was in the case of the Haslam jetty.

Mr. Gunn: They still haven't forgiven you.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not do the job: it was the contractors. However, I accept responsibility for it. There are many of these jetties throughout the State, and they are costly to maintain. If they are not kept in a good state of repair, they can be dangerous. We cannot afford more than the present allocation, most of which will go on repairs to the jetties. We must be realistic about this. In certain places, the jetties are of great value. People become attached to them, and are emotional if we want to do anything with them. This has been shown recently.

Mr. RUSSACK: In his explanation, the Treasurer said that $80,000 had been provided to continue work on the fishing jetty at Wallaroo. Will this allocation complete the establishment of the jetty? Because of the committee's findings with regard to a second port, the fishing industry and tourist trade at Wallaroo now need all the assistance they can get. The jetty will assist greatly.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As far as I know, this sum will provide for the work to be completed. From memory I think that the total cost was $100,000, and the present allocation is to continue work already commenced. I will check on the matter and let the honourable member know about it.

Mr. BLACKER: A sum of $100,000 is provided for the Port Lincoln slipway. I am not sure what is involved here. The proposed work involves a fitting-out berth, which will be a most necessary part of fishing craft repair work, but I do not think it can be provided by this allocation. Will facilities be curtailed as a result of this, or is this sum related to a section of the work?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have already referred to expenditure of $7,050,000 in this area, and now another $100,000, which was not referred to before the election this year, is being provided because of the needs of fishermen in the area. Port Lincoln has the largest fishing fleet in South Australia, if not in Australia. The slipping facilities at Kirton Point are totally inadequate. Following deputations from the fishermen in the area led by the former member for Flinders (Mr. Carnie) and a conference with the officers of the Marine and Harbors Department, we decided that we had to increase the facilities there. The honourable member has referred to a fitting-out berth. The sum of $300,000 a year provided for this line is an increase on what was provided in recent years. Although it is not sufficient and I would like more, other demands do not allow more money to be provided. The honourable member and the fishermen in Port Lincoln should be fairly happy with the deal they are getting now.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the question of a breakwater at Port McDonnell. I know that the littoral drift can cause troubles with sandbanks and that there is a difficulty with regard to supplying the material to be used in building the breakwater. This will not be a cheap undertaking. Is it intended that research will be undertaken in connection with the construction of this facility?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This work is continuing. Wave recorders are in position and, as the honourable member will appreciate, they must remain in position for a time. Following the evaluation of data, the designing of the breakwater will proceed. I want to make clear to the honourable member as I have made clear to the people of Port MacDonnell that, even if the breakwater is feasible, the matter of cost is involved, and this project could cost up to $1,000,000. Therefore, it will have to take its place with everything else when Loan funds are allocated. I have never tried to deceive the people of Port MacDonnell or anyone else by saying that once the breakwater is designed work will automatically go ahead, because that is not the case. If I am still Minister, I will certainly present the case for the breakwater to the Government; I will put the case if I am in Opposition. However, I can give no guarantee at this stage when, if ever, work will go ahead.

Mr. RUSSACK: With regard to fishing havens, in 1972-73 the sum proposed for this line was $200,000, the actual payments being $348,462. For 1973-74, the sum proposed is $300,000. If the sum of $80,000 is insufficient to complete the establishment of the Wallaroo fishing jetty, can some extra money be found so that work can be completed this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: One of the reasons this project is being held up is that the fishermen of Wallaroo have changed their minds, I think, four times. Therefore, we can hardly be blamed if work is not finished this year. We have done our best to get this project off the ground but, as the honourable member will appreciate, plans were changed several times. We will do our best to serve the people of Wallaroo in this regard.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, $34,220,000.

Dr. TONKIN: Although I have looked through the provisions relating to metropolitan .and country waterworks, I can find no reference to the filtration of water supplies. At the election before last, the Liberal and Country League policy was to filter Adelaide's water supply, on the grounds of aesthetics and of health and safety. Surprisingly, at that time the Labor Party decried the idea but, just before the last election, it suddenly became urgent that the Adelaide water supply should be filtered as it was a matter of general health. In fact, the Minister of Works made a long statement about amoebic meningitis, and I am sure the member for Stuart will echo my sentiments in this: it is a serious matter and we can all be thankful that there was no outbreak of amoebic meningitis last year.

The CHAIRMAN: As there is no line in these Loan Estimates dealing with that matter, I cannot allow the honourable member to debate it.

Dr. TONKIN: With respect, there is a line "Metropolitan Waterworks" dealing with the large-diameter pipes and trunk mains, and, if they do not carry drinking water that should be filtered to the people of Adelaide, I do not know what we are talking about. I have strong feelings about this, for the health of the people of Adelaide is at stake. Why has there been this sudden reversal of opinion and attitude by the Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A sum of $500,000 has been provided.

Dr. Tonkin: Where is it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know where it is but it has certainly been provided.

Dr. Tonkin: This does not seem to be very important to the Minister, does it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is important. It is planned that about $6,000,000 will be made available for this purpose next year. The honourable member knows perfectly well that it will cost altogether about $40,000,000, but we cannot do it all in one year.

Dr. Tonkin: I should like to see it started, though.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A start has been made. I have made the announcement. I cannot do more than that. If the honourable member did not hear what I had

to say a short time ago about water treatment, he cannot be so interested after all.

Dr. Tonkin: I am interested in the matter before this Committee.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Plans are in hand for spending $500,000 this year and possibly $6,000,000 next year, and the expenditure will continue. Hope Valley reservoir will be the first place to be treated, and then the western suburbs will be dealt with. The honourable member has made great play about the Labor Government's changing its mind. We said that we believed at the time that we should examine other methods of filtration as we were not satisfied that that was the only way of doing it. We were satisfied at the time but we were big enough to say later that our original thoughts were not as good as the proposition that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had advanced to the Hall Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: The same as occurred with dial-a-bus.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Davenport is obviously a small-minded man. He thinks no-one should be big enough to change his mind or to be able to say that he was probably not right in his first deliberations. We are saying we did change our minds, but he cannot see that as being a good quality in someone. We hope that, instead of taking 10 years to complete the programme, we shall be able to do it in eight years, when the whole of the metropolitan water supply will be filtered.

Mr. WARDLE: I refer to the matter of Murray River disposal stations. The Public Health Department and local government have been considering receptacles on vessels to take their effluent, for which there must be disposal points. Is the provision in relation to the Murray River disposal points for that purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This money is being provided for disposal points. I cannot tell the honourable member their exact location, but $30,000 is provided for that purpose. Regulations will govern the size of the river craft that must carry receptacles.

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful to the Minister of Works for his reassurance about water filtration. However, I am disappointed that it is obviously considered of so little importance that he could not find the allocation in the lines and that a greater sum is not being provided this year to accelerate the programme.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Several weeks ago I asked a question about the purchasing of a foothills water company that supplies water to Teringie Heights. Is there any provision here, if the Minister sees fit to take over that water supply and to purchase that company? The Minister indicated in his answer to my question that the cost would be about $100,000 and, as I see no specific mention of it, I ask whether there is any provision.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member does his job and gives me the details, I am sure we shall purchase. The money will be available.

Mr. HALL: I refer to the line "River Murray weirs, dams, locks, etc.", under which $1,600,000 is provided for the Dartmouth reservoir, $800,000 of which is offset by a Commonwealth provision. Can the Minister tell us what this money is to be spent on? I take it it will not be on the major dam, since construction is not due to begin there effectively in this financial year.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think it is in connection with the by-pass tunnel. However, I will check and let the honourable member know later.

Dr. EASTICK: When the Treasurer was reading his statement last week, he said $200,000 was to be provided for Gawler sewerage, and I interjected "Not enough!" I based that interjection on the proposal to complete the Gawler sewerage scheme within five or six years. Previously, $600,000 has been spent in a 12-month period. 1 draw the Minister's attention to the fact that, as a result of representations I was pleased to make on behalf of a section of the community in the Munno Para district council area, adjacent to Gawler, the extension of the main at that point was undertaken so that further capital works could be done by the council. The extension of the main at that point brought about a reduction in the sum available for Gawler. As a result of representations made by the Treasurer to the department, an extension was made to a metwurst factory in the Gawler South area; that extension permitted the factory to proceed toward obtaining an export licence. The fact that the Treasurer's representations brought about that alteration of priorities means that the thickly populated areas of Gawler are not receiving sewerage connections at the speed originally intended. Gan the Minister say whether the provision for Gawler is being held back for a specific purpose this year, and whether a larger sum will be made available in 1974-75? If the project is to be completed within the time allotted, a greater allocation will be necessary. The Mayor of Gawler has undoubtedly made representations to the Minister on this matter. Will the Minister make all the relevant information available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offhand, I cannot give the Leader the information, but I will inquire and let him know.

Mr. JENNINGS: In 1951 or 1952 during the campaign for the by-election at which Mr. Clark was elected, Sir Thomas Playford made great play about sewerage for Gawler. He implied that, if the Liberal candidate was elected at that by-election, Gawler would be sewered almost immediately. Of course, the Liberal candidate was not elected, and we are still waiting for sewerage for Gawler.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: At least Tom kept his word.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. However, he did not say to the public, "If you elect the Liberal candidate, Gawler will be sewered." What he said was, "Gawler will be sewered. This indicates the progressive attitude of my Government." Unfortunately the Playford Government did not carry out that project. I do not know whether Sir Thomas Playford decided to take it out on the people of Gawler or whether the work would not have been done anyway.

Mr. EVANS: There is a serious need for sewerage facilities in the Mitcham Hills area. Because of the number of houses recently built and because of the nature of the soil there, what might have been acceptable two years ago or one year ago is unacceptable today. There is a serious health risk in the area. If more money is made available by the Commonwealth Government, is there any chance of employing another gang of workmen in the area, and is there any chance of upgrading the planning for those areas for which planning has not yet been done? I refer particularly to Coromandel Valley West, Glenalta and parts of Hawthorndene. The sum of $1,400,000 has been spent since 1969-70—an average expenditure of $460,000 a year. This year only $493,000 has been allotted. So, we are hardly keeping pace with the inflationary trend. The amount of work we can carry out his year will not be as great as the amount carried out last year.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is a difficult situation. No-one would like more than I to satisfy the need of the honourable member's constituents for satisfactory sewerage facilities. Of course, we have to deal with problems in the watershed areas, areas near the Murray River, and areas overlying underground waters in the South-East. However,

that does not mean that we do not have regard to people in the areas referred to by the honourable member.

Dr. Eastick: I believe there is a special investigation proceeding at the Treasurer's insistence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know about the "Treasurer's insistence". Without an investigation, we appreciate that the work needs to be done. The Commonwealth Government has said that it will make money available for the backlog of sewerage connections. Of course, that assistance will favour capital cities in the Eastern States, where relatively little work has been done in the past. I am pleased to say that 97 per cent of the Adelaide metropolitan area is sewered—a higher percentage than that of any other capital city in Australia. Of course, the figure should be 100 per cent. We will now suffer as a result and it is for this reason that we made the plea that, if we could not get all that we would like in that area, we would like to obtain funds from the Commonwealth Government for water treatment, which we consider is a disability we have but which none of the other cities have. It is something with which we have to deal. I can give the honourable member no other ray of hope but to say that we will do the best we can, because we do appreciate the problem. We have to keep on keeping on.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the provision of reticulated water at Manoah, on Upper Sturt Road, involving about 300 allotments, on which several homes have already been constructed. Has the Minister detail of plans being made for that area? If money is the problem, will consideration be given to the approval of a community project where the residents contribute for the services themselves at the normal interest paid by the Government on Loan money until about five years hence when the Government has money available? Because of the menace of bushfires, this is a dangerous area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of any such plans, but I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

Mr. EVANS: No reference is made in the Loan Estimates to land acquisition in the proposed catchment area of the Clarendon dam. Although reference is made to Myponga and Mount Bold, some property must still be acquired in that catchment area. As there is no immediate need to increase the water supply to Adelaide, those property owners who wish to continue operating their properties would be assisted if they could have this information.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of $115,000 is provided for the Clarendon dam and land acquisition: the line is there. We do not have to set out every acre of land we are going to purchase. Regarding the long-term programme for Clarendon, I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

Mr. BECKER: The sum of $1,638,000 is allocated to enable work to proceed on the continuation of the Darlington to Port Adelaide trunk main. This 54in. (137 cm) main enters my district in Gordon Street, Glenelg, passes across Anzac Highway, along Adelphi Terrace, across the Patawalonga basin, and proceeds to Henley Beach. What is the exact route of this main, and what is the time table to be followed for construction through my district? I understand that the programme has been amended several times and as, during the tourist season, certain works could affect the business of hotels and motels on and near Anzac Highway, this information would help all concerned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to inquire and get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I refer to Country Waterworks and the provision of $2,055,000 for extensions, services and minor works. Is there provision in this line for the commencement of extension of water services for American River on Kangaroo Island? This is an important project that has been brought before this House over the past decade and to the notice of various Ministers in various Governments, and the correspondence on it is voluminous.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That project is not listed here, but that does not mean that money cannot be spent on it. This project was referred to the Public Works Committee. This is an extremely difficult problem, which rests with certain people who want the service but do not wish to pay for it. That matter has been investigated again and will have to be referred to the Public Works Committee again, although there may be some objection on the part of landholders who own property through which the main will go and who may be rated. I will get the latest information for the honourable member.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister has worked on this and has given me considerable correspondence on the matter even in the short time since I have been a member, and I appreciate that. I cannot understand, however, his continual reference to people who do not want to pay for the service. This comment seems to be a reflection on the people of that community and, although I appreciate that this is not the appropriate time to take him up on it, I consider—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can't deny it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I deny that the people seeking the water are not prepared to pay for it, but there is a question concerning the people along the route of the main. The township of American River requires the water and, because it is many miles from the source of supply, it is unfair of the Minister to reflect continually on landholders on the island.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is being naive. True, some people do not want to pay for the water. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks we will set up a scheme unique to Kangaroo Island and treat the rest of the State differently. That is not what we will do, and that must be made clear to the honourable member. I do not intend to reflect on his constituents. What I have said is a statement of fact and the honourable member knows it. If he wants more information on the matter I shall get it for him. I know that the community that the water service will serve in the end is perfectly willing to pay for it and desperately needs it, but the other statements I made are correct and cannot be denied by the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: The sum of $8,907,000 is provided for metropolitan waterworks, whereas 12 months ago the figure was $10,140,000. The amount for country waterworks this year is $8,160,000, whereas in the previous 12 months it was $8,359,000. Can the .Minister say whether the lower amount for both water services is a reflection of the altered method of charging for water extensions adjacent to resubdivisions or to new subdivisions? Even within a town area where a block may be divided into two, the subdivider is required to lodge a sum for an extension to a block where access in future will be from a road not serviced previously. Where a block is serviced by roadways both at the back and the front, and where the water enters from the rear of the block, with subdivision resulting in access to only one of the roads, thus cutting off the water from one of the blocks, the subdivider is required to provide a complete new service to the isolated block, even though an arrangement is entered into or an

easement given across the block with the current water supply, thus permitting the new block to receive an indirect service via that easement. This is an expensive matter for subdividers. Will the works to be undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department be greater but the amounts paid less as a result of the revenue obtained from additional charges imposed on the subdividers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot answer that question off the cuff, but I will inquire.

Mr. BLACKER: The amount provided for country sewerage extensions, services and minor works is $763,000, with $4,032,000 for plant and machinery for the department. Both amounts may or may not include additional services at Port Lincoln. Recently a report on pollution was presented accusing Port Lincoln of being the most polluted harbor. If that is so, is something to be done about this in the immediate future?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be aware that I announced recently the setting up of a high-powered committee to examine the survey by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on pollution in Spencer Gulf, in which it was claimed that raw sewage was entering the sea at Port Lincoln. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks the committee would be able to make its report, that its recommendations would be accepted by the Government, and that plans could be made for money to be spent this year. If he thinks that, he is most optimistic.

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the 54in. (137 cm) main from Darlington to Port Adelaide, the explanation states that the scheme, when completed, is intended to balance water supplies in the metropolitan water region and to serve the West Lakes area. I seek as assurance from the Minister that this will mean that the main will enable the water pressure to be improved in the Glenelg, Novar Gardens, and West Beach areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall inquire and let the honourable member know.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, $60,100,000.

Dr. EASTICK: In the line for other Government buildings we see an amount of $13,100,000, with details of the various units of the Agriculture Department. I acknowledge the reasons for the expenditure at Kybyolite, Minnipa, Parafield, Struan, and Turretfield, but I am surprised to find $120,000 for additions at the Northfield Research Centre. As no clear decision has been made on whether the Agriculture Department and its various services will be located in future at Monarta, and as the Minister of Agriculture apparently cannot give a clear indication to people involved in the industries serviced by the research facilities at Northfield, his most recent statement suggesting that a decision will not be made for at least six months and that a report of Sir Allan Callaghan on the reorganization of the Agriculture Department plays an integral part in the decision on Northfield and the establishment of the offices of the department at Monarto, can the Minister say what this money will be spent on at Northfield? Can the Minister assure members that the State will get long-term value from such an expenditure? Some industries, including the pig, horticultural, and viticultural industries, have pointed out to the Minister that their industries have injected much money into existing facilities at Northfield and that they will be vitally concerned if a decision is made to relocate at Monarto. Tens of thousands of dollars they have made available in the past would be of little service to their industries in the future. Can the Minister give a clearer indication of the intentions of the Government in this regard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will find out for the Leader but it is inevitable that certain research facilities will remain at Northfield, irrespective of any decision on the future site of the Agriculture Department.

Dr. Eastick: That's the first indication I have been able to get that that is so.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We would not contemplate spending this money if that was not to be the case.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 16, at 2 p.m.