

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 3, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

COUNTRY HOSPITALS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question follows one that I asked the Minister of Health on January 25 last. It concerns doctors being available for northern hospitals. In his reply the Minister stated that the Government proposed to provide cadetships to assist graduates. Can the Minister give any information as to the progress made regarding the establishment of such cadetships, and whether any result can at present be assessed? Has any further approach been made by the Australian Medical Association (South Australian Branch) or the Australian College of General Practitioners regarding the introduction of a trial voluntary internship at an early date?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In reply to the first question, considerable progress has been made and discussions have taken place with the A.M.A., the Parliamentary Draftsman and, I understand, the University of Adelaide. I know that there will be legislation to amend the Act to provide for cadetships and an examining committee for doctors from foreign countries. It is hoped to introduce the amending legislation soon. We already have one cadetship. The student concerned is in his final year, but he ran into financial difficulties and the Government assisted him. We hope that he will pass his examination this year. As far as the second question is concerned, I don't think the matter of voluntary internship has made as much progress as the other matter but I will have further inquiries made and inform the honourable member in due course.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Can the Minister say when the student he has referred to will graduate and whether the service in the training hospital must take place before he can be available for service in an area to which he may go, if required?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I understand that it is compulsory, for the graduate who passes, in his first year to serve at least 12 months in a training hospital. It is then possible for a graduate who has completed one year's service

to be permitted to serve in country areas on a voluntary basis. The intention of the cadetship is that for each year the graduate receives help from the Government he will be at the Government's disposal to go to certain parts of the State. If he is supported for one year he places himself at the Government's disposal for a minimum of two years. If he is assisted for two years he will be under Government control for two years, and for three years if he is assisted for three years. As I understand the Act, after graduation he must do one year in a training school, even before he is permitted to go to the country on a voluntary basis.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: If the student is successful, does it mean that he will be available only for the period that would be covered by voluntary internship, or something related to that? I do not want to debate the question, but to ascertain whether it means a wait of a further 12 months before he becomes available, which is different from the suggestion of the A.M.A. for an internship.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Taking the student we are assisting as an example, my understanding is that if he graduates this year he will do at least 12 months in a training hospital before going to the country, where it will be necessary for him to do two years. My understanding is that he is at the disposal of the Government after an internship of one year at the hospital.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: He would not be available for outside service?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, not for at least 12 months. He could be in the second or third year.

CAMBRAI-SEDAN WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: On February 16 last I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Works a question regarding the supply of water to the Murray Plains as a result of the new pipeline from Swan Reach to Stockwell. Has the Minister obtained a reply?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has conferred with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who has reported that the water supply situation in regard to Cambrai and Sedan has not changed from the information that was given to the honourable member on February 16 this year. I can inform the honourable member that, following the recommendation by the Public Works Committee, Cabinet has given approval for the construction of the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, at an estimated cost of \$8,000,000. As previously stated, the provision

of branch lines from this main has not been included in the scheme now approved, but there will be ample capacity to supply the Cambrai-Sedan area. It is accordingly planned to give consideration to such a supply when the main is nearing completion which, at this stage, is expected to be in 1969.

CONTAINERIZATION.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Marine a reply to my question of July 28 concerning containerization?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I have received the following report from my colleague:

Containerization or, to give it a more general term, unitization of general cargo, has been developing gradually over the past five years and is rapidly gaining momentum. So far as South Australia is concerned, practically the whole of the intrastate trade is handled in this way by the *Troubridge*, which was introduced in 1961 and for which the board expended about \$600,000 on specialized berths at Port Adelaide, Port Lincoln and Kingscote.

So far as interstate traffic is concerned, a fair proportion has been transported for some time in the standard 3-ton seaintainers at the normal shipping berths, but earlier this year No. 5 berth, Port Adelaide, was adapted to the needs of a fleet of specially modified vessels that are engaged on the Melbourne-Adelaide-Fremantle run utilizing the much larger 16ft. 8in. x 8ft. x 6ft. 4in. x 17-ton capacity seapallets and containers. In this connection, the board has strengthened the floor of No. 5 cargo shed and is carrying out certain other modifications to the cargo shed and wharf apron. The board has also agreed to the use of No. 6 berth by other specialized interstate container vessels. In all these cases the vessels concerned carry their own lifting gear. So far as containerized oversea cargo is concerned, it is expected that this will commence early in the year 1969 or perhaps late 1968.

Port Adelaide, however, will only be a "feeder" port, with Melbourne as the most likely terminal port, at least initially. This being the case, many of the existing berths at Port Adelaide will be quite suitable for the traffic without any alterations and as the proposed feeder vessels will carry their own lifting gear no special wharfside equipment will be required from the Harbors Board. Two shipping companies have already reserved sites in the board's industrial estate at Gillman for the eventual establishment of the necessary container and pallet marshalling facilities and the board is about to start on the construction of the associated roadways, land reclamation, etc. The whole situation is being most carefully watched so that any needs in connection with the unitization of oversea cargo can be anticipated and met in good time.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a further

question of the Minister of Labour and Industry representing the Minister of Marine.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Minister said in his reply:

Port Adelaide, however, will only be a "feeder" port, with Melbourne as the most likely terminal port, at least initially.

Can he say whether that means that Port Adelaide will not remain a major import/export port when containerization becomes operative?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: As the question concerns an answer supplied by my colleague, the Minister of Marine, I shall be happy to convey the question to him and get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

GAWLER BY-PASS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On June 21 I asked the Minister of Roads a question with reference to accidents on the Gawler by-pass and the possible provision of 25 miles an hour speed limit signs on the through portions of the crossways in that area. Has the Minister a reply to that question?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The reply is as follows:

An analysis of the accident situation at the Gawler Belt intersection shows no increase in the intensity of accidents despite a 45 per cent increase in traffic movement since 1963. The accidents which have occurred there have been relatively serious. An inspection of the intersection shows that it is clearly defined and well signed. It is considered that one of the basic accident causes may be misjudgment of speed by drivers approaching the intersection after having driven at relatively high speeds for many miles on open highway. The solution to the problem is the re-design of the intersection so that each arm of the Main North Road forms a T-junction with the by-pass. The matter has been taken up with the Highways Department.

As a temporary expedient the Road Traffic Board has approved the erection of "give way" signs on the northern and southern approaches of the Main North Road at this intersection. This will give priority to traffic on the by-pass and the Greenock Road over traffic travelling along the Main North Road. The installation of 25 m.p.h. signs for the intersection would not appear rational to the motorist and would require a high level of enforcement to ensure obedience. The imposition of a speed limit is considered to be not warranted. The Highways Department has also been asked to give consideration to improved advance direction signing to indicate the importance of this intersection to the motorist.

DEFEND AUSTRALIA LEAGUE.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the

Chief Secretary representing the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In yesterday's paper it was reported that at an Australian Labor Party conference of the Federal Executive being held at Surfers Paradise a resolution was passed banning the members of the A.L.P. from being associated with the body known as the Defend Australia League. I understand that this organization was sponsored by a Labor member in association with Mr. Short, the General Secretary of the Ironworkers Union. Is it a fact that this decision is binding on all members of the A.L.P. in every State, and is it also a fact that these members are banned from being associated with this organization but, at the same time, would be permitted to remain members of other organizations that have known Communist sympathisers associated with them?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If the honourable member wanted to be more political, he could not possibly be. I know that the honourable member is conversant with all these questions and I appreciate that, with his mentality, he would know that the answer was explicitly plain in the *Advertiser*. I have no desire to add to it.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BORROWING.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It has been the custom for a considerable number of years for local government to be enabled to borrow a sum of approximately \$800,000 by request to the Minister. I have noticed recently that many local government bodies have had to raise their rates, mainly for the purpose of road building: hence, my question is directed to the Minister of Roads. Recently, the Minister in reply to a question in this Council informed us categorically that no money would be available from the Loan Estimates of this Government for concrete construction—mainly for bridges. Following that statement, I now ask: will the Minister consider asking his colleagues in Cabinet whether they will approve of an increase in the amount made available to local government bodies out of the total Loan moneys available in order to permit them to borrow, or, alternatively, will he suggest other means of raising money?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will look at the question. To answer it off the cuff, Sir Norman previously mentioned specific bridges, which are being constructed or will be in the course of construction in the very near future, tenders having been called for. He named those bridges and asked whether Loan funds were available to build them or whether the money would come out of the Highways Fund. My answer then was that they were being built with money from the Highways Fund, not from the Loan funds. So the honourable member already has an answer to that. As far as district councils and municipalities are concerned, Sir Norman is well aware of the assistance given by the Highways Department in their roads programmes by grants, as I have already mentioned in this Chamber. However, the honourable member now asks whether I will take up with my colleagues the possibility of allowing councils to borrow additional sums of money for the purpose of carrying out works in their area. I will take up this matter and give a reply as soon as possible.

FARES.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a brief statement explanatory of a question that I propose to ask of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In the *News* of July 29 last, the following appeared in a leading article:

Like many other cities, Adelaide faces the now familiar problem of public transport services that fail to pay. It is a pattern of rising costs, attempts to increase revenue by raising fares and economizing in service—followed almost invariably by failure to reverse the decline in public patronage. In this State, the Transport Minister, Mr. Kneebone, has once again made it clear that the alternatives facing the Government in trying to meet the Municipal Tramways Trust deficits are—either fares or the Government subsidy must rise. Fares went up late last year, and Mr. Kneebone admits another increase was not expected so soon. But he also says: "It will be difficult to increase the subsidy because we do not have an endless supply of money."

Will the Minister advise whether it was his intention, when making that statement, to prepare the public for another increase in Tramways Trust fares at an early date?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The answer to that question is that this was just a statement of fact and in making such a statement it was not considered necessary to give a warning to people. It is a matter that has

yet to be considered by Cabinet, and my guess is as good as that of the honourable member as to what Cabinet may do when it studies the report it has received from the Tramways Trust and another report that it expects to receive from the Railways Commissioner.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It rather looks as though there will not be a further subsidy!

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My question relates to paragraph 28 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech and to a question that I asked the Chief Secretary on June 21. Whilst the Chief Secretary and I did not get off to a very good start on that day, now that I have had a period of peace in the interim I ask this further question. That paragraph stated that the Government had received many complaints concerning the operations of certain insurance companies, particularly in the field of workmen's compensation, personal accident insurance and motor vehicle insurance. It was further stated that some of the companies, in the opinion of the Government, had not stood up to their obligations. On June 21 I asked the Chief Secretary whether he would name the companies who were offending because it was in the interests of this Council and the public to do so. Will the Minister enlighten me further on this subject?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

BUILDING INDUSTRY.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In this morning's *Advertiser* on page 5 an article appears under the heading, "Union Leader Says Building 'Chaotic'." In that article the Federal President of the Builders (Labourers' Union (Mr. E. H. Thorp), who is also the State Secretary of the union, says, amongst other things:

Master builders were taking Government contracts at a little above cost price to keep in business.

Mr. Thorp further said:

One master builder, engaged at work on the Bolivar sewage treatment works, had gone out of business . . .

He also said:

A firm of steel-fixers . . . who had always employed day workers in their 30 years of business, were now forced to use piece work and subcontract work to be able to compete in this field.

He further stated:

The number of building workers engaged on the Electricity Trust of South Australia's power station at Torrens Island would be reduced from 247 to 140 within three weeks.

In that article, Mr. R. A. O'Neill, who is President of the South Australian Master Builders' Association, said that the South Australian building industry was at its lowest ebb in the 26 years in which he had been associated with it. In recent weeks similar pessimistic comments have been reported in the press by Mr. V. J. Martin, a trade union official, and Mr. J. J. Weeks, a prominent master builder. At the present time many architects—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must not debate the question.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am sorry, Sir; I thought I was just stating facts, but I will withdraw my last comments and ask my question. Has the Government any plans by which it can assist in preventing the downward trend in the building industry in this State, or will the Government consider instigating an inquiry into all aspects of that industry with a view to taking measures to arrest the present alarming situation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question is obviously one that should be placed on notice, and I ask the honourable member to do that.

COMPUTERS.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I draw attention to an article appearing in the *News* of August 1 under the heading, "Computer to Check L.C.L. Poll".

It states:

A computer is to be used to analyse information gained from Saturday's "secret" L.C.L. householders' survey.

The article continues:

It is known that hundreds of Young Liberal volunteers canvassed houses in electorates considered to be of "key" value at the next election with a survey form carrying questions about the householders' needs, views and services provided for them by Government.

The result of the questions are to be sent to another State to be analysed by a computer.

Does the Chief Secretary believe that this is an indication that the L.C.L. is at its wits' end in regard to working out what is required by the people as it is now referring the question to a computer?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As one who never puts any great faith in surveys and with my limited knowledge of computers, knowing that they give only the answers required, my humble opinion of the Liberal and Country League's programme would not be of great value.

TEA TREE GULLY HOSPITAL.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the proposed Tea Tree Gully Hospital which now, I understand, is to be erected at Modbury. Honourable members will remember only too well the promises of the present Government before the last election when it stated it would build a 500-bed hospital at Tea Tree Gully and, I think, an 800-bed hospital at Bedford Park. I notice that so far the Minister is not quite sure whether the Government has sold the old property at Tea Tree Gully—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the honourable member that he must not debate the question.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask that the honourable member withdraw the statement he has just made. That question was answered plainly and truthfully in this Chamber either last week or the week before and the exact details of what has become of that property were given. I take strong exception to any honourable member playing politics to a gallery, particularly when his statement is not true.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call on the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to ask his question.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If what the Minister has said is a fact then I withdraw my statement. On the last occasion I thought he said he was not quite sure—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There was no question about it. The honourable member cannot debate the matter in that way.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I will proceed to explain my question.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Question! The honourable member is not permitted to explain it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Very well. I have heard that a foundation stone is shortly to be set in a block of concrete in a paddock at Modbury. If this is the case, I ask the

Minister how many beds will be the capacity of this hospital in the initial stages?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have no intention of answering foolish, stupid questions asked without any—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I object to that description of the question, Mr. President. I ask the Chief Secretary to withdraw it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Honourable members cannot have it all one way.

The PRESIDENT: The Chief Secretary said he would not answer a stupid question.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I did, Mr. President. If that is offensive, I withdraw.

SOUTH ROAD.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Minister of Roads a further reply to my question of July 27 relating to progress, or lack of it, of work on the South Road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, the answer to the honourable member's question is:

The acquisition of all land on the South Road as far as Hackham has not yet been finalized. One property in particular at Morphett Vale and owned by the Commonwealth is proving very difficult (and, incidentally, we know that it is not a Commonwealth Labor Government) and is disorganizing roadworks.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The Minister is not playing politics now, is he!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is a two-way bat, you know.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A Liberal member wants the Hackham crossing done.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The answer continues:

However, construction is generally within schedule and it is expected that the new duplicated road will be opened as far as Beach Road by Christmas of this year.

CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question regarding landholders in the Chowilla dam area, the future of their land, and the proposed tramway?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The answer, which is in three parts because the question was asked in three parts, is:

(1) The temporary spur line of railway from the main line to Baramera to the Chowilla dam site will be constructed by the South Australian Railways, by arrangement among the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Railways Commissioner.

(2) The right-of-way for the spur line is being secured by the Director and the Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and will not be vested permanently in either the Minister of Transport or the Railways Commissioner. The area will be occupied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for approximately four years. The area will only be fenced where special needs exist.

(3) The Engineering and Water Supply Department will assume all responsibility in connection with noxious weed control for the period of occupancy.

EQUAL PAY.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Some weeks ago I read in the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal that, in connection with the case before the Teachers Salaries Tribunal for the implementation of the Government's policy of equal pay for women and men teachers, some hitches had been encountered in that there were difficulties regarding categories. I think the category mentioned was that of infant mistresses, for which there was no male equivalent office. Last week the award of the Teachers Salaries Tribunal was published in the *Government Gazette* and the infant mistresses are to receive the same increases, along with other women who have male equivalents in technical, high and primary schools. Can the Minister say how that difficulty was overcome and who decided that there was, in fact, a male equivalent of an infant mistress?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I would not presume to answer on behalf of my colleague, so I shall convey the question to him and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Works, in connection with salinity in the Murray River.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Recent reports indicate a dangerous build-up in the salt level in the waters of the Murray River and its backwaters, and a sharp decline in river flow is also indicated. Can the Minister say what action can be taken by the Government through its appropriate officers as an immediate palliative to the situation, and what effect the

Chowilla dam will have, when completed, on the quantity and quality of Murray River water?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works on the subject of salt effluent disposal in the Murray Valley.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Recent reports of the breaching of the salt evaporation basin at Renmark (either by accident or maliciously), where the concentration of salt approximates that of seawater, highlight the need for a more satisfactory and permanent form of effluent disposal. Permanent unsightly damage to flora is resulting from the ponding of salt water in backwaters and on islands in the Murray system at Lake Bonney; Katarapko Creek, Loxton; Dishers Creek, Renmark; and other places. Will the Minister institute a full inquiry into the alternative methods of disposal, paying particular attention to deep under-strata research as an alternative to the present method?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's request to my colleague and obtain a report as to whether this can be done.

REEVES PLAINS SCHOOL.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the Reeves Plains School and the projected closure thereof. I think all honourable members realize that we have to proceed with a policy of providing more effective schools and that small one-teacher schools should be closed and amalgamated as time passes. I understand that officers of the Education Department have discussed with the parents in the Reeves Plains area the closing of this school, which has 26 pupils and the provision of a bus service. I am also led to believe that the parents have agreed to this, provided that the department, on its part, is considerate enough to allow the school to remain open until the celebration of its centenary at the end of this year or early next year. However, I understand that there

is now a move afoot to close the school somewhat more precipitately. Can the Minister say whether it is possible to delay closure until early next year so that this district in particular which, like others, has built up tradition over the years, can celebrate its centenary?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall discuss this request with my colleague and see what can be done in the circumstances.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page 773.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to speak on this important measure because underground water in this State is priceless. Many good speeches have been delivered in this Chamber on the subject since the Minister introduced the Bill here a few weeks ago. There are one or two observations I should like to make regarding the measure.

In 1957, the previous Government introduced legislation in another place. The introductory speech was made by the then Premier, but the matter then lapsed. It was not until 1959 that another Bill was brought forward in this Chamber. Members will remember that it had a reasonably stormy passage through the Council. We moved a number of amendments to it, but some of the features of the 1957 measure were not considered by this Chamber to be suitable. However, I believe that since 1959 quite a different situation has come about as a result of the usage of water. In particular, we have thought of the quantity of water that will come down the Murray River in the next 20 or 30 years.

The present Bill is receiving from members a much more sympathetic hearing than did the equivalent in 1959, mainly, perhaps, because we have had time to consider the problems resulting from indiscriminate use of water in the basin. I refer, particularly, to the basin on the Adelaide Plains that my colleagues have mentioned. It would be a tragedy for money to be lost that had been invested in the area near Two Wells and Virginia by one-generation Australians who sold out to some advantage to the Housing Trust in the Henley Beach-Underdale area and elsewhere. If this investment is allowed to continue without control there could be very serious financial losses, either to the State or to the people involved. When I say "the State or to the people involved," I mean

that the State will have to put in a main from the Murray River or somewhere else to provide the required water. If the Government does not do that people in the area will find that their investment in glasshouses and other capital structures, as well as the land, will be wasted should there be indiscriminate use of the waters in the area.

Mention has been made of people who desire to further subdivide farming land in the area. Some people have questioned whether the value of the land will be depreciated as a result of this Bill. I think the land value could slightly increase as a result of the Bill, because there will be some control over the use of the water in the basin. If this indiscriminate use of water is allowed to continue, it will mean that every buyer will require the landholder or the agent to give an assurance that there is sufficient water for the needs of the land that he is about to purchase. It would be a foolish person who would go into the area and buy land if he could not get that kind of assurance.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He would have to contract subject to a consent for a bore to be put down.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. He would have to contract on the assurance that a bore had been put down and that there was proof that the water the vendor said was there was actually there. That is only half the story, however. A buyer may find a very nice stream of water underground, but the next-door neighbour may put a bore down about half a chain away and cut into that stream. That would reduce the amount of water available and then there would be a race to find the next stream.

This would be expensive to the persons involved and it would be dangerous to other people in the basin area. I agree that we should have some control over our underground water supplies, which are a heritage. We did nothing in providing the underground water. It was there, and to allow some people to foul the basin by using cheap methods, being careless or over-using the water, is wrong and improper.

When the full effect of this legislation becomes apparent, the landholders in the area will not be able to subdivide their land into such small parcels, as some fortunate people did earlier. On many of the original 600-acre farms there would be anything up to 60 bores. Some of them are practically 24-hours-a-day pumpers; they pump water on to their land in daylight and into the reserve dams at night.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Did you say 60 bores?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. This is a tremendous drain upon the area. I stand by that figure. It may be that these bores will have to be reduced in number by some sort of control. It is better for it to be done now than that people should have to face a tremendous financial sacrifice if something is not done. That is in the inner area of the State, but there are many other basins in the same category.

Then we deal with the perhaps even more important areas where the true artesian basins and the true artesian wells exist. Several members have mentioned the definition clause. Yesterday it was referred to by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I should like more information from the Minister about this definition. His officers should be able to give us a much clearer definition of an artesian well. The definition in the Bill is:

"Artesian well" means a well from which water flows naturally to the surface of the land, together with all works constructed or erected in connection therewith."

That is a good broad explanation of a genuine artesian well (I believe that) but I am worried about the intermediate category of sub-artesian wells that flow at times under various influences—either tidal pressure or the non-use of the well in certain months of the year when water under its own hydrostatic pressure comes to the surface.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But not for long.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It may operate for only one month.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is not the intention to include in the definition of an artesian bore a bore that flows for only a short period at times.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister should use those words in the definition, because it will save much embarrassment and litigation before appeal boards later. If we know exactly what we want, and the department and the Minister know what they want, let us have the words in the definition and have done with it. Honourable members have doubts about the definition. We are not vitally affected by artesian bores—but we have other types of bore on our places from time to time! Not many members here are personally affected, but the people vitally interested in this problem want a clearer definition. If the words that the Minister used just now were put into draftsman's language now, it would save us much embarrassment later.

The next point of definition is the "prescribed depth", which the Minister has had included in this Bill. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday had a few things to say about it. This is one of the discretionary matters left in the Bill, the type that this Council took great exception to in the Road and Railway Transport Bill. These discretionary matters are to be fixed by regulation. I do not quite know what formula the department will use in assessing "prescribed depth". Certain areas of the Murray Mallee and many other basins have already been subjected to geological surveys. Many reports are available to the Mines Department as a result of its own efforts. No doubt it can accurately define in most basins what is a safe depth to which to go, being careful about the inflow of salt water and that type of thing. We should have a further explanation about the prescribed depth. I think I am right in saying that the department at present probably has sufficient detail to be able to say what the safe depth in any basin is at present. The Minister mentioned by way of interjection yesterday a prescribed depth for each particular basin. If this could be done, it would save much heartburn. I am all for that, because heartburn is a costly business. If we do not get our definition right in the first instance, it can be costly later.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We cannot write in definitions to cover all basins.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, we cannot write in a definition for every location, but I hope the Minister, when he comes to reply, will give an explanation that will satisfy most honourable members.

Clause 7 of this Bill repeals and re-enacts section 9 of the principal Act. Part III of the present Act deals with the Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination. I omitted to say at the outset that the long title of the Bill has been altered. I agree with that entirely, because the addition of the words "conserving and" is most important. Part III of the existing Act is repealed by clause 12 of the Bill. It is replaced by a new Part III dealing with well drillers. I am reluctant to see the Part III dealing with the Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination go, because, if my memory serves me aright, this was one of the main reasons why this Bill ever flew in this Council when it was here previously. That Part was inserted virtually for the benefit of this Council, and I can see no good reason at the moment

why the advisory committee cannot continue. Section 21 (2) (e) of the present Part III states:

A person to be nominated by the council or councils of the local governing area or areas affected by any question referred by the Minister under this Part: provided that such person shall be a member of the committee only when the committee is investigating a question affecting the area or areas in respect of which that member is so appointed.

That gave local government some representation on that committee. Paragraph (f) states: such other person, one of whom shall be a landowner, as the Minister considers necessary.

By this measure we delete the Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination from the Act. We have in no way provided for giving local government in any area, or a landholder, as a representative of a particular area, the right to sit on the appeal board. Provision has been made in this measure for people engaged in well drilling and they have been given representation. Legislation was before this Council a short time ago dealing with the licensing of electricians, and the Government was adamant that it was necessary to have an advisory committee. One was set up and there was provision to look after every possible group of people. I cannot see why it has suddenly been decided not to have an advisory committee in this matter.

If honourable members think one is not necessary, the appeal board must be representative of all the people concerned. I have strong feelings on this matter because I think that the landholder under this Bill will be vulnerable, and that the Director and Minister will assume great power. Although this Chamber realizes how important is the control and non-pollution of underground waters, it must be recognized that this is sweeping legislation. It will mean that some people will be hurt in its operation.

In the interests of the whole population the Bill will have a fairly easy passage through this Chamber. The least we can do is to make sure that the landholder has representation. I will raise the matter again in the Committee stages, so I will not labour it now. New section 20b states:

No person shall—
(a) cause or allow or suffer any underground water from a well to run to waste;

We believe in that. It continues:
(b) extract from any well underground water in excess of his reasonable requirements.

The term "reasonable requirements" is a loose one, because my requirements may be 10,000 gallons a day whereas the requirements of another person may be 20,000 gallons a day. He may be more thirsty than I am.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It will be wide in its scope.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is so. I believe that the use of a loose term like "reasonable requirements" is the sort of thing that keeps my lawyer friends in business. It should be made more specific. It is a broad term and I would like the Minister to examine it. It will not be explained in the regulations, because everything will not be spelt out there. It is a loose term, and my knowledge of law is not sufficient to enable me to say whether it will be accepted in the eyes of the law. Certain terms have been defined by the courts as having an accepted meaning.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think this is one of them.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know, and that is why I am asking the Minister about it. I have nothing else to offer at this time, but I will raise a number of points in the Committee stage. This is a sweeping piece of legislation, but it is essential that we have control because, as one who lives on the Murray River, I know the dire position that can arise from the effects of salinity. I would not like to think that any of our wonderful underground water basins were not available in the development of the State because of carelessness and the actions of avaricious people. Therefore, I somewhat reluctantly support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the Bill at this stage, but look forward to further discussions in Committee. I draw attention to two principles or policies that I favour at present. One deals with the basin just north of the city in the Virginia-Smithfield area. It is an area in which I have had some experience in selling property.

For example, in deceased estates the property has been cut up and sold to people who have come to this country and want to become market gardeners. Some have come to the area from other places where they have sold their market garden land for housing purposes. The principle here that I hope the department will adopt (and the Minister favour) in regard to bores (being sunk is that the number of bores in the locality will not necessarily be limited but rather the use of the old bores and the proposed new bores will be restricted so that the control

that is necessary to limit the total quantity of water taken from the basin will be exercised in a fair manner. I think it will be better to say that we will more equitably spread the use of the available water to those who wish to set up market gardens than say, "No, there are enough bores there at present and we are not going to permit any more."

It will be possible for the quantity of water to be taken from existing bores to be controlled by regulation. Take the instance of a property in the area at present that is used for general farming: it may have been in the family for some time, but because of the decease of the owner or owners it has been placed on the market for sale. If such a property were cut up and disposed of to the best advantage, it would be only fair from the point of view of the beneficiaries, that the purchasers should be permitted to put down a bore or bores of some size rather than be told that, because of the supply position, no bores would be permitted on that newly subdivided land.

It would be unfair to keep what may be called a "closed shop" practice in existence in that area by limiting the number of bores and preventing purchasers from sinking new bores whilst the existing bores remained with their current supply. If there was a more equitable spread of the use of water there would be a more equitable spread in values, which I think would be in the interests of everybody. If the bores are limited as far as supply is concerned, land with bores on it at present will hold its high value. Land on the market in the disposal of a deceased person's estate, as in the example I have cited, would bring low prices indeed if people thought that bores could not be sunk upon it.

I now refer to the conditions in contracts. I think the fewer conditional contracts we have and the simpler they are, the better. In the example I have cited regarding the disposal of a deceased estate, buyers who insisted on having certain conditions in the contracts regarding bores to be put down would find that the conditions extended to such matters as depth and flow, and these conditions could not be met. The inclusion of a simple condition regarding obtaining consent to hav-

ing a bore on the land, even though it be a small bore, would involve fewer problems.

I hope that, when controls are exercised, the emphasis will not be on limiting the number of users. As I understand the position, the department could say that there were sufficient bores in the neighbourhood or that sufficient water was being taken from the basin, and that no further bores would be permitted. However, I shall be guided by the Minister's explanation.

The second point concerns the metropolitan area, particularly my district, in which there are bores at present in the gardens of some private dwellings. Although there is not a large number of these bores, many people with large suburban gardens do sink them, and I do not consider that this practice should be discouraged. As I understand the underground basin position, the shallow basin below the southern suburbs is not connected to the large basin in the north that is used for commercial purposes.

The State is involved in great expense in pumping water from the Murray in the summer months and the interests of the State would be better served if that rather expensive pumping were limited. As time passes and as the water rate and excess charges increase, more people will be desirous of putting down bores in their own gardens. It is a pity that such bores will be controlled by this measure but, nevertheless, a strong case can be made out as to why they should be controlled.

I hope the department will be generous to people who apply for permission to sink bores in their own gardens and that it will not encumber applicants with too much red tape. I think the department should encourage people to sink bores, provided that they are sunk correctly and that the water is used in a sensible manner. It is in the interests of everyone that the department should do that. I support the measure.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.32 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 9, at 2.15 p.m.