LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, March 15, 1967.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question of March 7 about the power station at Torrens Island?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have been informed by the Minister of Works that there is no slowing up in the programme of expansion of the Electricity Trust. On the contrary, the trust's works programme in the financial year ending June 1967 is an all-time record of $35,000,000. This compares with an average of $20,300,000 in the past five years. Because of the heavy financial commitments this year on the Torrens Island power station, it is not possible to step up the work on electricity extensions in the South-East. These extensions are being carried out as rapidly as finances will permit.

MUNNO PARA COUNCIL.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I noticed in this morning's press that the Minister of Local Government had ordered the Munno Para District Council to pay $6,611 to the Lyell McEwin hospital by April 28. I understand that the council has already paid $10,487 to this hospital and that this, together with its contributions to the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler, represents about 6 per cent of its rate revenue, which is up to the top limit of contributions paid by any council. The payment of the additional $6,611 will mean that the council will be paying a little more than 10 per cent of its rate revenue as hospital contributions. With the opening of the casualty department at the Lyell McEwin Hospital next year, the council could on present rating be paying up to 25 per cent of its rate revenue to hospitals, and the Minister will agree that this would be an impossible situation. As I believe the council is not able to pay the additional sum ordered by the Minister, will the Minister indicate how he intends to obtain payment—whether he will hold back grant money payable to the council or refuse to pay to the council debit order money already spent by it but owing to it by the Highways Department?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not get caught like this! Under the Act, the council is due to pay this sum. It refused to pay the balance, and the matter was referred to me under the Local Government Act in order to issue a direction. I have given that direction. Whether the council intends to meet its obligations at this stage, I do not know. If it does not meet the obligations consideration will be given to other factors connected with this matter.

GREENHILL ROAD.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked on March 9 concerning the Greenhill Road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The following extract appears in the annual report of the Highways and Local Government Department for 1965-66:

Forty miles of the outlets from the city through the Mount Lofty ranges close to the metropolitan area include the roads from Adelaide to Mount Pleasant, Lobethal, Strathalbyn, Meadows, Belair, Uraidla and others. These are all substandard in regard to geometric alignment and they present serious traffic hazards because of restricted visibility, sharp curves and steep slopes. They have not been programmed in the five-year plan as funds are not available. Because their relocation will involve extensive land acquisition and earth works, the cost per mile will be very high.

The Greenhill Road is one of the roads mentioned above, and the position will be best relieved on this road by pressing ahead with the work already in hand on the South-Eastern freeway. Improvement of individual corners is not considered satisfactory as it merely emphasizes the danger of the next corner, and so on. Any piecemeal development on these lines would not be satisfactory. In the meantime, the erection of safety fencing is still continuing at the locations where it is considered warranted.

RAILWAY TICKET OFFICES.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On Sunday, March 5, at the Port Pirie railway station considerable inconvenience was caused to the travelling public because there was insufficient

change at the ticket office for people who wished to pay for their tickets before travelling from Port Pirie to Adelaide. Will the Minister ask the Railways Department to look into this matter because of the problem of shops being shut on the Sabbath, and will he see that steps are taken to ensure that there is sufficient change at railway ticket offices for the benefit of the travelling public?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will have a look at the matter and bring back a report.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Education an answer to my recent question regarding the cleaning of school windows?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The reply from my colleague is along the lines of the reply that I gave to the honourable member when he asked the question. The Hon. Mr. Hart asked whether it was true that, because of the policy of the Education Department in discontinuing the cleaning of school windows, some schools had to resort to artificial lighting during the daylight hours because the windows had not been cleaned. My reply was that I did not think so. My colleague, the Minister of Education, states that to his knowledge it is not true.

GLADSTONE-WILMINGTON LINE.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the Gladstone-Wilmington railway line?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have the following information. It is proposed to give the normal servicing to the narrow gauge rolling stock used on the Wilmington line at Gladstone. For major overhauls this rolling stock will be transported to Peterborough. The freight rates will not be varied because of the break-of-gauge. All systems of cargo handling, including containerization, will be considered in an endeavour to overcome the break-of-gauge problem.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

McDonald Park Primary School,

Re-establishment of Mount Gambier High School.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COSTS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 8. Page 3485.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): In connection with Sir Arthur Rymill's Bill to provide that costs shall not be awarded to the Crown unless the court certifies that the action has no substantial merit, I suggest, with the concurrence of the Attorney-General, that the Bill be deferred for the time being. It is pointed out that this Bill deals with only one aspect of proceedings by or against the Crown.

A draft Bill to deal with the whole matter is currently being considered by Their Honours the judges and the Law Society and it is not considered desirable to proceed with a Bill that deals with only one aspect of the larger question. It is the Government's intention to introduce a Bill dealing with the whole matter and, in the circumstances, it is considered that Sir Arthur Rymill's Bill should be deferred until the next session of Parliament, by which time it is hoped that the Government will be in a position to introduce its comprehensive Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I listened with much interest to the Chief Secretary's statement and was pleased to hear that the Government was considering various aspects of law reform. I hope that serious consideration will be given by the Government to this particular item when it is considering the whole matter. I agree, perhaps, that this is only one aspect of the whole problem but, nevertheless, it is an important aspect, and I commend the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for bringing in a Bill to endeavour to give some justice to the ordinary citizen who may be involved at some time in his life in an action against the Crown or, as more frequently happens, may be involved in an action brought by the Crown against him.

I think that the Bill, as introduced, is so simple that it does not need explanation. It merely provides that costs shall not be awarded to the Crown in actions or proceedings by or against any person to which the Crown is a party unless the court certifies that the action has no substantial merit. We are not without precedent for this kind of thing, because earlier in this session we passed an amendment to the Excessive Rents Act Amendment Act, and this provision was also included in the old Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act. Section 15 (*b*) provides that no costs shall be allowed in any action under the Act unless it appears to the court that the conduct of a party in

bringing or resisting the application or in relation to the subject matter thereof has been unreasonable, vexatious or oppressive.

I think that provision expresses in another way what the honourable member wants to do in this Bill. He has used slightly different wording, namely, that the bringing or opposing of the action or proceeding has to have no substantial merit. I hope that the Government will give serious consideration to this important and valuable piece of law reform and include it in the wider Bill that it intends to bring down.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG-RACING CONTROL BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from March 14. Page 3624.)

Clause 1—"Short title and commencement."

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I wish to say a few words about the work of the Select Committee and am informed that this is the correct time to do so. First, let me say that I was one of those who opposed the appointment of the Select Committee, but the result of its work proves just how wrong one can be. The results reached only prove that, if a committee settles down to its task and works fairly and practically along the right lines, getting the necessary evidence, it can come to a satisfactory conclusion. In my opinion that is exactly what happened on this occasion. I want to thank my colleagues on the Select Committee (Hons. Jessie Cooper, D. H. L. Banfield, L. R. Hart and H. K. Kemp) for the amount of effort, time and energy they all put into the work of this committee.

We met on eight occasions; the sittings were long and we heard some 21 witnesses in all. They gave a considerable amount of evidence. I personally want to thank the members of the Select Committee for their ever-ready willingness to meet my convenience at all times. It is not easy even during a Parliamentary recess, to fit in times to suit everyone, but I thank the members of the committee for their consideration of other appointments I had. I pay a tribute to the Clerk of the Parliaments (Mr. Ball) and his assistant (Mr. Mertin), who acted as secretaries to the committee. Nothing we asked them to do was left undone; in fact, if one wanted to find fault with their work, it would be impossible to do so. It was impeccable and right up to the minute.

Not only has the result of the Select Committee's work strengthened the Bill, which fully guards against what each and every member of this Chamber has in mind about the cruelty that is said to take place in connection with coursing, but also, because of our efforts and discussions with it, the National Coursing Association has agreed to take charge of the sport. It has a set of rules under which it will operate. I think that strengthens the report of the Select Committee. Provided the rules are honoured, I think that any wrong-doer in connection with coursing will be severely dealt with. At one time I thought that reports of this wrong-doing were exaggerated, that it did not take place, but I am so far satisfied now as to say that I think it is probable it does take place in isolated cases and by a minute majority of the people interested in coursing. If anyone is caught "blooding" a dog (as we have been told has happened) I hope (and I think all members of the Select Committee and all honourable members in this Chamber also hope) that such a person will receive his just reward. It is not my place to present my personal views. In any Select Committee members may have two points of view and at times both sides tend to be a little biased. I am sincere in saying that it was not an easy committee on which to serve but I thank members for their assistance. I think we have brought down a very sound report—better than I expected, and a most heartening one in that it was the unanimous decision of all members.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I take this opportunity of briefly supporting the remarks of the Chief Secretary. I am pleased that he has spoken in such a manner. I know of the interest that members of this Select Committee took in their tasks and I know they took meticulous care in tackling the job and sifting the evidence obtained. Evidence was taken outside the State of South Australia and, like the Chief Secretary, I realize that the work of the committee was not easy. I think the fundamental point is that this shows clearly the value of such Select Committees in assisting in the deliberations of this Chamber.

The Hon. L. R. HART: As a member of the Select Committee I endorse all that the Chief Secretary has said. I wish to refer to a comment made by a witness, the gentleman being a member of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and also a life member of the Animal Welfare League. He also appeared on Channel 7 in a *World of Sport* programme and, although I did not see the telecast, I understand he implied that he was denied sufficient time to present his evidence to the committee. In fact, in a circular

letter that I have received (and I understand other honourable members have also received it) this man states:

In the limited time provided me before the Select Committee I gave as much of the true documentary facts as I could get in, but only half of the sordid story has been told . . .

I mention that the gentleman appeared before the committee on two occasions; on the first of those occasions he was granted an extension of time and, in fact, he probably spent more time before the committee than any other witness. Indeed, we had a great deal of evidence of this character and much of the evidence submitted by the gentleman in question was a repetition of what had already been submitted by other witnesses.

In fairness to the members of the committee I think it should be clearly stated that no witness was denied sufficient time to present his case. I believe that we owe a great debt to all the witnesses who appeared and they gave their evidence in a satisfactory manner, clearly and concisely. This was of great assistance to the committee and helped members make up their minds. Some of the evidence presented was not entirely relevant to the Bill, but whether that should be debated here or not is another matter. Also in fairness to members of the committee, I believe that a further statement should be made; that is, that many witnesses stated that this legislation would not be successful until such time as betting facilities were provided. I do not wish to elaborate on this, but in fairness to the committee it should be pointed out that at some stage there will be further requests from greyhound racing people for betting facilities.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I congratulate the committee on the work it has done. The Chief Secretary said he appreciated the work of these committees, so perhaps this will be his attitude towards other Bills of this nature. I was overseas during some of the time this matter was discussed, but on a television programme it was stated that a mechanical lure was being operated in this State. I believe action has been taken to prevent this, but I am rather surprised that while this Bill was before the House some of the people sponsoring it were breaking the law. I have heard one point of view that it will be possible for gambling facilities to be used in connection with mechanical lure racing without any amending legislation being passed, and another that further legislation will be required for this to be done. Can the Chief Secretary comment on the aspects I have mentioned?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I understand that a mechanical lure can be used to educate one dog. I understand that a complaint was lodged, the party concerned willingly told the police where the lure was and the matter was investigated, but I do not know the result. If this Bill is passed any betting at a greyhound meeting will be illegal, although perhaps someone can read otherwise into the Lottery and Gaming Act. I said I would not ask the Government to introduce any form of gambling for greyhound lure racing until it could be proved that this racing could be conducted properly and fairly. This Bill was introduced by a private member. The Government has not considered legalizing betting on this racing, and I think I can say that this will not be done during the life of this Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. ROWE: I am indebted to the Minister for his explanation.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Licensing of dog-racing clubs."

The Hon. L. R. HART: Before this Bill went into Committee I had on honourable members' files an amendment that now appears as subclause (3a). I intended to move this amendment because I thought it necessary to have an appropriate body to control greyhound racing and the Bill contained no provision for any controlling authority except that it provided that the Minister was the person who was to issue licences and who had complete control. On visiting other States my views on this were reinforced, as in both Victoria and New South Wales there was not only a National Coursing Club to control this sport but also a board of control. On my return to this State I was concerned about whether the rules of the National Coursing Association of South Australia would cover the problems I had in mind. I contacted the association and found that its constitution did not provide for mechanical lure racing, but I was told that it intended to draw up a fresh constitution. This has been done, and I congratulate the association. All the problems that worried the committee have now been covered by the association's rules. Because of this and because of the amendments made to the Bill, I think the control of dog-racing will be in good hands.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Power of authorized persons to enter premises, etc."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: What concerned this Chamber mostly was cruelty in connection

with the training of greyhounds for racing. It became abundantly clear to the committee that the respectable dog owner and trainer considered cruelty was completely unnecessary in the effective training of greyhounds. Later in the evidence before the committee it became certain that a minority, not a small majority—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I thought I said a minute minority.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: —considered the blooding of greyhounds a normal procedure in overcoming the reluctance of dogs to race under the essentially artificial circumstances of tin hare racing. It is certain that there is considerable traffic in small animals, particularly rabbits and opossums, for this purpose in some parts of Australia. The matter has been ventilated in the press recently. However, we have had repeated assurances by very reliable witnesses that such practices are completely unnecessary and that they are not officially countenanced by the sport. The amendment, as it is encompassed in the report, is designed to make these practices illegal, but the newly-adopted rules of the National Coursing Association go further and bring vividly to the notice of the Committee the sincerity with which the association is tackling the suppression of such practices. I will read the rules in detail because they will become the rules governing greyhound racing when introduced. Section 70 of the rules of the National Coursing Association states:

(*a*) Every person shall strictly comply with all municipal and statutory requirements relating to greyhounds or to the presence of greyhounds in public places, and subject thereto—

(1) All greyhounds being led or exercised on public highways shall be strictly confined to the carriageway, unless traffic regulations otherwise provide.

(2) All greyhounds being led on public streets and highways shall be properly muzzled.

(3) No greyhound to be led or exercised in public parks without the permission of the respective councils, and when allowed to be led or exercised in public parks shall pay full respect to any conditions made by the local government bodies.

(4) No person under the age of 16 (unless accompanied by an adult) shall lead and/or exercise greyhounds on public streets or parks, and not more than four greyhounds shall be led at any one time by one person.

(*b*) Any person contravening any such requirement shall, in addition to any penalty to which he may be subjected by law, be liable for a first offence to disqualification for three months and for a second offence to disqualification for an indefinite period or for life, and in addition any dog concerned in the commission of such offence may be disqualified for any term.

(*c*) Any person convicted of cruelty to a dog or to any animal in connection with the training of a dog shall, in addition to any penalty imposed by the court, be disqualified for five years for a first offence, and for life for a second offence.

The public, therefore, may be assured that the clubs will police this matter. It was brought out frequently in evidence by the people who were against dog racing that it was impossible for a body like the R.S.P.C.A. to stop malpractices connected with the training and handling of dogs, much of which is done in semi-private circumstances. Because the National Coursing Association, through its affiliated clubs, has accepted the policing of these rules as its own responsibility, I believe that misgivings in this regard have been removed.

When we were drafting these amendments I was sure that they did not go far enough and that they did not tie the responsibility for policing malpractices to the club. However, now that I realize that the National Coursing Association has accepted the responsibility through the new rules, I do not think that there can be any objection whatever. We have had good evidence that greyhound racing, as practised in other States, is a clean and attractive sport, but essentially a betting sport. The Chief Secretary has made the Government's position clear concerning betting, but I believe that there is no doubt in members' minds that the sport is regulated very well in other States, particularly in Victoria. I believe also that there can be no hesitation in members' minds about accepting the recommendations in the report.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7a and 7b passed.

Clause 8—"Regulations."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Roads): I notice that this clause deals with regulation-making powers. Do the same conditions prevail (concerning the requirement that the regulations be laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament) that members insisted on last night in connection with another Bill?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): The answer is "No".

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If the Minister wishes that it be altered in that way, I will support him.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 9 (clause 3)—Before "penalty" insert "or other".

No. 2. Page 2, lines 10-13 (clause 3)—Leave out all words from "commissions" to the end of line 13.

No. 3. Page 2, line 18 (clause 3)—After "service" insert "or in the case of a worker employed on piece or bonus work or any other system of payment by results".

No. 4. Page 3, line 5 (clause 4)—Leave out "fifteen", and insert "ten", in lieu thereof.

No. 5. Page 3, line 7 (clause 4)—Leave out "fifteen", and insert "ten", in lieu thereof.

No. 6. Page 3, lines 10 to 12 (clause 4)—Leave out the whole of subclause (ii) and insert in lieu thereof—

> "(ii) in respect of each year of service completed with the employer after such ten years service, to nine calendar days leave."

No. 7. Page 3, line 16 (clause 4)—Leave out "fifteen", and insert "ten" in lieu thereof.

No. 8. Page 3, line 18 (clause 4)—Leave out the whole line and insert "nine calendar days for each completed year" in lieu thereof.

No. 9. Page 4, line 20 (clause 4)—Leave out "ten" and insert "five" in lieu thereof.

No. 10. Page 4, line 20 (clause 4)—After "years" insert "adult service".

No. 11. Page 4, line 21 (clause 4)—Leave out "fifteen" and insert "ten" in lieu thereof.

No. 12. Page 4, line 36 (clause 4)—Leave out "fifteen" and insert "ten" in lieu thereof.

No. 13. Page 4, line 36 (clause 4)—After "made" insert "in respect of the number of completed years of service with the employer".

No. 14. Page 4, lines 29 to 31 (clause 5)—Leave out all words from "and shall not" to end of line 31.

No. 15. Page 5, line 37 (clause 5)—Leave out "fifteen" and insert "ten" in lieu thereof.

No. 16. Page 5, lines 43 and 44 (clause 5)—Leave out all words from and including "and eight" in line 43 to and including "entitlement" in line 44.

No. 17. Page 6, line 30 (clause 7)—Leave out "twenty-eight" and insert "sixty" in lieu thereof.

No. 18. Page 6, line 35 (clause 7)—Leave out "in not more than two separate periods".

No. 19. Page 6, line 36 (clause 7)—After "entitlement" insert "in periods of not less than four weeks".

No. 20. Page 8, line 22 (clause 11)—After "leave" insert "(whether immediately or upon fulfilment of certain conditions)".

No. 21. Page 8 (clause 11)—After line 24 insert following new subclause:—

> "(*aa*) for whom provisions entitling the worker to long service leave (whether immediately or upon fulfilment of certain conditions) have been made by an industrial agreement filed pursuant to the Industrial Code, 1920-1966, and which provisions the Industrial Commission of South Australia, constituted by the President or a Commissioner or the Industrial Registrar has declared, on the application of any party to the industrial agreement, to be not less favourable to the worker;
>
> or"

No. 22. Page 8, line 25 (clause 11)—Leave out "obtained an exemption from" and insert "been exempted by" in lieu thereof.

No. 23. Page 8, line 30 (clause 11)—Leave out "(*b*)" and insert "(*aa*)".

No. 24. Page 8, line 30 (clause 11)—After "may" insert "also".

No. 25. Page 8 (clause 11)—After line 43, insert new subclause as follows:—

> "(3a) An application for exemption may be made by the employer concerned or by any registered association (within the meaning of the Industrial Code, 1920-1966) which is a party to the agreement or scheme."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: All honourable members have the schedule of the amendments before them and I think I can say fairly that the amendments can be divided into three distinct categories. First, some deal with one of the fundamental matters in the Bill, namely, the period of qualification for long service leave. The other place has, in each case, reduced the qualifying period by five years. The amendments in the next category deal with the rather vexed matter of whether bonuses, commissions and other systems of payment by result are to be included in the pay that a person on or entitled to long service leave is to get. The third category deals with a series of drafting amendments, principally to clause 11.

I have no objection in principle to these last-mentioned amendments but, when one looks at them incorporated in the clause, one sees that the clause as amended becomes such a monster and so difficult to interpret and understand that one hesitates about having any Bill pass out of this Chamber with such a conglomeration of words. An easy way could be found to deal not only with the amendments made by the other place but also with the clause as it left this place. I can see a simple way in which the whole wording can be reduced so that it makes sense. However, I do not think this is the time or place to do that. I say without hesitation that, although there is nothing wrong with the amendments in principle, they almost make clause 11 unworkable in every respect.

The amendments in the second category, those dealing with whether bonuses, commissions and piecework payments are to be included in any amounts paid to a man qualified for and on long service leave, are such that I do not think I need to repeat what was said in the lengthy debate in this place.

I do not think I made any secret about the fact that this was a difficult problem, so difficult that no other Statute, award or agreement that I have been able to find has been able to solve it. That is because of the difficulty of determining what is meant by a commission or a bonus.

Although I have some sympathy with what the other place has endeavoured to do, I point out that we cannot simply solve the problem by saying that all commissions, bonuses and piecework rates shall be paid to a person who is on long service leave. That is impracticable. Consequently, the amendments made by the other place in this regard do not come near to solving the problem. They do nothing more than dodge the issue.

The main amendments (and that is most of them) deal with the qualifying period for long service leave. This is the crux of the Bill. Obviously, the Government wants to write its own terms into the Bill and we are told that these terms are determined by Party policy, whatever that may be and wherever it may come from. The other place has written into the Bill, no doubt at the behest of the Government, provisions to give to certain workers in South Australia a long service leave qualification period that is unique in Australia. I emphasize that. No other State, by its legislation or under any award or agreement that I have been able to find, gives the workers a qualification for long service leave after five years. That is really the basis of the amendments. There is a pro rata provision relating to service after five years and a qualification period of 10 years. That is superior to what is enjoyed even by public servants in this State.

What was the fundamental purpose of my Bill? It was to give justice to a minority of employees in this State. The other day a Minister from another place said that 85 per cent of the employees of this State were covered by the provisions of some award, industrial agreement, scheme, or something of that kind. If that figure is true (and I am prepared to accept it, although I have certain doubts about it) 85 per cent of the employees are enjoying the benefits that my Bill sought to extend to the other 15 per cent. Under my Bill 15 per cent of employees in South Australia would get justice, because they would be brought under the same conditions as 85 per cent of the employees in South Austraila are already enjoying.

But what does the Government want to do? By its amendments the immediate effect is to give that 15 per cent superior rights to those of the other 85 per cent; in other words, it will take this 15 per cent, which will get justice under my Bill, and give them superior rights so that immediately there is created an injustice to the other 85 per cent. The whole purpose of this exercise, of course, is in the process of time to encourage the other 85 per cent by approaching the courts, the tribunals or the employers, to work themselves up to the position where they can enjoy the superior rights immediately being conferred on the 15 per cent. It means that a simple Bill brought in to give justice to the minority creates an injustice for the majority, which is ridiculous. For all these reasons, I move that amendments Nos. 1 to 25 be disagreed to.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I do not propose to deal at length with the arguments put forward when this Bill was previously before us, but I do not agree with the honourable member in some of the things he has said today about the amendments moved in another place. I ask the Committee to accept those amendments and reject the honourable member's arguments.

The three drafting amendments first referred to show how legal people disagree with each other, because I have legal advice that these amendments are all right and that the amendments that the Hon. Mr. Potter says are acceptable in principle, but not acceptable because they make the provisions difficult to understand, are understandable. As regards the payment when on leave of people who during the time of their qualifying period for long service leave receive piecework rates, retainers, bonuses and so forth, the honourable member says that this is impossible or difficult to apply. The Bill says that they should be paid the average weekly rate of earnings during the period of 12 months immediately preceding the date on which they commence their leave. This is simple. We have only to divide the gross annual earnings of an employee by the number of weeks he works, and that is the answer. That is not particularly difficult. There should be no argument on that basis, that these people should not receive the average of their weekly earnings.

As regards the qualifying period, I put forward arguments previously when the Bill was in this Chamber. This is and always has been the policy of the Government for many years. We have expressed this in our Policy Speech more than once, the last occasion being prior to the last election. It was expressed to be the policy of the Party at that time and was accepted by

the electors. We are only carrying out our policy, which has been with us for a long time. It is a policy reached at conferences between our Party and the affiliated organi: ations concerned. Policies are discussed at those meetings and our policy is then formulated, but not in the way some people try to pretend by snide references to other people. This is our policy. We have submitted it here and in another place and shall continue to submit it. We promised to introduce a Bill incorporating our policy. Because of the many industrial matters that had to be straightened out following this Government's coming into office, we have not been able to bring in all the industrial legislation we intended to, but this will be taken care of in the near future.

Irrespective of whether or not these amendments are accepted, we propose eventually to introduce a Bill along the lines of our own policy. I ask honourable members to consider this seriously before accepting the Hon. Mr. Potter's motion that the amendments moved in another place be rejected.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (13).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, L. H. Densley, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter (teller), C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (4).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone (teller), and A. J. Shard.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Amendments thus disagreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT ACT (No. 2), 1966, RECTIFICATION BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 14. Page 3591.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I believe that the advent of this natural gas pipeline could be the greatest single economic event in South Australia's history. One of our great handicaps ever since the State was founded has been a lack of indigenous fuel. During the Second World War the then Playford Government did its utmost to cope with such as we had and founded the Leigh Creek coalfield. There was a great deal of criticism of this, and much opposition to it, but it has been a wonderful asset to the State, despite the poor quality of the fuel itself.

I think this instances how badly South Australia needs indigenous fuel. In my opinion, with this wonderful discovery in the north of this State this lack from which we have suffered throughout our history can be largely overcome in one hit, as it were. I am very proud to have been able to assist in helping to arrange finance for the pipeline in the private sector. Indeed, I possibly trespassed or overlapped a little into the Government sector because that appeared to become, in a way, necessary. Of course, I was doing this in the interests of the State, with which my family has been so long associated.

Before I proceed I should like to make two corrections of speculations that may have been made in the press. The first of these occurred when one of the daily newspapers reported that I had been invited to help arrange the finance. That is not correct. I volunteered to do this, and I am happy to say that my offer was accepted because I consider that some success has been achieved. That does not mean that it would not have been achieved without my intervention. The second instance occurred the other evening when a newspaper article stated that I might be appointed as a member of the proposed authority. I wish to make it entirely clear that not only have I not been invited to be a member of the authority but, much as I might like to be, it would not be possible for me to be a member. I thought I should clear up those two pieces of speculation.

I am not one of those prophets of gloom found all over the streets of Adelaide. We have heard for decades that no oil existed in Australia; in fact, it became almost trite to mention it, and when an oil search was announced most people thought it was just a fantasy. This wonderful discovery has now been made, and instead of this Bill being met with this pall of gloom that seems to have surrounded its advent I should like to say that it is a joyous day for South Australia. I rejoice in it, and I hope that the rest of the people of the State will rejoice likewise. I am sure that they will rejoice in due course, as everybody should on such an occasion.

Private enterprise has already rallied nobly and literally millions of dollars have been promised to the extent whereby the requirements are practically filled. I believe several leading Australian institutions have yet to be

approached and I have no doubt whatever that such institutions will respond to the cause and that the money from the private sector, as required, will be readily available.

One sour note only has been struck, and I think I should refer to it. It appeared in a political commentary in last Saturday's edition of the *Advertiser* and was supplied by the Australian Labor Party. The article was headed "Sour Grapes on Gas Bill". The extract to which I refer reads:

Naturally enough the L.C.L. Opposition in the Assembly did not formally oppose the measure. They knew that it would be far too politically dangerous to do so. In these circumstances the Leader of the Opposition contented himself with a "sour grapes" speech from which it could be interpreted that his only possible objection to the Bill was that it was the Labor Party that introduced it.

That sort of thing does not help and I do not think it is worthy of the Labor Party when we are all trying to help. After all, why should there be any sour grapes, because the Playford Government started all this; it did not start with the Labor Party but with the Playford Government and it started long before sufficient reserves had been proven and before the Moomba field had been discovered. It started with Gidgealpa, which was discovered in the time of the Playford Government, and that Government immediately started an investigation into the possibilities of a pipeline. I hope one or two of the then members of the Cabinet still present in this Chamber will give us more details of what went on at that time because I do not know all about it, although I know quite a bit about it. I simply know enough to be able to say that this is so.

This allegation of sour grapes has apparently arisen because members in another place have tried to ensure, as is their duty, that this enterprise is carried out on proper lines. That is why honourable members are here. They made suggestions that on the face of them appeared to be good suggestions. They did not oppose the Bill, as the article suggested they did; they tried to help the Bill along, and they raised various points. If the points did not prove to be of very great value, that does not matter; they have been fulfilling their duties, and I shall try to do the same this afternoon.

Having said that, I congratulate the Labor Government on carrying on in a forceful and effective way to try to establish this pipeline, which I believe will be of great value to the State. From what I have seen, I think the Government's attitude to the whole matter has been very reasonable, and in most regards I find the Bill is reasonable. I do not suppose all members would ever be satisfied with any Bill. I could suggest things that I think would improve the Bill, but I do not intend to do so because I do not wish to delay the matter: the sooner we get on with it the better it will be for all concerned.

The Bill leaves to private enterprise (the producers and discoverers) power to bargain for the best price they can get. This is as it should be, and I congratulate the Government on this because, unless it does this sort of thing, it will only stifle oil and gas search. This is a "risk" business, as all the money may be lost. It is not like an investment in Government bonds, where one knows one will get one's money back, even if it has depreciated in value. All the money in this venture can be lost, so there should be a reward for such investment. If the Government tries to minimize the profits of these people, oil search in Australia will wither and die. I believe this Bill is correct in its approach and, as far as I can see, there is nothing in the Bill that will in any way stifle further search.

The fuel industry is tremendously competitive. We know that ever since the pipeline has been advocated it has become more and more competitive, as oversea companies have been offering advantageous prices for contracts with the big consumers here. I believe these have been far more advantageous than we have had before. This in itself is an advantage, but these international tactics are familiar: in private business I have come across them before. People overseas try by doing this to discourage local people from going on with local enterprise, and when they have succeeded in stifling the enterprise the prices go up again. I believe that despite this intense competition from overseas our producers are even now able to match or even beat them. This is a great thing, but it can be a greater thing because, as I understand the situation, the contracts that will be entered into are for 20 years. If in 20 years' time we will be able to get this gas for the same prices as in 1967, with the inflation which we may have until that time it will be most advantageous.

I believe that the price now is good. I think that in due course other discoveries will be made. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said yesterday, many other structures in the area look promising, and I think there is a great future for natural gas in this State.

The pipeline is wanted by the producers. Although their attitude to the Bill is much the same as mine, and I do not think it is ideal from their point of view, I think it is acceptable to them. It is wanted by the consumers and by the Government, and I have no doubt that it is wanted by the general public, so let us get on and get the thing done because, in all matters of finance, delay can be fatal, as things can happen that can frustrate matters. We have seen many examples of this, and things happen in ways that cannot be anticipated.

A lack of confidence is fatal. I have no lack of confidence. I have an unbounded confidence in the future of natural gas in South Australia, and so has anyone else who has looked into the matter and with whom I have discussed this. I have mentioned that honourable members in particular have been worried quite properly about certain details. Certain questions have been raised, and I should like to deal with a few of them. The first very important question is about the reserves of gas at Gidgealpa and Moomba. We know there are prospects of further discoveries, but what reserves have we? The question has been asked whether the reserves have been sufficiently proved. I should like to deal with this by quoting from a statement made by Santos-Delhi in the *Advertiser* of March 7:

> Lewis Engineering of Dallas, Texas, recognized world authority on estimating gas reserves, stated that in its opinion there would be sufficient recoverable gas there to supply Adelaide and South Australian industry on projected demand based on market surveys for a period of at least 20 years.

That was the opinion of a world expert. I discussed this question with a man associated with one of the producers and he said, "Let us be sensible about this. Until we can be assured that a pipeline will be forthcoming, what sense would there be in our going any further drilling the field extensively at a cost of probably millions of dollars without knowing whether we would ever be able to transport the fuel to Adelaide? As soon as the gas pipeline is assured we will go straight ahead with our drilling and before any contract for the pipeline is entered into we will make absolutely certain the reserves are there." That is only common sense. We know that many holes were put down at great expense at Roma, Queensland, but nothing has happened, and nothing may happen. This is a sensible approach, as it would be stupid to go any further until it was known how gas could be transported. I have been told—and I know it will happen—that before any contract is entered into the reserves will be fully proved. My informant tells me that 20 years is a minimum, not a maximum, estimate of supply on present indications.

I think the situation regarding finance is very good. It is better than private enterprise alone could have done it, because private enterprise would have needed equity capital, which would be "risk" capital and which would demand quite a high percentage rate. Also, of course, the debenture rate would be much higher than the rate in relation to the proposed semi-government authority. The Loan Council has recently decreed that semi-governmental borrowing can now be at 5¼ per cent on long-term, and this is being offered by established authorities. The Government guarantee has enabled the money to be readily obtained and it has also enabled the low rate of interest to be obtained. The reason for this is, of course, partly that the authority will be a semi-governmental authority recognized for what is known as the 20/30 ratio for taxation purposes, and also recognized for the 55 per cent ratio that private trading banks must invest in Commonwealth and semi-governmental and "other" securities. So all these things have made it easier to arrange finance.

I should like to add that the provision of this money by any of the institutions that are providing it will not impair their ability to lend money for other legitimate purposes, particularly housing. I want to make this clear because some of the institutions have been very generous; one must be very careful in these days because the finger of scorn is very readily available, particularly on housing. I know that all private trading banks, whose quota for housing is 25 per cent of their deposits, are transacting business right up to the maximum. The fact that some of them have been generous (I can think of one in particular) does not mean that they will reduce their lending for housing: it will be kept at the maximum rate because these great Australian institutions are very conscious of their obligations to the community. Of course, this is one of the reasons why, for a project of national importance such as this, they have done their best to help: they are very conscious of the fact that they must help. I noticed in this morning's paper that a great life assurance company said how interested it was in matters of national importance.

The route of the pipeline is a very controversial matter, and I believe that the Government has suggested that it is in favour of the

so-called eastern route suggested by the Bechtel Corporation who are its consultants in this matter. The matter has not yet been decided; in the Bill it remains in the hands of the authority which, however, has to obtain the consent of the Governor-in-Council to any proposed route. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris analysed this very carefully and excellently yesterday when he pointed out that the direct line could, on an engineering survey, be more expensive than a line running to Leigh Creek and then down the railway line. He pointed out that the line must be buried because of the temperatures encountered in the North. A very important financial aspect of this matter will be how much rock and other substances of a difficult nature are encountered below the surface, and this is why he urged that an engineering survey be made. I entirely agree and, I would add, the sooner the better.

Another matter concerning the direct route must be mentioned. The railway line is graded and it runs from point to point on a line that we know. The direct route will have to go over and around hills in places, and every time that happens an additional length of pipeline becomes involved; this means (to me, as a layman) that it is by no means certain that the direct route will necessarily be the cheapest route. However, a proper engineering survey (which has not yet been made) must be made, and the sooner the better.

Another matter causing concern has been a suggestion that the matter should be referred to the Public Works Committee for a report. This committee is a very excellent body, as we all know, and one on which this Parliament relies very considerably. The suggestion was altruistic and made in the best of faith to try to help the scheme to be successful; the suggestion should not be interpreted in the way that one or two cynics have tried to interpret it. Although, on the face of it, the suggestion looks satisfactory, I believe that the Public Works Committee would merely be an intermediary superimposed on a body that is already included in the Bill for this express purpose: I refer to the authority itself.

As I said before, it is the authority (though with Government approval) and not the Government that will have to make the decision on the route. The authority consists of two representatives of the producers, two representatives from the South Australian Gas Company and the Electricity Trust, and two Government appointees. Without in any way criticizing the excellent Public Works Committee, I believe that the representatives of the producers would surely have more knowledge and experience of such things as pipelines than any member of the Public Works Committee. The representative of the Gas Company would also have more knowledge and experience. Though the Gas Company's pipelines are of a different nature, they are pipelines, after all. So I think the best way of handling this is to do what the Bill says and to leave it to the authority to determine the route, with the approval of the Government.

There are certain prerequisites before the pipeline can become a *fait accompli*, that is, before the contract can be entered into, and I have mentioned three of these before—finance, route, and so on. The other things are conditions precedent to this: all of these relate to contracts. The first is that it will be necessary for the producers to finalize satisfactory contracts with the consumers. It has been announced in the press that the producers have already signed an agreement with the South Australian Gas Company, and I believe that this is a very advantageous agreement to the Gas Company. The Electricity Trust agreement is, I believe, in the course of negotiation; I do not think it has yet been finalized, but, of course, the Electricity Trust, at the moment anyhow, will be the biggest consumer and therefore a contract with it is a "must" before the pipeline can be embarked upon. Finally, there must be a contract between the producers and the authority itself concerning the cost of transportation. Very rightly the Government has left all these things open for negotiation; this is a very proper thing and it will ensure that everyone will have the fairest opportunity to do the best for himself.

So, after all these conditions precedent have been arranged, and not until then, a firm contract can be entered into for the pipeline itself, and then we shall know exactly what it is going to cost because I believe that a firm contract will be available and that it will not be a cost-plus contract. I sincerely hope it will be a firm contract.

I should like to describe briefly the pipeline's advantages to the State. I have met a few people who have expressed doubts about its advantages. The economics are good at present. The cost of the gas at present is very competitive. It will be possible to stabilize the costs over 20 years at present-day prices and, as I have said, that is good. In addition, new industries always wrap themselves around pipelines, as experience throughout the world has shown. The principal chemical product

from a pipeline is nitrogenous fertilizer. It has been said that South Australia is not the most ideal place for this, and that may be so at present. However, it is clear that nitrogenous fertilizer will come into use more and more. There have been dramatic results from its use in South Australia already. I think many honourable members may be interested in this, because many other people have asked me what other industries wrap themselves around a pipeline. I asked the question of an expert, who referred first to nitrogenous fertilizers and said:

The building block for this industry is anhydrous ammonia, which is most suitably manufactured from natural gas. From ammonia several other compounds can be manufactured, including urea, nitric acid, ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulphate. Another important industry which uses natural gas as a feed stock is the carbon black industry. This product is used heavily in the manufacture of tyres.

Of course, we have some great manufacturers of tyres in this State. The expert continued:

An important chemical derivative of natural gas is methanol or methyl alcohol. This is a basic chemical which is consumed in large quantities itself for such uses as antifreeze solutions, and also used to a considerable extent as a chemical building block. Derivatives include formaldehyde, acetic acid, methyl chloride, methylene chloride, and methyl methacrylate. Hydrogen is now being produced in large quantities from natural gas.

Hydrogen in turn is used in many chemical manufacturing operations such as cyclohexane, alcohols and aluminium alkyls. Very large consumers of hydrogen are found in refinery processes, including hydrodesulphurizing, hydrotreating and hydrocracking. The further possibilities of using heavier hydrocarbon recovered from natural gas as petrochemical feed stocks cannot be overlooked. These open the doors to manufacturing almost anything. Basic derivatives include acetylene, ethylene, propylene, butylenes and butadiene.

The pipeline proposed at present (there will be offshoots from it) will be amortized, I understand, over 20 years, after which time it will be a valuable asset to the State. The royalties payable to the Government, of which I have not heard mention previously in the debate here, should be considerable. The pipeline will be a great attribute to the State Government's revenues.

I refer honourable members to clause 13, which provides, in effect, that the pipeline will be a common carrier; in other words, that anyone who produces natural gas or its derivatives (not only the present producers) will be entitled to use the pipeline, provided that contracts have not previously been entered into by the authority whereby the pipeline is already fully loaded. They get a right to that effect, and that is a proper provision.

I have mentioned the encouragement of oil search and I repeat that risk capital must get its proper reward. As I have said, this Bill leaves it open to the producers to negotiate a price. I am happy that the Government has taken this attitude. The business is highly competitive, and this will regulate the cost, anyhow. I am sure that the Government's attitude in this matter is completely right and that, if it goes along on this basis, we shall get continued oil search in South Australia. If it were not for this attitude, I am certain that this work would not go on, so I compliment the Government on its approach to the matter.

Finally, I summarize by saying that we shall get a clean, efficient and modern fuel for use in South Australia, and this is going to be particularly important in Adelaide. I emphasize the clean aspect. It is only two or three years since we passed a Bill which was introduced, I think, by the previous Government and which referred to what is generally known as smog and the advent of smog over the Adelaide plains. I have been travelling over O'Halloran Hill on most Monday mornings for the last 10 years and have been amazed at how smog has developed in that time. The plain was clean and clear 10 years ago. However, now it is alarming to see the rate at which the smog is growing.

The authority appointed under the Act to which I have referred is watching the position. Up to date the smog has not got out of control, but it is getting worse every day, and something will have to be done. I consider that natural gas could be the complete answer to this, because it is a clean fuel, unlike coal in particular, and fuel oil. I consider that the Council should be enthusiastic about this Bill: no-one is more enthusiastic than I am and I ask honourable members to join me in giving the measure a speedy passage.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): For some time we have awaited this Bill with much interest because since gas was discovered at Gidgealpa and the field showed promise of being successful members of this Parliament have been interested in the part that gas will play in the future in South Australia. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has mentioned in some detail the value of the project to the State as a whole and, in particular, to the metropolitan area.

However, as wonderful as this discovery is, we must not accept entirely that this is the answer to all the financial problems in which the State has found itself in the last two years. It is, nevertheless, just as important that it should be developed to the fullest extent. Other States have large supplies of natural gas, some of which are near the centres of population, and because of that South Australia must have a similar advantage in order to maintain its position in competition with other States for industries. Although this gas may not be the answer to all our financial problems, it is even more important for this reason that we should have it here available at the cheapest cost at the earliest possible moment.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has spoken of the great advantages to the State and to industry in the metropolitan area. This advantage will, of course, extend beyond the metropolitan area through our network of power lines that transmit electricity through a large part of the State. However, as a member representing the northern part of the State, I cannot help but be aware of a wider interest in the use of natural gas than merely the metropolitan area. We have a source of power that will travel throughout the northern part of the State. I speak of that part of the State because I believe that to extend this pipeline much farther south than Adelaide would involve too great a cost to help the southern part of the State at this stage. There is also the possibility that at some future date the Otway sedimentary basin, which extends from Victoria along much of our south-eastern coastline, will prove to be successful. That is the reason why I mention the northern part of the State in particular.

I must commend the attitude taken in planning for this pipeline, to the degree that I believe the Government has been correct in tailoring the short-term proposal to the financial resources of the State and the present possibilities of the Gidgealpa field. It would have been perhaps indiscreet to launch into an overlarge programme until the future reserves were known. At present, of course, it is proposed to build a pipeline at a minimum cost to give a supply to the metropolitan area and at future intervals of time by means of loops and compressors to increase the capacity of the pipeline as the known reserves become larger and consumption increases,. Nevertheless, some pertinent points have been raised about this pipeline with reference to the northern part of the State.

The difference between the longer and the shorter routes from Gidgealpa to Adelaide is only about 30 miles. Insufficient information has been given to Parliament about the possibilities of further alternative routes. I do not suggest that the eventual route should be either of the routes suggested, but there could be an alternative route that would serve the northern part of the State even more successfully than either the eastern or the western route, so far discussed at some length. Any move that can supply gas to a larger area than the metropolitan area is a strong move towards real decentralization in South Australia. This point must be considered together with the financial advantages in the long-term planning for future development in this State. I understand from information given in another place that the Bechtel organization is conducting a further detailed survey of alternative routes to the eastern route. I am sorry the Government has not been able to give us full information on the complete Bechtel report. I am aware, of course, that it does contain some confidential information about users and business enterprises in the metropolitan area that could damage the organizations concerned if it became known to their competitors but, in this matter of assessing the costs of alternative routes for the pipeline in the north, it is something that could be made available to Parliament because it would be a straight-out comparison of costs.

I hope the Minister in his reply to this debate will be able to answer some of these queries. I should like to know whether full consideration has been given to and a full survey made of the costs of alternative routes from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, and whether the cost of gas supplied through suggested branch lines would compare competitively with the price of gas delivered to Adelaide which is farther from the source of supply. This last question is probably the most important as far as any decentralization of industry and help to the northern part of the State are concerned. However, if there is not some equality in the cost of gas supplied, the gas as such will not help much in the establishment of any new industry in that area. This is an important point upon which I should like information, whether consideration has been given to this whole project as an overall scheme or whether it has been given only to the pipeline to Adelaide, the branch lines to be added at extra cost. In the costing of gas in Adelaide, the figures often cited during the debate included a proposed 99.5c or thereabouts for the initial

supply, this decreasing with the use of more gas and possible future development. Has the Government considered the overall cost of a full pipeline scheme with a branch line to each point, or are these branch lines merely being considered as an auxiliary to be installed later, at extra cost?

The referring of this part of the Bill dealing with the route of the pipeline to the Public Works Committee was mentioned by both previous speakers in this Chamber. Although to some extent agreeing that this is an authority to be set up under similar terms to those of other authorities in the State without reference to the Public Works Committee, I believe we should have some detailed information on the very matters that have been brought forward. I would appreciate an undertaking from the Minister that in due course a report will be laid on the table detailing the difference in cost in relation to the various routes that could be taken from Gidgealpa to Adelaide so that members may have the opportunity of examining the matter. I believe this is the crux of the matter as far as the public and members of both Houses are concerned. We are all anxious to see the legislation in operation but it seems we are being denied full information on several points.

Honourable members are well aware of the manner in which the authority is to be set up and how the project is to be financed, but I want to refer to clause 10 (2), which clearly defined who is to be the controlling body. It reads:

> The authority shall not—
>
> (a) construct, reconstruct, install or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed any pipeline unless the route thereof has been approved by the Governor.

It is clear that the final decision on the route of the pipeline rests with the Governor in Executive Council. Therefore, as this matter will be decided by the Government, represented in this Chamber by the Minister, I hope he will make full information available to Parliament. I support the second reading.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to speak briefly in support of this Bill. All honourable members must be indebted to Sir Arthur Rymill for his lucid and comprehensive exposition in support of the Bill. I want to speak briefly because I am in favour of all possible developments of the natural resources of this State. South Australian's mineral resources have not yet proved to be great in comparison with those of some other parts of Australia. I, therefore, believe that the maximum potential should be extracted from all deposits in South Australia.

Although the full extent of the deposit of natural gas is not yet known, expert reports would appear to indicate that sufficient is available to make its immediate development economically desirable, especially when viewed against the background of existing payments away from South Australia for other varieties of fuel. We have the good of our State at heart and surely we must try to keep our money here as far as possible and not perpetually be at the mercy of other States in the matter of fuel.

All of the Australian States are in the process of rapid development, rapid increases in population, and rapid development in commercial activities, primary industry and in the development of mineral resources. At this time, when the race is to the swift, South Australia's development regrettably, as statistics show, has slowed down under the present administration and the Treasury seems to be getting low in funds. Once again private enterprise, supported in this case by a Commonwealth Loan, has had to produce another great forward step in the development of this State. Again we see that when a risk has to be taken for real progress or development it is private enterprise that initiates the operation, supports its development and sees that the job is done. At the same time we do not overlook the magnificent help being given in this operation by the Commonwealth Government. However, I say most emphatically that without private enterprise the present Government would have been completely unable to go ahead with this pipeline.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I pay a tribute in connection with the speeches that have been made on this Bill, especially that made by the Leader of the Opposition (the Hon. Mr. DeGaris) who I thought covered many aspects exceedingly well. Secondly, I pay a tribute to the excellent contribution this afternoon by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill. It could only have been delivered after much thought, investigation and time being spent upon it. I think the honourable member covered so many aspects of the matter that other speakers need not feel obliged to speak extensively on the Bill.

The history of South Australia has been one of great struggle, as far as development is concerned. We have not been as well endowed with natural resources as extensively as other States. From the commencement of our history

we have had to make our own way by going to extreme lengths and using the resources available to us. Without going back too far into our history, I think this kind of survey and discovery, and this energy in developing State resources, really had its first great impetus when Sir Thomas Playford came to the Treasury benches. We all know the terrific struggle he had with regard to the development of Leigh Creek coalfield and the opposition he encountered. He had many problems to overcome. We know today that that is why the coalfield is the cheapest source of power in South Australia. The fact that our industry has progressed, and the fact that we have moved from being first a primary-producing State to one where the economy is heavily geared to secondary industry, is due to the establishment of the Leigh Creek coalfield.

Whilst not in any way wishing to derogate from the work of the present Government with regard to getting this Bill before us, I think the truth is that the discovery of natural gas, and the encouragement of its discovery, started as far back as 1940. In that year Parliament, under the then Playford Government, passed the Mining (Petroleum) Bill. That was the Bill that really gave encouragement to people to go about the business of looking for oil and gas in South Australia. It was the Bill that gave power to a company to take up exploration leases over a wide area, and that Bill, it is rather interesting to note, was brought before Parliament at the time our present President (Sir Lyell McEwin) was Minister of Mines. The Bill set a pattern for that kind of discovery and provided the encouragement needed by people to go ahead with the search for oil and gas, to such an extent that it became virtually the standard Bill for this kind of enterprise for the whole of Australia.

I want to pay a tribute to the work done in connection with that Bill by the then Government Geologist, Dr. Ward. He worked on the Bill, advised the Government with regard to terms and conditions, and was a great officer as far as the Government was concerned. Much of what flowed from the original Bill was due to his unfailing energy and enterprise. As I said, following the passing of that Bill, it was possible for exploration for natural gas to proceed over a very large area. The effect was that it enabled oversea companies with extensive experience, and money available for investment, to become interested in this work of discovery by means of geophysical surveys. That was an advance in the methods used in connection with discoveries of natural gas. I think it is important to mention that the Playford Government at that time purchased two complete seismic plants to be engaged in this work at a cost of $1,000,000, so as long ago as 1940 the then Government was going about this business in a serious way. In 1940, $1,000,000 was not chicken feed in relation to the Budget.

It is interesting that, when we got the two seismic plants working, they were operating with a staff of between 60 and 90 people. I understand that the operating cost of those plants was about $6,000 a day, although I am subject to correction on that. These plants did seismic traverses right across the Great Artesian Basin, commencing in Queensland about 400 miles above the South Australian border. The Government of that time played a particular part in the expenditure and gave assistance by constructing access roads and, more important, by voting very large sums of money to the Mines Department to build up its strength so that it is probably one of our largest, most successful and best staffed departments now.

Following that, the Playford Government engaged a paleontologist of world class. In case honourable members are not better informed in these matters than I was when I looked into this, a paleontologist is an expert who looks at fossils, stones and other things and determines the age of a particular area. From this he can give some indication whether there is likely to be gas in the area. With the assistance of the paleontologist and by keeping an active team of Government geologists in the field, we were able to establish that there were possible supplies of gas in this particular area. I should like to mention particularly the work of Mr. Reg Sprigg, who was the Chief Government Geologist. He was enthusiastic about the possibilities of this field, and he never lost his enthusiasm. He subsequently left the Government and was employed by certain mining companies. I believe his work was of outstanding importance and that his name ought to be mentioned in relation to the development of this field.

Later, the Government employed Dr. Levison, who was one of the world's authorities on this subject. His encouragement played a great part in explorations in this area and in attracting oversea people to become interested in this work. At about that time the Government gave very favourable licences to Santos and the Delhi group of companies, so that at the time of the 1965 election (I hope everyone will appreciate this fact) the Gidgealpa field had been completely surveyed and proved, and two boring plants were in operation there. After

the elections there was a slackening of activity in further exploration for a period. I believe that since the 1965 election only two effective holes have been sunk, and they are on the Moomba field.

I have given the history because I want to pay a tribute to the people who have worked on this matter unceasingly over the years since 1940, and I want to place on record that all the hard preliminary work in connection with the discovery and opening up of these fields was done before this Government came into office. The Government had only to build on the excellent foundation that had already been established. I think it is only fair to say that some prodding and encouragement from the Opposition was necessary to ensure that this work was carried on. I do not want to go into this in detail, but I think everyone knows from press reports what was done by Sir Thomas Playford, who on August 3, 1966, in another place moved the following resolution:

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into and report upon what steps should be taken to expedite the construction of a gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide and matters incidental thereto.

I do not want to cover all that was said in that debate, but early in the history of the Government (on December 2, 1965) Sir Thomas Playford asked a question in another place. I think I am entitled to quote it, as it is in *Hansard* for the previous session. He asked:

Recently I had a rather lengthy discussion with the Premier of Victoria and I was agreeably surprised at the rapid progress being made on plans for the introduction of natural gas into Victoria. These plans are extremely well advanced and will undoubtedly be of great advantage to that State.. Can the Premier say whether he will take up with Cabinet the advisability of sending a Minister overseas, particularly to America (perhaps accompanied by an officer of the Electricity Trust) to get first-hand Ministerial knowledge of what is being done overseas so that the South Australian Government can be fully apprised of what can be done in this connection?

The Premier replied as follows:

When I returned from Alice Springs I said that there seemed to be a great potential for natural gas, not necessarily in this State but in the Northern Territory. I also indicated that we were awaiting a report from the Bechtel company that was expected to be submitted some time this month. As yet we have not received that report. Some discussion has taken place in Cabinet on the matter of an oversea visit but no finality has been reached. Now that the Leader has raised the matter it will probably be revived in Cabinet and further consideration given to it. When a decision is made I will advise the Leader.

From that reply one would not gather that there was any particular enthusiasm by the Government. However, that was followed by further prodding and encouragement by the then Leader of the Opposition, Sir Thomas Playford. Considerably more was done, and quite properly the Premier and the Minister of Mines went overseas to investigate this matter. I think that was a correct decision and, as a result of the visit and of the pressure placed on this Government to do something to develop and expand industry in this State, the Government got down to the job and presented us with this Bill.

I could say much more, but I do not intend to do so because it has been or will be covered by other speakers. The only other point I wish to raise is that in due course the Government may have to come back to Parliament and ask for certain amendments consequent on things that will happen when it proceeds further with its negotiations, either with regard to gas discovered at Gidgealpa or Moomba, with regard to the terms of finance that can be arranged, or with regard to the volume of consumption that can be expected in this State. If and when the legislation comes back to us, I think it can be assured of proper and faithful consideration.

I think this is one of the forward moves made in connection with industry in this State and that it is something that should not be unduly delayed. However, I emphasize that the only way in which the State can progress, and the only way it has progressed in the past, is by keeping its costs lower than those of its competitors. Consequently, it is very important that everything possible should be done to ensure that this gas is brought to Adelaide at the cheapest possible cost. Because of this, I believe that we are right in making this authority a Government instrumentality; we are doing this instead of leaving it entirely to private enterprise to build its own pipeline and bring its own gas down from the North.

I compliment all those concerned with the work that has been done, and I particularly compliment the Commonwealth Government on its coming to the party; obviously, without its assistance this Bill would not be before us today. I compliment those private organizations who have had to find $20,000,000 (which is not chicken feed and which cannot be found without some effort) and I sincerely hope that all our best anticipations will be realized, and that

it will usher in something that we badly need in this State, that is, a great encouragement to the attraction of further industries to the State.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): This Bill is of vital importance to every facet of South Australia's progress in the world of commerce and economics. Other members have made this point very well and I need not labour it. There are three things that make a town, city, State or nation grow. The first is water—and sufficient quantities of it. Secondly, power is necessary—and a sufficiency of it. Thirdly, the correct types of communication are necessary—communications for export and import, internal communications by rail and road. There three factors are basic if the area is to grow.

Adelaide, with its excellent deep-sea port is an example. It has excellent feeder systems of railways and roads; it has water and power. We all know about the development that has occurred in the suburbs over the years: more secondary industries have been established, more labour has been employed, and more materials have been exported and imported. In all this, the three basic factors have been utilized.

Other areas of the State, particularly the cities of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla on the shores of Spencer Gulf, have most of the attributes possessed by Adelaide. These cities have power, communcations (particularly by sea, so that the exports and imports of this area can be handled) and necessary supplies of water to maintain population growth so that industries can thrive.

It is well known that this gas pipeline from the North is designed primarily to supply power as cheaply as possible to the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I realize that the South Australian Gas Company will make full use of its share of the gas but the principal reason for this Bill and the initiative shown over several years is that a better and cheaper supply of power may be available for the Electricity Trust. When the Leigh Creek coalfield was discovered it was thought that it would be wiser to build a power station near the source of the coal, and so Port Augusta was selected as the site: the Sir Thomas Playford power station is there today. I understand that the Americans are adopting a similar principle, and I also understand that in New South Wales it is not uncommon for the buildings and apparatus necessary to generate electricity to be established close to the source of fuel.

Would it not be within the realms of possibility in the future for yet another power station to be constructed (after the Torrens Island power station has been built and has reached its maximum output) near Port Augusta thereby supplying power to the vast network of lines that the Electricity Trust is progressively putting up in the North of the State and on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill referred to the by-products of natural gas which are used by industry. Output of such by-products will provide an opportunity for an increase in the work force. Because of the geographic position of the major towns on the shores of Spencer Gulf, their population growth, and the industries already there, I ask the Minister to urge in Cabinet that this pipeline should come down on the western side of the Flinders Ranges so that it can in time serve not only Adelaide but also a large section of the State around Spencer Gulf. In this way, the Gulf towns will expand. Would it be detrimental if other cities in the State expanded, or must Adelaide be a giant octopus with all the power from Gidgealpa reaching that one city without concern for anyone else? With those remarks, I support the Bill; I believe that it is a Bill that will help to maintain the rate of progress in this State that has been attained in the past.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): Every member of this Council knows what the piping of natural gas will mean to this State. The average student can tell us of the uses and by-products of natural gas. Most of the points have been ably put by previous speakers. I can only say that the passing of this Bill will indeed have my blessing and I do not propose to speak upon it at length, except to make one reservation: I hope that the authority in its wisdom will give consideration to the best route for this pipeline. Much disappointment, dissatisfaction and argument have been voiced by people about the proposed route. They have been dissatisfied because no real costing has been done or because, if it has been done, it has not been made known to them. I hope that all aspects will be considered, especially decentralization, about which we hear so much only at election time. The additional cost of decentralization can hardly be taken into consideration fully in the $2,250,000, which is the cost of the additional 30 miles of pipeline for the longer route. That cost has been questioned by people competent to make such assessments and the correct amount may be much less.

As the Hon. Mr. Geddes pointed out, the city of Adelaide could double its size if natural gas were available to boost industries. Already

the city area has absorbed some of the richest country in the State. On the other hand, there is much cheap land available, particularly in areas adjacent to the western route of the proposed pipeline, that should be an inducement to industry. Water at depth is available at various points, and this is required by industry. I hope that the facts about the route of the pipeline will be made known to enable the public to assess the wisdom of the route chosen.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): It seems to me that previous speakers have completely overlooked the fact that this project is the prototype of one of the most interesting developments of the modern age. The authority set up will be concerned eventually with far more than Gidgealpa and Moomba and whether the pipeline runs east or west of the Flinders Ranges. Those matters are almost irrelevant to this discussion. Of course, the construction and working of pipelines in South Australia involves the Gidgealpa and Moomba gas discovery and the marketing of the gas in Adelaide, but those matters may be only of minor importance. The more heavily settled parts of the world are criss-crossed with pipelines that carry a huge variety of products in addition to oil, oil products and natural gas.

Although the non-profit making organization being set up by this Bill will be concerned immediately with operating a pipeline to bring gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, eventually it must operate to serve every part of the State in the same way as pipelines serve other parts of the world. I do not think that even the Government appreciates this. The second reading explanation shows a pre-occupation with Gidgealpa and the destination of the gas. It is important to consider the legislation as a foundation stone for the future development of an extremely important industry.

For instance, when we were considering bringing Nairne pyrites to Adelaide, a feasibility study was made about whether it would be cheaper to slurry the pyrites at Nairne and pump it to the railhead or to Adelaide than it would be to cart the pyrites by road to Adelaide and incur the heavy carting costs. In North America coal is being moved in large quantities by pipeline and practically any mineral product can now be transported in this way. I understand that in Tasmania a pipeline for the movement of minerals from the fields on the west coast to the shipping point is on the drawing boards.

Because this legislation will guide such future projects, Sir Thomas Playford has been insistent on placing the authority in the position of being a common carrier. We must lay down in unmistakable terms that the authority will be such a common carrier, because this will give the State an immeasurable advantage in future. It means that the producer of any of these materials capable of being carried by pipeline can go to the authority and say, "That material is there; it is your duty to carry it." Thus we are placing those people interested in production at an advantage. Without this, there is concern that the exploration for oil and gas that must go on in other parts of the State will be impeded.

It is terrifically important that we give this advantage to these people so that, rather than being restrained and slowing down their exploration for other possible deposits, they are encouraged to speed up their activity in the knowledge that their products can be marketed more easily than in any other State.

We have the assurance of the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill that clause 13, in fact, makes the authority a common carrier, but there are some defects there. The authority has power to refuse carriage if its pipelines are otherwise committed. These are reasonable restrictions to put in the clause, because naturally establishing a pipeline is a complicated business. There is not only the material available to be considered: there must be an available market, and the feasibility study must be gone through before a pipeline can be built and operated.

It is impossible for anything more than the broad outlines to be incorporated in a Bill of this nature. What is most important is the principle that this pipeline authority shall not only be concerned with the carriage of Moomba and Gidgealpa gas to Adelaide but shall also have the duty of extending its services as and when they are required in this State. This is an obvious need. At present we are talking of bringing gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide but we know very well that there are promising fields, probably on-shore and possibly off-shore in the South-East, as far as gas is concerned. We have also been told again and again by the geologists that probably the most promising of the basins that enter South Australia is the Eucla basin, which is big and has a depth of sediment that must conceal large amounts of gas, even if so far it has not been concentrated. It is rated as an area that should be explored as soon as possible. To

allow an authority to be formed with the duty only of conveying this one first small finding would not be doing a great service to the State.

I do not want to labour this point but, because of its vital importance, there are on the files before honourable members two amendments that possibly will not greatly affect the working of the Bill but they do unmistakably provide that any producer who has a product worthwhile and marketable under the Mining (Petroleum) Act will be able to go to the authority and be rated equally with the producers who at present have wells operating. It is most important that we make this provision unmistakable so that the public confidence will be there to sustain the exploration of other deposits.

My purpose is to make it clear to any disgruntled person who can read that this pipeline authority will not cease its functions when it has built a pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide and got it working. Undoubtedly, the conveyance of minerals other than gas is, under this legislation, beyond the duty of this authority, but it will be not at all difficult in the future, if the need arises, for its powers to be extended. It would be both silly and premature to attempt to write that into this legislation at present, but I make the plea that we incorporate the two amendments, which do not in any way alter the powers of the Bill but lay a further duty on the authority.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise at this late stage in the debate to support the Bill. In so doing, I will possibly underline what all other honourable members have said, both yesterday and today, on these matters. In my view, this is one of the most important, if not the most important, Bill to come before this Parliament in recent years. Sir Arthur Rymill said it could be the greatest event in South Australian history. That may not be an over-statement. At this stage, it is certainly not my intention to deal in any detail with the Bill. I have examined it but am aware that other honourable members have dealt with it in some detail, so I do not intend to refer to the clauses themselves.

I support the Bill and the Government in bringing it down. I applaud it for that but I do not forget the work of the previous Government, which really made this enterprise possible. I draw attention to the work of the Playford Government over many years. The Hon. Mr. Rowe mentioned it in some detail this afternoon. It goes back a long time, prior to the search for oil and natural gas, to the days when South Australia was in a difficult fuel position. We can all remember the restrictions upon enterprise and even domestic lighting as a result of the shortage of coal. We know the way in which the previous Government developed the Leigh Creek coalfield and put us in a position comparable with that of other States as regards fuel. Although previously we had suffered a great disadvantage in fuel, I believe the foresight of the previous Government in developing the Leigh Creek coal deposits and going ahead with the exploration that resulted in the discovery of natural gas at Gidgealpa in 1963, and the way it has been carried on by the present Government, are matters of vital importance to this State. I believe this matter is above Party politics, and I do not think anyone would be foolish enough to oppose or criticize very greatly the enterprise intended to be implemented by the Bill. The Minister of Mines, soon after coming to office, acknowledged that this matter was above Party politics, because he took Sir Thomas Playford with him on a visit to the exploration fields in the upper north of the State.

I support the Bill in general terms. I believe it is for the most part satisfactory. It is not ideal; nothing that is created with human hands ever is. If we wished to spend time criticizing it we could pick out portions that may be improved. Although I support the Bill wholeheartedly, I question the suggested route. Although the Minister has said that "whilst no final determination has been made on the precise route of the pipeline, it seems virtually certain that the most practicable route for the main pipeline will be the most direct one", I seek an assurance from the Minister that a proper investigation will be made by the authority and its officers before this matter is finally decided.

It seems to me that there is considerable argument for the alternative route (which the Hon. Mr. DeGaris mentioned earlier and which, incidentally, I mentioned on a previous occasion) and the possibility of bringing the pipeline down along the railway line which, as an honourable member said today, is already graded and which would present less problems from the point of view of transport. I ask the Minister for an assurance that the authority will have a careful look at this matter before a final decision is made. I am aware that the route, as the Hon. Mr. Kemp said, is probably not all-important, but I do believe it is important for the development not only of the city of Adelaide but of other industrial centres in South Australia.

The Hon. Mr. Geddes mentioned the northern towns in his district. I must say I am pleased to see that a loop is to be constructed to serve industry in the town of Angaston. I hope something might be done for the town of Wallaroo. I understand that some reference has been made to the production of nitrogenous fertilizers in that town. The amount of nitrogenous fertilizers used in South Australia at present is rather limited, and I wonder whether that really does provide much scope for further development in that area. However, I hope something can be done for the town of Wallaroo and its surroundings. I believe in this regard that a loop from a western route pipeline might be possible somewhat earlier than that from what is now considered to be the eastern or the most direct route. However, I am only bringing forward these suggestions as a layman and I hope the Minister will have a good look at them and that they will be carefully examined by experts before any final decision is made. I note from page 4 of Parliamentary Paper 102 that, with regard to the size of the pipeline, the following comment is made:

To meet fully the prospective market for gas as a fuel only, as it seems likely to develop over the next 20 years, would call for a 22in. pipeline in the first instance, followed by looping with a second 22in. pipeline commencing after eight years. Our present problem, however, is to tailor our programme . . . having the maximum of flexibility to provide subsequently facilities to supply additional quantities of gas within potential demands, as those additional reserves may be established.

It goes on to say that initial construction of an 18in. pipeline from the field to Adelaide is contemplated. Later on, at the bottom of the page, the following comment is made:

To proceed as contemplated would, in the event of the establishing of much greater reserves, be rather less economical than if larger pipelines were provided in the first instance, based upon the probabilities of demand rather than the limitations of progressively established reserves.

I am sorry that it is probable that there will only be an 18in. pipeline. I know that this is not actually part of the Bill, but it is certainly part of the enterprise and I had hoped it would be possible to erect a 22in. pipeline. I consider that an 18in. pipeline may well be overtaxed almost from the commencement, and it may be necessary that much earlier to provide a second pipeline. Therefore, it may not be a great saving in the long run.

I do not wish to delay the Council any longer over this matter. I have mentioned one or two things that I believe can be improved. I endorse some of the comments at least of the Hon. Mr. Kemp regarding the authority being a common carrier, and I trust that clause 13 makes the position perfectly clear. As far as I can see, it would be so. Without any further ado, and with commendation to the Government for bringing down this Bill, following upon the spadework that was done, I support the second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines): I appreciate the fact that honourable members have given so much attention to this Bill; they have stated that they appreciate the importance of the venture itself and the importance of the pipeline to the State, and therefore support the Bill. They have indicated their desire that the Bill be debated fully and passed so that the various provisions can become effective. Some of these provisions, such as those in respect of the raising of capital to build the pipeline, are important in the setting up of the authority, and I am pleased that honourable members appreciate the position in this regard.

Certain comments have been made and certain queries raised, perhaps the most important relating to the proposed route of the pipeline. Deputations have waited on me about whether the line should be built on the eastern or the western side of the range. I say quite frankly that at the moment the eastern side of the range is favoured, because of circumstances, and because it is the direct route to the metropolitan area. After all, the metropolitan area will be the principal user of natural gas and it is imperative that it be brought to that area as cheaply as possible. That will be the location of the primary users of the gas in the initial stages of the development and the cheaper the gas is at the delivery point the less reason there will be for increasing charges as far as the Electricity Trust is concerned. It is interesting to note that every two cents increase in the cost of providing the gas adds approximately $1,000,000 a year to the department as far as maintenance is concerned. That is remarkable, but true.

Considerable investigation has been made into this matter of natural gas and I appreciate the comments of honourable members when outlining the history of the natural gas field. It is realized that when the inauguration of the Gidgealpa field took place it was the only natural gas field in the State. Inquiries continued around that field because it was realized that insufficient reserves were available there.

It was not then known whether it would be economical to construct the pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. I appreciate the fact that this matter was under investigation by the previous Government.

It was suggested to the previous Government that South Australia should have its own pipeline engineer. Whether or not serious consideration was given to this suggestion by that Government I do not know, but the appointment of such an engineer was not made until this Government came into power. I made the appointment of the successful applicant, who was sent overseas to gain all the experience possible about a natural gas pipeline. He spent some time with a world-renowned authority, the Bechtel Pacific Corporation, in order to gain field experience, and now we have our own pipeline engineer.

Figures mentioned have emanated from an investigation of the two suggested routes conducted by our own department and pipeline engineer. Representations have been made to me regarding the western route. A deputation from Port Augusta waited on me. It comprised Chamber of Commerce representatives and other interested people. It suggested that the pipeline should follow a route along the western side of the range, the line taken to Port Augusta, with the power stations there being converted to the use of natural gas. It also suggested that the Leigh Creek coal deposits be placed in cold storage until needed some time in the future.

I pointed out that I and my colleagues would not accept that suggestion. First, the old power station at Port Augusta could not be economically converted to the use of natural gas because it is reaching the stage where it is outliving its usefulness. It will not be many years before it will have to be replaced. The second station at Port Augusta (I understand it is known as the Playford power station) has compared the cost of Leigh Creek coal at Port Augusta with the cost of natural gas there. Because Leigh Creek coal is far cheaper, and because the cost of converting that No. 2 power station will not justify the use of natural gas, conversion cannot be considered.

When overseas visiting various countries I inspected power stations, many of which used natural gas. In some countries power stations were operated by four men on shift work controlling a panel and pushing buttons. These shift workers were engaged 24 hours a day for seven days a week. These huge power stations were so large that each of them could place our own power stations in one corner. I think there would be about 250 employees at Port Augusta. If those stations were converted to the use of natural gas, what would become of those people? Where would they obtain work? Would they be simply thrown on to the scrap heap? Likewise, if the Leigh Creek field should be closed down and held in reserve, all employees and their families would be thrown out of work. The suggestion was to close down the Leigh Creek field and allow it to remain idle to be used at some time in the future, or in an emergency, if required.

When I pointed out those facts the deputation saw the fallacy of its suggestion and did not pursue that angle. Later, the deputation made a further proposal that the Government should look 15 years ahead. The suggestion was that natural gas be brought down the western side of the range and into Port Augusta, which meant that in 15 years' time industry would go to Port Augusta.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Where did the deputation come from?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It represented the Port Augusta council, Port Augusta Chamber of Commerce, the council engineer (Mr. Green), and Mr. Sprigg, from Geosurveys. I also met a deputation at Port Pirie. It comprised these people and also representatives from the Port Pirie council and Chamber of Commerce, a representative from the Wallaroo Chamber of Commerce, a representative from Broken Hill Associated Smelters and another from the trades unions. I point out a survey has shown that not one of the three places mentioned wanted a supply of natural gas.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Not even the B.H.A.S.?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No, nor the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla. The latter company stated that at some future time it might require supplies of natural gas but, if so, it would let us know. In spite of that lack of demand for natural gas, a proposition has now been put forward from Port Augusta that the line go to Port Augusta and no further. It has been suggested that the gas be frozen, liquefied and then exported to Japan. What a great advantage that would be to South Australia! Here is a State desperately short of fuel of any kind, yet that is the kind of suggestion made to the Government! All we have is natural gas. All other fuel must be imported. If a major conflict occurred overseas and supplies of fuel were cut off, how long would it be before industrial activities came to a

stop? Natural gas is valuable in the advancement of all industries in this State, yet it has been put to me that the pipeline should go to Port Augusta so that the gas could be treated there and exported, thereby creating work in Port Augusta. Decent-sized ships cannot enter Port Augusta because of insufficient depth of water. How are we to accomplish all this? How ridiculous it would be for the present Labor Government, or a future Government, to utilize these resources in this way. I stress that no finality has been reached. I have been asked to give an assurance that a survey will be made of alternative routes.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: It does not concern the Government: it concerns the authority.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Does it? I suggest that the honourable member read the Bill. He will then ascertain whether the authority has full power to determine the route.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It concerns both.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Exactly. I have been asked to have a survey made of alternative routes. I can inform the Council that this survey is being made now. We have not yet received the answers from the Bechtel Pacific Corporation which is making the survey. We hope it will provide the answers concerning the relative costs of the suggested routes. At present we believe that it would cost an extra $2,500,000 initially to bring the pipeline down on the western side of the range and take it through Port Augusta and Port Pirie to Adelaide. This would result in the cost of deliverability of gas to the metropolitan area being increased. It would also mean that an additional $2,500,000 would have to be raised, interest would have to be paid on it, and the capital sum would have to be repaid. Also, there would be the cost of floating the loan. All these factors would add to the cost of the deliverability of gas to the metropolitan area. It is vital to this State's welfare that we deliver gas in that area at the cheapest possible rate. These matters have all been considered by the Government.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill went thoroughly into the matter and mentioned ways in which natural gas could be used. He referred to certain by-products. I could name several. A synthetic cloth is being manufactured from natural gas overseas at present. I have watched the weaving of this cloth; one would not realize that it had been manufactured from natural gas.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: We are not short of wool, are we?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am not suggesting that. I am naming industrial uses of natural gas. I am a stickler for supporting established local industries. Another example is that of synthetic rubber. I defy anyone except an expert to pick the difference between natural rubber and synthetic rubber; motor tyres are manufactured from synthetic rubber. The development of uses of natural gas and its by-products is still in its infancy. This brings me to the question of the new industry proposed to be established at Wallaroo. The Government cannot obtain from the company concerned a final decision as to whether it intends to establish an industry (which relies on natural gas) at Wallaroo. The company has been assured that, if it is prepared to establish an industry in that town (it has bought the land), it will be supplied with natural gas.

I shall now refer to a query by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. The Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie asked whether I could give an assurance that, if at some future time there was a demand for natural gas in Port Pirie and a branch line was taken there, the cost of the gas there would be the same as the cost in the metropolitan area. I could not give that assurance: it was not for me to do so. I could not visualize that there would be a significant increase in the cost of transportation. The matter of the final cost of the gas is in the hands of the producing company, not the Government. Such final cost depends upon negotiation between the producing company and the prospective consumer; an agreement must be reached between them in the same way as an agreement was reached between the producing company and the South Australian Gas Company. Any difference between the cost of the gas in the metropolitan area and the cost at Port Pirie would be infinitesimal; the Government would have to consider the matter.

I shall now refer to the question of whether clause 13 provides for the pipeline being a common carrier. There is only one point in connection with the use of that term: if the pipeline in use at the time was full it would not be practicable to put any more gas into it. Therefore, a producing company at that stage could be refused permission to put gas into the pipeline. This would be a genuine reason. I cannot see that it would ever eventuate, because before we reached the stage

when the pipeline was full it would have been duplicated. So the position concerning the pipeline being a common carrier is adequately safeguarded in the Bill. I hope I have answered the queries raised and I thank members for their attention to the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

After subclause (2) to insert the following subclause:

(3) if an application by or on behalf of a body corporate that is the holder of an oil mining licence or a petroleum production licence granted under any Act is made to the Minister of Mines that he make a recommendation to the Governor that the body corporate be declared to be a producer company for the purposes of this Act, and that application is refused by that Minister or not granted by him within two months after the application is received by him, the Minister of Mines shall make a report of that fact to the Governor and cause a copy of that report to be tabled in each House of Parliament.

The amendment guarantees that any future producer will be considered if he has gas available to be placed in the pipeline. It is an attestment and guarantee to the many holders of exploration leases that they will receive consideration if they make a discovery. I move the amendment with some diffidence because it is in the same form as an amendment moved by Sir Thomas Playford in another place. If it is carried, it will not alter the Bill materially. However, nothing would give more confidence to the competitive exploration companies than a clear statement such as this.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I oppose the amendment. The honourable member's statement that it does nothing more than induce industry to look for gas is not correct. The best way in which to induce companies to search is to ensure that the product from any discoveries they make will be transported to a ready market. It has been necessary to define a producer company. At present, we have two such companies, Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited and Santos Limited, and these companies are entitled to nominate two representatives on the authority. However, the amendment would give to a non-producer company that may be exploring an immediate voice in the selection of the producer company representatives on the authority.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: No.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The amendment requires the Minister to report to Parliament whenever he refuses an application by the holder of an oil mining licence or a petroleum production licence that he recommend the proclamation of the applicant as a producer company. The only reason for proclaiming a producer company would be to enable the nomination of the two representatives on the authority. A company does not need to be proclaimed a producer company to be entitled to use the pipeline in terms of clause 13 (*a*). Any person, including a company who is the holder of an oil mining licence or a petroleum production licence, is entitled to use of the pipeline so long as there is space available in the pipeline. The Hon. Mr. Kemp's amendment is not understood, because the argument that the honourable member has advanced is adequately covered in the Bill. I hope that the Committee will not carry the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I appreciate the motives behind the amendment but I agree with the Minister that it is somewhat unworkable. Clause 13 lays down clearly that the authority will be in the category of a common carrier to carry natural gas or any derivatives of that kind. The only reference in the Bill to producer companies is in the interpretation, and the producer companies are defined as Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited and Santos Limited.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Authority to convey natural gas in certain cases."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "to the extent that it is not precluded from doing so by reason of any" and insert "with due regard to".

The matter of refusal of use of the pipeline if it is completely occupied arises in the clause as it stands. If a pipeline is properly managed, there is always reserve capacity. Provision regarding the load to be carried and the machinery required is made years ahead, and an example of this is to be found in regard to electricity. It is unlikely that a pipeline would be unable to contain additional gas.

This amendment, which does not alter the spirit or sense of the clause, cuts out unnecessary words. It clarifies the position that it will be the job of the pipeline authority to carry whatever it is offered. It makes no profound alterations but substitutes four words for a number of words that give rise to ambiguity. I cannot help but think it improves the clause.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not understand what the amendment is intended to do. The honourable member says this is a safeguard for the common carrier and that on rare occasions if the pipeline is full we ought to do something about it. If the pipeline was full there would be nothing practical that we could do about it. No Government would allow itself to reach the stage where it would have a pipeline full so that nothing else could be put into it. Before that stage was reached (which would be years hence) the Government would appreciate that within a given period it would need to duplicate the pipeline to meet the extra demand. The clause does exactly what the honourable member is trying to do by his amendment. I hope the Committee will not accept it.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Again, I understand clearly from the explanation of the Hon. Mr. Kemp the motive behind this amendment but, with all respect to him, it seems to me that the present wording of the Bill carries out his intention better than the words he wishes to substitute. The Hon. Mr. Potter nods his head in agreement. "The authority shall, to the extent that it is not precluded from doing so" is an absolute obligation on the authority at the moment, whereas, if it has only to "have due regard to", it has not the same obligation. The authority would have a complete discretion in itself to reject or accept the gas, whereas at the moment it has no discretion at all: unless entirely precluded from accepting, it has to accept the gas. It is far better to leave the clause as it is.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (13 to 19) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.48 *to* 7.45 *p.m.*]

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DIVIDENDS).

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to protect the Treasurer and the Dividends Adjustment Account (which is maintained in the Treasury and made up of the fractions referred to in sections 28 and 31n of the principal Act) from the operations of persons who attempt to exploit the money-back guarantee given in those sections. Similar guarantees have been the subject of totalizator manipulation by exploiters operating in the Eastern States.

The effect of this Bill is that, on and after the appointed day, totalizator dividends to which the guarantee applies must be calculated in accordance with rules approved by the Chief Secretary. Experience in the other States has shown that it is essential that such rules should be capable of swift amending action, and for this reason it is not intended that the actual method of dividend calculation should be dealt with in the legislation.

Paragraph (*a*) of clause 3 inserts in section 28 of the principal Act a new subsection (4a) which provides that, on and after the appointed day, all dividends payable by a totalizator used by a club (whether the Totalizator Agency Board is also using the same totalizator or not) shall be calculated in accordance with rules made or adopted by the club and approved by the Chief Secretary. At present there is nothing in the Act or in the regulations prescribing the method of dividend calculation, although practically all licensed clubs operate their totalizators under the same rules as have been promulgated by the South Australian Jockey Club. Paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of clause 3 provide in effect that on and after the appointed day the money-back guarantee will apply only to dividends payable by any totalizator used by a club and calculated in accordance with rules approved by the Chief Secretary.

Clause 4 extends the money-back guarantee principle to dividends payable by an off-course totalizator conducted by the board where those dividends are calculated in accordance with rules made by the board with the Minister's approval in pursuance of its powers under paragraph (*c*) of section 31u. On the passing of this Bill the necessary rules will be made and approved. The totalizator manipulations to which I have referred had been directed at place dividends on totalizators, and members will be interested to know that under the legislation in Victoria, on which most Australian T.A.B. legislation is based, a system has been adopted whereby the dividends on placed horses are calculated from equal sharing by the placed horses of the net amount of money in the place totalizator pool, after the deduction of the commission, but where a share of the pool is insufficient to enable at least 50c to be paid as the dividend on a placed horse, its share is increased from the rest of the pool sufficiently to pay 50c as that dividend.

The South Australian Totalizator Agency Board has proposed a rule that in a three-dividend race the commission is first deducted from the pool, then the stake invested on each

placed horse is deducted, and the balance divided into three equal parts, one part being apportioned to each placed horse. Each part is then divided by the number of tickets sold on the appropriate placed horse, and the resulting amount, with the respective stake money, is paid as the dividend for that placed horse. Both these proposals protect the totalizator against manipulation, and either would be acceptable to the Government. Racing and trotting officials have presented alternative proposals and these are being examined.

Honourable members will know that an announcement has been made that the Totalizator Agency Board will commence operations on March 29, 1967. This date then becomes the "appointed day" for the purpose of the 1966 amendment which introduces the guarantee of return of stake money. I do not think there is anything contentious in the Bill, and I ask that it be given speedy passage so that rules may be made and promulgated by all racing and trotting clubs prior to the appointed day. I draw honourable members' attention to the time element involved, and it would be appreciated if the Bill could be dealt with as quickly as possible.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill has been found necessary because of the operations of certain people in the Eastern States who have exploited the minimum guarantee dividend on investment in the totalizator. This minimum dividend allows these operators to invest very large sums of money and so inflate the dividend payable on other horses, and with this money back guarantee on the odds-on favourite a certain profit can be obtained. I think all members will have followed the reports of the activities of these manipulators in the Eastern States.

This Bill overcomes that difficulty. As I understand it, all dividends payable by the totalizator shall be paid subject to certain rules to be adopted by the various clubs. Perhaps the Hon. the Chief Secretary will correct me if I am wrong, but it is my understanding that these rules must be approved by the Chief Secretary. I believe that practically all the clubs have the same rules.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They follow the S.A.J.C. rules.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think there are one or two clubs which do not have exactly the same rules as the others. Therefore, I think it is necessary to have the rules of these clubs altered before the appointed day of March 29. Of course, the rules will need the approval of the Chief Secretary. Clause 3 (*a*) inserts a new subsection (4*a*) in section 28 of the principal Act. This is somewhat difficult to follow, because the amending Act was passed only in this present session. New subsection (4*a*) states:

Notwithstanding any law, rule or practice relating to any totalizator used by a club, every dividend payable by a totalizator used by a club on or after the appointed day shall be calculated in accordance with rules of the club made or adopted by the club and approved by the Chief Secretary.

Paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of clause 3 provide in effect that on and after the appointed day the money-back guarantee will apply only to dividends payable by any totalizator used by a club and calculated in accordance with those rules. Although I had some difficulty following this, I believe the alterations in these paragraphs provide for that. Clause 4 contains a similar provision, except that one paragraph applies to on-course totalizators and the other applies to off-course totalizators. In his second reading explanation, the Chief Secretary said:

On the passing of this Bill the necessary rules will be made and approved. The totalizator manipulations to which I have referred had been directed at place dividends on totalizators, and members will be interested to know that under the legislation in Victoria . . . a system has been adopted whereby the dividends on placed horses are calculated from equal sharing by the placed horses . . .

We have in this Chamber at the moment no knowledge of any particular system that the Chief Secretary may approve. He has told us that dividends on placed horses would be worked out on an equal sharing basis, and that after the deduction of the commission (which I think is 14 per cent) the net amount would then be made available to the three placed horses. The one paying less than 50c is paid up to 50c and the other two share a somewhat smaller dividend. That is one plan to which the Chief Secretary has referred in his second reading explanation. The second system seems fairer. It stipulates that the stake invested on each placed horse is first removed and the balance is divided between the three placed horses in relation to the number of tickets taken out on each horse. Both systems protect the totalizator from the exploitation or manipulation seen in the eastern States.

I have no wish to delay this legislation. It has come in quickly and I have had a quick look at it. The Chief Secretary has said that he does not think the Bill contains anything contentious. I would not be sure of that; I notice that the Hon. Sir Norman Jude is not

in the Chamber at present, but I expect him to return shortly. From my memory of the amending Bill passed earlier in the session, the matter of fractions was raised. I cannot recall the section concerned, but such fractions are paid down to the nearest 5c. When that debate was taking place it was suggested that the amount of the fractions could grow into a considerable sum and that the fractions should be made up or down to the nearest 5c. It appears possible that the sum established for that purpose may not be drawn upon at all, and it may be that the question of fractions will have to be examined in relation to this legislation.

At present it appears that once again the punter will be expected to bear the brunt of this equalization, if I may use such a word, or the guarantee that the totalizator cannot be manipulated.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He may be bearing the brunt of the totalizator dividend.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, bearing it on the fractions payable. While I do not wish to delay the Bill because of its urgency and the need to protect the totalizator system from manipulation, I suggest any system of which the Chief Secretary approves should be examined at some later stage by this Chamber in order to consider the matter of fractions. It may then be possible to return to the punter something that has been taken from him by fractions. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): This evening I have been forced into the unfortunate position of speaking on a Bill the contents of which do not satisfy me. The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation was given after the dinner adjournment, though the Bill was on the Notice Paper and there was nothing to prevent him giving the explanation earlier this afternoon. That would have given me an opportunity to consult knowledgeable people on this matter. I hope that he can offer an explanation of the course adopted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will hang your head in shame when I do.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The Minister will have his opportunity. I have been forced to reply to this Bill at virtually an hour's notice. I have consulted one knowledgeable person concerning it, and I plan to consult another person who is now returning from Melbourne. This Bill was on the Notice Paper this afternoon. Apparently the Chief Secretary is satisfied that he can bulldoze it through at any time he likes. I want to tell honourable members that the whole object in bringing on this Bill tonight was that I would move that it be further adjourned so that the story could be spread that we delay matters in this Council. The Chief Secretary often talks about his honesty of purpose.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must not pass a reflection.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I withdraw. The Chief Secretary knows the point that I am making; he had no need to bring the Bill on this evening because he could have given his second reading explanation this afternoon. I admit that there may have been reasons for his course of action, but it would have taken only five minutes to give his explanation. To be fair to the Minister, I must say that he did me the courtesy of letting me see it just before the dinner adjournment and I did my best to study it.

There are no remarks available that were made about this measure in another place because it passed through there so quickly. Apparently, everybody feels because there is an appointed day, everybody must rush around and accept that as an excuse for not giving the Bill proper consideration. I believe that this is another alliance between a body and the Government against what might be termed the small bettor. If this is not so, I would be interested to hear the Chief Secretary, who represents the Minister in charge of the Lottery and Gaming Act, explain the matter this evening.

Is this not an arrangement whereby, if there is any loss, it will affect the people who bet for a place on a horse where the dividend is less than 50c? If he can explain that I might be prepared to go ahead and say, "We shall accept this assurance," but if he cannot do so I believe that in all fairness we should wait until tomorrow when we can obtain more information as to whether once again a certain group (it might be a minority) is being exploited. What is this scheme that is to be adopted?

The explanation specifically says that in the past the South Australian Jockey Club has promulgated rules that practically all licensed clubs operate under. This explanation makes no suggestion that that club shall promulgate new rules to suit this measure. It says that the odds shall be calculated in accordance with rules made or adopted by the club. Which club is meant? Is it the South Australian Jockey Club, the Gawler Jockey Club, or some

other club? Will there be a different set of rules for the Mount Gambier Club from those for the South Australian Jockey Club because the club may object? The Chief Secretary, not Parliament, will decide suitable rules.

Before the Chief Secretary asks me am I not in favour of protecting the Government against coups that may be made by, shall we say, sharp-minded people, I say that I am against such schemes. However, I remind honourable members that this has come about only because we got away from the ordinary laws of wagering. If the pool is not big enough to pay the dividend and if it is decided to give an honorarium based on stake return to the unfortunate punter who wagered at odds of 10 to 9 on instead of at even money, some bright person is going to work out how to defeat the system and collect a dividend.

In the past it has been arranged that, in *bona fide* betting, the stake, as a sort of honorarium or bonus, shall be made up to the unfortunate punter who it seemed would lose his money because of the tax. The fractions taken by the Government were used to make this payment to the punter. Although I have not the figure with me, it is easy to check the amount of unclaimed dividends which go to Government revenue every year. I have spoken about that matter on many occasions over the years. This is always a windfall to the Government. I am not against a protection scheme against coups, but surely the Council is entitled to know what the scheme is.

As I see it (and I am speaking subject to correction) whereas at present the man who backs a winner gets a dividend of 65c and the other man who backs the second or third horse gets a dividend of 45c, the man who backs the winner will have his dividend reduced from 65c to 60c. We should like to know from the Chief Secretary whether that is so. However, he does not know, because he has said that the rules have not been made. He expects honourable members to accept that sort of arrangement at short notice. If he had given us time in which to examine the matter, we could have given our views. However, we are expected to take a pig in a poke.

I have not gone into the verbiage of the Bill, but the object is to protect T.A.B. and the Government against a coup. In the case of the small man, there is no reason why the Government should not make the payment from the fractions to which I have referred. One of my knowledgeable friends (and the Chief Secretary is aware of this) told me that the punter was going to pay it, as far as he could see.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He always pays.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It is all right for the Chief Secretary to say, with a grin on his face, that the punter pays the additional touch.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did not say that. I said that the punter paid every time.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: He pays the fractions all the time and it seems that the Government also collects anything he forgets to collect.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your Party did it for 30 years and loved it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I have a thought for the little man.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You never showed it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I hope the Chief Secretary is enjoying this. I have plenty of time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: So have I.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am surprised that that is so. The Chief Secretary was in a great hurry to have the Bill passed tonight. If the Chief Secretary's further explanation is not satisfactory, I hope that honourable members will see the point of my having asked him to report progress at that stage.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): In replying to the second reading debate, let me say that during the sessions of Parliament I think I have been most tolerant of all honourable members' wishes. I have rarely asked (and this would be the one occasion I have asked) for a Bill to go through rather speedily. It is not that it interests me so much for it to go through quickly, because there is much work to be done between now and the appointed day; I am more concerned about the staff that has to handle the Bill than I am about the Executive Council. If this Bill is passed, we must get on with the job. I take strong exception to the Hon. Sir Norman Jude's remarks. We discussed this matter this afternoon and I gave the honourable member a copy of the second reading speech at about 4.30 p.m.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: To what remarks do you take exception? I thought the honourable member was moderate.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It can be read in *Hansard* tomorrow. He said he did not have it until after dinner.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I do not think that is correct.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My remark was that I gave due credit to the Hon. Mr. Shard for being courteous and showing me the second reading explanation before dinner. The honourable member said it was after dinner.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Hon. Sir Norman Jude is correct, but he said the second reading explanation had only been given "in the last hours".

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He said "an hour for consideration".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and when he spoke he had had four and a half hours to consider it; he had already read the Bill and we had discussed it. He said it at the end of his speech: I am not sure what he said at the beginning. All the thanks I received for trying to be helpful was a belting around the tail.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You are being precipitate with this Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but I rarely ask that this be done. The Bill does two things: it includes a clause that attempts to prevent a coup, as happened in New South Wales, and save the Government money, and, secondly, it gives power for the Chief Secretary to agree to certain rules dealing with the manner in which totalizator odds shall be paid. How it is to be paid or whence it should be made up are not provided for in the Bill. It is a flexible Bill. No-one knows from week to week whether the preventive measures in New South Wales are foolproof, and no-one knows whether this legislation will be foolproof. The Bill was drafted after consulting our advisers. I attend race meetings and know the difficulty, and anything that I sign will have to be fair, because I shall not see the punter who bets on the totalizator suffer any disadvantage. Honourable members can do one of two things tonight. They can accept the Bill as it is so that coups will be prevented, because permission will be given to the Chief Secretary to decide how the dividend should be paid. However, if the Bill is not accepted, no protection exists.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You mean the Government has no protection?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Of course it has not, and it should have the right to protect its money.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Not at the expense of someone else.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is how the honourable member is thinking at present, because rules have not been made and cannot be made until the Bill is passed. I can assure honourable members that I will have to be satisfied before I sign anything. I may sign after being directed by Cabinet, but everything will be closely scrutinized. People, particularly small punters, are entitled to receive the correct dividend the totalizator shows and not have something taken off to pay someone else. I tried to make that point this afternoon. I ask honourable members to accept the Bill to allow those concerned to get on with it and take care of the finances of the State.

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

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SENIOR CONSTABLES).

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with two matters. In making provisions for supplementary pensions it is parallel with the comparable clauses in the Bill to amend the Superannuation Act. It also makes provision to authorize the contribution for rather higher pensions for senior constables than for the general grade of constables, whereas both of these grades are at present on the same level. There are no provisions in this Bill parallel with the reduced contributions clauses which are incorporated in the Superannuation Bill, for the reason that contributions were appropriately and fully adjusted in the Police Pensions Act Amendment Act, 1966.

Clauses 4 and 5 of the Bill make provision for senior constables of all grades to contribute for benefits 12½ per cent higher than the benefit prescribed for constables generally. Provisions at the present time place constables and senior constables on the same basis of contributions and benefit, and the Police Association has now requested this differentiation. At present police sergeants are upon a basis of contributions and benefits 25 per cent higher than for constables, and the Government agrees that it is reasonable, having regard

to relative salary scales, to place senior constables in a position midway between those for constables and sergeants. Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 8 makes provision for supplementary pensions upon a basis comparable with the provisions proposed in the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill. The latter provisions apply to most other Government employees apart from police officers. The amount to be transferred for these purposes in accordance with subsection (2) of new section 42a from the present surplus in the fund is only $100,000, as the number of pensioners expected to qualify for benefit is relatively very much smaller than that expected to qualify under the corresponding amendments to the Superannuation Act. This arises mainly because a very high proportion of police pensioners receive pensions to such an extent that they qualify for part Commonwealth social service pensions and therefore, in accordance with the present "means test", would not ordinarily receive a net benefit from the grant of supplementary pensions.

Subsection (8) of new section 42a provides that supplementary pensions may be granted to an extent not exceeding one-fifteenth of the existing rates of pension provided that the pension concerned commenced before November 21, 1964. The reason for this limited increase is that successive increases in pensions have been authorized prior to and upon that date which have effectively maintained their purchasing power until very recently. After the establishment of new scales for retired members in the 1954 Act there were increases of 21½ per cent in the 1957 amendment, 12½ per cent in the 1960 amendment, and 7½ per cent in the 1964 amendment. For widows' pensions the increases provided were greater, raising them eventually from 50 per cent to 65 per cent of members' pensions. A further increase of one-fifteenth, or 6⅔ per cent for pensions commenced before November 21, 1964, will provide against subsequent price variations by placing all pensions which commenced prior to the recent 1966 amendments upon very closely comparable scales. A table has been prepared showing basic rates of police pensions, including widows' pensions, operative from time to time and proposed under the amendments. These exclude the lump sum payments prescribed under the Act. I request that this table be incorporated in *Hansard* for the information of Members without the necessity of my reading it.

Leave granted.

POLICE PENSIONS.
(Lump sum payments excluded.)

TIME OF COMMENCEMENT OF PENSION.

	To 1957.	1957-1960.	1960-1964.	1964-1966.	1966. +
Basic member's rate—					
1954 Act	£364 p.a.				
1957 Act (21½ per cent increase)	£442 p.a.	£420 p.a.			
1960 Act (12½ per cent increase)	£497 p.a.	£472 p.a.	£480 p.a.		
1964 Act (7½ per cent increase)	£534 p.a.	£507 p.a.	£516 p.a.	£570 p.a.	
1966 Act	$41.08 p.f.	$39.00 p.f.	$39.69 p.f.	$43.85 p.f.	$48.00 p.f.
1967 Act (1/15th increase)	$43.82 p.f.	$41.60 p.f.	$42.33 p.f.	$43.85 p.f.	$48.00 p.f.
Basic widow's rate—					
1954 Act	£182 p.a.				
1957 Act (21½ per cent increase)	£221 p.a.	£210 p.a.			
1960 Act (12½ per cent increase)	£249 p.a.	£236 p.a.	£240 p.a.		
1964 Act (29 per cent increase)	£321 p.a.	£304 p.a.	£310 p.a.	£342 p.a.	
1966 Act (1/12th increase)	$26.75 p.f.	$25.33 p.f.	$25.83 p.f.	$28.50 p.f.	$31.20 p.f.
1967 Act (1/15th increase)	$28.53 p.f.	$27.02 p.f.	$27.55 p.f.	$28.50 p.f.	$31.20 p.f.

NOTE.—p.f. means per fortnight.
p.a. means per annum.
Higher pensions to the extent prescribed are payable to members retiring with rank above that of constable, and to their widows.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The amendments have the general concurrence and support of the Police Association and of the Police Commissioned Officers, and I commend them to the favourable consideration of the House. The only other amendment is made by clause 7 which corrects a typographical error in the 1966 Act.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from March 14. Page 3620.)

Clause 42—"Plans of subdivision of land in prescribed localitites within Metropolitan Planning Area."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not wish to go on with the amendment I have on the files in relation to this clause.

Clause passed.

Clauses 43 to 46 passed.

Clause 47—"Registrar-General may refuse to register dealing unless appropriate plan deposited or approved."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

At the end of the clause to insert the following words: "; but, nothwithstanding that such a plan of re-subdivision has not been so approved, he may, subject to the directions, if any, of the Minister, accept for registration any instrument purporting to convey any land to or from the Crown, whether in right of the Commonwealth or in the right of the State or to or from any person who, in his opinion, is an agent or instrumentality of the Crown, whether in right of the Commonwealth or in right of the State".

One of the dangers that we have tried to prevent in this town planning legislation is what I term "over-government"; the purpose of this amendment is to try to prevent this. In the past, Government departments and semi-governmental authorities have wanted to transact a small business deal. For example, the Electricity Trust may wish to purchase a small piece of land adjacent to a substation because the trust wishes to consolidate that piece with its holdings. Again the Engineering and Water Supply Department may want to buy a small piece of land, perhaps half an allotment.

These transactions involve plans because part of one allotment must be transferred to the department and consolidated with its existing title. The Registrar-General has, I believe, in the past exercised discretion and has registered transfers of this kind without their passing through the normal machinery, that is, without their going to the Town Planning Office for approval.

I believe that it is possible under the Bill that all these small transactions may have to go to the town planning authority or to the Director and this would affect the efficiency of the department concerned—and the departments I have named are very efficient. In many cases, work that the departments would have liked to carry out might be held up. Consequently, this short cut may be taken, but only with Ministerial consent, as provided in the amendment. I trust that this amendment will meet with the Minister's approval.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): To show the Committee that I have no prejudice against the honourable member, I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 48 passed.

Clause 49—"Grounds upon which the Director or a council may refuse approval to a plan."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

In paragraph (*g*) to strike out "four" and insert "three".

This is one of the grounds upon which the Director or a council may refuse approval for a plan of subdivision or resubdivision. As the Bill stands at present, if the natural slope of the whole of the land in any allotment is steeper than a gradient of one in four, that would be a ground for a refusal. I am endeavouring to change that so that the slope must be steeper than a gradient of one in three.

I draw the Committee's attention to the many reasons that are included in this Bill for the refusal of a plan of this kind. From page 42 of the Bill onwards under this section, namely, "Grounds upon which the Director or a council may refuse approval to a plan," there are 20 grounds. There are further grounds in clause 50 and still more grounds in clause 52 where the Director can refuse permission. My point is that there is a very wide coverage of reasons and it is necessary to consider whether, perhaps, one or two of these reasons go too far; in my view this one goes too far.

I know that it has been said that steep land is very expensive on which to build, and I agree with that, but that is a matter for the individual. If an individual wishes to build on a steep block he should be allowed to do so. We see examples, especially in the other States, of attractive homes built near cliff faces and on harbour-front blocks. The people can afford to build them and they live there happily. I cannot see why we should not allow the same kind of venture in Adelaide.

Why should we try to bring about uniformity in regard to housing? We ought to provide this opportunity for people prepared to pay the cost of building on steep allotments. A grade of one in three is equivalent to a fall of 10ft. in 30ft. and houses are built on land with such a grade. This can be done by providing a garage or rumpus room and building a second storey in the front of the house. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the guide should be a grade of one in three.

Young architects are designing attractive houses with modern character. All these reasons justify me in endeavouring to write into this measure a provision that the gradient should be one in three, not one in four.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am sorry to inform the Committee that my agreement with the honourable member has been exhausted. I oppose the amendment. Some subdivisions cannot be serviced because of the gradient of the land and, in terms of the 1962 Act, the town planning authority has been careful about allowing subdivisions. The amendment would present extreme difficulty, but the honourable member has said that that is the responsibility of the purchaser of the block who wants to build on it. The clause enables the Director or a council to refuse approval to a plan of subdivision or plan of resubdivision if the natural slope of the whole of the land in any allotment is steeper than a gradient of one in four. The honourable member wishes to steepen the gradient to one in three, which is a fall of 50ft. in a building block of a depth of 150ft.

The Town Planner, Mr. Hart, informs me that, when he receives applications to subdivide extremely steep land, he refers the applications to the Director of Mines for report. Most of these applications concern land in the hills near Adelaide, but applications are sometimes received to subdivide former quarry workings or cliffs overlooking the sea. The following is an extract from a report made by the Director of Mines to the Town Planner concerning a subdivision in the Adelaide foothills:

The valley slopes are generally fairly steep, with maximum grades up to one in three.

That is the gradient that the honourable member wants to adopt. The report goes on:

On such slopes soil creeps (that is, movement of the soil mantle downhill over the underlying rock surface) and even movement of the weathered rock itself can occur if the subsoil is allowed to become saturated.

In another report the Director of Mines points out that, if dwellings are to be built in cuttings on the slopes of one in three or steeper, then cutting faces up to 30ft. high are possible, and he then goes on to question the long-term stability of such cuttings. As it is impracticable to control the angles of cuttings and support methods, for example, retaining walls, used by individuals, and watering gardens and disposal of roof and other drainage, it is undesirable to allow building on slopes steeper than one in four unless detailed investigations are made and special precautions are taken.

The clause enables the Director of Planning or the council to exercise discretion and, if the subdivider produces satisfactory engineering or geological evidence as to the suitability of his land, then the application could be approved. Alternatively, the subdivider would have a sound case to put before the Planning Appeal Board in the event of a refusal. The gradient of one in four is contained in the control of land subdivision regulations which operate at the present time. The honourable member has referred to what happens in other States and has mentioned houses that are built around the Sydney Harbour, where he says the land is much steeper than a grade of one in three.

The geological conditions to be found around Sydney Harbour differ completely from those in the Adelaide Hills. In Sydney the rock is horizontally bedded sandstone, giving a solid foundation. Here we have soils overlying clays with rocks dipping at various angles, and unstable conditions can quickly arise. So, although the honourable member draws an analogy between the Sydney Harbour area and the Adelaide Hills area, there is a difference between the two places as far as stability is concerned. In one case, it is solid rock that can be built on, whereas in the other it is not. For these reasons and because of the extreme difficulty in servicing places on slopes such as this, I hope that the Committee will not accept the amendment.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Problems in regard to soil movement are problems for engineers, and landowners can take care of that. We do not have to take planning to the point where there may be a landslide. I agree with the Minister's comments in regard to water disposal and drainage, but I refer the Committee to paragraph (*b*), where there are provisions regarding these matters. I think that the other points that have been raised by the Minister are covered. I was not referring only to the Sydney Harbour area or to Sydney.

Houses such as I have mentioned can be seen in this State. One is being built on Hayborough Estate at Victor Harbour. It is the talk of the South Coast. It is a most attractive house, on a steep grade, and is not built on rock of the type found around Sydney Harbour. Other houses of that type can be built here and I do not think that the authority or the Director need be as stringent as is provided for in the Bill.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 50 and 51 passed.

Clause 52—"Further grounds of refusal by the Director."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

In subclause (1) (*d*) (iii) to strike out "the amount of land in the vicinity of the land depicted thereon which is already divided into allotments and the extent to which such allotments have not been used for the purposes for which they were so divided;

This is another reason for refusal by the Director of these plans. During the second reading debate, I expressed concern that this might seriously affect the important principle of free enterprise and freedom of choice by individuals. I pointed out then that all services to these new estates were now paid for by the subdivider and that expense to the State was not involved there.

If a subdivider wishes to subdivide land, he should not be refused permission simply because the Director says "No. In my view there is at present sufficient vacant land in this vicinity." There are many reasons for refusals. This is going too far.

Young people in particular ought always to be given a wide freedom of choice of blocks of land in our suburbs. I hope that individuals in Adelaide will never have to live in certain areas because they are forced to do so by planning.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It could make allotments much more expensive.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is an important point. This freedom should be clung to here. Individuals do exercise this choice as they think best, and not as others think they will choose their sites. This point is proved by the fact that the Town Planning Committee's report of 1962 predicted that the population of Tea Tree Gully would be 25,000 by 1971. I have been told that this figure has already been reached.

That is an example of a planner considering that a population will grow to a certain size in a certain area and the individuals themselves desiring to live in that area choosing it. We ought to allow ample opportunity for that. Young people especially should be able to choose the suburb in which they want to live, with no restriction on that right.

Speculation comes into it. For example, if a speculator knows that this is in the Act and he observes where land is available for sale in allotment form, surely he will tend to buy that land because he feels that the adjacent broad acres will not be allowed to be subdivided until the particular land in which he is interested has been either fully or partly built upon. So he buys it and sits upon an appreciating asset.

What then is the position of the young people who wish to buy in that locality? They are forced to pay his price. That is the effect of this kind of restriction whereas, if the land adjacent was subdivided, there would be such a supply there that this spectre of a speculator buying up the available land would not be present. This paragraph interferes with supply and demand. We ought to encourage young people to buy land.

It is thought that much vacant land is already held by speculators or land dealers, but in many cases it is held by young people who are buying it on terms. We should encourage that. In many cases they would be far better off buying land on terms under a system of compulsory saving than spending their money on motor cars and assets that depreciate quickly.

Further, if young people invest $1,500 in land, they become eligible for the Commonwealth grant of $500. In other cases many blocks of vacant land are being held by parents on behalf of their children. I see no reason for this paragraph.

The Town Planning Committee's report shows that in 1965 the number of allotments created in the metropolitan area was 11,866, while in 1966 the number was 8,311; so the trend of the subdivision of new allotments is downward, and the number of vacant blocks must therefore be decreasing. Also, in the Adelaide division, which comprises 32 municipal

councils (which would, in effect, be the metropolitan area under this proposed plan), last year 10,012 dwellings were completed.

That figure includes flats but to offset that we can say it was a very bad year in the building trade; so, if one aspect offsets the other, it still appears that the building rate is ahead of the current rate of land subdivision. That means, too, that some of the vacant land is being absorbed.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I draw the honourable member's attention to many areas not far outside the city boundary where a fair amount of subdivision is going on, and the blocks have not been sold. When things are different they are not the same. I shall not attempt to go into the detail that the honourable member has in trying to substantiate his amendment. At the moment, this clause we are discussing is in the present regulations and nobody in this Chamber has ever complained about them.

The Director would face an appeal before the board and would have to be satisfied with the adequacy of the information upon which he based his decision. The honourable member has in mind that the authority would refuse subdivision of land. There is nothing to prevent parents from holding land until children are old enough to get married and build on it. I think the Hon. Mr. Hill's main concern is with large areas, which often are purchased by people who can well afford to do that and make a profit out of resale or subdivision. I shall not elaborate on this. I oppose the amendment, and I hope the Committee will oppose it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (12).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, L. H. Densley, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill (teller), Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, and Sir Arthur Rymill.

Noes (5).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), R. A. Geddes, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 53 to 58 passed.

Clause 59—"Penalty for dividing land otherwise than in accordance with plans."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "—(*a*)".

This part of the Bill had to be drafted in advance. Clause 44 (4) enables home units to be sold without contravening the clause if they form part of a scheme comprising three or more such units. Clause 59 (2) needs to have the same exemption. The amendment also removes references to portion only of one allotment. Such a person will own a whole allotment by virtue of the definition that has been included. Therefore, it is unnecessary to differentiate between the owner of whole and the owner of a portion of an allotment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "whole".

The necessity for this amendment has already been explained.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

At the end of subclause (2) (*a*) to insert: "which part of the allotment does not include or constitute a building or portion of a building that is designed, held or disposed of as a unit for separate occupation within a building unit scheme comprising three or more of such units erected on the allotment and approved by the council within whose area the allotment is situated".

To strike out "or"; to strike out paragraph (*b*); in subclause (4) (*a*) to strike out "the whole of"; and to strike out subclause (4) (*b*).

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 60 to 62 passed.

Clause 63—"Power of authority to acquire land."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(4a) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section—

(*a*) the authority shall not subdivide or re-subdivide any land acquired or taken by it under powers conferred on it by this section unless such land, at the time of such acquisition or taking, was used for residential purposes or purposes associated therewith and except for the purpose of redeveloping it or rebuilding on it, or rendering it suitable for redevelopment or rebuilding on it, for residential use or other use associated therewith;

and

(*b*) the authority shall not sell any land so subdivided or re-subdivided except for residential use or other use associated therewith or for the purposes of being redeveloped or rendered suitable for such use.

My intention is to clarify the reasons for the authority having the power to acquire land other than for purposes of architectural, historical and scientific interest. I believe that the authority should only have the right to acquire land (other than for these reasons) in run-down suburbs, that is, land that we all

want to see redeveloped for residential purposes. Previous speakers have stated that it seems that the authority, under the Bill as it now stands, has power to act as a principal in many ways; I do not think that this is the role of a planner.

A planner's role should be limited to what I call redevelopment. I believe that, under this Bill, it would be possible for the authority to buy open space land (it might be farming land) and later to subdivide that land. A very good reason could be given as to why some of the land should be subdivided; it might front a main road or highway and it might be risky to use such land for recreational purposes.

Therefore it would seem reasonable that the authority should be able to subdivide that strip of land fronting the road into allotments, and consequently the authority would make much money which would go into the fund. However, this would be extremely unfair to those from whom the land was acquired. I believe this was not the intention behind this provision but, nevertheless, I believe that it could be done under this provision.

Any land transactions of the authority, other than those connected with historical, architectural and scientific interest, should be limited to buying land in older run-down suburbs. In such cases the authority could be given the right to resubdivide the land so that small lanes, minor streets and small allotments could be put into the melting pot in the plan for the new subdivision. It should have the right to do this and to resell that land for that same residential purpose.

The amendment also states other uses associated therewith. It refers to the possibility of shopping areas having to be provided within those same residential areas. I believe that if we limit the authority to this kind of land dealing, we shall also hasten the redevelopment of such areas because the authority would then be able to treat with the Housing Trust. The trust might purchase some of this resubdivided land and redevelop it.

The authority would also be able to treat with the private sector of the building industry and, indeed, it might create much interest within that sector in a venture of this kind, that is, by buying land from the authority conditional upon it being redeveloped in accordance with the wishes of the authority. I believe that this amendment will hasten this process. They will also have the right or opportunity to rebuild, if they have funds in hand or if they borrow for the purpose, but I hope that the latter process will not be adopted.

I hope that the Housing Trust and private enterprise will redevelop under the guidance of the authority. Although the amendment perhaps shifts the emphasis from development to redevelopment, I think that should be done. The amendment clarifies the position and prevents the authority from acting at any time as a principal and from acting unfairly as a principal at the expense of private persons. At the same time, it will hasten the achievement of the goal of redeveloping some of our inner suburbs.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I oppose this amendment. It seems that the intention is to limit the power of the authority by preventing it from subdividing or resubdividing land, except for residential redevelopment. It severely curtails the power of the authority to promote development in accordance with an authorized development plan. For example, it may be necessary for the authority, when buying land for a recreation area, to purchase the whole of an estate and dispose of unwanted portions. This would involve a plan of resubdivision. Confining the activity of the authority to purely residential uses of land in redevelopment areas would severely limit the effectiveness of the authority.

The main characteristics of problem areas for development are a mixture of residential and non-residential areas, and an obsolete pattern of roads and allotments with a multiplicity of ownerships. Redevelopment of such areas by private enterprise is highly unlikely. If the power to resubdivide land and to reallocate uses, including non-residential uses, is removed from the State Planning Authority, then these conditions could not be corrected and comprehensive redevelopment would be impossible. There may be areas now occupied by substandard housing that it would be better to redevelop for industrial use. This could involve a subdivision of the land if a new road were required or a subdivision if only a rearrangement of title boundaries were necessary.

I know that there have been discussions between two municipalities that are anxious for redevelopment. Because of the run-down condition of the whole of one area and because of the completely built-up area surrounding it, the land is required for recreation purposes. However, in order to establish it for such purposes, the council would have to acquire the whole area. The work could only be done by

bulldozing and then providing the recreation area. This amendment would prevent the council from doing that. If that is the intention of the honourable member, he is doing it effectively.

Having regard to all these amendments, I do not know whether the authority will be able to operate at all, although we were told earlier that it was necessary to have an authority so that we could have organized planning of development and redevelopment and of zoning into various industrial and residental areas. I suggest that we look at the ramifications and effect of the amendment before we vote. I hope that the Committee will not carry it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Many of my fears have become very real as a result of the Minister's comments. I see no reason why the authority needs to purchase recreation areas. If we want a recreation area in a locality for the people in that neighbourhood, the council should buy the area. If the council has not the money for the purpose, it should ask the authority for some of the money that is in the fund that will be created by payments by people who resubdivide land. If that were done, the people of Millicent would not have their money spent on work on a foreshore at Port Lincoln.

We recently passed a Bill providing for national parks, so we have two kinds of area provided for, one being for neighbourhoods and the other being for national park purposes. I favour acquisition of land for both purposes, but why does the authority have to do the acquiring when power for that purpose already exists? The Minister has mentioned that it may be necessary for the authority to buy a big holding and dispose of an unwanted portion, and that is what I am afraid of. I want to have the matter dealt with by the owner.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, L. H. Densley, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill (teller), Sir Norman Jude, F. J. Potter, and Sir Arthur Rymill.

Noes (6).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), H. K. Kemp, A. F. Kneebone, C. D. Rowe, and A. J. Shard.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 64 to 68 passed.

Clause 69—"Compensation on refusal of consent to destroy place of historical interest, etc."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

In subclause (4) (*a*) to strike out "1959, as amended" and insert in lieu thereof "1966". This will bring the citation of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act up to date. That is the intention of the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 70 to 76 passed.

Clause 77—"Power of Director to do work for the public."

The Hon. C. M. HILL moved:

To strike out the clause.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I oppose this amendment. The clause enables the Director of Planning to prepare plans and reports for any person, with the Minister's approval, surveying being expressly excluded. This provision is contained in section 7 of the present Town Planning Act and has been there since 1929. The effect of the honourable member's amendment is that advice and assistance being given by the Town Planner and his staff to councils in country areas would have to stop. There is constant demand for the services of the Town Planner and his staff to be made available in country areas. The Hon. Mr. Rowe referred to this during the second reading debate. The present Government (and, I believe, the previous Government also) has allowed this work to be done without charge. It is a service that has been gladly given to country councils and I know it has been appreciated by them, particularly those lacking in financial or technical resources.

Samples of this work include lay-outs for the foreshore at Barmera, improvements to the main street in Jamestown, and lay-outs for reserves at Clare, Mannum, Hawker Flat and the Sturt reserve at Murray Bridge. Currently, the Town Planner is advising the District Council of Port Elliot on improvements to the water front at Goolwa. The present Government (and, again, I believe, the previous Government also) has considered that metropolitan councils should seek independent advice from town planning consultants or engage their own town planning staff in such matters. The Town Planner also receives continual requests for advice and assistance from bodies other than councils and Government departments. Retailers and developers frequently are glad to have forecasts of population and indications of trends of development. This is a service that the State Planning Office can and should give.

I suggest that honourable members would be unwise to accept this amendment. We have

had no explanation of it, the honourable member merely getting up and saying, "I move the amendment." I have gone into this matter and given a full answer to it. All through this debate we have had it wrongfully stated over and over again by honourable members that this Bill is taking powers away from local government. The honourable member has been one of the the loudest in his remarks at various times during the second reading debate and in Committee about taking powers away from local government—which this Bill certainly does not. On the contrary, it adds to the power of local government. This amendment, however, takes away powers from district councils in country areas, denying them the opportunity to consult the Town Planner, free of cost, on their planning, and receive advice.

I do not know whether or not that is the intention of the honourable member. He has not said so but it appears so. I appeal to honourable members not to accept this amendment but to allow the Town Planner (or the Director) to give his services authorized by the Minister for these particular purposes. That power has been here for years. Why now discard it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I had interpreted this provision to mean that the Town Planner had the right to offer his services to persons—landowners—who might seek advice from him concerning proposed subdivisional plans. I thought the provision would cause some embarrassment to the Town Planner and place him in an invidious position, because he might have advised a landowner along certain lines, and that landowner might have accepted that advice and paid for it, the money going to the general revenue of the State; and then the planner would have had to consider this as an application and it would have been a proposal which involved his advice and recommendations.

Similarly, if the matter had gone to the authority the planner would have sat as the Chairman of that authority and been involved in the particular proposal. I would have thought that was not a position in which any person would want to be placed, and that was one reason why I thought it unwise that this provision should be left in the legislation. My second reason concerned the meaning of the word "surveying" in this clause. I thought it was unfair to the surveyors as a profession.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They are excluded under it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When a person goes to a surveyor and asks that surveyor to draw up a proposed plan of subdivision or resubdivision, I wonder whether that surveyor is indeed carrying out work of surveying up to that point. I doubt very much whether he is. I did not want to see the surveying profession in such a state that surveyors could ultimately be reduced simply to putting pegs in land because all the preparation of the plan and ideas—the paper work—might have been carried out by the Director, because, of course, the Director would have had the power to do it.

Thirdly, I had in mind that I hoped soon to see professional town planners setting themselves up in private practice. I think there will be a demand for their services, and I think it will be a good thing for town planning if they do establish themselves, because then we shall have a variety of ideas in this new profession.

I cannot see any fully qualified professional town planner being very keen to resign from a well paid staff position somewhere and enter into private practice when he knows that within the Act the Director can be his principal competitor. I thought we should have some encouragement to these planners to set up practice in this way. These are the reasons why I moved for the deletion of this clause. I did not consider that the word "persons" included "a council". However, I have had this checked in the last few minutes and I now agree that that is so.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I do not think the Hon. Mr. Hill realizes how much the work of the Town Planner has been appreciated in this connection in country districts. It is an activity which I am sure we should not in any way limit. The work that has been done for the smaller councils has been most valuable and highly appreciated, and it would be a great pity to see that work truncated in any way. Although it is rare for an individual to seek these services, I know that there have been instances where that has been done. I put the plea that this cause be not interfered with.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I find myself in the position that I can support the Government when it is right. From my own experience I consider that this is an instance where perhaps it would be wise not to delete this provision. I endorse the remarks, I think made by the Minister, that many country councils have greatly appreciated the assistance given by the Town Planner and his officers. Indeed, I do not think it would be possible for councils to get this work done unless they had the services of this officer.

Under the Acts Interpretation Act the word "persons" includes councils and bodies corporate. I think the majority of assistance given will be given to councils and to that type of organization. I cannot imagine that the town planning department is adequately staffed to embark on a whole series of work for private people. If that was the situation, I think perhaps we would need to have another look at the question. I would not like to see a curtailment of the kind of assistance that the Town Planner has been giving to councils, and consequently I support the retention of this clause.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (78 to 81), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

That the Bill be recommitted for the consideration of consequential amendments to clauses 2, 5 and 19.

Motion carried.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 2—"Arrangement of this Act"—reconsidered.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

After the words "Planning Appeal Board" to insert "and the Planning Appeal Committee".

Amendment carried.

Clause 5—"Interpretation"—reconsidered.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

To insert the following new definition after the definition of "the board":

"The Committee" means the Planning Appeal Committee constituted pursuant to section 26(*a*) of this Act.

Amendment carried.

Clause 19—"The Planning Appeal Board"—reconsidered.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

In the heading, after "Board" to insert "and the Planning Appeal Committee."

Amendment carried.

Bill reported with further amendments. Committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COMMONWEALTH POWERS (TRADE PRACTICES) BILL.

Received from House of Assembly and read a first time.

GARDEN PRODUCE (REGULATION OF DELIVERY) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 14. Page 3593.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): The purpose of the Bill, as has been explained by the Minister, is to control the times of delivery within a prescribed portion of the metropolitan area of fruit and vegetables that have been purchased by wholesale. I think the essence of the explanation is contained in this portion of the explanation:

However, in recent years, regular purchases of market produce by wholesale have been operating just outside the prescribed East End Market area and are therefore not regulated by the by-laws made by the two market companies. They have begun conducting business much earlier than the official time prescribed for opening the East End Market by the two market companies. This has made it necessary for the tenants of the East End Market to commence business earlier than the official time prescribed in order to be able to compete with traders outside the East End Market area. Any attempt by the two market companies to enforce the official market starting time would only result in tenants leaving the market area and setting up business nearby. As a result, conditions at the East End Market have become chaotic and the stability of the industry is in danger.

Then the Minister states that the proposals that he has brought forward have the support of the whole industry. There is great interest in this measure. I have had several telephone calls today from people connected with that market about this issue. I accept generally that the trade in some respects needs regulating.

Most of the traders in that area and I accept that there is a need for some change in the present position; there is a necessity to regulate trade in the market or its environs. It seems that, although the present official starting time is seven o'clock in the morning, many wholesalers operate from a much earlier hour than that, and congestion, confusion and some unfairness occur as a result.

Here we have the Government's attempt to rectify the position. But what does it do? It gives the Minister the opportunity to prescribe a time within which business shall be conducted. The big point in the whole matter is that the Government then prescribes the area in which this kind of business can be carried on. I emphasize this aspect of "area" because, instead of it being in or around the market (and that is where the problem, as explained by the Minister, occurs), the Bill has taken a wide sweep and states that a prescribed

area can be within a radius of 25 miles of the General Post Office in Adelaide. That is mentioned in clause 4, which reads, in part:

The Governor may, from time to time, by regulation constitute any area defined therein (being an area that lies within a radius of 25 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide) as a prescribed area. . . .

In my view and judging by the inquiries I have been able to make so far, the prescribed area should be the actual market area and perhaps a few streets surrounding it. I should like the Minister in his reply to give a further explanation of the reason for this 25-mile radius, because the more I think about it the more I suspect there is something sinister about this matter. It may well be there is a monopolistic danger in this proposal.

It seems that, if business is to be forced into that area, certain people will profit by it and, as I see it, there will still be the chaotic conditions caused by congestion because of the semi-trailers coming in from various places. If the wholesalers who come in from the hills and other areas, and some from other States, are all forced to come in within a limited time or not before a certain time, there will be congestion in that area of a kind never before seen.

I am hoping for a further explanation on these points. From the point of view of a person's freedom to trade, I cannot see why some forms of wholesale dealing in fruit and vegetables could not be conducted away from that area. If they were conducted away from that area, this Bill provides that regulations could immediately come in and could of course make the times so inconvenient that the trade would be forced back into that market area.

For example, I cannot see why a fairly big purchaser of produce buying from a wholesaler (for instance, a big supermarket operation) who ordered and purchased by agreement produce from Midura or Perth, if he came in in a vast semi-trailer which was arranged to be off-loaded in an area outside the congested traffic area (for example, at Gepps Cross) could not carry out his transaction in the normal way in which ordinary business transactions are carried out. Why should that business be in danger of being forced into a net, forced to operate at a certain time and forced to come back to this central area?

It is not only the big operator who will be affected: even the small grower in the Adelaide Hills, who of course sells wholesale, will be affected. It seems that he could be stopped from delivering to a small retail shop on the Magill Road if he came down from the hills areas towards the city. If there was any move to restrict this kind of business operation, it would be most unjust.

Strong opinion on this has been expressed by people who have contacted me, who say there are many issues at the East End Market that should be closely looked at. They may be the reason why the marketing of produce on that basis or on other bases in certain metropolitan regions or council areas may ultimately become a matter for local government to examine.

One of the greatest dangers from this measure concerns the Central Market, which is of course a retail market in Adelaide. It seems that the stallholders in that area wish to purchase at an early hour in the morning, because the wholesalers say they can immediately put that produce on their stalls for sale. Retail selling there commences about half-past six in the morning, mainly for the benefit of shift workers.

People must buy wholesale in the very early hours but, as this Bill reads, those traders can be brought into the net and wholesale delivery in the early hours of the morning can be prohibited to them. All this arises from this mysterious 25-mile radius set down in this Bill as a prescribed area. Again, I say the only problem, as I read the Minister's speech, seems to be in the East End Market and in its vicinity. The Bill is far too wide on this point.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Shan't we be able to police this by the regulations within the 25-mile radius?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We do not want to go over the question of regulations again, surely! Why are we wasting our time here, allowing the 25-mile radius provision to remain, if it is not intended? If it is not intended, why can it not be removed from the Bill and the area limited to the small area in question? It is foolish to persist with this 25-mile radius unless a further explanation is given. Indeed, a similar debate will ensue when regulations to cover an area are made; for instance, in respect of Gawler, because that would come within the 25-mile radius, as I see it.

Now is the time when an explanation on this matter should be given. I shall look forward to hearing further debate on this question. However, I point out that I intend to move amendments to restrict the area to the immediate vicinity of the East End Market.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): The Bill, dealing with a market place, no doubt brings back to the minds of some people cherished memories. We associate certain people and

characters with market places. One only has to mention that delightful musical "My Fair Lady", with its famous leading lady Eliza Doolittle, who sold flowers in a market place, for some people to be filled with nostalgia. Then there was Irma la Douce, that person of great character but little chastity, who originated in a market place. Possibly the East End Market has its own characters of equal fame, but it is not those individuals with whom we are concerned tonight. Some suggestions have been made recently that the East End Market should shift its location out of the city proper to a less congested area. Possibly, we should be directing our attention along those lines at present, rather than dealing with the present unsatisfactory position by debating this Bill.

Although I have not undertaken any research into the present situation, I understand that the control of the present market is vested in the East End Market Company Limited and possibly also in the Adelaide Fruit and Produce Exchange Company, provided those organizations use the area for the purpose of conducting a produce market. Whether the present operating companies are able to realize on existing assets, I do not know. If they could, however, now might be the opportune time to shift the market, particularly while other suitable sites are still available. This is a short Bill, and the Minister says there is nothing in it. However, experience has taught me to be suspicious of short Bills with nothing in them, particularly when they interfere with people's liberties.

Criticism of the Bill is made more difficult as a result of the Minister's statement that the measure has been prepared after discussion with representatives of the fruit and vegetable industry and that it has the support of the whole industry. I am not prepared to deny that some irregular trading exists, but I doubt whether a Bill of this nature is required to eliminate certain current practices. As in the case of much of the legislation recently introduced, the Government seems to have taken out a sledge hammer to crack a peanut. As I understand it, until recently growers had stands (both in the old and the new East End Markets) from which they wholesaled their produce. Growers must have their loads of produce in the market before 6 a.m. and, if the produce is not there before that time, the people concerned have to wait until after 10 a.m. to gain entry.

At a time before the market opens for delivery, the prices for the various lines of produce are called. Although the prices are not binding on the seller, they act as a guide, and the seller may sell at over or under these prices. Contracts to purchase in many (and possibly most) cases are made prior to the opening of the market. Delivery, however, cannot be made before 7 a.m. The buyers' vehicles are parked in the street area. At 7 a.m. the handcarts, which are used to convey produce from the growers' stands in the market to the buyers' vehicles, are unlocked and delivery starts to take effect, not without some congestion, I am informed. These conditions obtained for some years and were, indeed, observed in compliance with the two market companies' by-laws.

However, in recent years, to use the Minister's own words, "regular purchases of market produce by wholesale have been operating just outside the prescribed East End Market area, and are therefore not regulated by the by-laws made by the two market companies". That statement was also referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hill. The Bill seeks to correct the chaos being created by the by-laws not applying to the immediate environs of the market. Possibly, little objection would be raised if the Bill went only that far. However, the measure contains provisions of much wider application that are causing me (together with other members) some concern. The Bill provides that the Minister shall decide the hours of opening the market, or the hours in which delivery shall be given.

I am concerned about who will guide the Minister in that regard, as many interests are involved in this particular aspect of marketing—interests including the city council (in relation to traffic problems), the market companies themselves, the gardeners (the people who bring the produce to the market to sell), and the wholesale buyers, as well as others that may be involved. By whom will the Minister be guided when he prescribes the trading hours? I agree with the Hon. Mr. Hill, who said that the Bill should apply only to the immediate environs of the East End Market. I do not believe that the trading hours of the Central Market or of retail shops should be affected by the Bill, nor do I believe that people living within a radius of 25 miles of the General Post Office should be brought within the net.

I could give many examples of why such people should not be ensnared by this measure; the Hon. Mr. Hill has already given a number of them. We have the situation of the grower who does not market all of his produce through the East End Market. Growers living in my

district bring a truck and trailer-load of produce to Adelaide, one particular grower delivering his trailer-load of produce to a purchaser on the South Road. He delivers to this particular person three times a week. He then proceeds to take the truck load of produce to the market and sell it through the normal channels. The trailer load that he sold to the purchaser was sold not at cut prices or anything of that nature but at the ruling price; this was quite legitimate trading. Under the Bill, if this comes within the prescribed area, that person will not be able to deliver to his purchaser on the South Road prior to the prescribed delivery time at the market.

We have the situation of greengrocers who purchase direct from the gardeners. If these areas are brought within the prescribed area the greengrocer purchasing direct from the gardener at wholesale rates will be precluded from going to that garden other than within the prescribed hours of trading. This will cause much inconvenience to many of these people. I could go on and on giving many examples of people who are, and have been trading under this established practice for many years and will be denied the right to continue this trade. This is legitimate trading, and it has been carried on at prices acceptable to the whole industry. This type of trade is not undermining the industry or bringing about a situation of cut prices, and it is acceptable to all interested parties.

Why should we pass a Bill that will deny the continuance of this trading? There must be some reason why this Bill should be so wide in its application, and that reason has not been given to the Council at this time. I am afraid I will not be able to agree to clause 7 in its present form, unless the Minister can give a good reason why the prescribed area could be up to within a radius of 25 miles of the G.P.O. I do not wish to say anything further in this debate, and I will reserve further comments until the Committee stage. At this stage, I merely support the second reading.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from March 14. Page 3600.)

Clause 3—"Enactment of s.41 of principal Act''—which the Hon. C. D. Rowe had moved to amend by striking out all words after "councils" second occurring in paragraph I of new section 41.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I cannot add much to what I said last evening. True, as the Hon. Mr. Potter said, the regulations can be disallowed by this Chamber. The people on the reserves want some responsibility and a right to do certain things. As I said before, regulations made under this new section would be considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee in the usual way and would be subject to disallowance. The Hon. Mr. Rowe's amendment seeks to remove some of the provisions that were included in paragraph I so that reserve councils would know some of the specific duties they had to perform. It was suggested that the councils might say that police officers could not enter a reserve. However, if such a proposal were included in a regulation, that regulation would not be passed by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. If the proposals of the councils were not reasonable, then undoubtedly the regulations would be disallowed.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am indebted to the Minister for his remarks, but I still believe that we could make all the regulations we could want to make if the second part of this paragraph was deleted as I have suggested. Power would still be provided to make regulations for the establishment of reserves and for defining the rights, duties, powers and functions of these reserve councils. I particularly want to delete that part of the paragraph which provides for refusing permission to any persons or classes of person to be on a reserve. If regulations were proposed that set out that a certain class of person could not enter or should be excluded from the reserves, we could be faced with the argument that the Bill specifically gave us the right to make that sort of regulation. I do not think we should be limited in that way. When regulations come before us we want to be quite free and unfettered whether we disallow or allow them. I do not think my amendment would restrict what the Government wants to do. I agree that the object of the Bill is to gradually give councils power that they can appropriately use. However, I am not satisfied that the power in this provision is something that should be the exclusive prerogative of these councils. I believe the Minister should determine who should go on or go off a reserve. Although I have no objection to paragraphs II and III, I think it would be helpful if the second part of paragraph I were deleted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Chief Secretary say whether the deletion of the latter part of paragraph I will restrict the making of regulations in relation to these matters?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A person living many hundreds of miles away from a reserve could be a tribal relative of Aborigines living on the reserve. True, regulations submitted by the councils would go before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. However, a fear exists that the councils might disapprove of a certain type of Aborigine, not because of living habits but because of tribal affiliations. Therefore, I support the amendment. I should like a better explanation of the new section than that the Subordinate Legislation Committee can examine the regulations. The fear exists that reserve councils could possibly exercise too much power against their own people.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have been told that this provision was inserted in order to spell out what the people on the reserves could do. I have rarely refused to answer a question, but I shall not fall for the three card trick.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As far as I am concerned, there is no three card trick in this. The power to make regulations is not restricted by this amendment, but the Subordinate Legislation Committee is given better grounds on which to recommend disallowance of a regulation. The question was in no way designed to trap the Chief Secretary.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (13).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (4).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment; Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.38 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, March 16, at 2.15 p.m.