

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 21, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

WEIGHBRIDGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Highways Department has a weighbridge situated on the western side of the Port Wakefield Road, between the Cavan crossing and what is known as the overway bridge. All truck drivers, whether travelling north or south, are required to stop and submit their vehicles for weighing on this weighbridge. Failure to do so, I believe, renders them liable to a penalty of \$100. During the early morning and late afternoon periods, this section of the Port Wakefield Road carries a heavy volume of traffic, and trucks endeavouring to leave their traffic lane or re-enter it, whichever the case may be, create a grave traffic hazard.

Possibly, the position is at its worst on Wednesdays, when many stock-carrying vehicles are using the road. Few, if any, of them would be carrying over-weight loads, so there is little, if any, need for them to go over the weighbridge. Will the Minister consider exempting stock-carrying trucks from their requirement of having to be weighed on this weighbridge or, if that is not possible, will he arrange for a police officer to be in attendance during the peak traffic period to direct these vehicles back into their traffic lane? If this is not possible, will the Minister have a weighbridge built on the eastern side of the road as well so as to minimize this serious traffic hazard?

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

OCCUPATION CENTRES

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained from the Minister of Education a reply to my question of October 15 about the position of Supervisor of Occupation Centres?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague reports:

A position of Supervisor of Special Schools has been created and this will be advertised shortly with a salary range of \$7,000 to \$7,600. The maximum of the range is higher than the present maximum salary of the most senior person that the appointee will supervise.

FERTILIZERS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A recent article in the country press stated that the Agriculture Department was working for big business against the long-term interests of the primary producer by advocating the use of superphosphate as a fertilizer for cereals and plants instead of a mineral type fertilizer which, I believe, is being produced in South Australia. Difficulty has been experienced in getting the facts as to whether this fertilizer gives as good a result as does superphosphate. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Agriculture Department is, in fact, working for big business in this regard?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: When I saw the article referred to by the honourable member I was completely at a loss to understand why such a matter should be publicized to the extent it has been. In the first place, the gentleman responsible for the statement has seen the Agriculture Department many times to resolve the situation regarding the use of the fertilizer referred to by the honourable member. It is a natural fertilizer, dolomite, which is extracted from two quarries in South Australia—one in or near the Adelaide Hills and one in the South-East. The department has bent over backwards in trying to establish the relevant facts relating to this fertilizer, and it is prepared to do everything possible to ensure that South Australian farmers are given the opportunity of knowing exactly what they are using on their properties. Apparently the gentleman responsible for this matter, even though he has seen departmental officers many times and has said he is willing to submit samples of the fertilizer for analysis, is sometimes not prepared to do this. He has also been to see me, as Minister of Agriculture, and I believe he has been to see the former Minister of Agriculture, too. We are completely unanimous on this matter: we want to protect the farmers of South Australia. If they are going to be led up the garden path, as has been suggested, I can only hope they will have another look at the situation and be absolutely sure that what they are using is recommended by the Agriculture Department.

PARTY MEETINGS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Leader of the Opposition.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: For several years we have been told in this Council that Liberal members do not meet as a Party in this place, yet a heading in yesterday's *News* said: "Key 'Tactics' Talk on Shopping Hours". The article that followed said that honourable members were going to meet behind locked doors today in regard to the question of shopping hours at Elizabeth. Can the Leader say whether this is a departure from the previous attitude of the L.C.L. towards honourable members' getting together and discussing certain legislation? Also, will he inform the Council what took place at the secret meeting?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: First, what I have said before is perfectly true: we do not meet as a Party machine. Secondly, if the honourable member would like to come to the meetings, he is quite entitled to apply, and I am certain that honourable members would be only too willing to accommodate him. The meeting of members of this Council today was a perfectly normal one, in that the legislation coming before us was discussed and speakers were arranged. No discussions took place on the matter on which the *News* reported.

EGGS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: For some time, producers in the shell egg industry have been endeavouring to find ways and means of getting rid of surplus eggs, and from time to time representations have been made regarding the setting up of a pulping plant or a pasteurizing plant. Can the Minister say whether any further progress has been made in this direction?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As the Egg Board already has a pasteurizing plant, I take it that the honourable member is asking whether the board would operate a pulping plant. This is one of the problems confronting the Egg Board in South Australia. The matter has not yet been discussed at any great length. I understand that it would cost about \$600,000 to put all these things under the control of the Egg Board, and I am afraid that that sort of money is not available at the present time.

WEEDS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of October 13 regarding kikuyu grass and salt water couch?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The suggestion of the honourable member has been carefully studied by officers of the Agriculture Department, and the Director has informed me that it is considered that there are many situations where, if kikuyu grass and salt water couch are properly managed, they can be useful plants. Moreover, there is no evidence that either species is likely to become a serious agricultural problem. I point out that the Weeds Act is designed to control "agricultural" weeds, and the proclamation of weeds as noxious plants for reasons other than for agricultural protection would be outside its ambit. For these reasons, it is not intended at this stage to proclaim either kikuyu grass or salt water couch as noxious weeds under the Act.

ABORIGINAL TRIALS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Some time ago a submission was made to the Attorney-General by the District Council of Murat Bay and also by a group of justices in that area that permission be given to try Aborigines on the reserves from which they came before committing offences for which they were to be charged. This suggestion seemed to me to have a good deal of merit, for it would give an opportunity for Aborigines to watch the course of justice and to gain further knowledge of the procedure of the white man's court. Also, I believe that these gentlemen had in mind at some future date the appointment of justices from those reserves to handle their own affairs. It is some time since this submission was made to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Do you mean the present Attorney-General?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes. Will the Chief Secretary obtain from his colleague information on how far this matter has progressed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to take up this question with the Attorney-General and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

NATIONAL PARKS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Lands say whether it is possible for members of the public to visit and inspect land held by the National Parks Commission in the Coorong region? If it is possible, how is it possible to gain entry?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Although I know that there is a physical disability in visiting these lands, I will inquire of the department and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

CITRUS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure the Minister is very well aware that the citrus industry is experiencing a very difficult time. I understand that he has received a report from the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford), who was appointed to inquire into the operations of the Citrus Organization Committee, a statutory body set up under a Statute of this State. Has the Minister received Mr. Dunsford's report? Has he had time to study it, and has he had an opportunity to discuss the report with the Citrus Organization Committee and industry leaders? If not, when is he likely to be able to do this?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have received the report from Mr. Dunsford, who was appointed by the previous Government to investigate the whole of the citrus industry. It is a very lengthy document and one that must be studied very closely. I have read the document twice, but there are certain aspects of it on which I want more information before I submit my recommendations to Cabinet. It is unfortunate at this stage that Mr. Dunsford has gone overseas on leave and that Mr. Jeanes, the Chairman of the Citrus Organization Committee, is on an overseas trip on behalf of the Australian Meat Board. However, I am expecting both these men back on duty in a few weeks and I am hopeful that by then I will be able to make certain recommendations to Cabinet.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to a matter which I raised with the previous Minister of Agriculture and which is in regard to the sealing of the main access roads around the Roseworthy Agricultural College. I believe that the last reply I received from the previous Minister was that this matter was receiving serious consideration. In view of the fact that, as far as I am aware, Roseworthy Agricultural College is the only important college of its kind in Australia which has no sealed roads around the main buildings, and because of the increasing importance of the college and the extension of its activities, will the Minister consider this matter further and see whether the main access roads around this most important college can be sealed?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. I will try to ascertain exactly what has transpired since the previous Minister was in office and whether we can re-examine the situation to see what can be done along these lines.

EFFLUENT DISPOSAL

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Since the introduction of a common effluent disposal scheme at Barmera some years ago and of similar schemes throughout the State, more and more communities are becoming interested in installing these schemes. Can the Minister obtain figures comparing the incidence of notifiable diseases in communities of a similar size that have installed this type of effluent disposal scheme with the incidence in other communities that have no such scheme?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall do my best to get the information for the honourable member.

FLINDERS WAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Before leaving office, the previous Government approved and instituted a plan for the establishment of a long walking and riding trail in this State. The proposal was that the trail should commence near Cape Jervis and stretch northward

to a point somewhere in the northern regions of the Flinders Ranges, the distance being, as I recall it, about 500 miles. A committee was set up to investigate this proposal, and it was decided that the trail would ultimately be known as Flinders Way. People associated with the National Fitness Council and national fitness generally have asked me in recent weeks whether the Government is proceeding with the matter and, if so, what stage of planning has been reached. Therefore, will the Minister get me an interim report on this matter stating the present stage of the proposal?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

CARP

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a short statement before directing a question about fishing to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Fairly disquieting reports are coming in at present about carp, which is present in the Murray River to such an extent now that it has got as far as Lake Bonney. Has the Minister had a report on this and can he say whether any action can be taken to eradicate this cannibalistic fish before it gets completely out of hand and ruins fishing in the Murray as it has done in other rivers of the world?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will try to get some information for the honourable member.

APPLES

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Is the Minister of Agriculture in a position to make any statement about the apple stabilization scheme, which I understand is being considered at the moment?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The present situation is that this matter was brought to the notice of the Agricultural Council on Monday. It is still in the interim stage in Commonwealth legislation. It is a matter for Commonwealth legislation; it was brought forward on Monday merely to let the States know what the situation was. We are hoping that Commonwealth legislation will be available soon.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister tell me the lines along which the Commonwealth Government is thinking?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I could, but it would tend to take away the kudos from the Commonwealth at this stage, because no finality

has been reached so far. However, I am prepared to discuss the matter with the honourable member privately and perhaps I can point out some of the things being thought of in Commonwealth circles. I shall be only too happy to do that.

PUBLIC RELIEF

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Potter:

(For wording of motion, see page 1715.)

(Continued from October 14. Page 1717.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): Mr. Potter's motion deals with two areas of "distress" in our community—first, old age pensioners and, secondly, deserted wives, widows and widowers with children. Let me say at the beginning that both these areas of difficulty have the greatest sympathy of the Government. The problems of the aged in our community are not only real but increasing. In my view, they must have high priority in action by both Commonwealth and State Governments. Nursing home costs have increased sharply in recent months and the Government is at present considering what interim assistance can be given to religious and non-profit-making nursing homes. A more realistic answer in this field lies in the Commonwealth Government increasing the present \$2 and \$5 a day nursing home benefits. The latter were introduced in very recent times for intensive care patients while the former have remained at the very low figure of \$2 a day for many years.

Additional nursing home beds are required and we plan to rebuild the Northfield wards for this purpose. Much more will be required and the Government would like to see this achieved largely through the expanded activities of religious and non-profit-making groups. They cannot do this unless there is some security to meet the costs involved. I do not want to hammer the need for more Commonwealth assistance, but realistically this is where the financial answer lies. Honourable members know that the Government, in association with the Commonwealth Government, is most active in the field of domiciliary care. Many aged people can remain in their own homes provided they can have necessary services such as Meals on Wheels, physiotherapy, chiropody, housekeeping, linen services, and so on. A pilot scheme for domiciliary care has been approved for Murray Bridge, and planning is

proceeding for Port Lincoln. These schemes will be based on the local hospital. Commonwealth approval has been sought for a more extensive scheme based on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The latter will service the Woodville area.

It will be seen that the State is both concerned about and active in the care of the aged and it will continue to apply its efforts to the provision of nursing home accommodation and the expansion of domiciliary care services based on local hospitals. The other part of the motion deals with deserted wives, widows and widowers with dependent children. Honourable members will be aware of present assistance in this field by way of social service pensions and State assistance through the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs, and there is no need for me to describe this in detail. My colleague, the Attorney-General and Minister of Social Welfare, is well aware of the legal problems facing deserted wives and children and their need for financial help. The Government does not oppose the appointment of a Select Committee.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I compliment the Government on its sympathetic attitude. A serious position has arisen in this State.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is Commonwealth-wide.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes, but it applies more particularly in this State. I am informed that there is actual starvation in the case of pensioners and that families with a deserted spouse are in really dire distress.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is the same throughout the Commonwealth. I have seen reports in New South Wales newspapers of similar circumstances.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I realize that the provision in respect of pensions is a Commonwealth Government responsibility, but in the past it was backed up sufficiently by State instrumentalities to ensure that there could be no distress of any real significance arising through ignorance or through circumstances that could not easily be legislated for.

As South Australians we believe we have provided security, but obviously this security has largely broken down. Consequently, it is up to us as Parliamentarians to find out why this has happened and where it is happening so that provision may be made not to hold off something that may occur but to correct a tremendous social injustice that is present with us.

I know that people who for a long while have been on the pension and who made as sufficient a provision as possible many years ago and have for some reason survived for a long time are in particular trouble. These people have been thrifty during their lives and perhaps purchased their own houses; consequently, they thought they would be secure after they had finished their working lives, but they now find that they do not have sufficient to exist upon.

I know that churches and many other charitable institutions interested in this matter have been doing a tremendous job. However, as we saw reported last weekend, despite their efforts, they cannot cope with the problems that confront them. We cannot tolerate such a situation occurring in this State.

I am proud to be a South Australian. To think that people who have worked all their lives are being left in incredible want is most disturbing. The pensioner who becomes sick is in a particularly difficult state; this has been admitted by the present Government and the former Government. It seems that the person in really bad strife at present is the widow or wife who is suddenly deserted and for a long time apparently can be left wanting without any aid unless she can go to a church or charitable institution that has money available for the relief of immediate distress. Is this right?

When a person loses his job he can, without very much formality, register as an unemployed person and get relief nearly immediately. Why should this long rigmarole be followed before relief can be obtained for a wife who suddenly finds herself without a husband and who has dependent children to care for?

This matter must be very carefully considered. If the provisions we have made in the past are not coping with this day-to-day problem, it must be corrected very soon. I sincerely hope the Council will get the proposed committee working as quickly as possible, because the need is urgent.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLEVE BY-LAW: BUILDING ALIGNMENT

Order of the Day, Private Business, No. 3:

The Hon. F. J. Potter to move:

That By-law No. 27 of the District Council of Cleve in respect of Building Alignment, made on August 14, 1969, and laid on the table of this Council on July 14, 1970, be disallowed.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2) moved:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. H. K. Kemp:

That the regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1969, made on June 18, 1970, and laid on the table of this Council on July 14, 1970, be disallowed.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1720.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I oppose the motion because it is most important in these days, when we are considering what has happened in regard to water supplies and the way waters and springs have been polluted in other countries, that we take action as rapidly as possible. I have before me a docket containing the reasons why action should be taken urgently and why the regulations were introduced. Many of these points were put to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation which, as a result, decided that no action should be taken in regard to these proposed regulations. I make no apology for reading this material to honourable members, because it is well put and brings home the seriousness of the situation and the reasons for introducing the regulations, which, after all, are minimal. I will now read from this material.

The department's object in opposing certain subdivisional activity on the metropolitan water supply watersheds in the Mount Lofty Ranges is to maintain them and their associated reservoirs for State public water supplies. This is fundamental to the future prosperity of South Australia, bearing in mind that these watersheds supply about 48 per cent (19,000,000,000 gallons) of the State's water supplies in the driest State of the continent. The metropolitan reservoirs in their present locations and at their present levels are an integral part of the whole distribution system for metropolitan Adelaide and, irrespective of the source from which the water is derived, the reservoirs should be maintained free from any possible pollution. There is, of course, the obvious economic advantage of the water derived from the watersheds and impounded in the reservoirs. During the past six years the average natural yield of the reservoirs was 19,000,000,000 gallons a year. This could be increased to about 30,000,000,000 gallons a year by the con-

struction of further reservoirs in the Mount Lofty Ranges, provided the system could be supplemented by Murray River water. The estimated cost at present of pumping 30,000,000,000 gallons of water from the Murray River (if the water were available) is \$4,500,000. However, the pumping of Murray River water to a distribution system, the storages of which were polluted, is completely untenable. The State cannot possibly afford, either physically or financially, to have these storages polluted.

General problem of watershed pollution: Throughout the world, streams and lakes used as water supplies or for other purposes have been receiving increasing quantities of sewage and other pollutants which not only serve to lower the bacteriological quality of the water but also act as nutrients for excessive biological growths (mainly algae). Algae in surface waters are mostly greenish, microscopic, free-floating organisms. In fertile waters they "bloom" in great numbers, giving rise to oxygen depletion (stagnation) and associated uncontrollable problems of odour, taste, turbidity, colour and general unsightliness. In some cases this has proceeded to such an extent as seriously to limit the use of the water for public water supply, irrigation and even recreation.

Nutrients that support algal growths in reservoirs and lakes originate in the surrounding watershed and enter with the run-off. If the soil is fertile, nutrients in algae are likely to be more abundant. Even the time and pattern of applying fertilizer to agricultural land may influence the contribution of nutrients to the aquatic environment. In their simple existence, algae utilize the mineral nutrients that have come from the land as well as carbon dioxide dissolved from the air or released in decay of organic matter. During warm seasons, when growing conditions are otherwise favourable, algal production slows down and finally is stopped by depletion of any one nutrient element. Because nitrogen and phosphorus are not abundant in most surface waters, more commonly than other elements they seem to act as a brake on further rapid growth as the season progresses. Thus, although some naturally fertile lakes habitually develop algal blooms from year to year, as a rule such blooms are less frequent and objectionable than in lakes polluted with sewage. The main nutrients (macronutrients) contained in sewage are nitrogen (20-50 p.p.m.), phosphorus (1-13 p.p.m.), carbon (70-100 p.p.m.), and potassium (15-50 p.p.m.), but sewage also

contains certain trace elements (micronutrients) which are also believed to stimulate algal growth.

Unfortunately, sewerage and sewage treatment is not the answer to removal of nutrients from sewage. The objectives of conventional sewage treatment are the stabilization of organic material and removal of suspended solids and dangerous micro-organisms in order to make the effluent acceptable for discharge to surface waters as far as health, aesthetic and most re-use considerations are concerned. However, removal of algal nutrients is negligible, and they are discharged in solution with the effluent. All lakes and reservoirs undergo natural ageing by accumulating sediments and nutrients, becoming shallower, more fertile and productive and thus qualify to be called "eutrophic". Excessive blooms of algae are the first sign that the wheels of the ageing process are fully in motion and the lake is headed for extinction. Normally, the ageing process is extremely slow and is immeasurable in the human life span, but significant sewage pollution dramatically accelerates the process.

Throughout the world there are many examples of enrichment of surface waters by sewage, sewage effluents and urban stormwaters, with consequent changes from being attractive, clear, sparkling to becoming malodorous, unsightly and near-useless to useless. Over the past 25 years, the nature and extent of the problem has been widely documented in the international technical press. The discharge of sewages or sewage effluents is involved in every case, and the usual steps are (1) introduction of raw or treated sewage, (2) replacement of game fish with coarse fish, and (3) dramatic increases in algal and other undesirable biological growths resulting in serious interference in the utilization of the water resource for public water supplies, irrigation, tourism and recreation. Lake Zurich, Switzerland, is one of the best-known examples of induced eutrophication. The lake is composed of two basins separated by a narrow passage. The upper basin received no sewage and remained essentially unchanged whereas the lower basin, receiving the sewage from a group of small communities with more than 100,000 people, underwent typical changes as described above. In addition to adverse aesthetic considerations, seasonal blooms of blue-green algae cause great difficulties in water treatment works operation (filtration) resulting in increased costs of treatment.

Other Alpine lakes are reported to have shared the same fate, as have also lakes and impoundments in Sweden and England. Even more documented and spectacular is the induced eutrophication of natural and impounded lakes of the United States of America. Possibly Lake Erie is the most publicized but the Madison Lakes (Wisconsin), Lake Zoar (an impoundment on the Housatonic River, Connecticut), and Lake Washington, Washington, have all undergone advanced eutrophication under the influence of sewage and industrial wastes discharge. Current plans for diverting sewage effluents away from Lake Washington are now in hand at an estimated cost of \$US80,000,000.

It is not necessary to go overseas for instances of concern regarding induced eutrophication by sewage and sewage effluents. In Queensland, the Redlands Shire Council (Brisbane) has just completed the Leslie Harrison Water Supply Dam on Tingalpa Creek. The watershed of the dam is about 35sq.m. and lies partly in each of three local areas (the Redlands shire, the Albert shire and the Brisbane City Council). Following proposed improved access by new highways, rapid subdivisional development is taking place in Albert shire. While the three local authorities are co-operating in an effort to provide maximum protection of the watershed by control of land use, they are under increasing pressure to re-zone rural land on the watershed. Investigations are still proceeding but it has already been suggested by the Local Government Department that the solution may be to provide as much protection as practicable for as long as possible and then consider the advantages of purchasing treated water from the Brisbane City Council in preference to the difficulties of treating a polluted supply. It will be appreciated, however, that this fortunate alternative water supply resource is not available to Adelaide.

The metropolitan reservoirs: The watersheds of the metropolitan reservoirs are large (500 sq.m.) in relation to the relatively small storages (40,000,000,000 gallons) which means a higher than normal pollution potential. Unfortunately, this is coupled with other watershed characteristics that make the reservoirs particularly vulnerable to pollution:

1. Inhabited watersheds: In the first place they have inhabited watersheds which comprise some of the most productive and fertile land of the State—compare Melbourne, Sydney, Perth.

2. Close to the metropolitan area: The watersheds are less than 10 miles from the inner city—compare Sydney (40), Melbourne (45), Perth (20), Brisbane (80).

3. Extremely accessible: By the Hills Freeway and excellent secondary roads, Stirling is now barely 20 minutes from the General Post Office by road.

4. Attractive for semi-rural living: These characteristics all contribute to the water pollution problem in that they have stimulated the following recent trends in human activities on the watersheds:

- (1) Intensifying rural activity to supply the primary production needs of the growing metropolitan area.
- (2) Expanding industries, for example, Plaimar (Lobethal), Southern Farmers Union (Woodside), quarrying generally.
- (3) Increasing recreational use by local and metropolitan populations,
- and last, but by no means least
- (4) Urbanization, particularly by commuters who seek a semi-rural way of life.

The question is what can be permitted on the watersheds without causing undesirable nutrient enrichment of the metropolitan reservoirs. At this stage it is not possible to give a quantitative answer to this difficult question, nor is it likely that a reasonably sensible answer could be given at an early date because of the complex and variable interaction of nutrient leaching from the fertile soils of the Adelaide Hills, the existing and future pattern of usage or phosphatic and nitrogenous fertilizers; the type of future rural development on the watersheds; future population trends; waste disposal from existing and future subdivisional and industrial development and climatic conditions.

A sanitary survey has already been put in hand by the Water Pollution Control Laboratory at Bolivar. An experienced biologist has been assigned the task of evaluating nutrient levels and related biological activity in a programme aimed at monitoring trends in the enrichment of metropolitan surface water supplies. However, overseas experience indicates that it will be five to 10 years before confident quantitative predictions can be made. There is qualitative evidence, however, that due to naturally fertile watersheds and their calcareous nature, the metropolitan reservoirs are susceptible to eutrophication and there are already the following symptoms of nutrient enrichment.

The first time copper sulphate was needed to control algae was a single dose in Hope Valley reservoir in 1924. It was not until 1937 that the next algal problem occurred

(again at Hope Valley), and systematic quantitative surveys were subsequently initiated. Over the past few years, copper sulphate dosing of reservoirs to control excessive algal growths has become routine. Appendix IA to this statement shows the pattern of usage on the metropolitan watersheds over the past 10 years. In 1969, 90 tons was used, representing an annual cost of \$45,000 for materials only. By contrast, Appendix IB shows copper sulphate dosing in country reservoirs over the past 10 years and indicates no similar trend.

This year a very large floating odorous blue-green algal mass at Mount Bold was required to be treated not only for water quality control but also to remove it from view of the many tourists who visit the reservoir. Some measure of the deterioration of water quality is evidenced also by the increase in chlorine demand of the water. In the period 1961-68 the weighted average chlorine dose has risen by 50 per cent from 2.1 p.p.m. to 3.2 p.p.m. to ensure the distribution of a safe water supply to metropolitan consumers. This is a measure of the oxygen demand of the water due to organic enrichment, which includes that attributable to the lowered bacteriological quality of the raw water.

A recent laboratory test series was done on oxygen depletion of the relatively nutrient-free Murray River water and this showed that this water could be stored for at least three to four weeks in a main without significant change in dissolved oxygen level or palatability. By comparison, metropolitan reservoir water, which is usually devoid of oxygen after a week, is unpalatable and gives rise to many consumer complaints. At the present time, it is believed that the major source of nutrient pollution is derived from rural activities but that wastes derived from human habitation are playing an increasing part.

Proposed amendments to the Waterworks Act have been submitted to the Government to control more positively the discharge of effluents from undesirable rural activities, for example, piggeries, poultry farms, feed lots, etc., and only one further aspect may call for additional control. There is, I understand, a surplus of nitrogenous fertilizer at the present time and farmers are being encouraged to use increased application rates. It is conceivable (if only just) that limits might need to be placed on the application rates of fertilizers if excessive quantities of fertilizers can be demonstrated in run-off. Generally speaking,

I am confident that the astuteness of farmers in such matters will make this restriction unnecessary.

Pesticides and weedicides are not detectable in the waters derived from the metropolitan watersheds at present nor are these chemicals involved in this particular aspect of water pollution. Increases in industrial wastes from expanding industries on the watersheds are being dealt with either by discharge to departmental sewage treatment works (for example, Plaimar, Lobethal) or by close liaison with the industry to determine treatment requirements (for example, Southern Farmers abattoir and smallgoods works, Woodside).

Except in certain locations, recreational activities do not constitute a significant hazard; therefore, our greatest concern is centred on urbanization, which has been shown by experience to be associated with all serious eutrophication problems elsewhere. The departmental policy with regard to subdivision on the watershed is enumerated in detail in the Water and Sewerage Co-ordinating Committee Report dated November 25, 1969. In essence, it proposed:

1. Limiting the country living areas largely to the existing subdivided areas.
2. Limiting existing watershed townships to existing defined areas. (There would be no point in limiting one area to find development shifting to other areas on the water sheds.)
3. Limiting subdivision in the remainder of the area to allotments of 20 acres minimum.

Quite frankly, I am of the opinion that the recommended 20-acre minimum allotment size outside of established centres is too small from the water supply point of view and that it would be more desirable to "freeze" the water sheds at this point and embark on a complete technical sanitary survey. Bearing in mind the other demands on the area, I do not think this latter proposal would be reasonable or acceptable. The adoption of 20 acres is based on the judgment that it will control the rate of development to such an extent that trends in pollution of the watersheds may be assessed and that water treatment and advancing technology in water pollution control should be able to maintain an acceptable water supply for metropolitan Adelaide in the interim.

The present development plan, in general terms, envisages:

1. Urban type development in the "country living" zone and Hills townships.

2. Minimum 10-acre allotments in the rural zone (discretionary powers are also available for smaller allotments in the rural zone and these have been exercised on many occasions).

On the basis of six persons an acre (which excludes any consideration of high-rise development), the defined "country living" area of Stirling-Bridgewater alone will accommodate 58,000 persons so that ultimate urban development on the whole watershed would approach 80,000 persons. The State Planning Authority's prediction of the Stirling District Council only is 30,000 persons in 1991 and this is already considered conservative. The existing watersheds are 500 square miles in area. On the basis of extending the rural zone to the remainder of the watersheds, one dwelling, say, 3.7 persons each 10 acres, will add about 114,000 persons (and their sewerage nutrients) to the watersheds.

1. The metropolitan watersheds will grow to 660 square miles with planned new storages on the Little Para River, Onkaparinga River and Finniss River.
2. Improvement in access and the extension of the metropolitan urban area to the north and to the south will create demands for urban and semi-rural development in areas of the watersheds not under immediate pressure.

The present planning, therefore, represents a total of 172,000 persons on the watersheds; this is a frightening figure when compared with lesser populations which have induced serious eutrophication situations overseas. For example, 100,000 persons Zurichsee, 76,000 persons Lake Washington—capacity 635,000,000,000gall., area 21,600 acres. The tremendous momentum of such development would also demand extremely firm governmental resolve to stop the whittling away of fringe rural areas. Even the Engineering and Water Supply Department's proposals will eventually lead to an ultimate population of about 80,000 persons. While this is a considerably lower figure, it is still alarming. However, it is believed that it will result in a much lower rate of development, because the 20-acre allotment is not normally manageable by the average city commuter and is slightly less than the minimum area from which a reasonable living from primary industry can be made.

I might add that in view of the already relatively eutrophic status of the metropolitan reservoirs I would expect that, before full

development of the area takes place, evidence will be available that could call for even more rigorous limitations on subdivisional development of the metropolitan watersheds. The departmental proposals do not stop those South Australians who wish to live in the "country" while commuting with the city for employment. For instance, the continuation of the Hills Freeway to the eastern boundary of the Onkaparinga River watershed (between Hahndorf and Mount Barker) will open up an even more attractive "country living" area, which will be a mere 30 minutes travelling time from the inner city. A large community in such areas would encourage industries which cannot establish themselves economically on the watersheds because of the stringent requirements for effluent treatment. My personal view is that the proposals would also retain some of the best agricultural land in South Australia for primary production.

There is no provision under the Planning and Development Act to allow objection to subdivision on the grounds that the subdivision would lead to pollution of a public water supply. The evidence is that water pollution from extensive and uncontrolled urban development of the metropolitan watersheds will lead to serious water pollution problems. The proposed Regulation 68a would give the Director of Planning (on the advice of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief) discretionary powers to refuse a subdivision on this basis. The subdivider has, of course, right of appeal to the Planning Appeal Board and higher courts if any decision is considered unreasonable.

Further to the same matter of pollution of the river front development, the following details were provided:

Judged by the level of pollution which exists in many of the major river systems of the United States of America and Europe, the Murray River in South Australia is a very clean river. Considering that the majority of South Australia's future water requirements must be derived from the Murray River, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is very conscious of the need to fully protect this important water resource and in co-operation with other departments is continually moving to eliminate (or at least contain) significant foci of pollution.

Even at the existing low level of Murray River pollution, there is evidence of eutrophication (nutrient enrichment) in the lower slow-flowing reaches of the river system. Algal

blooms have been recorded at Taillem Bend and further downstream and there are extensive biological growths in Lake Alexandrina.

Excluding salinity, there are three main sources of pollution potential on the Murray River:

1. Industrial wastes from industries associated with established irrigation and pastoral areas.
2. Wastes from recreational activities such as houseboats, swimming, water ski-ing, fishing, etc.
3. Domestic wastes from the river towns such as Renmark, Berri, Loxton, Barmera, Waikerie, Mannum, Murray Bridge and Goolwa and other riverfront development including homes, shacks, caravan sites, etc.

Great strides have been made in recent years in the control of Murray River pollution from industry. At the present time only two industries discharge relatively untreated wastes to the river and both of these industries will have their wastes diverted from the river within two years.

Some pollution is inevitable as the result of recreational activities. No restrictions should be necessary for swimming, water ski-ing or fishing and it can only be hoped that participants observe reasonable sanitary behaviour. In townships, adequate public lavatory facilities are generally provided. The recent explosion of large houseboats on the river has introduced a new source of pollution. These boats at present discharge all wastes directly to the river and proposals are being designed to store these wastes on board for subsequent disposal away from the river at sanitary mooring stations.

With regard to domestic wastes, considerable improvement has been achieved in the control of Murray River pollution by the installation of septic tank effluent drainage schemes at Renmark, Berri, Barmera and Waikerie, and others are under consideration; and the installation of full sewerage schemes at Mannum and Murray Bridge. There is no doubt that stormwater and other township-associated wastes contribute significant pollution to the river although the effect of these is reduced as the source is located further and further from the river proper.

Unquestionably, our major concern is the ribbon-like riverfront development for houses, shacks and caravan sites. Much of the existing development is on Crown or leasehold land, while some is on relatively new subdivisions which abut the water's edge. With increasing

population, increasing leisure time and increasing affluence it can be expected that this type of development will tend to escalate until virtually the whole riverfront, which is suitable for this type of development, is built up. The control of water pollution from this source (which has given rise to serious river pollution problems overseas) can be achieved only by keeping all new development back from the water's edge.

It is not possible economically to sewer these strip developments and, while many of the older shacks have pans, septic tanks are normally installed. Provided that soil conditions are satisfactory for subsurface irrigation and subject to the disposal area being well away from the river, river pollution from this source should be limited. In many cases, soil conditions for subsurface disposal are not satisfactory and a wide buffer area between the waste disposal point and the river is essential to even minimize pollution. Nor is sewage the only source of river pollution resulting from concentrations of human habitation on its banks. Garbage, domestic animals, rodents and other pests, garden fertilizers, etc., associated with human occupation all contribute significant pollution to the aquatic environment.

The degree of contribution to water pollution from these sources is very much related to the distance of the houses, etc., from the water's edge. The recommended figure of 300ft. is considered to be a minimum to keep Murray River pollution within satisfactory limits in the long term. This water resource must be retained not only for today but for all generations of the future. The existing legislation under the Control of Waters Act is curative rather than preventive and is ineffective in controlling pollution from extensive undesirable riverfront development such as shacks, houses and caravan parks located close to the water's edge. The proposed Regulation 68a would give the Director of Planning discretionary power to refuse subdivision of land within 300ft. of the river and associated water where the Director and Engineer-in-Chief is of the opinion that water pollution will occur. This is considered to be minimal control and, in any case, the subdivider has right of appeal to the Planning Appeal Board and higher courts.

I want to read the last submission, by Mr. Beaney, the Engineer-in-Chief, who states:

This legislation is vital to the control of pollution of the two most important water resources in South Australia—both of which

are very vulnerable to serious pollution as outlined in the evidence given before the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about Dartmouth?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Dartmouth would not have any direct bearing on the pollution that comes from South Australia. We are talking about pollution as a result of what happens in this State. In addition to what we get from other States, we have to control our own pollution. The submission continues:

(See also departmental water pollution control statement for the Metropolitan Watersheds.) This statement and another indicate the concern for water pollution which to an increasing extent in the future will be associated with increasing human occupation on the watersheds and on the banks of the Murray River.

The Waterworks Act (sections 56-58) and the Control of Waters Act (section 12) provide "curative" legislation, under which a limited degree of control of rural and industrial pollution can be achieved. Amendments to strengthen this legislation (as a holding measure until more comprehensive legislation is enacted) have been in the hands of the Parliamentary Draftsman since last year.

I say "last year" to indicate that those measures were supported by the previous Government. The submission continues:

Obviously such legislation cannot be effective against water pollution derived from established human occupation because this will inevitably result in personal hardship and operate against good public relations so necessary to water pollution control.

There can be no doubt that the control of the distribution of urban and similar type development in the State must be the responsibility of the State Planning Authority under the Planning and Development Act. In this dry State, decisions of the Director of Planning will be greatly influenced by factors concerned with the protection of the State's water resources but, except for regulation 68A which is under notice of disallowance—

as a result of the Hon. Mr. Kemp's motion—there is no provision under the Planning and Development Act (section 49) which allows the Director of Planning to refuse a plan of subdivision or resubdivision which will give rise to pollution of an important water resource.

If regulation 68A is disallowed, the only basis on which the Director of Planning (on the advice of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief) could oppose undesirable subdivision or resubdivision in the watersheds is the existing section 49 (e), which reads:

sewage cannot be disposed of from each allotment defined therein without risk to health.

No other more appropriate clause is available. While the major water pollution problems of the latter half of the nineteenth century and

the early part of this century were health problems associated with waterborne disease, this is not the case today and it is not possible to sustain a reasonable case on the basis of health hazard. The present concern is associated mainly with other aspects of the quality of natural waters, including their suitability (chemically, physically and biologically) for public water supplies and for industrial, agricultural and recreational use; for fish and wildlife conservation; and for the maintenance of an aesthetically desirable environment.

Contrary to the reports in the press, the proposed legislation is minimal and provides for the absolute maximum of protection to the individual. In every case, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief must examine the proposals in detail and advise the Director of Planning of his opposition to or acceptance of the proposed subdivision or resubdivision. The Director of Planning, after giving due consideration to all factors involved, "may" (or may not) refuse approval for the plan of subdivision or resubdivision. Finally, the subdivider has right of appeal to the Planning Appeal Board and higher courts.

Based on oversea experience, I am convinced that there will be the need for stronger and more comprehensive water pollution control legislation in the not so distant future. That date will be brought forward considerably if uncontrolled urban development on the riverfront of the Murray River and on the metropolitan watersheds is permitted to proceed over the next few years.

I urge honourable members to defeat the motion for disallowance.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1722.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): This private member's Bill was introduced in another place by Mr. Coumbe and in this Council by my friend and colleague the Hon. Mr. Story. The Bill provides that sums of money expressed in the old currency should be changed to decimal currency, and it provides for an increase from \$200,000 to \$400,000 in the minimum cost of projects that must be examined by the Public Works Committee. The work of Parliamentary committees is very valuable, first, because they inform honourable members who are fortunate enough to serve on them of the various functions of Government and, secondly, because they save many thousands of dollars and often contribute towards the construction of better facilities on better sites than perhaps would otherwise have occurred. I can remember that a

year or two ago a very new member of another place was anxious to save \$3,940 by abolishing a certain committee; however, when I informed him that in that very year that committee had saved the Government \$550,000, he had second thoughts about his scheme.

The longer we are here the more we realize how valuable Parliamentary committees are. I pay a tribute to members of the Public Works Committee for what they accomplish. Because I have attended their inspections from time to time in my electoral district, I know of the valuable work they do. The committee has saved the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars and has often made recommendations that have led to better projects on better sites. The committee conducts its investigations in a non-Party atmosphere. In general, our Parliamentary committees work in such an atmosphere. The Hon. Cyril Hutchens said years ago that Parliament gets on much better when members work together. The Public Works Committee has from time to time recommended modifications to projects and alternatives. For example, I refer to the changes it recommended in relation to the construction of additions to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as a result of which the committee was instrumental in saving the Government millions of dollars.

This Bill alters the minimum cost of projects that must be referred to the committee from \$200,000 to \$400,000. After considering this matter I am inclined to agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and the Hon. Mr. Geddes that it is probably unwise to alter the figure now. I think the Hon. Mr. Geddes suggested that the figure might be smaller rather than greater. The honourable member, a man of experience, said that a school might well have been placed in the bed of a creek had it not been for the committee's investigations. I can think of a similar instance, when a school was to be sited on what appeared to be a flat and ordinary piece of ground. Had it not been for local knowledge that school would have been put there; however, the area was subject from time to time to floods 2ft. to 3ft. deep.

Having considered the proposed increase and the suggestion that the figure be reduced, I am inclined to come down on the side of leaving it as it is. The amount paid to the members of this committee in the way of extra salary is very insignificant when one considers the value of the committee to the State. With those reservations as to the

necessary corrections from the old currency to decimal currency, I oppose the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I do not want to say much about this Bill. I intend to support the second reading. I do not think any member of this Council wishes to depreciate in any way the very valuable work the Public Works Committee does for this Parliament. I know that they are a conscientious group of men who work very hard indeed at the assignments sent to them.

I do not think this Bill in any way is really wanting to reduce the authority of that committee. However, I think we must be realistic about these things. The figure of \$200,000 that we are now seeking to increase was fixed in 1955, and I think all I need do is refer to the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Story in introducing this Bill, namely, that the cost of a building which in 1955 was estimated at \$200,000 is now, because of changes in the value of money, about \$285,000. One can see, therefore, that in that period the original amount that was fixed as the basis upon which matters were to be referred to the committee has gone up by nearly 50 per cent.

I believe that the amount proposed in this Bill, namely, a figure double the original figure of \$200,000, is going too far. I think we should limit this to the change in the value of money as mentioned by the honourable member who introduced the Bill, and I indicate that in Committee I intend to move an amendment to provide that only projects estimated to cost over \$300,000 shall be referred to the committee in future. That does not mean that projects costing under that figure are not to be referred. The responsible Minister of the day can refer to the committee any project that he thinks should be referred. What is more, any member of this Council who knows of a project going on in his area, such as a school building, and who thinks that perhaps some error has been made in some way, can ask the Minister in this Council to consider referring the matter to the committee. I think that with these safeguards we can safely come up to the new values that now exist because of changes in the value of money and increase the ceiling to \$300,000.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Do you think the committee is over-committed or over-worked at present?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not know about that. All I know is that the matter came to us from another House, where it had been

introduced by a former member of the committee, and that it had the support of all other members of the committee in that House. I think one must take some cognizance of the fact that those members must know the amount of work the committee is actually doing. Indeed, I do not know that this is really the right criterion: I do not know that we should worry about whether the committee is working to its full capacity at any particular time. A committee can be very busy indeed but in fact can be busy doing relatively unimportant things. I do not in any way suggest that the work the committee is at any time doing is unimportant. However, it is possible that that situation could exist.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: What would be the use of referring a project to the committee after it had commenced, which is what you seem to be suggesting?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: What I said was that at any point of time the responsible Minister could refer any project to the committee. A member may know that a school is to be built in his district and he may have some doubts regarding the project, and in those circumstances he can approach the Minister. He can ask a question in this Council, and if he wishes to do so he can even move a motion requesting that the Minister consider referring the matter to the committee. I think these matters can thus be covered in other ways. Indeed, my point about increasing the amount to present-day levels is that if we do not do it now we will surely have to do it within the next three or four years, and I do not see why we should delay the matter. As the Bill has been brought before us, we have the opportunity to take this action now, and I think we have every warrant for doing it, seeing that we have upgraded figures in other legislation from time to time. Accordingly, I intend to support the second reading in order to move the amendment to which I have referred.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the second reading. I had been inclined to support the Bill through to its final stages but, on reflection, I believe there is considerable merit in the Hon. Mr. Potter's foreshadowed amendment to meet the position halfway and to fix the limit at \$300,000. This would tend to ensure that the committee would deal with the larger public works, which was the intention back in 1927 when the committee was first formed. I think it should concern itself with the major public works of the State. I read with interest that there has

been only one change in the limit between 1927 and now, and that was the change in 1955 that honourable members have mentioned when the figure of £100,000 (\$200,000) was fixed.

Many compliments have been paid to the members of the committee for the work they do, and I endorse those compliments. However, no mention has been made of the capabilities and the dedication of senior public servants in this State who prepare and draw up the plans and specifications for and supervise the construction of these major works, and I take this opportunity to pay some compliment to them. During the two years I was a Minister I came in close contact with many of the senior public servants of this State, and I was very impressed by their capabilities and dedication and by their ability to plan and carry out the works for which they were responsible.

I place much trust in these professional men. They are busy men who have much work to do. I refer particularly to officers of the Public Buildings Department, which often comes in for a certain amount of criticism because of delays that occur. On the smaller jobs in which it is involved, if Parliament could assist it by allowing expedition and by allowing it to proceed with urgent jobs, it would mean that the jobs would be completed more quickly than they would be if it involved much detail in presenting a case to the committee. That expedition, from the point of view of the Public Service and of those who occupy the new buildings (such as school staff and schoolchildren), ought to be considered.

The Bill was introduced in another place by a former Minister of Works (Mr. Coumbe), who was in charge of the Public Buildings Department. I am sure that members on both sides of the Council would agree that Mr. Coumbe was a very conscientious Minister who gained, through his experience and his attitude to his work, a very intimate knowledge of this problem from the point of view of the officers concerned.

I am sure that he brought the matter forward only because he genuinely considered that a real purpose and benefit to the State could be achieved if some change were made. However, on the other hand, I completely agree with the sentiments that public funds must not be squandered on public works. I point out that there is a process of checks at present, all of which tend to ensure the

careful expenditure of money on our public works. A department's officers are responsible to their particular head, and from there to the Minister and to Cabinet; overseeing this whole question is the Auditor-General. So there are checks involved to ensure that the risk of unfortunate expenditure that might come into the category of squandering of money is kept to a minimum.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is there not more chance of mistakes being made on the smaller projects than on the larger ones?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know. Through some particular degree of risk in a job there may be the possibility of 1 per cent or 5 per cent of the total cost being poorly expended. If we look at it from that point of view, the larger the job the larger the amount of money involved. How far can we take the argument that money may be squandered on small jobs?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Wouldn't the department find out the mistakes in the smaller jobs much more quickly than in the larger ones?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. That is a very good point. In smaller jobs small errors could be found more quickly, and it could be seen that they did not occur again. How far will we get with a Parliamentary committee overseeing the Public Service? Taken to the extreme, are we to have all our departments bringing down small jobs to the committee to peruse? We must keep a reasonable balance in our consideration of this point.

Regarding the question of whether or not the committee has time to consider all projects, my experience on one occasion as a Minister led me to understand that the committee had its hands very full and was unable to attend to a certain matter, when I had hoped that it would attend to it. It has been my impression since that occasion that its work has kept it very busy indeed.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The closing of a railway line was under consideration at that time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was the closing of a railway line, but I did not intend mentioning it. The committee was too busy and involved in other matters and could not deal with it at that time. I appreciate all the aspects involved in that case, but it has led me to believe that the committee has had much work to do. As time passes and as the costs of all these projects increase, it seems to me

that the committee will certainly get more work if the figure remains at \$200,000.

However, a compromise is something that I always endeavour to support, and on this occasion I am only too happy to support it. If the Council will agree to the limit being increased to \$300,000, another review could be made in the future. In the interests of the Public Service and of the work that the committee is capable of handling, and taking all factors into account and bearing in mind the points that have been made regarding the value and costs of projects and how these costs are rising all the time, I consider that a \$300,000 limit is a fair and reasonable compromise. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): First, I wish to thank all honourable members who participated in this refreshing debate. Every honourable member has a different point of view, and that is very good. I will regret it very much if the Bill is not passed, because the time has come when the limit should be increased. However, I have always been a realist, and if I can get half way there I shall be delighted. If amendments are moved in Committee, I shall carefully consider them.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Duty to submit proposals for new public works to committee."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I move:

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

This will mean that there will be some reduction in the amount envisaged in the Bill. It will provide a half-way house between the \$400,000 proposed and the existing limit of \$200,000. The amendment will bring the limit into line with the change in money value, as referred to by the Hon. Mr. Story.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I oppose this amendment. I need not debate fully all the matters I raised in my second reading speech but I find it hard to understand the somewhat irresponsible attitude towards the spending of this State's money. In my second reading speech, I quoted extensively from the Auditor-General's Reports, where repeatedly, year after year, he expresses concern about controlling the spending of money on those projects not covered by the Public Works Standing Committee Act—that is, those projects not required to be referred to that committee.

It has been mentioned that perhaps errors in smaller projects would be discovered more regularly and quickly by the departments. In fact, those are the very projects with which the Public Works Committee has had the most trouble. There are repeated claims by Governments for more money for various projects—health, welfare, schools, etc.—calls for more Commonwealth aid and suggestions that we must have an increase in taxation to meet these commitments. Surely, the first responsibility of Parliament should be to see that the money available is spent in the most efficient manner for the protection of the taxpayers and the provision of those facilities that are needed so badly.

I refer to one occasion when a delay occurred in the closing of a railway line but this was because of a provision in the Road and Railway Transport Act that, unless the Public Works Committee objected within a stated period, a railway line could be closed. A somewhat similar provision exists in the regulations dealing with the railways. If such a reference came during the Christmas break, some inconvenience might be caused. The committee requested that an extended period of time be written into the Act to cover that sort of problem. I am strongly of the opinion that Parliament has an obligation to the taxpayer, and I cannot see how this amendment or the remainder of this Bill can in any way assist in the administration of Government departments or in furthering the welfare of the State. I oppose the amendment and indicate that I shall also oppose clauses 4 and 5.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I support the views taken by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan on this matter. There are one or two things in this Bill that are non-controversial—for instance, the drafting alterations from pounds to dollars. However, I can give no support at all to these other changes. For the reasons given in my second reading speech, I intend to vote against the amendment. However, Mr. Chairman, is it possible for a further amendment to be moved on the question of the amount of money after a vote is taken on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The procedure is, of course, that the question will be put that the word proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause. If that is carried and the word "four" remains, it can be amended later. If the question is decided in the negative, then will come the question of the insertion of the word "three", in which case any honourable member can take the opportunity

of moving any further amendment he desires to. The question before the Chair is, that the word proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause.

A division on the question was called for.

After the division bells had ceased ringing:

The CHAIRMAN: I appoint the Hon. Mr. Story teller for the Ayes, and the Hon. Mr. Potter teller for the Noes.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Hon. Mr. Story called for the division and that he had voted for the Noes.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. Potter is moving this amendment and I have appointed him a teller. A couple of voices called for a division and I do not know whose they were.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Because a division was called for, the Hon. Mr. Story is obliged, under Standing Orders, to vote for the Noes. In the circumstances, I do not see how he can be teller for the Ayes.

The CHAIRMAN: I appointed the Hon. Mr. Potter teller for the Noes and the Hon. Mr. Story teller for the Ayes. A division was called for, but it seems that no-one wants to be a teller. We may as well call the division off unless someone is prepared to be teller for the Ayes.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will be teller for the Ayes. I am always accommodating.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Mr. Chairman, I take a further point of order. You declared the vote in favour of the Ayes, but since the Hon. Mr. Story called for a division he is bound by Standing Orders to vote for the Noes, yet he has crossed the floor to vote for the Ayes.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that it is better to call off the division. I had better put the call again and give honourable members another opportunity to do what they wish to do.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Standing Order 220 states:

A member calling for a division shall not leave the Chamber until the division is concluded, and shall vote with those whose voices, in the opinion of the President, were in the minority.

The CHAIRMAN: Giving effect to what I said before, honourable members can consider again in which way they will vote. Since there seems to be some confusion, I am trying

to help the Committee. By leave of the Committee, I put the question, which is that the word proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause. For the question say "Aye"; against say "No". The Noes have it. I put the question: that the word proposed to be inserted be inserted. For the question say "Aye"; against say "No". I think the Ayes have it. The question now is, that the clause as amended be passed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Committee having changed the word "four" to "three", have I the right to move a further amendment to change \$300,000 to a different amount? Since the question has not yet been put, I think I can still move that the clause, as agreed to, be amended.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader can do that on a recommittal of the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the only thing I can do now is to vote against the clause.

The Committee divided on the clause as amended:

Ayes (11)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, Jessie Cooper, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone, F. J. Potter, E. K. Russack, Sir Arthur Rymill, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story (teller).

Noes (6)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, H. K. Kemp, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clause 5—"Operation of section 25 during time of war."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

To strike out "four" and insert "three".

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the word proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause. The Noes have it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Mr. Chairman, I desire to move an amendment providing that the figure be \$250,000, with a view to a possible recommittal of the Bill in relation to the amendment passed in clause 4. Would I be in order in moving first that the word "hundred" be struck out so that I can move that the amount be \$250,000?

The CHAIRMAN: The question now before the Chair is that the word "three" be inserted. If the Committee desired to insert another figure, it would vote against the insertion of the word "three". Then some other figure

could be considered. The question is that the word "three" proposed to be inserted be inserted.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, Jessie Cooper, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone, F. J. Potter (teller), E. K. Russack, Sir Arthur Rymill, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story.

Noes (6)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, H. K. Kemp, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

That the third reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I oppose the motion. It has been the practice—

The PRESIDENT: The Chief Secretary should vote against the motion if he is not in agreement with it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I want it to be made an Order of the Day for next Wednesday.

Motion negatived.

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the third reading of the Bill to be moved forthwith.

The PRESIDENT: As I hear a dissentient voice, there must be a division to prove that there is an absolute majority in favour of the motion.

While the division bells were ringing:

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The reason I voted against the motion is that I understood that the Leader of the House did not want the Standing Orders suspended. If he is happy about it, so am I.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is not the correct position. I do not want to be misunderstood. I take exception to a private member's Bill being made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting when the Council has laid down over the years that private members' Bills be debated only on Wednesdays. I have no objection to Standing Orders being suspended so as to enable such a Bill to go through its remaining stages on the day on which it has been dealt with.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no-one for the Noes, there is no need to take a division. I am sure I heard someone call "No". There being no-one to tell for the Noes, I declare the Standing Orders suspended.

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Motion carried.

Bill passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF WOODVILLE WEST LAKES LOAN) BILL

Bill recommitted and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

After consultation with the appropriate organizations (and I point out that they are quite happy with the Bill) a review has been undertaken of the provisions of the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1968, which provide for compensation payments. At present, section 6 of the principal Act provides that, where after slaughter an animal is found to be diseased, the compensation payable will be about 25 per cent less than it would have been if the animal were found not to be diseased. In addition, for the purposes of calculating compensation payments the upper limit of the market value of stock slaughtered is, at present, fixed at \$120.

Clause 2 recasts section 6 (1) to relate that subsection more closely to the provisions of the principal Act that set out the circumstances in which compensation is payable. In addition, this clause provides for the abolition of the 25 per cent deduction in the case of animals found to be diseased, since it is felt that this deduction is no longer warranted. Clause 3 amends section 7 of the principal Act and provides for the lifting of the upper limit of market value from \$120 to \$200, thus recognizing the generally higher cattle prices which have prevailed since 1951 when the upper limit was last fixed. Since these proposed amendments will result in some increase of payments from the Cattle Compensation Fund, the position will be continually reviewed to ensure that the fund remains financially sound.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ADULT FRANCHISE)

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

BRANCH FROM SANDERGROVE TO MILANG RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on October 20. Page 1839.)

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Removal of portion of the railway."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As this clause deals with the disposal of the assets of the line—the rail itself, the ballast and the other equipment for which the Railways Commissioner would have no other purpose—can the Minister tell me the Railways Commissioner's intention in regard to the land involved? I know that, as a general policy, the Commissioner likes to retain land of this nature and that his opinion is that in the long term it is of some advantage for a utility of this kind to hold the land because it is possible that in many years there will be a need for another service of this kind along the same route.

However, the thought occurs to me sometimes that, with the cost of maintaining such land and the problems it often gives rise to, such as the danger of bush fires, the maintenance of fences, and so forth, it is better to have a programme of disposal of some of the land in fee simple by tender. I see no reason for the railway line between Sandergrrove and Milang being reinstated in the foreseeable future. In a case like this, involving the general economic programme of the Railways Department, the whole operation of the railways should be treated in a businesslike manner and serious consideration should be given to the sale of the freehold of the land as well as of the actual equipment. What are the Commissioner's intentions?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I do not know what the Commissioner intends to do with this land but I will note what the honourable member has said. If this Bill passes, consideration will be given to what is to be done with the improvements on the railway line and with the land. I assure the honourable member that I shall look closely into this matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

KINGSWOOD RECREATION GROUND (VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1841.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I support this simple and desirable Bill. The origins of the Kyre Oval are not exactly as they were related in the Minister's second reading explanation. As this Bill is connected with the history of the district, I think the record should be put straight. It is the record of a very worthwhile community project in what used to be my home district. Kyre Oval was originally the playground of Kyre College, which no longer exists. It was closed in 1917 and purchased for the establishment of Scotch College, which started in the premises of the old college. Scotch College moved to its present site in 1919.

The oval therefore became surplus and was offered at public auction, but Councillor Robert Duncan thought it was a great pity not to retain the oval as a playground for the district. Councillor Duncan called a meeting on October 26, 1917, to propose the acquisition of the land so that it could be used as a public playground. At that meeting a start was made on collecting funds, and £342 was raised immediately. At subsequent meetings on November 27 and December 6 a total of 27 residents of the district guaranteed the balance to meet the purchase price of this block of land—the entire block fronting Victoria Terrace.

The block was eventually purchased for £3,691. I leave it to honourable members to imagine just what the value of that land would be today. It not only fronts Victoria Terrace but it extends the full depth to Rugby Street. It was a genuine community project: even the Kingswood League of Service Ladies weighed in with £113 10s. The outstanding workers should be recorded: they were Messrs. T. E. Yelland, S. Winwood, Laurence Boorman, and Norman Mellor.

As the Unley High School was immediately adjacent at that time, the land was vested in the Minister of Education under a deed of trust that was then intended to be in perpetuity. However, the present Bill breaks that arrangement. The management and maintenance of

the land was undertaken by the group of 27 citizens who had guaranteed the purchase price and raised the necessary £1,830 (the purchase was made with a Government subsidy of 50 per cent). Now, of course, the Unley High School has been moved to Netherby on land given to the Education Department by Mr. Peter Waite. Because the premises previously occupied by the school are now used for technical instruction, the need for a playground remains.

Since the work falls on a limited body of citizens, the cost and difficulty of maintaining the area have become more and more onerous. As this increasing burden has been carried for over half a century, the thanks of the community are due to the many people who served without thought of reward. To transfer the burden to the willing shoulders of the Mitcham council cannot be but a step forward. That council's record in maintaining its reserves is excellent, and we will watch with interest the improvement of this land, which will undoubtedly occur. I commend the Bill to the favourable attention of honourable members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Appointed day."

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I have obtained from the Minister of Education replies to several questions that the Hon. Mr. Hill asked about this clause. The honourable member suggested that in subclause (1) the word "shall" should be substituted for the word "may". With respect, I do not think that in this context the word "shall" would be appropriate, nor would it add anything to the meaning or effect of the measure. In its present form it provides, in effect, that as soon as the Minister is satisfied as to certain matters he may (that is, the Minister has power to) appoint a day. I assume that it is not in the honourable member's mind to suggest that the Minister does not intend to appoint a day as soon as he is satisfied as to the matters specified. Surely, if there was any suggestion of this, the Minister would not have gone to the trouble of promoting the Bill in the first place. I think that explains the matter simply.

Further, the Hon. Mr. Hill suggested that the word "public" in subclause (2) (a) should be omitted, with a view to having that subclause cover both private and public educa-

tional institutions. In this regard, it may be helpful if I enlarge somewhat on the history of this provision. From its inception some 50 years ago, the ground has had a close and formal connection with the Unley High School and in addition, since that school was moved, the Mitcham Girls Technical High School. In fact, the reserve has for practical purposes been regarded as part of the ordinary recreational facilities of those establishments.

As the honourable member would be aware, the titular owner of the ground has been the Minister of Education and, in addition, the majority of the management committee have been drawn from his officers and the greater portion of the revenue of the ground has been provided from Education Department funds. Subclause (2) (a) then reflects this special relationship; it would not be too much to suggest that it forms the basis of arrangements with the council. At present, the only private establishment that appears to have an interest in the ground is Scotch College, the present arrangement being for the use of the ground for one hour a week. This arrangement was, I am informed, entered into in June or July of this year. This arrangement will, in the terms of the measure, be protected in common with arrangements made with other users.

While it is possible for the Minister to visualize and make future provision for his own establishments it is, I suggest, beyond his power to make formal arrangements for the future use of the ground by organizations and establishments that, at this time, may not even be in existence.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am prepared to accept the Minister's explanation regarding the use of the word "shall" instead of "may". However, I am not satisfied with the explanation given on the second point. The clause states that the Minister shall not fix a day until he is satisfied that arrangements have been made to permit the use of the recreation ground, after the appointed day, by children attending such public schools as the Minister sees fit. It seems clear to me that one has to interpret that as it reads. The Minister has admitted that an arrangement with a private school now exists and that that arrangement would be honoured. However, it seems to me that it would not be possible to consider that school in any respect in the future.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Why not?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Well, I think the description "public schools" must be accepted as meaning "State schools". I am a member

of the council of Scotch College, and I have close associations with that school. However, I have not contacted anyone associated with that council or the school in regard to this matter, because I do not want to get involved in the matter and be accused of having any unreasonably close interest. My only knowledge of this matter comes from reading the evidence of the Select Committee, and I have accepted that as being factual.

One point that has worried me is that there could be an unfortunate tendency for the Mitcham Girls Technical High School almost to control this whole ground eventually and use it to the exclusion of other interests. I hope that would not eventuate. However, from what the Minister has said, I have some fear that that might be the case. Private schools such as Scotch College and Walford House Girls School pay rates to the Mitcham council, and they are institutions that will require sympathetic consideration from the council if and when they seek to use the recreational areas that the council can see fit to make available for schoolchildren for play and recreation and sport.

The time may come when Scotch College requests that the special arrangement it now has for the use of this ground be continued. Also, Walford House school might request that it be considered as a possible user of the land. I do not want the situation to arise that the Minister can say, "I am sorry, the Act states that the ground can be used only by public schools, therefore I cannot consider the application."

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What about sub-clause (2) (b)?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That reads:

Such other persons or bodies who or which were entitled to use the recreation ground immediately before the appointed day.

As the word "and" joins paragraphs (a) and (b), both categories are involved. However, this does not mean that the point I am making is invalid. My point is that if the Bill is passed in its present form and a private school applies in the future to make some use of this land, no matter how small that use may be,

I am not convinced that that school will be eligible.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Why not?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because it is not a public school. Why does the Minister not consider deleting the word "public"? If he did that, it would certainly satisfy me, for I believe it would put the question beyond all doubt. Surely the intention is that children attending such schools as the Minister thinks fit may use the land in the future as school playgrounds or for the purposes of sport, recreation, physical culture or other activities.

I think the point is reinforced when one considers the present use of the land. I admit that Walford House is in a slightly different category in that it does not use the land at present and it has not, to my knowledge, used it in the past. However, Scotch College is using the land now, and the Minister has said that that arrangement will continue. Again, after a year or two that school might dissociate itself from the land for a short time and then reapply for permission to use it. The continuity of that occupancy having been broken, the Minister would not then be able to consider allowing that occupation because the Bill, as I read it, precludes that.

This land is to be under the control of the Mitcham council and not a State Minister. We cannot join the State Minister together with State public schools and see some co-ordination between these two entities, because this land is to be under the control of the Mitcham council, whose duty it will be to endeavour to assist schools within its area that pay rates. The council is the servant of the ratepayers, and Scotch College is a ratepayer. I fail to follow the point the Minister has made, and I ask him to consider this matter further. If he is not prepared to do that, I will move that the word "public" be deleted. However, the Minister may have some additional explanation on this point before I take the matter further.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 22, at 2.15 p.m.