

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday, August 19, 1971

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS****DARTMOUTH DAM**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government has taken the initiative in arranging a meeting of the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement regarding the building of the Dartmouth dam? I noticed in this morning's newspaper a report that the Premier had said again outside the House what he said during the Loan Estimates debate on Tuesday afternoon, namely, that he would set no time limit to the negotiations for the building of the Dartmouth dam. He also disclosed in the House (I think at the same time as he made that remark on timelessness) that replies had been received from the Commonwealth Government and the two other State Governments making some suggestions for a basis of negotiation, not, I think, tasteful or very pleasant to the present Government but nevertheless providing something that could be talked about. The Premier did not say what was proposed regarding such talks. As we should be getting on with this matter (and I hope the Premier will agree with that)—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment. He is not explaining the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask whether the Government is taking the initiative to get further talks and, if that initiative has been taken, when the talks will take place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the Government is not taking the initiative regarding fresh talks. Since the discussion in this House last week, following receipt of material from the Commonwealth Government and the other States, the Minister of Works has attended a meeting of the Water Resources Council and has had consultations with me on his return. In the circumstances, given the nature of the replies from the Prime Minister and the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales, the Government has not sought to initiate further talks. It has, however, made some decisions on this matter about which I am sure the honourable member will hear soon.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to know whether the decisions made by

the Government in relation to Dartmouth can be announced in the House now. The Government came into office after having made specific promises relating to the Dartmouth-Chowilla controversy and, so far, those promises have been dishonoured. It is clear to the people of this State that those promises have been dishonoured up to the present time and, therefore, it is a matter of concern to this Parliament—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to comment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —to know whether the Premier will make any statements on the decisions at the first opportunity: that is, right now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No promise made by this Government on the matter has been dishonoured, nor will it be.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, you're kidding.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is being his usual self.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are out of order interjecting. The member for Alexandra has asked the Premier a question, and the honourable member deserves to have the reply to his question heard in silence without his colleagues interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that an announcement will be made to this House shortly.

**NATIONAL SERVICE**

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General, consequent on the declared intention of the Commonwealth Government to reduce the period of National Service training, take up with the Commonwealth Government the position of men presently interned under the National Service Act? A week or so ago I asked the Attorney-General to take up with the Commonwealth Government the possibility of its giving a remission of sentence or parole, especially on behalf of Charles Martin, who is at present serving a sentence at Cadell because of his refusal to comply with the National Service Act. Now, with regard to the Commonwealth Government's policy decision that has been announced in this morning's press, I consider that the time is even more propitious for seeking a remission of sentence for those men who are interned.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will consider this matter and examine what course of action is indicated.

### SCENIC ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked him on August 5 about making a financial allocation available for reconstructing, sealing and maintaining Range Road North, Range Road South, Churchett Road and Seaview Road, Houghton, this road having been declared a scenic highway under the Planning and Development Act?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Road grants are given to councils to assist in the construction and/or maintenance of roads which are subject to other than purely district use and concerning which the costs involved would place an unduly high burden on the district ratepayers. Councils make annual application for grants in respect of such roads, and the priorities allotted by a council in relation to individual roads play a large part in determining whether or not a grant can be made available. The roads listed (Range Road North, Range Road South, Churchett Road and Seaview Road, Houghton) come within the category of roads for which grant assistance could be sought and, in fact, two sections of Range Road North were included in the application from the city of Tea Tree Gully for grants for 1971-72. However, the council rated the sections as priority 8 and 9, and this precluded any serious consideration of the allocation of grants, as available funds permitted grants to be allotted to only the first three roads in the application.

### ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Premier give the House any information on the dispute between the South Australian National Football League and the South Australian Cricket Association concerning the Adelaide Oval? I believe that, to try to resolve the differences between these two bodies, the matter has been referred to an arbitrator, if I can use that term. This oval is in my district, and I consider that most people would prefer to see football matches continue there. However, I should like information on that matter and on whether the Government has been approached by the league for additional land or an alternative site for the establishment of an oval. If it has been approached, what has been its reaction to such an approach?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has made it clear to the league that it regards the solution of this problem not as being in its province but as a matter for negotiation between the parties. The Govern-

ment has been approached over a period of years by the league, which has been seeking to establish its own area for a headquarters. An original proposal, made to the Government in 1967, that an area of the west park lands be enclosed for a football stadium was refused by the Government, as it did not believe that further areas of the park lands should be enclosed from the public and subject to entry fees. In consequence, the Government was not prepared to accede to a request for a development in the west park lands area. Other sites with which the Government might assist were discussed with the league, including, in 1967, the possibility of the league's being involved in a development in the Islington area. However, the league was not interested at that stage in proceeding with such a proposal. Latterly, the league has sought the Government's assistance in providing additional areas of land adjacent to a suburban oval that might conceivably be leased to the league as a headquarters; but, unfortunately for the proposal, the Government will have further need of the land involved. So far, no agreement has been reached between the Government and the league on such a development. I am sure that most members of the general public would like to see the Adelaide Oval retained for Australian rules football. The difficulty that faces the antagonists, if I could call them that, is that the lease of the Adelaide Oval is in the hands of the cricket association. Provision that would ensure to the league the kind of headquarters and facilities I believe the league should have could not result from the discussions that have so far taken place with the association. I hope that out of the current proposals some agreement can be reached that will provide for further development at the Adelaide Oval and, at the same time, give the league its own facilities that would not be subject to arrangements entirely in the hands of someone else. So far, the association has not discussed the matter with the Government.

### APPRENTICESHIPS

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government will take steps to encourage young people to seek apprenticeship training?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As much has been said and written about the shortage of skilled tradesmen and the need for additional craftsmen to be trained, I am pleased to announce that the Government has taken definite action in an endeavour to make the present apprenticeship system more attractive

and to consider whether alternative training methods can be introduced. Last year, when he was the Minister of Labour and Industry, the Minister of Environment and Conservation initiated discussions between representatives of the trade unions, employer organizations and the Government to see what positive steps could be taken to improve the present training arrangements through the apprenticeship system. One of the gravest shortages of trained tradesmen exists in the building industry. At a conference of representatives of the Master Builders Association, the United Trades and Labor Council and the Government, which I chaired just five days after I assumed this portfolio, it was agreed that a small working party, comprising two representatives of the Master Builders Association, two of the Bricklayers Union, a subcontractor, and the Director of Technical Education, with the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission as Chairman, should meet to examine the practicability of introducing a new type of training for bricklayers. It was agreed that this would be a trial study, and the bricklaying trade was selected, because at the end of 1970 there were only 45 apprenticed bricklayers in South Australia. It is a matter of considerable satisfaction that this working party unanimously recommended that a pre-employment training scheme should be introduced for bricklayers as a trial on the following basis:

- (1) The course to be full-time for 18 weeks for 10 students.
- (2) Students to be between 18 and 20 years of age, apart from ex-servicemen, for whom there was no age limit.
- (3) No charge to be made for attending the training course.
- (4) Those who successfully complete the course then to be indentured for a period of two years and to be paid as a third-year apprentice during the first year, and as a fourth-year apprentice during the final year. During the first year, they will receive the same technical college training as a third-year apprentice.

There were 36 applicants to enrol in the course and, although some did not proceed with their applications, the course was commenced last Monday at the Marleston Technical College. The Education Department has appointed an additional trade teacher to instruct this class. If it is successful, and I hope it will be, I am sure that further pre-employment training courses will be considered for bricklayers and also for other trades. This type of training is

most suitable for those trades suffering from acute shortages of apprentices. It has the advantage of attracting applicants, with the promise of their being able to find employment on completion of a shorter period of training, because the initial training is given on a full-time basis and the wages on commencement of employment are much higher for a normal first-year apprentice. It is also more suitable for those trades in which there is a strong emphasis on the acquisition of hand skills rather than related theory.

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain how many apprenticeship indentures have been cancelled by the Apprenticeship Commission during the past 12 months and also will he ascertain, if possible, the corresponding figure in regard to the preceding 12-month period?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

### SOUTH-EAST PLANTINGS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about forestry plantings in the South-East?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Forests states that the extent of forestry plantings in the South-East (South Australia only) as at December 31, 1970, is as follows: State, 138,086 acres net; private companies, 36,346 acres net; and total, 174,432 acres net.

### ROAD SIGNS

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on July 29 about the powers of the Road Traffic Board?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Under powers conferred on the Road Traffic Board by sections 15, 26, 30 and 31 of the Road Traffic Act, the board promotes uniformity in the design, specifications, location and proper use of traffic control devices and may order the removal of any device installed on or near a road which is dangerous or conflicts with approved traffic control devices. Other authorities may, with the consent of the board, install certain traffic control devices. I believe no alteration to existing legislation is necessary as the board has adequate powers to require uniformity in signs and other traffic control devices. No difficulty has been experienced in policing such devices erected in accordance with the board's specifications.

### STEEL PRICE

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the agreement between steel suppliers in South Australia and the Prices Commissioner and about the previous intention of steel wholesalers and retailers to apply a surcharge in respect of small orders?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The nature of the arrangements which have resulted from Mr. Baker's negotiations is as follows:

Steel merchants' expenses have risen by 15 per cent in the past year and it is apparent that some relief is warranted on small orders which are often costly to handle and non-profitable. A flat surcharge was considered inequitable to small users who could not adjust to the increased cost by ordering larger quantities less frequently.

To provide merchants with relief and encourage users to restrict the number of orders a formula had been proposed which A.N.I.-Austral Steel Ltd. has agreed to apply. The new formula based on a quantity extra cost will be: for sales under one ton; the under-one-ton price on the B.H.P. list plus under 1 cwt. \$60, 1 cwt. and under 5 cwt. \$40, 5 cwt. and under 10 cwt. \$20, 10 cwt. and over nil. This will price a 28 lb. order of one type of steel at \$2.90 (\$9.65 under the original proposal) and a 56 lb. order at \$5.80 (\$11.80 under the original surcharge). Other steel distributors are expected to follow this formula.

### PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Works say what action the Government intends to take to establish Public Buildings Department regional centres? On July 21, I asked the Minister a question about the breakdown of the air-heating plant at the Mount Gambier High School. I have received a reply from the Minister, part of which states:

It is intended to overhaul the system during the coming summer months at which time any design problems will be eliminated. The equipment is now included in regular maintenance schedules and both routine and breakdown work will be carried out by personnel from the Netley workshops.

This means that the work will be carried out by workmen from the Netley workshop, which is 300 miles away from the breakdown. I hope the Government is taking steps to establish regional workshops throughout the country areas so that a long time does not elapse between a machine breaking down and the repair work being done.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have told members previously that consultants in the department have examined this matter, and this examination was conducted before this Government came into office. I have a report and I

am pleased to be able to give it to the House. In April, 1970, the Director, Public Buildings Department, obtained approval to commission management consultants (P-E Consulting Group Proprietary Limited) to assist in investigations into ways and means of improving performance in the area of minor works services. On May 6, 1971, joint recommendations of the Director, Public Buildings Department, and the consultants were submitted to the Minister of Works. In recognition of the need and urgency, and after discussion with departmental management and the consultants, proposals were submitted to Cabinet, and on May 10, 1971, Cabinet approved in principle the major recommendations which are as follows: (a) A separate and distinct branch should be established in the works division of the Public Buildings Department with a total responsibility for minor works. The branch should be headed by a manager with supporting technical and administrative staff. Management should be aided by a computer-based information system, (b) To facilitate performance increased levels of delegation and streamlined accounting procedures should apply in the department, (c) The decentralized district offices of the department should be progressively strengthened to handle a wider range and level of work without reference to head office.

Following the Cabinet approval the following action has been taken: (a) The Public Service Board, which had a representative participating in the investigations, has recommended the creation of new positions and Cabinet has approved of these recommendations. Applications have been received and are currently being considered (and an appointment will be made shortly), (b) With the concurrence of the Auditor-General, who made an officer available to participate in the investigations, necessary amendments have been effected in audit regulations to enable increased delegations to be given to the department, (c) With the support of the Under Treasurer changes have been made in accounting conventions which will facilitate the provision of an improved service, (d) A computer-based information system commenced on July 1, 1971. (e) Pending complete establishment of the new branch, the department has set up a special branch management panel to be concerned with minor works services and to recommend special measures where considered necessary to expedite completion of works. (f) In the next six months the department anticipates submitting for approval programmes of work to meet new and existing demands.

Over the next 12 months district organizations will be strengthened and expanded.

### **MANNUM PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about repaving a large part of the yard at the Mannum Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Private consultants have prepared specifications, and the matter is being referred to the Principal Engineer for tender call.

### **LYSAGHT COMPANY**

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say to what extent the uncertainty of an assured and adequate supply of water for the future entered into the negotiations that resulted in the Lysaght company's decision not to establish in South Australia? I believe that every effort was made to attract this industry; the site was available and we had the advantage then of being a low-cost State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The adequacy of the water supply did not enter into the negotiations because we had sufficient water and had assured that sufficient water would be available to provide for anything that the steel-works required. The difficulty, however, for us arose from the company's computer studies of their marketing possibilities in the immediate area, and it was around the immediate market possibilities that the decision was eventually made in favour of Western Port.

### **WINE GRAPES**

Mr. CURREN: Does the Premier consider it to be the State Government's responsibility to provide finance to establish an emergency pool to handle wine grapes that are surplus to winemakers' requirements as a result of the imposition of a wine excise in the 1970 Commonwealth Budget and the continuation of that excise in the 1971 Budget? A report in today's *Advertiser* indicates that the Prime Minister, when replying to a question asked by Mr. Giles (who is stated in the report to be a Labor member for South Australia, but whom we disown), said that he considered it to be the State Government's responsibility to provide the finance for an emergency operation. I have obtained from Canberra a full transcript of the Prime Minister's reply, part of which states:

The investigation showed that similar causes to those previously mentioned still existed and, whilst there were some problems associated with the production and sale of grapes, it was felt that this was a matter that probably could

be handled more effectively by the State of South Australia than by the Commonwealth itself.

At that stage, Mr. Hurford interjected, "How?" and the Prime Minister then said:

It could easily do what other Governments have done; that is, form a pool for the purchase of grapes. That was done on at least one other occasion by a South Australian Government.

Actually, it had been done on two other occasions by South Australian Governments, first in 1964 and again in 1965, and Loan funds were provided, under the Loans to Producers Act, to produce brandy, on which the Commonwealth Government received the excise and also the sales tax.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was bemused, as I would imagine most other members of this House were, at the Prime Minister's reply on this matter. Members will remember the history of the wine-grape situation in South Australia. In 1964 and in 1965 we had to finance, through the Loans to Producers Act, growers' co-operatives for the crushing of the grapes. By 1967 we had, with the assistance of the minimum grape price legislation introduced by the Labor Government, formed a sound foundation for the industry and, in fact, the industry was buoyant. Indeed, it was one of the few areas of primary production in South Australia that was buoyant. The situation in this industry, which is vital to the State because we produce 70 per cent of the wine and 90 per cent of the brandy produced in Australia—

Mr. Gunn: Remember that when you're dealing with the opal miners!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I admit that there are not many wine-grape growers around Coober Pedy or Ceduna, in the honourable member's district, but other members on his side, including the honourable member sitting next to him, are interested in this topic.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you give us some new facts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, if the honourable member does not want to hear them, some other members may.

Mr. Millhouse: We know them already. We've read all this in the paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not be continually calling members to order for interjecting when Ministers are replying to questions. I think the interjections are most discourteous to their colleagues, and they must cease. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact is that the interruption of the buoyancy of this industry occurred as a result of the Commonwealth Government's imposing, for the first time, an excise on wine in Australia. The honourable member who asked the question in the Commonwealth Parliament had told electors in his district, where much wine-grape growing occurs, that he would cross the floor of the House on this issue if it was found that the excise affected the industry. Well, quite clearly the excise has affected the industry. There has been an extraordinary downturn in wine sales as a result of the excise. It is marginally cheaper to buy beer and, in consequence, beer is being bought. The Prime Minister's suggestion that the remedy for the imposition of the excise is for South Australia to form another growers' co-operative pool for the crushing of wine grapes is one of the most extraordinary replies that have been given by an extraordinary Prime Minister.

Mr. Venning: He's doing a good job.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member had better tell that to the wine-grape growers.

Mr. Gunn: You had better—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government will continue to support this industry. If the industry is in trouble, it can be certain that we will come to its aid; we always have in the past and we will do so again. However, there is not the slightest excuse for the Commonwealth Government's trying to load the South Australian Government with responsibility for establishing a marketing pool when the reason for the situation we are now facing in regard to wine-grape growing is its imposition of the excise which, as it has seen, has decreased the market for our products and which it has refused to take off. I hope that members opposite will not only continue with their efforts but will redouble their efforts with their Commonwealth colleagues in trying to get this impost removed, because it is ridiculous to suggest that the Commonwealth Government should depress the markets for our products and then load the State with the necessity of supporting the industry whose markets have been depressed.

### ROAD HAZARD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about a road hazard at the junction of

Mount Osmond Road and the South-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In the view of the Road Traffic Board, the traffic problem at the junction of Mount Osmond Road and Mount Barker Road is not one which can be resolved by the use of signs. The better solution would be to redesign the traffic island system in this vicinity. A suitable design will be investigated by officers of the Road Traffic Board and the Highways Department.

### PORT LINCOLN RAILWAY

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the Port Lincoln railway?

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: Recent studies of the economics of improving the grade of the main railway line between Cummins and Port Lincoln have indicated that regrading may now be economically viable. In order to better assess the position, I have only the other day approved the engagement of a consultant surveyor to carry out basic surveying work for the construction of a deviation between Wanilla and Coomunga.

### PYRAMID SELLING

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked some time ago about Holiday Magic? On July 15, I asked a question about this matter (at page 101 of *Hansard*) and the Attorney-General said he would bring down a reply in a day or so. I wonder whether he now has that reply.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not recall that question and I have no reply here, but considerable thought has gone into the problem of pyramid selling and into how the problems arising therefrom may be solved by legislation. There have been investigations in other States on the same matter, as well as discussions at the conference of Attorneys-General. I think that substantial headway has been made by the officers who were deputed by the Attorneys-General conference to devise a programme of legislation. I hope that at the next conference of Attorneys-General in Hobart late in October it will be possible to reach agreement on uniform legislation to deal with this mischief, and that it will be possible to introduce the relevant Bill later this session.

### RAILWAY REVENUE

Mr. BECKER: For and on behalf of the member for Heysen, I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he has a reply to the question about railway revenue which

was asked by the honourable member on August 5.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On August 5 the honourable member indicated that he thought that the Railways Department revenue had dropped by more than \$1,000,000. At that time I indicated that I felt that he would find that the Railways Department revenue had increased by \$1,000,000 in the last financial year rather than decreased by a like amount as alleged by the honourable member. I have since closely examined the figures and I find that, in effect, railway revenue increased by a total sum of \$964,044 for the year. To me, this is near enough to a \$1,000,000 increase, as stated.

### KAROONDA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about the Karoonda water supply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has been actively pursuing the possibility of desalting the bore water available at Karoonda. However, no small-scale method of desalination can be considered as cheap. Investigations and experience to date reveal that the likely overall cost a thousand gallons for a desalination scheme will be considerably more than the cost of a scheme dependent on water from the Murray River. Estimating on the basis of overseas costs is very hazardous in determining both initial cost and operating costs; however, a desalination scheme to suit the demand at Karoonda may cost about \$100,000. This figure is much less than the capital cost of a scheme from the Murray River; however, because of high operating costs the desalination scheme may be the more uneconomic. The latest process to be examined is the recently developed sirotherm process which may offer some economics over the reverse osmosis and electro-dialysis processes but no particular figures are yet available. It will be some time before a recommendation can be made.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works say what Murray water scheme his previous reply refers to, as representations by the Karoonda council for connection of Karoonda to the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme were rejected?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That would be the scheme referred to, but it was referred to only as a matter of comparison of costs. Although it was stated that the initial capital outlay of a scheme from the Murray River

would be more expensive (a sum of \$100,000 was referred to as the cost of a desalination plant to handle the situation adequately), the operating cost of that scheme would be less than the operating cost of a desalination plant. As a matter of interest, yesterday I visited the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories at Thebarton where I examined the latest information about this and saw the machines that are concerned with this matter. It may be advisable for the honourable member to see what is happening, as it is most interesting. I was surprised at the amount of work being done.

### EXPORT ABATTOIRS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is taking any action within his Party to re-establish on a new site and upgrade the metropolitan and export abattoirs? Much comment by country members has been made in this House from time to time regarding these abattoirs and the necessity to re-establish and upgrade them to a standard that meets export requirements. At present, as primary producers are handling much more stock, it will be necessary to augment the killing facilities in South Australia and, as these are the main abattoirs in the State, the people concerned consider that the re-establishment of abattoirs in a new area is long overdue.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will call for a report from my colleague.

### HOUSING TRUST LAND

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether land held by the Housing Trust is considered to be Crown land, *vide* section 10 (1) (a) of the Land Tax Act, for the purpose of assessing land tax? In reply to a Question on Notice asked earlier this week, the Premier indicated that the broad acres of land in the hundreds of Yatala, Mudla Wirra and Munno Para were a certain size and that the trust was responsible for the payment of council and water rates in respect of that land, but he did not mention land tax. He then told me that the cost to people who grazed or used this land agriculturally was \$4 or \$6.50 a year as the case might be. The figure for which this land was made available for agricultural pursuits is much less than the cost an acre to people who have freehold land in this area. If the land tax is not charged to the trust, then people who crop the land in these areas have a considerable advantage over those who own land contiguous to it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have this matter examined and obtain a report for the honourable member.

### ANGASTON BRIDGE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about a railway culvert at Angaston?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The flood opening referred to is at 50m. 14c. Angaston line. When it was reconstructed in 1943 it had a clearance of 3ft. 6in. above the bed of the waterway. Since that time silting has occurred downstream from the culvert, but it has progressively encroached towards railway land until it was noted in July, 1970, that the silt deposit had reached the flood opening and the latter had become substantially blocked. As it was a prerequisite to the clearing of the railway culvert that the silt be removed downstream, negotiations were entered into with the landholder, who agreed to co-operate. However, although it was planned to undertake this work during the summer, the work on private land was not commenced until June of this year. Meanwhile, in order to protect the railway from flood damage, a relief channel was constructed on railway land in order to divert excessive flows into a borrow pit. It was an overflow from this channel which is alleged to have caused the damage to private property and which is at the moment the subject of legal action. This week the work on railway land was completed and the relief drain closed.

### LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government has avoided using the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, in its desire to acquire houses in Rupert Avenue and Francis Street, Bedford Park, and, if it has, why? First, I remind the Minister that section 10 (1) of the Act, which was passed during the term of the previous Government, provides:

Where the authority proposes to acquire land for the purposes of an authorized undertaking, it shall serve upon each person who has an interest in the land ... a notice ... of intention to acquire the land.

It is a mandatory obligation. Today's *News* contains an article headed "Forced to Sell \$4,000 Cheaper. 'Robbed' by Government over Homes. Claim by Residents". The article states:

Bedford Park residents are rebelling against State Government moves to take over 34 homes in Rupert Avenue and Francis Street ... Residents claim they are being forced

to sell their houses to the Government at up to \$4,000 less than the price set by an independent valuer ... The Works Minister, Mr. Corcoran, admitted today there had been a delay in issuing a proclamation stating that the land was necessary for Government use. The letter of intention—

presumably that is the notice of intention—to acquire properties could not be sent until this proclamation had been made.

The Minister is quoted as saying that the proclamation has been made in Executive Council today. This is not the first publicity for this issue, as I remember reading the complaints of residents about six months ago in the local paper that circulates in that area. I therefore ask the question of the Minister, as it appears that the Act has been circumvented.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was not the Government's intention to avoid the provisions of the Act. The Public Buildings Department, which had been acquiring land for the Hospitals Department, had not issued letters of intent, although it was thought at that stage that a proclamation had been issued declaring the land for Government purposes.

Mr. Millhouse: It's mandatory under the section.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, but it is not always given effect to, and this does not always invalidate—

Mr. Millhouse: Are you sure—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I could give the honourable member a number of examples of this provision not being applied strictly in accordance with the letter of the law when his own Government was in office. He knows as well as I do that the purpose of the notice is to set out clearly the rights of people whose properties are being purchased by the Government. I do not want anyone to think that the Government was trying to avoid its responsibilities in this matter: it clearly was not. The criticism referred to took place about six months ago, at a time when the Government decided that it was necessary to purchase the properties. The honourable member is as well aware as I am that no-one likes to have his property acquired compulsorily. Immediately I became aware that no proclamation had been made I took steps to see that one was made and, as today's *News* states, the proclamation was approved in Executive Council this morning.

All of the people involved in this land purchase will be issued with notices of intention. I point out to the House that five properties have already been purchased and settlement has been effected. Negotiations have



been completed in regard to 10 others, but settlement has not been effected; those owners will be issued with notices of intention. Eighteen others are at some stage of negotiation. The remaining six properties are blocks of land and, therefore, houses are not involved. I think that 39 lots in all are involved. The honourable member claims that residents could be forced to sell their houses at up to \$4,000 less than the figure set by an independent valuer. However, no doubt he is aware that certain people engaged in businesses would set values designed to attract business when these people vacate their houses. In addition, he knows that, once a notice has been issued, people can go to court if they are not satisfied with the Government's valuation. Irrespective of whether or not the proclamation has been issued, I consider that no injustice has been done to anyone as a result of the dealings of the department with individuals concerned. If there has been injustice and I receive complaints, I will have them investigated. I consider, however, that no-one has suffered an injustice as a result of this oversight, as the position has now been rectified.

#### **POONINDIE SCHOOL**

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Poonindie school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position is as I previously indicated to the honourable member. I took up the matter of the provision of school signs at Poonindie school with the Minister of Roads and Transport. He has informed me that the message "school" has been installed on the road pavement and that an order has been placed with Linemarking Services for the supply of the "school sign ahead" signs. These signs will be erected by the District Council of Lincoln immediately following delivery.

#### **WOODWORK CENTRE**

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say what plans his department has for the future of the old woodwork centre at Wilson Street, Prospect?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to look into the matter for the honourable member, and to see what shavings can be gleaned.

#### **NURIOOTPA PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the absence of the Minister of Education, has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Nuriootpa Primary School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The current planning for the replacement of Nuriootpa Primary School is that it is expected that tenders will be called towards the end of 1972 with an estimated availability date of June, 1974. This means that funds will first be required during the 1972-73 financial year. Therefore, the project does not appear in the Loan Estimates for 1971-72. However, I point out to the honourable member that these dates are tentative and are subject to the availability of funds.

#### **TRANSPORT DIRECTOR**

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the appointment of Dr. L. Alston as Director-General of Transport has now been confirmed, whether a time has been set for him to commence his duties, and what are the terms of his employment? Yesterday, a newspaper report stated that Dr. Alston had said that he did not know when he was to begin his duties, because negotiations were not complete. Bearing in mind the fiasco that occurred when Dr. Breuning's appointment was announced here without the doctor's knowing anything about it, I should like to know whether this new appointment is a definite arrangement, whether it has been confirmed, or whether it is one of these nebulous things.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that the honourable member referred to what he described as a fiasco involving the appointment of Dr. Breuning. Perhaps he may care to check back and he will find that the fiasco that occurred related to events subsequent to the appointment by the previous Labor Government of Mr. Donald Currie. We are attempting to make sure that we never again have such a fiasco involving a man such as Dr. Alston; hence the delay in his appointment. Dr. Alston has been offered the position, which he has accepted. When he says that details are subject to confirmation, he is referring to the contract which is currently being drawn up and which will be subject to negotiation between the worthy doctor and the State Government. In that contract, we will seek to give Dr. Alston the protection he is entitled to receive, and to make sure that he is not subjected to the sort of treatment to which that former appointee (Mr. Currie) was subjected. We intend to try to protect Dr. Alston from the unscrupulous actions of other people.

His commencing date is the subject of further negotiations. If he has read the

article, the honourable member will know that Dr. Alston happens to be employed. He has a responsibility to his current employer, the British Railways; the matter of his fulfilling his obligations to that employer is something for negotiation between the British Railways and him. Obviously the terms of reference to which the honourable member referred will be dealt with in the contract which is currently being negotiated and which is a matter between the Government and the doctor.

### **SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY**

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether in the design of the South-Eastern Freeway no provision is made for people who wish to take the Woodside Road to leave the freeway, or for people travelling along Woodside Road to join the freeway, at Verdun? I ask this question, as people in the Woodside, Stirling and Bridgewater areas are concerned about the matter. If traffic cannot join the freeway at Verdun, to join the freeway it will have to continue along the winding section of the road until it reaches Bridgewater, or it may even have to continue to Stirling and join at the complex there. It has been put to me by residents that, if it is intended at Balhannah to divert traffic towards Hahndorf and then on to the freeway complex, the little settlement of Verdun will be isolated and any businesses there, such as the hotel, will be finished. The same problem will exist in relation to leaving the freeway. The problem will be even greater on the Easter weekend when, on the Saturday and Monday, traffic proceeding to and from Oakbank is on the freeway. If people who wish to leave the freeway must leave it at Stirling or Bridgewater, the congestion that now occurs will be accentuated during the Easter weekend, and there will be the danger of accidents occurring. If the traffic wishing to leave the freeway is forced into Hahndorf, traffic hazards will still be created. As the freeway construction has reached this area, this matter should be settled now. If provision has not been made in the present design for traffic to join and leave the freeway at Verdun, will the Minister have this matter considered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter examined.

### **RURAL SCHOLARSHIPS**

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Education table the notes of an interview that he had on June 23 with a

deputation from the Stockowners Association of South Australia that was seeking assistance for outback children? I am asking this question after having consulted members who represent most of these children. One of the members of the deputation wrote a letter to the *Northern Observer*, and part of the letter states:

Our request for financial help for primary students of station hand and railway families on correspondence lessons received the unsympathetic reply that in some cases the family would rather spend their allowance on booze than education.

I have checked with another member of the deputation to ascertain what was said, and that person's notes show the Minister as saying:

There is no guarantee that they would spend assistance to help in education: they could spend it on grog.

I also have a copy of a letter the Minister wrote in reference to this deputation in which he says:

If the allowances were paid to all parents, whether or not a governess was employed, some of the money could be used for other than educational purposes. (I presume that is where Mr. McTaggart got his statement from "booze").

In view of the conflicting reports, it seems to me that it would be reasonable for the Minister to table the notes of the interview which undoubtedly he would have had made at that time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I kept no notes of that deputation because it was my custom at that time to trust the people who came to see me. Apparently that trust was not warranted.

Mr. Millhouse: But—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do object to the honourable member for Mitcham, before he has even heard any reply, reaching any kind of judgment and interjecting. The mistaken impression that Mr. McTaggart has given to many people concerns me greatly. I am surprised that the member for Alexandra, with his high standards, has not consulted with the Hon. Mr. Geddes about this interview or, if he has, that he has ignored what he was told, because at that interview the matter of the request for a governess allowance was discussed. First, I said that, if a governess allowance was paid only to those people who employed a governess, it would be giving assistance to those who were best off financially in that area. Secondly, I said that, if financial assistance was given whether or not a governess was employed, I would be making money available to individuals and

there would be no guarantee that that education money would be spent on education: that it could be spent on anything—food, clothing, travel or booze.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You said all of this?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not recall the exact words I used but I have mentioned those possibilities; it is just a matter of common sense. I did, however, tell the deputation confidentially that the Government was considering a special rural scholarship scheme that would apply to outback children for all of their secondary education. That scheme has since been announced. Mr. McTaggart, however, chose to report to members of the Outback Parents Club that the Minister had been completely unsympathetic and did not care. The honourable member no doubt knows that I have written to Mr. McTaggart objecting in the strongest terms to the action he has taken. I have also written to every member of the Outback Parents Club explaining exactly what happened. The sum involved in the Government's provision for rural scholarships will, in areas like Eyre Peninsula (where students can attend school), cover only Matriculation level, but for outback children it will cover the whole of their secondary education. I have also indicated that, once the scheme is properly established, the extension of this scheme for outback children into, say, the sixth and seventh grades of primary education will be considered.

I informed the deputation that I considered it to be fundamentally important to ensure that outback children have the opportunity to get the necessary education at the secondary level to enable them to carry their education as far as they were capable of carrying it. Mr. McTaggart and the other members of the deputation, who presumably were the source of the honourable member's question, have chosen to ignore all that and to persist in misreporting the terms and general statements that I made at that interview and to give a completely false impression, and I am surprised that the member for Alexandra, remembering all the occasions that he has got up in this House demanding the highest standards from people, should have taken up this matter without making further inquiries, particularly from the Hon. Mr. Geddes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He should have checked up.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not continually going to rise to my feet to call honourable members to order for interjecting when ques-

tions are being answered. I am warning honourable members that from now on I shall be naming members if they do not observe my appeal to keep order in this Chamber. The discredit that is being brought on Parliament is staggering: people from outside are complaining to me, and I appeal to members to conduct themselves in a manner befitting the position they hold. If I do name members and if the penalty is not greater than has been imposed previously, I will take further action on that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member wishes, I am prepared to show him a file on this subject: he can see some of the abusive letters I have received as a consequence of Mr. McTaggart's efforts, and he will understand my anger over the matter. The moneys involved in the scholarship scheme, which involves a payment that can be over and above the boarding allowance to the extent of \$370, are greater than what would be involved in paying a governess allowance. I reached the recommendations involved in the scholarship scheme, and the Government accepted them, on the understanding that this help would do more for the educational standards of the children involved; that is and must be the main purpose of any educational money used for assistance in this area.

### LOTTERIES

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about small lotteries and the fee that organizations have to pay for conducting them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is intended to amend the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act relating to "annual licences", which allow for any number of lotteries to be conducted for prizes valued up to \$200. The amendment will provide for greater control. Several other amendments to the regulations have also been recommended by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Amendments include a "minor annual licence" which will allow organizations to conduct small lotteries, with prizes up to \$50, for the small fee of \$2 a year. This fee of itself will not cover cost of administration.

Officers of the Chief Secretary's Department had earlier suggested to the State President and the State Secretary of the Country Women's Association that, if the association could control the fund-raising activities and the conduct of small lotteries from headquarters, one "annual licence" would be appropriate for the association. However, the Country Women's Association has

quite clearly stated that each branch is an autonomous body desirous of controlling its own fund-raising activities and the use of those funds. As such, it is legally necessary that each branch which desires to raise funds by means of lotteries must be licensed. The new "minor annual licence" at a cost of \$2 a year will be suited to the purposes of the Country Women's Association branches. If the Country Women's Association is prepared to reconsider and adopt a system of organizing and controlling small lotteries from its headquarters, it will be in a position to obtain only one licence.

### HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: As Honeysuckle Drive, Highbury, is one of the access roads that will be used by children who will attend the new Highbury Primary School, which is now being constructed and which is expected to be occupied in February, 1972, will the Minister of Works seek immediate approval for the sewerage of all this street although, when estimates are prepared, there may be insufficient return thus preventing the work from being recommended? On May 5, 1971, the Minister informed me by letter that a scheme to provide for the sewerage of the proposed school and part of Honeysuckle Drive had been approved, it being expected that the work would be completed by the end of June, 1971. Apparently, the Engineering and Water Supply Department intended only to sewer the section from the proposed Highbury Primary School to the reserve at the bottom of the hill. This would leave unsewered only the section from Waratah Drive to the reserve, and a single length of sewer main along Honeysuckle Drive would complete the system. I understand that the policy of the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully is not to undertake road reconstruction until sewer mains are laid. However, road reconstruction and the making of footpaths in this street are necessary, mainly for the safety of the children, before the school is opened. On June 22, following a further letter from me dated May 27, the Minister informed me that a further examination of the area would be made and a scheme prepared to sewer the remainder of the area. Estimates would then be prepared to ascertain whether the scheme would give sufficient return to enable this proposal to be recommended.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will consider this problem.

### MURRAY RIVER ZONING

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Government intends to zone the Murray River in order to provide special areas for skiers? I refer to the report of the power boat committee, I think issued in 1967: at page 18 under the section "Zoning Activities" the committee recommends that the present enactment be substituted by one under which the State marine authority could stipulate areas for the exclusive use of water skiers and speedboats. I wonder whether the Government objects to this action, knowing, as the Minister knows, that certain council areas have adopted by-laws for this purpose. I believe that there may be several councils that have not adopted these by-laws, as they do not know whether the Government will take this action.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Provision has been made in the legislation for the registration of power boats to allow the Marine and Harbors Department to zone the Murray River. I have already discussed this matter with several people involved in both the industry and the operation of power boats. I invited representatives of councils to be present, but they did not attend the last meeting that was held. I think I have told the honourable member before that the Government intends to introduce this legislation this session so that it could apply next season. I emphasize that I did not mean the coming season, because, as the honourable member would appreciate, not only does the legislation have to be passed but we have to prepare regulations (which are now being considered) and also provide staff to police the provisions of the Act. It will not be possible to have the provisions of this legislation applying before the 1972 season. I think I may have given the impression in the House previously that these provisions would apply in the 1971 season, but I now want to correct that impression. Although zoning has been provided for, I will check specifically for the honourable member and obtain further details for him.

### DISTRICT REPRESENTATION

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister of Education intend to observe or to disregard the normal conventions or courtesies in relation to the electors of other members of Parliament? Recently, the Minister showed a party from a private school in my district through Parliament House. This action is in sharp contrast to the courteous behaviour of the Minister of Roads and Transport, who has

always scrupulously observed the convention of not entering into such matters in another member's district. In addition, the Minister of Education was reported in the local newspaper yesterday as having announced the installation of traffic lights at the Morphett Road and Oaklands Road intersection. This is another matter concerning my district. Would it be too much to ask of the Minister that he abandon his know-all tactics and tendencies, at least in this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is becoming rather provocative in presenting his question. Honourable members appeal to the Chair to try to maintain order, so I suggest to the honourable member that the question could be asked in a less provocative way.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologize if I have upset the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Nevertheless, it was an explanation—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Minister desire to reply?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will deal with the second matter first. Several people in my district have complained to me about the problem at the Morphett Road and Oaklands Road intersection, and on behalf of these constituents I spoke to the Minister of Roads and Transport. I am sure that the member for Glenelg would appreciate that many people from my district have to travel through this intersection, and I think he would grant me the right to make representations on their behalf to the Minister of Roads and Transport and to report on the result of my representations.

Mr. Mathwin: By headlines in the local paper!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry if the report—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —that was given to the local newspaper was headlined on the front page. I assure the honourable member that I did not write the headline, and did not (nor could I) say, as the honourable member well knows, what the local paper should or should not do with the information given to it. The only thing I can say is that, for some time, complaints about problems at that intersection have been made to me. Concerning the other matter, I think I should tell the honourable member that I received an invitation from that school, which is certainly in his district, to talk to the Matriculation class. I think the honourable member would

permit me, as the Minister of Education, to talk to a Matriculation class outside my district—

Mr. Mathwin: I have no complaint about that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —without any information being supplied to the honourable member. My talk to the Matriculation class was about general questions of the responsibility of Parliament and the role of the politician. As a result of that discussion, the visit to Parliament House by the Matriculation class at that school arose. It was a natural consequence of the discussions that had taken place with the class. No discourtesy to the honourable member was intended, but many of the things that I was able to tell the group that came through the House flowed on immediately from the discussions with them at the school some weeks prior to that. If the honourable member had bothered to raise the matter with me beforehand, I could have given him an explanation that I am sure would have satisfied him.

#### POINT PEARCE RESERVE

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say what further progress has been made in relation to transferring the Point Pearce Reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust? Last March, when the member for Mitcham asked a question about this matter, the Minister stated:

The Secretary of the trust is proceeding to Point Pearce for further discussions about this matter of the transfer.

I assume that those discussions have been completed. The Minister said that he hoped that the trust would be able to take over the reserve when it became an economic proposition to do so.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government decided that Point Pearce Reserve would be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and made the necessary financial rearrangements for the trust to operate that reserve. A Commonwealth Government contribution towards the trust's operating the reserve formed part of the project, and representations were made to that Government for the partial funding of the project. It is still considering this matter, no reply having been received yet. I have had discussions with representatives of the Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs on the matter, and I hope that an early reply will be forthcoming. I assure the honourable member that the Government is ready, willing and anxious to transfer the Point Pearce Reserve to the trust and that it will do so

immediately a satisfactory reply is received from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister say whether it is expected that there will be any change in departmental administration when Point Pearce is transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust?

The Hon. L. J. KING: When the Point Pearce Reserve is transferred to the trust, the operation of the reserve will be the responsibility of the trust; the department will have no further responsibility for its operation. The department's activities at Point Pearce after that time will be limited to welfare activities. Some consideration is being given to the future withdrawal of the staff at Point Pearce, so welfare activities may well in the future (though not in the immediate future) be conducted from outside the reserve. The object will be the immediate transfer of control of the operations of the reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the gradual reshaping of the welfare services, so as to ensure that the Aboriginal people at Point Pearce not only have control of their own reserve but also are themselves conscious of the fact that they have control of it and that the welfare services provided are provided for their benefit and at their request. So there will obviously be considerable changes in departmental administration in respect of Point Pearce.

### GAWLER ROADWORKS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport give the House any details of the Highway Department's plans to duplicate the Main North Road from the commencement of the Gawler by-pass road to a point near the southern extremity of the Gawler racecourse? This is the final section in the duplication of the highway from Gepps Cross. About half a mile has not been completed. At the northern extremity, which is at the southern point of the Gawler racecourse, a road junction comprises five roads, and early in the morning and again in the afternoon (the times when schools are starting and finishing for the day) this road junction is congested by buses. A Catholic school is about 200yds. or 250yds. from the junction, and the Gawler High School, comprising about 800 students, is about 250yds. away in another direction. The view of this junction is partially obscured by an incline in the existing roadway where it passes over a bridge across what is known as Potts Creek. The carrying out of work on this road would help the position at the junction.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot at present give the information that the honourable member seeks, but I will obtain it and give it to him later.

### GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say when he expects to confer with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport about gauge standardization work in this State? The press, either yesterday or this morning, contains a statement that the Minister intends to confer with the Commonwealth Minister soon on certain aspects of the next stage of gauge standardization in this State, and I should be pleased if the Minister could tell the House when he expects to have these talks.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member cares to check *Hansard*, I think he will find, in the reply that I gave in the House yesterday, all the information that he seeks. Obviously, the honourable member was not in his place then. I stated that I had written to the Commonwealth Minister telling him of the position and of my willingness to confer with him at his convenience and, I hope, at the earliest possible opportunity, as we were most anxious to proceed with the standardization proposals. The matter is now in the Commonwealth Minister's hands and I can do no more than await his advice, which I hope to get soon, because I know full well that he, like this Government, is most anxious for this project to proceed.

### TREE REMOVAL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport tell the House why the Highways Department has issued an instruction to certain councils that they must obtain the Minister's permission before any trees with a trunk of a greater diameter than 6in. are removed from roadsides? I was approached by a council in my district after it was told that it could not proceed with a new road project to provide an outlet for settlers in a developing part of the council area. This road was to be about five miles long, and at present the persons that it was intended to serve must make a round trip of about 20 miles. If the road that the council had plans for had been proceeded with, the distance would have been reduced to about five miles. I know that many persons in the community consider that, every time a council or the Highways Department sees a tree, it starts sharpening the axe. This council does not

want to start knocking down roadside vegetation indiscriminately, but I believe that the Government has not properly considered what this instruction will mean to councils. I hope that the Minister will review the matter and be a little more considerate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope that the honourable member will review what he has just said and give me the whole details of the matter so that the facts may be considered. I know of no refusal of such a request from a council within his district to remove trees in order to build a road. I hope the honourable member will either provide the details or admit that what he has said is a figment of his imagination. The point behind all this is that there has been a requirement since the term of office of the Labor Government between 1965 and 1968, carried on by the Hall Government between 1968 and 1970 and continued by this Government, that, before trees are removed, the authority of the Minister must be obtained. This may sound a little bureaucratic to some people but let me assure members that the sole purpose of this is to preserve one of the greatest heritages of South Australia. True, there are some people in our society who, on seeing a tree, immediately sharpen their axes, as the honourable member has suggested. I can say with some certainty that the Highways Department does not come within that category; in fact, it has gone to extreme lengths on many occasions to redesign a road, cross-over, bridge, or whatever structure may be involved in, in an endeavour to preserve trees, and only as a last resort are trees removed.

However, there are cases in which the inevitable decision has to be made whether to provide a safe road or retain trees. When we reach that point, there is no alternative, and I do not hesitate to give the necessary approval. The only reason, I imagine, why the question has been asked is that this matter has been looked at recently because an interpretation was sought and it was decided that a reasonable interpretation of "tree" was that it should have a trunk 6in. in diameter or greater. That is all there is to it. I hope the honourable member will come forward with the facts of this matter. When he does, I think I shall be able to provide him with some rather surprising information.

#### **GOODWOOD ROAD**

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport examine the recent action of the Road Traffic Board in having the island

on Goodwood Road, immediately south of Daw Road extended? This extension prevents access to Boothby Street, Panorama, by all right-hand turning traffic travelling north on Goodwood Road. One of my constituents who has a business near the intersection I have mentioned finds that his business has been particularly affected by the change in the conditions that previously reigned at the intersection. I also understand that this action may have arisen as a result of some intervention by the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have that matter examined.

#### **COLONEL LIGHT GARDENS**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to take any action in relation to the zoning of Colonel Light Gardens? As the Minister is aware, Colonel Light Gardens is partly in the electoral district of Mitcham and partly in the electoral district of Mitchell.

Mr. Payne: You are showing a bit more courtesy this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The remarks that the Chair makes apply equally to members on the Government side as to members on the Opposition side. If members think they are assisting their own dignity by entering into a debate across the Chamber, I am afraid they are mistaken. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what the interjection meant, anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to comment on or answer interjections. If he has asked his question, I will call on the appropriate Minister to reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. I will get on with the explanation. Colonel Light Gardens is partly in the electoral district of Mitcham and partly in the electoral district of Mitchell. At present, as the Minister may know, the whole of it is zoned "residential" under a by-law of the Garden Suburb Commissioner, except for three streets which are zoned for shopping. It is a very old by-law. Under the Act the Garden Suburb Commissioner is the sole arbiter on building in the Garden Suburb; there is no appeal from him as there is under normal local government. Last Monday, when I was talking to some of my constituents (and, I think, probably some people who came from the electoral district of Mitchell), they voiced to me worry and concern about the fact that the Garden Suburb

was zoned in this way and they could find out nothing as regards any revision of the zoning that was going on in the city of Mitcham, which surrounds the Garden Suburb. I realize that this matter is bound up with the whole future of the Garden Suburb, on which I have asked several questions of the Minister, who has now been responsible for it for about 16 months. I should be most appreciative if, when he answers my question, he would as well give any information on the general question of the future of the Garden Suburb.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think I would be breaching your instructions, Mr. Speaker, were I to meet the desire of the honourable member in answering the question he asked at the end of his explanation, so I will confine myself to the other question he asked of me: whether the Government intends to take any action regarding zoning in Colonel Light Gardens. All I can say at this stage is that no action has yet been taken but the matter is being considered.

#### **VICTOR HARBOUR LAND**

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Premier make available an officer from his department who deals with tourist matters to discuss with the District Council of Encounter Bay the possible acquisition of land near Victor Harbour? From this land, which is situated on the main road near the entrance to Victor Harbour, the most prominent view of the town can be seen. However, if it is in any way interfered with, the tourists' view of the town will almost be shut off. As the Premier will remember, the council has contacted him and, at his suggestion, other Ministers, and the whole matter has been at a standstill because sufficient money has not been available to purchase the land; the council has not got the money, and the Premier has said that the Government is unable to provide it. Nevertheless, the council still considers this matter to be not just a routine matter but one of considerable importance, and it has requested me to make one more attempt to obtain assistance. I thought the best way to do so would be to have an officer from the Premier's Department visit the council and discuss the matter with its representatives, as there may possibly be ways and means by which this land, which is such an important tourist asset for the district, could be saved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will arrange for an officer of my department to examine the matter with the council representatives. I certainly have examined this matter previously.

The Government has not on other occasions granted money to councils for this purpose, and it would be a completely new departure if the Government did what the council in the honourable member's district is requesting it to do. If the Government were to accede to the council's request in this respect, it would obviously be inundated with requests to do so elsewhere. The Government is currently devoting a large sum for the promotion of the tourist industry, and I cannot see how it can extend that allocation at present. However, I shall have a departmental officer examine the matter to see whether there is any way in which the Government can assist the council to which the honourable member has referred.

#### **WEST TERRACE BUS STOP**

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport approach the Road Traffic Board regarding the safety during peak traffic hours of a bus stop in front of the West Terrace cemetery? One of my constituents has written to me regarding this matter as follows:

After buses have stopped at the bus stop in front of the West Terrace cemetery, they then have to go from the left-hand lane over to the right-hand lane of West Terrace to turn right at Grote Street. There is usually up to half a dozen buses in a row trying to do this, and I feel it is very dangerous.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am aware of the problem to which the honourable member has referred, and I shall be pleased to have it examined. This is a good example of a situation in which exclusive bus lanes could be of tremendous advantage. Although some people probably think that it might be advantageous for accidents to occur outside the West Terrace cemetery, I do not subscribe to that point of view.

#### **PINNAROO POLICE**

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to the question I asked on August 3 about the Police Department's policy regarding future police activities at Pinnaroo?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the Pinnaroo police district will come under review within the next few months in the course of the survey being conducted to determine policing requirements throughout the State. This survey will include an assessment of police work loads, as well as community development or diminution. Results of the survey will influence future policing arrangements, but at present it is intended to continue the provision of a police station at Pinnaroo.



Records currently maintained show a significant drop in the work load over the past two years. Resulting from this there is no intention of increasing the establishment.

### SOCIAL WORKERS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to the question I asked on August 4 regarding social workers on the staff of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The number of social work field staff employed in the department as at August 9, compared to the number as at June 30, 1970, is as follows:

	At 30/6/70	On 9/8/71
Staff holding a Diploma in Social Studies or other equivalent qualifications in social work.....	35	42
Arts degree.....	4	3
Australian School of Pacific Administration (12 months' course).....	6	6
Social welfare in-service training course (12 months' course).....	23	38
Some of these people are now studying for the Diploma of Technology in Social Work at the South Australian Institute of Technology on a part-time basis.		
Group work certificates, theology or nursing qualifications .....	7	7
No special academic qualifications .....	37	30
	112	126

In addition, 20 people are currently undertaking the one-year departmental training course for social work staff. Those who successfully complete the course will be appointed to the department's staff at the beginning of 1972. Ten other people are doing full-time social work studies at Flinders University and the South Australian Institute of Technology, under the sponsorship of the department. Two people are studying full-time at the Australian School of Pacific Administration. This is now an 18-month course. The department is trying to increase its number of social workers by recruiting people with social work qualifications (15 people with relevant tertiary qualifications have joined the department this year), by offering studentships for full-time study at institutions of tertiary training, and by conducting its own 12 months' training course for new social work staff.

### LOANS TO PRODUCERS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier consider assisting, under the Loans to Producers Act, a co-operative winery in my district which met him recently regarding this matter? In view of what the Premier has said today about loans to producers, I think the winery in my district to which I have referred, and about which I have asked questions previously, should be eligible to receive such assistance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said today that, in emergency situations arising in relation to the sale of wine grapes, special provision of funds would be made under the Loans to Producers Act to support the wine-grape industry, as has been done previously. That is a different situation from that of the winery for which the honourable member has sought assistance. He asks that a certain co-operative be given assistance under the legislation to enable it to purchase marketing facilities in another State. In this area the Government has never granted money under the Loans to Producers Act. The call upon money under this legislation previously was indeed heavy. If the Government extended the provisions of the legislation to assist enterprises to obtain marketing facilities outside the State and did not assist those enterprises that have always been the recipients of loans to producers assistance, it would have a further heavy call upon these funds, because the Government could then be asked for all sorts of assistance in relation to marketing facilities elsewhere. I pointed out to the body concerned that we would be prepared to help it obtain moneys from elsewhere at commercial rates of interest in order to finance its marketing operation in other States. However, the point was that this was not satisfactory to it because it considered that the economics of the operation would require the tax deductibility that would be involved in a loans to producer operation. We do not feel able, so far, to extend loans to producers to this situation, which is quite a different situation, in respect of the general provision applying to the wine industry in South Australia, from the emergency situation to which the member for Chaffey referred.

### PRINCES HIGHWAY

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the Princes Highway, referring especially to the "S" bend west of Murray Bridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Tentative design of the South-Eastern Freeway west of Callington takes it across or adjacent to several mineral claims in the Callington area, and notices of intention under the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, have recently been served on the landowners concerned, who now have the opportunity to make claims for compensation. The final path of the freeway and the rate of freeway construction will now depend on the outcome of subsequent negotiations.

### BIRDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education ascertain when it is expected that work will begin on effecting improvements to the Birdwood High School oval? A letter I have received from the Secretary of the Birdwood High School Council states:

Since 1966, when we started using the Birdwood High School oval, we have been plagued with severe drainage problems. Though it has to be used, it is really quite unsuitable for winter use. Naturally, we have been in contact with the Education Department; in fact this has been done many times, both personally and by letter. The Public Buildings Department is handling the job, but action is lacking.

The last reply which the school council has received from the Education Department's Land and Building Officer on this matter, and which the council has been good enough to give me, states:

This matter was referred to the Director, Public Buildings Department, on June 3, 1971, for urgent attention, following a previous letter from your council.

As the oval is quite unsuitable for use in the winter, I ask the Minister whether he will ascertain specifically when it is expected that work will begin on draining the oval.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to take up that matter for the honourable member.

### ANDAMOOKA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say when it is expected that work will commence on the proposed new school at Andamooka?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Andamooka Special Rural School's new buildings are to be in Samcon, and the programme will depend on the Samcon building programme of the Public Buildings Department. I will inquire and inform the honourable member of the detailed position as soon as possible.

### QUESTION TIME

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is not the first time this week that I have been in the position of asking the last question, but I do not desire—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please be seated. The honourable member did not seek leave of the House to make an explanation. I cannot see the time from the Chair, except when I stand—

Mr. Millhouse: I can tell you what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, there are other questions to be asked, and I was going to call on the member for Mallee.

*At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

### DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement for the further variation of the agreement entered into between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia respecting the Murray River and Lake Victoria and other waters, to repeal the River Murray Waters Act Amendment Act, 1971, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is in similar form to that which was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition last year and which was defeated in this House in May last year. The Government has to report to the House and the people of South Australia that its negotiations concerning the dams on the Murray River have failed. We are satisfied now that we cannot in the immediate future get amendments of substance to the River Murray Waters Agreement amendment, signed by the previous Government. We have endeavoured to negotiate constantly. We have repeatedly put forward proposals for sensible compromise on the issue, retaining South Australia's special rights to the Chowilla dam and the special protections to the State provided by such a storage. However, the other States and the Commonwealth have relied upon the amended agreement, despite the fact that it was

signed by an Executive in South Australia which acted in plain contravention of the instructions of this House and which knew its action would not be acceptable to this House.

Nevertheless, the other States and the Commonwealth have said that they have an agreement from a Government in South Australia. They are not concerned in any way with the internal support or otherwise for that agreement. They are dealing with the Government of South Australia, and they have an amended agreement signed which has been ratified by their Parliaments, and they do not propose to budge an inch from that position. The amending agreement had removed, in effect, the special right which South Australia had to the protection of the Chowilla storage. Under the amending agreement, Chowilla will be looked at as a possible future storage, but will be judged on the basis not of the protections it can give to South Australia but of its yield and advantage to the total river system. In other words, if some other storage will yield more water to the up-river States, the special advantages of Chowilla to South Australia will be disregarded.

Under the present Government, South Australia's endeavour has been to renegotiate that position so as to retain for this State the special rights and protections which the Chowilla storage would have given us—special rights and protections which are needed by this State far more than by any other. The Government has found that the position is irretrievable. The other States and the Commonwealth will not concede that South Australia obtained rights under the existing River Murray Waters Agreement as a result of giving up water rights to the other States and the Commonwealth. They will not concede that we have some special right to protection from Chowilla, as people of this State believe we have, and as we know we have.

Further, the other States will not concede that they should negotiate the nature of further water rights arising if other storages, including Chowilla, are built. In addition, while the Commonwealth would concede (and indeed it was prepared to make this concession) that the costs of expenditure at Lake Victoria, which will be flooded by the building of Chowilla, will not be taken into account against the building of Chowilla, New South Wales and Victoria would concede no such position. The result is that we have been unable to make any sort of dent in the front which the other States have put up. South Australia has received support in its stand by a great many people. I am very grateful to the settlers on the

Murray River who have made it their personal campaign to go to other States and talk to their fellow river irrigators and point out that there was no difference in interest between them. The settlers pointed out that it was to all riverlanders' interests to accept South Australia's perfectly reasonable position in this matter.

The result of their campaign has been a change in attitude by irrigators in other States and the support for the South Australian position now publicly expressed by the Murray Valley Development League. However, the unfortunate political realities of the position are that the Victorian Government does not depend for its majority in Parliament on settlers in the Murray River area. These are Country Party seats, and the Victorian Government is not subject to the same pressures as Governments in other parts of Australia would be for the needs of settlers in these areas. As I have said, we have now reached an impasse in the negotiations. The Victorian Government has alternative water resources that it could develop to satisfy the needs of people, other than those directly irrigating from the Murray, and it seems quite content to see a decline in irrigation activity, since markets for Riverland products are falling, or will fall, particularly with the prospect of Britain's entry into the European Common Market.

While eventually all States will be forced to develop storages on the Murray River, it would appear that, in the short term, and if we continued present negotiations, a real danger would occur that Victoria would withdraw entirely from the provision of additional storages on the Murray River and this could endanger the use of additional Murray water by South Australia in the foreseeable future. The matter could then be resolved only in the long term, and in the meantime considerable harm could result to South Australia. It will be many years before Dartmouth is declared effective for the purposes of the River Murray Waters Agreement. We will not in any circumstances get instant water from the Dartmouth dam. It will take years to build and more years to store water. Nevertheless, the sooner additional storage is agreed on, the safer South Australia will be. And on balance, the risks of further delay by continuing negotiations are markedly higher than the risks to the State from losing the Chowilla project altogether.

The Government has done all it can. In the circumstances, it can only report the failure

of its efforts and recommend the ratification of the amending agreement. It has been suggested by members opposite that the Government would try to negotiate for some change in wording which might be a face-saver but which would, in fact, mean nothing of substance to the State. The Government is not prepared to do any such thing, and has never had any intention of doing so. Unless we can obtain amendments of substance that will protect South Australia's position in relation to the Chowilla dam and the quality of the water in the Murray River, there is no point in negotiating. At this stage of proceedings, we see no such chance in the immediate future or, indeed, in the foreseeable future. We can only, therefore, proceed with the position that obtained on the signing of the amending agreement by the previous Government.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I seem to remember the Premier telling the news media of this State, after the Bill partially dealing with the Dartmouth dam had been introduced a short while ago, that he had ratified the Dartmouth agreement.

Mr. Millhouse: That's right.

Mr. HALL: If he had ratified the Dartmouth agreement, why is he now repealing that Bill introduced only a few short months ago and introducing a new one? The answer is that his claim was false, and his credibility now lies shattered. He freely admits in this second reading explanation that he did not ratify Dartmouth. This fiction permeates the explanation, in which he attempts to try to make South Australians believe that he has had some kind of fight on their behalf; it is a fiction to protect his credibility. The Liberal and Country League is completely vindicated by the explanation the Premier has just given, and its stand over the years will bring to fruition the greatest advance in water supply in South Australia's history. The Premier knows that if he delays this matter any further he will run the risk that this additional water will be lost to South Australia altogether.

The history of the negotiations is of some length. The Premier will recall introducing in this House in 1967 a motion that mentioned alternatives to Chowilla and saying that whatever the alternative might be we must get as much water from it as from Chowilla. That proposition never satisfied the L.C.L., which would never accept from an alternative source the same amount of water that we could get

from Chowilla. The L.C.L. demanded substantially more, and we engaged in tough negotiations lasting for months with the Commonwealth Minister, the Premiers of the States of New South Wales and Victoria that are the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, and the Prime Minister, from which resulted a 37 per cent increase in usable water for this State. For all these months we have had negative attitudes from this Government. The Government used the proposition to gain office, obviously falsely, with the promise so easily given by the Premier publicly, if not in his election speech to South Australians, that he could renegotiate within a few months.

The answer is contained in this short second reading explanation, which tends to maintain the fiction that the Premier has been fighting for South Australia, when all he has been doing is holding up our development. Perhaps that is why we have not had any new industries of any consequence: they are frightened to come here, with the type of management the Government has given and the failure to give a guarantee regarding water. What is of paramount importance in the agreement is that the new increased allocation for South Australia cannot operate until Dartmouth is declared operational. Therefore, we are still at the mercy, in times of restriction, of obtaining only three-thirteenths of the available water from the Murray system. When the Bill is ratified and when Dartmouth is built, if it is built (as I hope it will be), I hope it withstands the test of the agreement's finance provisions. If it does not, I hope that new financial provisions can be renegotiated. When Dartmouth is built and operational (probably much sooner than the time referred to by the Premier), South Australia will have a guarantee of water supplies that it has never had before. South Australians on the river as well as South Australians in the metropolitan area will be able to develop and go forward with confidence. The long history of negotiation brings great credit to my Party: it brings to the Labor Party a sorry picture of political involvement which puts the Labor Party before any other interests and particularly before the interests of the public in this State. I am extremely pleased to see that at last the Premier has overcome whatever blockage there has been and has been able to bring in a Bill to fully ratify this agreement, which has my signature on it. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**MINING BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 917.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I join the member for Mawson in congratulating the member for Alexandra for the work he obviously put into the Bill and on his presentation. I am sure the Minister will be interested in what the honourable member had to say and, while he may disagree with some of the suggestions, he will certainly give them close consideration. I should also like to compliment the member for Mawson on the views he has canvassed. I hope that the conservationists who are watching closely the progress of this Bill have taken great heed of what the member for Mawson had to say and that they will see this Bill put into effect, because we on the Government side believe that protection for the environment and ecology is built into it. I hope that conservationists allow the Bill to prove just how good it is. I should also like to congratulate the member for Eyre on his contribution. When he was speaking last night I was convinced that he was sincere and I formed the opinion that he knew the subject about which he was speaking, but I have now decided that what we saw was a great deal of grandstanding, because I am sure the member could not believe that what he said last night was the truth. I will try to prove that the accusations he made against the Government were unfounded, and I believe he knew this last night.

I agree with the honourable member that the opal-mining industry is a valuable one for South Australia. I do not think anyone would disagree with this. The figures given to us by members opposite indicate that the value to South Australia of the opal industry is \$7,000,000 a year. It has already been pointed out that this ranks it second (to the iron ore industry) in the mineral field. Although it has been said that it will not be long before natural gas supersedes opal mining as the second most valuable mining venture in South Australia (and I think this may be so), that does not lessen one whit the value of opals to the State. Figures supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Customs and Excise show that the total value of opal mined in Australia is slightly less than \$13,000,000. The member for Eyre suggested that I should read a certain document; I shall read it both for my own benefit and to satisfy the honourable member. That document states that 95 per cent of the opals mined in Australia come from South Australia. Of course,

the figures that I have just referred to do not tie up with this statement, because the figures given by the State Government show that \$7,000,000 is the value of opals mined in South Australia. So, there is a difference of \$6,000,000 between the figure given for the value of opals mined in Australia as a whole and the figure given for the value of opals mined in South Australia, yet it is said that 95 per cent of the opals mined in Australia come from South Australia! That is the point that I tried to make by way of interjection when the member for Alexandra was speaking; I said that he could not be certain just how much an opal miner made during 12 months' work on a field.

Obviously, not all that an opal miner makes is declared; no doubt every member is aware of that. Also, I have no doubt that eventually the figures will become more consistent with each other. In one breath the member for Eyre said that opal miners had only very meagre means yet, in another breath, he said that they had heavy hire-purchase commitments in connection with bulldozers and that they were in a desperate situation. I would think that people with meagre means would not enter into hire-purchase agreements for bulldozers worth \$50,000 or more. Of course, I realize that there are both successful and unsuccessful opal miners. On the basis that 90 per cent (not 95 per cent) of the opal mined in Australia is mined in South Australia, and if we divide that 1,100 opal miners in South Australia into the total value of the opal mined here, a figure between \$11,000,000 and \$12,000,000, that gives an average income for South Australian opal miners of about \$10,500. I accept that some miners would get more, and certainly many would get less than that figure. However, the figure shows that the miners generally can expect a reasonable return for their labours.

When the member for Alexandra was speaking, I queried whether, if a miner had not declared a profit in 12 months from his activities, he should be able to renew his prospecting permit free of charge for the coming year, because earnings would not necessarily be divulged. Whilst there are 1,100 opal miners in South Australia, there are 912 registered claims and, of course, many unregistered claims. It is pertinent to consider the number of bulldozers used on the fields at Andamooka and Coober Pedy, because the member for Eyre made great play of the fact that, if bulldozer operators were forced to back-fill, it could mean

the end of the opal-mining industry. At Andamooka there are 300 opal miners, but only five bulldozers are operating at present.

Mr. Gunn: I could have told you that yesterday.

Mr. KENEALLY: But the honourable member did not tell us, for the very good reason that he tried to mislead the House. I am sure that the honourable member knew how many bulldozer operators there were at both fields, but he did not wish to tell the House. At Goober Pedy, where there are 800 opal miners, the proportion of bulldozers is much higher: there are 80 bulldozers there, which is an average of one bulldozer to every 10 miners. So, when the honourable member said that, if bulldozer operators were forced to back-fill, it could mean the end of the opal-mining industry, he was misleading the House. The honourable member said that he had received a telegram from the Coober Pedy Miners Association; portion of that telegram is as follows:

We the undersigned citizens of Coober Pedy declare that our miners association has never been fully consulted regarding this Act and our detailed submissions regarding our \$7,000,000 livelihood have been treated with contempt.

Can the honourable member say whether the 20 miners who signed that telegram were bulldozer operators or miners generally from the field? The honourable member then read the following letter:

We the undersigned have read the Mining Bill dated July 30, 1971, introduced to Parliament on August 3, 1971, and we ask you to have it recorded in *Hansard* that our submissions on behalf of the miners of Coober Pedy have been ignored by the Government. We believe that the new mining laws as set out in the Bill will cause hardship for the miners and trouble for everyone concerned.

The view was expressed in both the telegram and the letter that the Government completely disregarded the miners' interests. Every member is well aware of the efforts of the member for Eyre in representing the views of the miners association. I find it hard to believe that the honourable member has not made it his business to acquaint both the Minister and the department with the views of the association. I also find it hard to believe that the honourable member has not made it his business to ensure that deputations from the association have interviewed both the Minister and departmental officials. I am positive that the honourable member has done those things and that, in representing the miners at Coober Pedy and Andamooka, he has ensured that their views

have been made known to both the Minister and the department.

However, the honourable member refused to tell the House that he had ensured that those views had been made known. When we were told in this House that the miners association represented the opal miners of this State, I believe that we were being misled. The honourable member said that Mr. Konopka and Mr. Robinson, representing the miners, had put themselves out to come to Adelaide to speak to the Minister. But Mr. Konopka and Mr. Robinson both live in Adelaide! Also, in all his life, until recently Mr. Konopka has never had a prospecting permit for opal. Mr. Robinson has never had and still does not have a prospecting permit. I know of constituents in Port Augusta in my district who have bulldozers on the opal fields at Coober Pedy and who also do not have prospecting permits. When an honourable member says that, in speaking on behalf of bulldozer operators, he is representing the mining industry, he is completely wrong, because the people who operate bulldozers at Coober Pedy are not representative of the mining industry, and whether or not operators of bulldozers have to back-fill does not matter one iota to the success of the opal industry in this State.

Mr. Gunn: You're talking a lot of absolute twaddle.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Mawson pointed out to the Opposition that currently the Mines Department has at Coober Pedy a bulldozer that is making a substantial cut, indicating to the miners there just what the Government believes they should do with regard to back-filling. The member for Eyre is obviously not aware of the result of this, as he did not feel it necessary to refer in his speech to the fact that this was taking place.

Mr. Gunn: I didn't—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: I suggest that it might be of value for the honourable member to have a word with Mr. Konopka again, as that gentleman has been to Coober Pedy and would know what the department has done. I will leave it to the Minister when he replies to this debate to explain to Opposition members just what the results of that cut have been. In answer to an interjection, the member for Eyre said that I knew nothing about the mining industry and had never been to Coober Pedy. In his usual form, he is again wrong on both

counts. Possibly I do not know as much about the mining industry as the honourable members knows, but he sets himself up as an expert in this field, and I do not say that I am an expert. I know that there are constituents in my district—

Mr. Gunn: You should—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre. The honourable member for Stuart.

Mr. KENEALLY: Constituents in my district who are vitally interested in the opal-mining industry have expressed to me their concern about the Bill, asking me to see what I can do to assist them. I point out to the member for Eyre that the Commonwealth member for Grey (Mr. Wallis) also has a keen interest in what goes on at the opal fields. Through him, I have had conversations on the fields with people who have told me that they are greatly concerned that the Government should not be misled into believing that the miners association represents the opal-mining industry as a whole. They say that the concern they express permeates right through to their dealings with other Government departments. However, I am not allowed to refer to that. I have had lengthy discussions about this matter with people on the opal fields. I suggest that when the member for Eyre expresses to the House the viewpoint of the miners association he should also state that that is a sectional viewpoint.

The honourable member's concern that the Government would allow big industry to come into opal mining is, in the words of the member for Whyalla, "Just not on". At the request of a mining company in Queensland which is prepared to invest in South Australia, so it says, between \$750,000 and \$1,000,000 to mine opal, I have approached the Minister. This company believes that it is not in its interests to come to South Australia unless it can be given at least one square mile of the area so that it can prospect. I do not agree with this. I raised the matter with the Minister, who said that this was in possible, as the mining industry as a whole has told the Government what it desires not only in relation to opal mining but also in relation to other mining, and the desires of the industry have been noted. The mining industry is totally opposed (as it should be) to areas of the magnitude to which I have referred being granted to companies or individuals for opal-mining purposes, so the honourable member need not fear that we will open up opal fields to large interests, granting them large areas of land.

I approached the department and the Minister to see whether some incentive could be given to the opal-mining industry to assist the discovery of new opal-mining areas. I thought that perhaps one square mile might in this case be a just reward for a miner who found a new opal field. Here again, I was told that, although the Mines Department and the Government offered the mining industry 20 acres as a fair reward for finding a new opal field, the miners said that they did not want areas of this size granted, and that they would be happy with an area the size of four normal mining leases. Therefore, in this case, too, the Government has operated in the best interests of the miners, as the miners themselves see it. I notice that the member for Eyre has left the Chamber, but I believe it is necessary to continue to rebut some of the accusations he made. He accused the Government of governing by regulation. He knows that the Mining Act has always been implemented by regulation, as it must be because of the great variety of conditions that apply. The Act covers an area ranging from the Adelaide Hills to, for instance, Coober Pedy, so it is just not reasonable to expect that legislation should have written into it conditions covering the whole State. I believe the previous Government accepted that fact when it brought down regulations.

The member for Eyre knows that all regulations are subject to the assent of the House and that the industry can make submissions to the Minister. I believe that his accusation that this is a dictatorial Government which governs by regulation is an example of merely another opportunity he has taken to find a weapon with which to hit the Government. His accusation just does not stand up. He was also critical of what he called the restrictive areas that are made available to the mining industry. The position is that the Government will set aside certain areas that will be designated as opal-mining areas; within those areas, no other mining industry can intrude, so they are protected for the opal mining. This does not restrict people who have precious stones prospecting permits from going outside that area and finding other opal mines in South Australia, and we certainly hope they do that.

The member for Eyre wants the Government to expand the area made available to miners, as he believes they will find opals right up to the border of the area currently allowed. What would the honourable member say if this

area was expanded and opals were found right up to the border of the extended area? No restrictions are contained in the Act to prevent people from discovering mines outside the area, and they are encouraged to do so. If new fields are found the people will be able to apply to the Government for the area to be recognized as an opal-mining area. I concede that Opposition members, generally, do not oppose the Bill: the members for Alexandra and Victoria did not, but, unfortunately the member for Eyre was unable to realize that the Bill covered more than the opal-mining industry. It covers the whole mining industry in South Australia. It is a most progressive Bill, and is the most up-to-date mining Bill in Australia. It will protect the interests not only of the mining industry but also those of the pastoralists and the conservationists.

It is a Bill that has been considered in co-operation with all those interested in it. It is not a Bill that the Government has introduced hastily, but one that will give the greatest satisfaction to all concerned. However, should this not be the case there is no reason why submissions should not be made to the Government for changes. Should this occur I am sure that the Government will listen sympathetically to any submissions and will accede to them if the point is proved. Several advantages contained in the Bill have not been referred to by Opposition members but, no doubt, they will be canvassed in Committee. I support the Bill, because it is a progressive one and has been motivated in the best interests of all concerned.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I was interested to hear the member for Stuart say that this was the most up-to-date Bill of its kind in the Commonwealth. It seems that it was only a short time ago that the most up-to-date Workmen's Compensation Bill was introduced, but before it passed this House it was a much different document from the one that had been introduced. In the Committee stage it may be necessary to change this Bill. Although they have not yet been canvassed, some features of this Bill are identical to those contained in the original Bill so that no great argument can be sustained about them. As the Minister said, when introducing the Bill, this legislation had grown like topsy and it was necessary to reframe it. We can appreciate that many of our State Statutes are in a similar position.

I was surprised at some of the Minister's statements made when explaining this Bill, having regard to what had been said outside

the House about matters that were the subject of correspondence with members (and I am led to believe, with the Minister), that the faults, if I may describe them as such, that were apparent to Opposition members and to persons outside the House in Bill No. 133, which was introduced last session, were to be amended, indicating that due recognition had been given to the submissions that had been made to the Minister during the intervening period. Because of this, I was not a little surprised to find that the Minister in his explanation stated:

The Bill as now presented has some minor drafting changes and additions—

and I stress "minor"—

and there have been no major changes in it.

I believe that this is a different attitude from that expressed by people outside this House, that the deficiencies of the Bill (as expressed by the members for Alexandra and Eyre) were being considered, as they were more than what could be described as minor drafting changes. The member for Stuart also said that the Bill would be fair to everyone: the Minister said the same thing when introducing it. In the *Hansard* report of August 3 at page 491 the Minister stated:

The proposed amendments now presented recognize the right of those people who have inherited or acquired freehold land containing mineral ownership to receive the equivalent of royalty from minerals obtained from such land, but intend that in all other respects such land should revert to the status of freehold mineral land.

This is a clear statement and presents no problems, but later the Minister stated:

It is further provided that the royalty payable on any minerals brought into production during a period of 10 years after the proclamation of this Act will be paid to the former owners of the mineral rights, and such royalty will continue to be paid until the mine ceases operation.

Surely this gives them the advantage of their inheritance, provided that the mine comes into operation during the 10-year period. Other provisions, in certain circumstances, ensure that the action must take place within two years. On this basis I suggest that it would not be physically possible in a 10-year period or a two-year period that will follow the introduction of this Bill for the inheritance of these people to be properly brought into production. It is not physically possible and not financially possible, yet we find that people who have purchased properties specifically for the minerals that are on them will lose these



rights if the mine has not come into production within 10 years. Perhaps a letter from a constituent who purchased such a title under the Real Property Act in 1961 may be of interest to members. It states:

I have a certificate of title under the Real Property Act for one moiety of the minerals only covering 164 acres.

He said that the certificate of title was volume 1502, folio 132, and that until now only one acre of the 164 acres has been worked. It was worked when the Kapunda mining boom occurred in the mid or late 1800's. It is known, and has been known for a long time, that a large quantity of copper-bearing ore still exists throughout that area. It is known, also, that the winning of much of this copper depended on the development of new methods of extraction that would be economical and feasible. On July 21 the announcement was made in this State (and I mentioned it in the Address in Reply debate) that one company had recently purchased the rights to part of the Kapunda area, for a cash transaction of \$200,000, and the placement of 5,000,000 shares at 10c, and it was to proceed with exploration and further development of this particular area. With this background knowledge in this area, people have purchased, or have held their entitlement for a long time. They have purchased for the specific reason that they believed minerals existed on the site.

I submit that that is no different from the case of a person who has purchased land containing houses, buildings, vineyards, or other improvements to produce wealth or income. In those circumstances, and as the Bill provides, these people will not necessarily be permitted to receive remuneration or consideration for their involvement. The Minister also states, at page 491, that the proposal has the effect of placing all freehold land throughout the State on an equal footing, regardless of the historical mineral ownership. I stress the reference to historical mineral ownership. Is it just of historical interest that a person will be denied rights or lose the money that he has put into an asset that he has hoped will eventually provide him with an income?

The member for Mawson, in speaking on this Bill, spoke on an entirely different plane from that which we have come to expect from him, and I congratulate him on the research and effort that he put into his contribution. However, I found him very condescending on one aspect. The honourable member stated:

I point out again that only a small proportion of the total land area of the State is actually

given over to the extractive industry. In fact, mining or quarrying operations occupy only one acre in every 24,000 acres of this State, compared with one acre in 30 acres that is under cereal cropping. That, I repeat, represents a complete environmental devastation, yet we realize that this cropping must take place.

How condescending of the member for Mawson! The *Pocket Year Book of South Australia* for 1970 shows that in 1968-69 the return from wheat alone in South Australia was \$110,880,000, and that wheat was grown on the area of land on which the condescending member suggested that it was not a bad idea to permit it, notwithstanding that the area also provides a home for many thousands of people. I shall now deal briefly with some other aspects of the Bill that I do not think have been commented on yet. A new Part XI, entitled "Encouragement of Mining" is included. This heading is also in the old Act, but in a different section. In the old Act, which was reprinted in 1952, Part IX deals with encouragement of mining and comprises sections 109 to 111, inclusive. In the present Bill, that is dealt with in Part XI, clauses 70 to 72, inclusive. The particular provisions that I want to read relate to the power that this new Bill gives to the Minister to disburse and distribute the funds of this State without reference to Parliament. Clause 70 of the Bill provides:

(1) The Minister may assist in the conduct of mining operations by the loan of mining equipment or of moneys to be expended in advancing mining operations.

(2) Assistance may be provided upon such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Minister but any moneys advanced under subsection (1) of this section shall become a debt due to the Crown to be repaid in such manner as the Minister may direct.

Right through this provision the power of decision is given to the Minister, not to anyone else. The Minister is not beholden to Parliament to present to it the arrangement that he has entered into or may enter into with an outside body, although clauses 71 and 72, which allow him to enter into arrangements for research and investigation and into acquisition of mining equipment, provide:

71. The Minister may—

- (a) conduct research and investigation into problems relating to mining operations or the treatment of ores recovered in the course of mining operations;
- (b) stipulate and recover charges for any such research or investigation conducted at the request of any person;

and

(c) pay the cost of any such research or investigation out of moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose.

72. The Minister may, out of moneys provided by Parliament, acquire mining equipment for the purposes of this Part.

In other words, he is required to tell Parliament what he is doing. A similar provision was contained in the old Act, in sections 109, 110, and 111, all of which empowered the Minister to incur expenditure and use "any moneys which are appropriated by Parliament". In other words, we find in the Bill a whittling away of Parliament's ability to determine, or be party to, any arrangement that the Minister of the day may have with persons outside. I am not denying and never shall deny that it is a worthwhile arrangement that a Minister of the Crown can enter into necessary arrangements with people with a like cause or a common purpose—in this case, research for the development of mining; but I believe it is entirely wrong that the Minister can undertake the dispersal of these funds in this way without being required to make the information available to, or advise, the House of what he is intending to do.

In the Bill, as in the old Act, there are provisions in regard to roads and streets. Twice recently in the House we have been told that the redevelopment of the main road to Victoria in the area of Callington Hill has been held up because the roadway is connected with mining leases or is included in the pegging of claims. The Premier has told me in the House that the course of the by-pass around the town of Kapunda cannot be determined because there are difficulties associated with the leases in that area, and the Government is negotiating or discussing ways and means of altering that situation. When he replies to this debate, perhaps the Minister will indicate whether the Government has been able to include in the provisions any satisfactory arrangement that will permit the Crown to provide acceptable corridors for the future development or upgrading of the present road system.

From a brief and rather superficial glance at the two provisions, the old one and the new one, I cannot see there is much difference, but I stand to be corrected in that respect. In the new Bill it is clause 10; in the old Act it is section 7. Certainly there is a difference in the total wording but I seek information on the actual rights or on the ability of the Crown, through the Minister of Roads and Transport, the Highways Department and what-

ever necessary authority may be involved, to undertake action in this direction. Also, I point out to the House that there are errors in some headnotes in this Bill. I suggest that the headnotes of clauses 13, 14 and 15 have been transposed or otherwise altered from reality. In the previous Bill last session, there was also some transposing of the headnotes but not in the same part of the Bill.

Briefly, I now refer to what the Minister said when presenting the Bill:

It should be emphasized that even the most protected landholder under the present system does not lose under the provisions of the Bill any effective protection, while many other landholders who are not so well protected under the present legislation obtain substantial advantages under the provisions of the Bill.

I suggest that this is in complete conflict with some of the other statements the Minister has made and with some of the areas I have canvassed earlier; and it is not borne out in the manner in which the Bill is presented to the House. I refer to the interpretation particularly of clauses 16 and 19, in relation to the person who apparently has rights (inalienable rights, I had believed) to the minerals for the duration of his own life or of the person to whom he may subsequently pass over the rights, and point out that those rights are lost. Therefore, how can we have it that nobody will suffer?

Mr. Coumbe: What about the agreements?

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. What about the persons who have made arrangements with banks and other organizations on the basis of what they own—suddenly to find by the action of the Government under this Bill that their rights are of limited value, that they will exist for only a predetermined period? It is also stated that a mineral claim is not transferable: that is, it cannot be sold or traded. If this is not a loss of a protection or an advantage that the present owner has, what is it? I do not need to answer the question, because it is so obvious.

Mr. Coumbe: He cannot pass it on by his will.

Dr. EASTICK: No; he cannot trade it: it is non-transferable. The pieces of paper that some people have held in their family for years or have purchased for a particular purpose, with a particular plan in mind—

Mr. Evans: And value.

Dr. EASTICK: And value—go out of the window then because the Government introduces this Bill. It is features of this nature that I cannot accept as being in the interests of the people of this State. It is also mentioned

that the mining lease requires the payment of rent to the owner of the land and the payment of royalty at 21 per cent of the value. Many arrangements exist today between the owner of the mineral rights and the company that is exploring, developing or raising those minerals where the royalty is well in excess of the 21 per cent. If these figures have been negotiated to the advantage of the owner, his family and his heirs, why should they cease under the new Bill? Yet I cannot find protection written into the Bill beyond the period of time I have stated.

I support the Bill in the second reading stage, but these are areas that I hope the Minister will comment on before we reach the Committee stage. I also mention briefly that the Bill is presented in metric form. This is commendable. One cannot argue against the fact that we are fast approaching the stage when all our determinations will be in metric form. At page 495, the Minister states:

Clause 45 permits the prescribing of the size of a precious stones claim. It is proposed that the regulations will specify an area similar to the present dimensions, namely, 50 metres x 50 metres (150ft. x 150ft.).

Whom is the Minister fooling? The measurement in feet approximating 50 metres is 165ft., not 150ft. There is a considerable difference between a lease pegged out on the existing basis and one to be pegged out on the new basis, and, bearing in mind that there is a difference of 15ft., I cannot accept that 150ft. is a close approximation to 50 metres. I support the second reading and look forward to comments from the Minister in the Committee stage.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer to various aspects of the Bill and to comments made by certain members opposite. First, I should like to clarify the position concerning Mr. Konopka and Mr. Buck. By way of interjection, the member for Stuart said that they were not representatives of the mining industry at Coober Pedy, and he took the member for Eyre to task when that member claimed that they were representatives of the industry. The Premier has in the past adopted a similar attitude to that of the member for Stuart. The following passage, which commences with the Premier referring to the member for Eyre, appears at page 3310 of *Hansard* of December 2, 1970:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member started off by saying that the opal industry was concerned at my inconsistent statements, and said that he had telegrams

from two people who claimed to be representatives of the opal industry—

Mr. Gunn: And they do represent it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and who are not.

Mr. Gunn: They are.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are not representatives of the opal industry.

Mr. Gunn: I challenge you to go and tell them that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told them to their face and I will tell them again. On February 3 last there was a deputation to the Premier comprising the Minister of Environment and Conservation, Dr. K. R. Miles, Mr. S. Konopka, Mr. H. Buck and Mr. B. Jameson. At that deputation, the Premier said:

Mr. Jameson suggested that you would like to have a further talk today.

Mr. Buck then said:

We did want to establish our *bona fides* today. I met you when you were Leader of the Opposition, and we want to know just exactly how we are regarded today.

The following is a report of the discussion that then ensued:

The PREMIER: YOU are certainly representatives of miners, and we have always wanted to treat you as such.

Mr. BUCK: Not only of the miners but opal buyers also, and cutters. These men have contributed to the association's funds to help us in our efforts and, in this respect, are entitled to be representatives of miners, buyers and cutters, as far as that covers the industry.

The PREMIER: Yes, I am aware that there is not entire accord in the matter, but I think you are representatives of a substantial body of people in the industry.

Mr. Coumbe: There's not much doubt there.

Mr. EVANS: This is a statement by the Premier himself. No wonder the member for Eyre said that the miners are concerned about the inconsistency of the present Premier, and we have recently seen a further example of that inconsistency. These people are concerned, because the Premier is inconsistent in his statements, and the member for Stuart knows that he is backing an unsuccessful horse when he makes the type of statement he made today that the people concerned were not representatives of this industry. At the deputation to which I have referred, other comments were made that concern the people in the industry. The Premier promised that a copy of the draft Bill would be made available to people in the industry and, at the time, Mr. Konopka said:

We would like ample time to go over it and study it.

The Premier then said:

We have every intention of letting you do that. The reason that these provisions were sent to the field and outlined beforehand was

that we wanted to take into account what people there had to say about the situation before final drafting. We will need your comments pretty quickly. Parliament sits on February 23 through to Easter.

Later, a similar promise was made by the Premier, namely:

We will send you a copy of the final draft. This was not sent to the mining industry until after the second reading explanation had been given of the Bill introduced early this year. The Bill was introduced, but people engaged in the mining industry in the area concerned were not given, as promised by the Premier, a copy of the draft. This is one of many reasons why the mining industry has no faith in the Minister of Environment and Conservation or in the Premier in relation to this Bill. Later in the transcript of what was said at the deputation to which I have referred, the Premier said:

I think you will find that you will get quite sufficient protection in it.

He was referring to the Bill, and continued:

We will send you the final drafting, and I suggest that you raise queries with us on that draft so that we can answer each specific query on that draft. I will get that to you as soon as the draft is approved.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Environment and Conservation definitely refused to give either Mr. Konopka or Mr. Robinson a draft; even though he was reminded of the promise made, he refused to make a draft available, yet Government members stand up here and say that the Government has gone to untold bother to co-operate with the people in the industry. I can only think that either they have bad memories or they avoid the truth. I wish to turn now to provisions that will affect opal miners. Clause 6 provides:

"declared equipment" means any equipment of a kind declared by regulation to be declared equipment for the purposes of this Act.

The regulation referred to in that definition must eventually come before this House, but can the mining industry trust the present Government to give it the right type of consideration in matters like this, considering the treatment that the industry has received recently? Would any member expect the industry to trust the Government, particularly the Minister and Premier? Clause 6 further provides:

"precious stones field" means any mineral lands declared by proclamation to be a

precious stones field pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

Exactly what areas are to be declared as precious stones fields? Can the miners trust the present Government?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: Obviously, the Minister did not hear me read from the transcript of the proceedings of a recent deputation; if he had, he would have doubts about the sincerity of some of his colleagues. Clause 9 (1) (d) provides that mining operations may be halted if they are on land within 150 metres of a dwelling house, factory, building, spring, well, reservoir or dam. What would happen if someone built a shed on land near a mine after the mine had commenced operating? Would the mining operations have to cease? That is not made clear in the Bill. I also strongly object to the loss of the right to minerals on a property by those landholders who at present have freehold titles in connection with which the rights to minerals are still retained. Under the Bill those rights will be taken away by this Socialist Government without any suggestion of compensation, when actually there is a value attaching to that part of the title that gives a right to the minerals. Perhaps it is a Socialist attitude to take as much as possible out of the hands of the private individual. Clause 44 (2) provides:

A precious stones prospecting permit shall not authorize the conduct of mining operations that involve disturbance of any land by machinery or explosives.

Does that provision mean that even a drill is prohibited? The matter will depend entirely on the one person who makes the decision, and I do not think we should leave it in the hands of one individual. Clause 60 provides that, before a person can start work on another lease, he must tidy up a cut, and an inspector must be satisfied that the miner has satisfactorily restored the ground that has been disturbed. We all know that at times there can be personality clashes, and such clashes are likely to happen in the mining industry, where there are often objections to authority by individuals. Unfortunately, some people involved in small operations are of the type that tries to live as far away from authority as possible. If an inspector decides to be tougher on some people than on others, injustices can occur. We are putting into the hands of one man the responsibility for making a decision that may be unjust. Consequently, the Bill should provide that more than one person must make the final decision on such a matter, because the decision could put a man out of business.

The overall effects of the Bill on mining as a whole and the environment as a whole are beneficial. It was necessary that the legislation should be redrafted. The following views about the effect of mining on the environment were expressed at a mining industry conference, attended by Sir Maurice Mawby:

The Mining Council view is that: "Natural resources constitute economic wealth only when developed by mining and other industries. This development is necessary to maintain national solvency and individual living standards. At the same time, man has a fundamental right to a healthy and aesthetically pleasing environment for work and leisure. The Australian Mining Industry Council supports the ordered development of natural resources in such a manner as to ensure that the highest possible environment quality is maintained." Mr. L. C. Brodie-Hall, a forceful mining leader from Western Australia, has summed this up by saying that there is a need to preserve things and conditions that are unique and rare for scientific or aesthetic purposes, or those that are essential to bodily and spiritual health and welfare.

None of us I am sure will disagree with these statements, nor with any of the examples of preservation that he listed. These included: representative areas of indigenous flora, unique geological structures and scenic attractions, indigenous fauna in a natural setting, unique native art such as rock paintings, Aboriginal sacred areas, areas of bushland and foreshore for public recreation and enjoyment.

People in the mining industry are concerned about and aware of the problems within our environment. I believe that, if the average man in the street was as aware of the problems that are associated with the environment and the amenities of the community as those in the mining industry are aware of these matters, we might achieve our goal much more rapidly, our goal being to maintain a reasonable standard of living in a reasonable environment.

Many of those who condemn the mining industry do not look at the broader aspects of the issue or at their own backyards. By this I mean that some people have one motor car and others have two; other people own a boat or a holiday shack. In this affluent society, whenever someone adds to his possessions he is making use of something that has been taken from the soil. If the materials involved have not come from under the ground they have been taken from vegetable growth on the surface. The member for Mawson spoke about the environment, saying that the position in desert areas, such as Coober Pedy, was finely balanced. I believe that the percentage of this type of country in South Australia that is involved in the same work as is done at Coober Pedy is very small.

Let us consider urban development. Overall in Australia the mining industry affects the

same area of surface land as is affected each year in the expansion of metropolitan areas. Our main problem is the demands made by human beings on the mining industry and on other industries. If we can slow down the demands made by people, there will not need to be so much material mined. If people in the community are prepared to pay double the price they presently pay for aggregate from the hills face zone, similar material can be produced from an area 50 miles away. However, the community must first be prepared to make this sacrifice. In 100 years from now the metropolitan area may have extended another 50 miles and people will again complain that quarrying is taking place too close to the suburbs.

The extractive industry in this State has produced the best housing standards in Australia, buildings of which we are all proud. We tell people in other States that our buildings are the best, whether we refer to the A.N.Z. Bank or to our own houses. This State has only a very small percentage of timber frame houses, and many of those houses have asbestos in their walls. When people speak of preservation and conservation they should be asked what sacrifices they are willing to make as individuals. If they are not willing to make sacrifices, they must be classed as hypocrites. The member for Mawson is concerned about conservation: I do not refer to preservation, because I do not think that that can be achieved. However, the process of conservation is now on everyone's mind. In many areas we can achieve a better result than we could have achieved in the past, but there is no sense in comparing what happened 100 years ago with what should be or what is happening today.

The Bill contains a provision that allows one man to order a person to back-fill. I suggest the ridiculous case of the Callington or Kanmantoo mine: there will be a 750ft. deep excavation to be used for open-cut mining, and 45,000,000 tons will be stockpiled in an adjacent area. Is it sensible to require in that area that the 45,000,000 tons should be placed back in the hole? Does the provision for reclaiming or back-filling, referred to in the Bill, suggest that that should be done? Should it be possible for someone to say to the mining company that that is what it should do? I hope not, and I hope that no person, organization, or Government will do anything so ridiculous. I do not think that the present Government would be as ridiculous as that. However, that is the kind of provision contained in the Bill.

Examples have occurred in Australia where mining companies have been condemned when they started operating. On the north-east coast of New South Wales, when the company commenced the rare earth project by taking zircon and rutile from the sand deposits, there was an uproar. However, as the company continued its operations the people realized that the biggest humbug in respect of the whole reclamation of the area and the regeneration of natural plant life would be caused by human beings who wanted to picnic on the site. It was only then that people realized the problems confronting the mining companies. In fact, only 1 per cent of the overall sand deposits was taken out through the dredging operation, and the rest was reshaped back into a better shape than the original sandhills had been to form a protection, and botanists and agriculturists were employed to plant native plants and encourage them to grow.

When considering the stockpiling of topsoil (and this will be the way we operate in future), we must remember that, in other countries where they have stockpiled topsoil from mining operations for many years before it was returned, the heat created by decomposing vegetable material in the topsoil killed all the seeds in the soil. If we think in terms of reclamation in future (and we have unique and rare plants that are native to our land), we must take the seeds or young plants and transplant them ready for the future, because in other countries the authorities have learned the lesson dearly in cases where they pushed the topsoil off without ensuring that the seeds would be readily available when the soil was again spread over the area.

In other countries, when a mining company has finished the operation and wished to back-fill, it has received letters of protest because people did not want to have removed from that area the small hills that had been developed from the waste materials. They did not want the land levelled out again; they wanted the dumps to remain, because they had greater scenic beauty, in the opinion of a few odd bods, than would have been the case if they had been reclaimed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who are those "few odd bods"?

Mr. EVANS: This happened in the case of the Peabody coal company in America, when there was much protest about one project in which the company wished to carry out this sort of operation. Perhaps one should refer to something else that Sir Maurice Mawby has

said on this subject. On page 7 of *Science and Technology* for May, 1971, he states:

Let me set down some of the things I believe we in the mining industry should be concerning ourselves with.

- (1) There is a need for a national policy of resource management, and there must be the means of implementing this policy. More and more we must think regionally: the geographical boundaries of the States must not be the arbitrary lines where policy changes.
- (2) Conflicts in land use can only be avoided if the ground rules are established quickly.

I think we are doing that, to a degree, in this Bill. The writer continues:

Any statutory body that establishes the ground rules must have adequate representation from mining and conservation interests.

I think we all agree with that. The report continues:

Any statutory body that establishes the ground rules must have adequate representation from mining and conservation interests.

- (3) The ground rules should establish:

Areas where minerals can be explored for and mined to enable the national objectives of growth and development to be achieved.

Areas where mining under no circumstances is allowed—for example, some parts of some national parks, water catchments, and so on.

The terms and conditions under which mining can proceed in that large indeterminate area in between the two classifications mentioned.

- (4) Society must make a judgment on what it is prepared to pay for control of the environment.

That is the point I wish to make strongly, and I think the member for Mawson agrees with me. The next matter that Sir Maurice Mawby mentions is:

- (5) Governments must make objective analyses of the possible ecological consequences that may follow from the establishment of each new industry.

I do not think the sixth and seventh points that the writer makes are so important, but the publication is in the library if any member cares to read it. There is one problem when we speak of a proposed mine or the possibility of an ore body in any particular area. If, before a company can start an operation, it must establish before a court that the mining operations should go on, the matter of who meets the expenses will arise. I do not think there is a simple answer to this matter. If we tell a group that it can explore an area but that if it finds the deposit that it is looking for, any person in the community has the right

to object, in a court, to mining operations being carried out, and if that is done before the group starts mining, what will happen?

We tend to restrict those who are willing to carry out exploratory work in the mining field. We have heard recently the Premier himself state that the mining industry last year was worth \$104,000,000 to this State, and that figure will increase at a greater rate than inflation will because we are finding more ore bodies all the time.

However, I am fully convinced that we must have tougher control and stricter legislation in the mining industry, but the fear in our heart is, of course, that, if we give groups that sometimes act emotionally rather than logically (I say that respectfully to the conservationists) this power to act through the courts, we may embarrass the whole mining industry of this State; but I see no alternative to giving them this opportunity to put their case before a court. We have reached the stage in the development of the State where we have to ask ourselves: are we prepared to go without the minerals and retain the environment as it is at the moment or are we prepared to say, "Yes, you can have a lease over this section of land but 20 per cent or 30 per cent of it must remain in its natural state; and, if there is no plant life there now of our native types, you must regenerate those native plants on 20 per cent, 30 per cent or some other percentage of the land"?

Have we reached that stage? Possibly, we have reached the stage where we should be

saying to practically every citizen who owns a block of land, "One-fifth of your block should have native plants or trees on it." There is no reason why a person in the suburbs should not maintain some of our native plants and shrubs if it is important to our environment to do so in other areas. So we have reached the stage where we must make this type of decision. We have also reached the stage where we must recognize the effort the mining industry has put into the development of the State.

I refer to the industries we have here, and particularly the motor industry, and how much we depend upon mining for that industry. At the same time we must remember that the minerals obtained from the mining industry are not lost to society. They are not wasted; they are recycled through the community. The motor car becomes scrap and is melted down. The lead used in the printing business is re-used on other jobs. However, if we clear the forests for timber, they are lost for all time. In the mining industry, what is mined is not lost; it is retained and used again and again by the community. The only reason why we have to continue mining to a larger and larger degree is the continual increase in our population. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 24, at 2 p.m.