

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**EYRE HIGHWAY**

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether he will, with the consent and advice of his Cabinet colleagues, direct Government policy towards building the Eyre Highway? Recently there has been mounting criticism of the Government for the inaction that seems evident concerning the Government's attitude to building the Eyre Highway. The Premier would be aware that the previous Government decided to take the highway as far as Penong, and at that time reliance was placed on a Commonwealth Government contribution to complete the remainder, although the previous Government had said that it would build the road slowly, step by step, if the Commonwealth Government would not come to the party. Of course, that would have meant extremely slow progress. Since then the Premier has said, on behalf of his Government, that he would agree to build the remaining stretch of bitumen by providing State funds to match greater funds from the Commonwealth Government: I think the figure he mentioned for State funds was about \$3,000,000. It seems that the Commonwealth Government will not accept this offer, and I ask the Premier whether he will still direct the \$3,000,000, which he offered in his proposal about combining with the Commonwealth Government and which he could evidently find from his road programme, towards building the remaining strip of bitumen required to complete the highway to the Western Australian border. Of course, the \$3,000,000 would not complete the stretch of road.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting.

Mr. HALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I must not do that. I ask the Premier whether, as \$3,000,000 would build a significant portion of that road, he will allocate that money, regardless of the Commonwealth Government's attitudes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The present Government has gone much further than the previous Government went to committing moneys to sealing the Eyre Highway. At present we are spending \$600,000 a year on seal-

ing the highway, and we will go on spending money on that highway. The \$3,000,000 that we offered towards its sealing will be spent, regardless of whether the Commonwealth Government contributes. However, that will not be sufficient to complete the sealing of the highway. Every Government in Australia, other than the Commonwealth Government, has supported the position taken by the South Australian Government that the sealing of the Eyre Highway is beyond the resources of this Government, that it is a matter of national importance, that it ought to be the subject of a special grant, and that, since special grants have been given to other States (particularly to Queensland in respect of beef roads, which carry much less traffic and which are not nearly as important nationally as the Eyre Highway), it is absurd that the Commonwealth Government should suggest that the Eyre Highway is totally our constitutional responsibility. Despite the fact that we have been supported in this way by every Liberal State Government in Australia, to date the Commonwealth has refused to contribute funds for this purpose. I assure the Leader that I do not intend to give up and, in fact, the Government has not been inactive in this matter. I have made, I think, about six submissions to the Commonwealth Government in the last 16 months but have received only two replies in that time, both of them considerably delayed, and I believe that we should proceed to demand some contribution from the Commonwealth Government towards this project.

Mr. Hall: Over what period will the \$3,000,000 State funds be applied?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have told the Leader, we are spending it at the rate of \$600,000 a year at this time, and that will continue. I hope that we can put a further proposal to the Commonwealth Government soon, but I believe that it is the Commonwealth's responsibility to contribute towards this road and that it is beyond the resources of this State to complete the sealing of this road entirely on its own.

BURNSIDE ACCIDENT

Mr. RYAN: Will the Attorney-General obtain a report concerning the allegation that the A.M.P. insurance company, as the insurance company covering a concrete mixer truck that was involved in a recent accident, may not pay bodily injury insurance under the third party policy because it may be considered that the accident was an act of God? It was

reported that an assessor, acting on behalf of this company, visited persons involved in the accident last week and told them that they might not receive any insurance under the Act if it was considered that the accident was an act of God, that the onus would then be placed on the injured persons to claim, through the courts, damages as a result of the accident, and that they must prove negligence by the driver concerned.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have seen the report to which the honourable member has referred. The persons who suffered injury or loss in this accident would be entitled to damages if it seemed that the accident was caused or contributed to by the negligence of anyone. I have read the report that suggested that the accident might have occurred without negligence by anyone. I am unable to express my opinion on the legal liability that may result from this accident, but such superficial knowledge of the facts that I have seems to indicate that it would be highly unlikely that an accident of this kind could occur without negligence by someone connected with either the driving or the operation of the concrete mixer truck. Whether or not that will turn out to be so, I cannot say. However, I strongly advise anyone who suffered injury or loss as a result of the accident either independently, or perhaps preferably as a group, to consult a solicitor and place the facts before him so that they may obtain proper advice on whether they have a claim.

UNIONISM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry, in the interest of industrial peace, intervene in the matters that have arisen between the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society and Aresco Trak-Chief Proprietary Limited to try to prevent attacks by the society on that company? I understand that some weeks ago Mr. O'Neill, who I think is the society's Assistant Secretary, went to the company's premises and, without the knowledge of the management, held a meeting of members of his society who were employed there. Subsequently, a second meeting was held with the management's knowledge and consent, and the purport of Mr. O'Neill's request was that there should be an official representative of the union at the company. The company's employees were not happy about this matter, so the company subsequently arranged for a secret ballot of its employees to decide whether or not Mr. O'Neill's request should be granted. As the

vote was strongly against it, the company has therefore not allowed that to happen. In last Saturday's *Advertiser* appears an advertisement, under the heading "Situations Vacant", as follows:

All members. Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society. Any member considering employment with Aresco Trak-Chief, Dry Creek, contact branch office, 264 Halifax Street, Adelaide, before accepting employment.

(Signed)

L. W. Heffernan, Secretary

Subsequent to that advertisement appearing, I was told by the company's Secretary that some of the suppliers to the company had been in touch inquiring about the meaning of the advertisement, and three boilermakers who had agreed to accept employment have since informed the company (I understand by telephone through their wives) that they now no longer wish to commence employment there. I have also been told that, on application to the society, at least one man has been told, first, that the company employs non-union labour; secondly, that the company uses the secret ballot; thirdly, that the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society is planning to boycott the company soon; and fourthly, that the boycott will be put into action as soon as a new crane bay building is completed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the honourable member can fairly say that that is an explanation of the question. He is referring to a newspaper. I call on the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, Sir—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham knows that he is entirely out of order in rising to his feet when the Speaker is standing. I have decided that the explanation goes beyond what is normally permissible, and I call on the Minister of Labour and Industry to reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I take a point of order. My point of order is that I was simply giving information to complete the explanation of my question.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members are permitted to give information only so far as is necessary to explain the question, and it is the Speaker's prerogative to determine whether or not that information is necessary. I have ruled that the honourable member has gone beyond explaining his question, and I have called on the Minister of Labour and Industry to reply. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I ask you, Sir, on what basis—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call on the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take another point of order, Sir, and ask you on what basis—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But I take a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have made perfectly clear to the honourable member for Mitcham that I have ruled that his question explanation goes beyond what is necessary to explain his question intelligently, and I have called on the Minister of Labour and Industry to reply to that question. I do not know what point of order the honourable member wants to take now.

Mr. COUMBE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Millhouse: Thanks, John.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must resume his seat until I am seated. The Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: In reply to the honourable member—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I take another point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that I have not finished explaining the facts of my question yet, and I ask you on what basis you say that I have. The basis has not been given.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member sought leave of the House and of the Speaker to explain his question so far as was necessary. I have determined and ruled that his explanation was longer than was necessary, and I have called on the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry to reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had a good deal more—

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Well, it has taken nearly 10 minutes for the member for Mitcham to explain this question, but I will not take that long to answer it. I am not aware of the matter he has raised, but it seems strange to me that the company to which he refers should go to him rather than come to

me or to someone who could solve the problem. The member for Mitcham is incapable of representing the company or solving the problem—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's been paid.

Mr. Millhouse: You're not getting away—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham must cease interjecting, because it is out of order. He is not going to stand up and dominate the House. Standing Orders provide that the Speaker must maintain order. I have called on the Minister of Labour and Industry to reply. There is a way of dealing with these things in accordance with Standing Orders, and the honourable member must contain himself.

Mr. COUMBE: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Torrens is out of order. It is the member for Mitcham's question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Sir. The Minister of Works suggested that I was paid to ask that question, and I resent that very bitterly.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member does not contain himself, I shall be forced to name him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I wish the honourable member would have a little respect for the constituents he represents and conduct himself in a manner befitting members. I take exception to his trying to dominate the proceedings of this House.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I withdraw—

Mr. Millhouse: Unreservedly!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I withdraw unreservedly the comment that I made by way of interjection. I did not say that the honourable member had been paid to ask the question: I said he had been paid to represent the company. I withdraw the interjection unreservedly.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I had practically answered the honourable member anyhow but, to conclude, I point out that it seems rather strange that the people concerned should approach the member for Mitcham—

Mr. Mathwin: There's nothing strange about that, because—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It is obvious that, by going to the member for Mitcham, the company does not want to solve the problem without having some good publicity slung around, helped by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: But I—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Minister take his seat? Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham knows very well that he is not allowed to interject while the honourable Minister is replying, especially in these circumstances.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It does seem rather strange that the company should have taken the course it has taken rather than coming directly to me or to someone who could assist it in getting the matter before the Industrial Commission. Although I will look into the matter, it seems to me that the member for Mitcham does not want to solve the problem; and, at this stage, I would have the same opinion with regard to the company.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works give some information about the current proceedings of the River Murray Commission? I understand that the commission, which is meeting at present, has discussed the subject of the Dartmouth dam and the increased cost thereof. Therefore, can the Minister tell the House about any instructions that he or the Government has given to the South Australian Commissioner (Mr. Beaney) indicating the views of the Government towards the increase in the cost of constructing the dam that has occurred since it was first mooted, and towards continuing with this project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I discussed this matter with Mr. Beaney last Wednesday or Thursday. He will deal with this matter, which is on the agenda for the meeting that is being held, I think, this afternoon in Canberra. I point out that so far only two parties concerned have indicated their acceptance of the fact that the South Australian Parliament has ratified the agreement. Although it will be necessary for the four parties to acknowledge that agreement, the fact that this has not been done will not, as I understand the position, delay the matter's being discussed by the commission this afternoon. The South Australian Commissioner intends to recommend to the various parties to the agreement that the construction of the dam be proceeded with, irrespective of the increase in cost

above the 10 per cent increase allowed for in the initial agreement. I will seek information from Mr. Beaney when he returns.

Mr. Coumbe: Will this require further legislation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. The South Australian Parliament has now ratified the agreement and two parties have accepted that. I understand that acceptance by the other parties is a formality. Therefore, the matter can be proceeded with in a way similar to that which has been outlined by the Premier in reply to previous questions asked in the House.

MODBURY WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works examine the possibility of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's immediately roofing the open terminal storage tank, in which the chironomid midge infestation occurred, with a view to preventing a recurrence of a completely unacceptable situation in a public water supply system? The Minister will be aware that tiny red worms, which have been identified as the larval stages of the chironomid midge (a small, non-biting, mosquito-like insect), have been found in the public water supply at Modbury. On Saturday, I went to a home where I saw dead and live worms which that day had come through the tap. The Director-General of Public Health has said that the insect does not constitute a public health problem, as it does not bite or carry disease. Although there is no health risk, such an undesirable situation should be prevented from occurring again.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is most unfortunate that the red worms appeared as they did in the water supply to which the honourable member refers. I have called for a full report on the matter. As the honourable member would appreciate, this matter was brought to the department's attention when it arose on, I think, last Friday. I was in Millicent over the weekend, but upon returning yesterday I called for a full report on the matter. If roofing the tanks will prevent a recurrence of this position, I will consider whether this can be done.

MARRYATVILLE SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about amalgamating the primary and infants sections of the Marryatville school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is intended that the amalgamation of the two parts of the Marryatville Primary School will be undertaken on the infants section site in Dankel Avenue, Kensington. Action is therefore to be taken to purchase several houses in Bishop Place, Kensington, and to close the road between these houses and the existing school-grounds to provide a sufficient area of land on which new buildings could be established. Notices of intention to acquire have been served on the owners of the properties affected. Each owner had previously been contacted and told informally of these proposals.

KILBURN INDUSTRIES

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation tell the House whether he would be willing to honour the promise he gave on September 21 last in reply to a question I asked about a health hazard in Kilburn resulting from a dust nuisance in that area? In his reply, the Minister said that no complaints in regard to dust had been received in the previous 12 months and that he would deal with the matter if I gave him more specific information. I canvassed the matter among the people involved, telling them that I was not satisfied with the Minister's reply but that I considered the Minister to be absolutely sincere in his attitude. Since then, the local newspaper got hold of the matter and one issue of that newspaper contains a report that states:

Factory Smoke Blots Housewives' Wash. Local Women Fight Filth and Grime. Sometimes the dust and fumes blot out the sun, even on a clear day—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think it is necessary to quote what the newspaper states.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, Mr. Speaker. I am merely asking the Minister whether, if I hand him this newspaper report defining the area and stating what are the major complaints and their nature, he will, as promised on September 21, have the matter properly investigated.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, I shall be pleased to examine the complaints to which the honourable member refers. True, I did raise with the Public Health Department the general complaint that the honourable member told me of a few week ago, and the department told me that there have been no complaints from that area. I point out two factors to the honourable member. First, the general complaint that he makes strengthens my desire to introduce, as soon as possible, clean air

measures that will generally reduce the problems of dust and smoke from factories. Secondly, I shall be pleased to have the department investigate the specific complaint that the honourable member now makes and, if the newspaper report refers to specific locations and factories, I shall be pleased to have the officers examine the emission from those factories to find out whether the position can be improved.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I direct my question to the Minister of Roads and Transport and I ask your leave and the concurrence of the House—

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What is the future of the Government's plan regarding transport to Kangaroo Island? There have been reports that the Government is negotiating to buy the *Troubridge*. In fact, some reports say that the Government has bought the vessel, and the whole Kangaroo Island community is extremely interested in this matter, naturally. The Minister has not said much about the matter and the most recent report I heard was that he was not commenting at that time. I simply ask him whether he can now comment and, if he cannot, when he expects to be able to do so, because I remind him that about five or six weeks ago, when I introduced a deputation to him, he expected to be able to make a statement within two or three weeks of that time. A series of questions has occurred to the people of Kangaroo Island, such as the future of the ferry programme to Kangaroo Island if the Government takes over the *Troubridge* and the future of the freight cost structure in relation to the vessel. The freight rates have been increased by about 30 per cent in the last 15 months. Recently, a 15 per cent increase was announced, and this disturbed the residents of the island further. That is the sort of question that the people on the island are asking and I now ask the Minister whether he will make a statement clarifying the position.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that I did not write down the series of questions that the honourable member asked. However, I saw a report that the Adelaide Steamship Company had increased the freight rates. Of course, that is a matter for the company: private enterprise can increase its rates (or decrease them if it wishes, although it rarely

does) without reference to the State Government for approval, as the honourable member would know. I did not read the report in the Kangaroo Island newspaper *Islander* and I suggest that the honourable member ought to direct his question to the editor of that newspaper if he wants to check the accuracy of the report. For my part, I regret that I cannot comment further—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Can you say how long it will be before you can?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have given several assurances to this House and to the people of the island, and I know that the Deputy Premier has also assured the people of the island that the Government accepts the responsibility to maintain a sea link between the mainland and the island. We will honour that undertaking.

PORNOGRAPHIC MAIL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the transmission of pornographic material through Her Majesty's mail in South Australia? An extremely irate constituent contacted me yesterday, giving me the rubbish that I am now holding. It is known as the *Adult Yellow Pages*, and it seems that these people are apparently of an international nature, as the words "Private and confidential: New York, London, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Brisbane" are printed on the envelope. The pamphlet (if I could call it that) solicits a subscription of \$20 from the people receiving it, and in return the organization guarantees to provide the subscriber with the addresses of business premises of people who will provide erotic and pornographic literature and films. They go so far that I consider—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. WELLS: But I consider—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must resume his seat when the Speaker stands. The honourable member can make the document available to the Attorney-General who is capable of looking at it, but he cannot continually go on quoting from the document.

Mr. WELLS: With the greatest respect, Sir, I have not quoted from any document. I consider that it is incumbent on me to inform the House about my question and some of the contents of the pamphlet. However, as you have ruled otherwise I shall accept your ruling. This is a villainous document.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and I have ruled repeatedly that comments are not permitted. The honourable member can explain his question so that the Attorney-General has sufficient information to understand what it is about, but to comment is to contravene Standing Orders. The honourable Attorney-General.

Mr. Wells: I think it is terrible—

Mr. Millhouse: We are in the same position.

Mr. Clark: I hope not.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, we are.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have seen the document to which the honourable member has referred. Apparently, it has been fairly widely distributed not only in South Australia but also in all other States. It is an obnoxious document not only because of its contents but also because it has been sent through the post to people who have expressed no desire to receive it but have received it completely unsolicited. I think this makes it an extremely offensive brochure and makes the conduct of those dispatching it extremely objectionable. The problem of the use of mails for transmitting undesirable and objectionable material has been much discussed by the Ministers representing the Commonwealth Government and the various State Governments, and some months ago a joint request was made to the Postmaster-General to increase the vigilance of his department in order to protect people from having inflicted on them unsolicited objectionable material. The Postmaster-General took some action with regard to post office boxes that were used as—

Mr. Wells: Clearing houses!

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, to some extent, but as places to which replies could be addressed. However, I think this action proved largely ineffectual, as all that has happened is that those connected with this trade have substituted private addresses, and tend to move from one address to another. At a meeting of Ministers in Sydney last Friday this problem was further discussed. The Postmaster-General claimed that some of the material transmitted through the post was not of itself obscene, and that he therefore lacked power to deal with it. I think this is probably so. Some of the advertising material is not of itself obscene, although it is extremely objectionable to people who receive it unsolicited. Discussions have taken place about whether the law, both Commonwealth and State, should be amended to specifically prohibit the dispatch of material of this kind to people who have not requested

it. It is difficult to formulate legislation of this kind, although there is a precedent in the unordered goods legislation of the United Kingdom, where an attempt was made to prohibit the transmission of material dealing with certain topics (and amongst the topics was the topic of sexual techniques) unless the material had been requested by the addressee. The matter is still being considered and it may be necessary that the Commonwealth law should be amended to deal with this type of material. It may be that this State will have to consider including a specific reference to this type of material in the legislation that the Government contemplates introducing regarding unordered goods. I am conscious of the problem raised by the honourable member, and I share his indignation, and that of his constituent in having this sort of material inflicted on him without request. I assure the honourable member that the Government will do everything in its power to deal with the problem.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to my question of October 6 about the extent to which water is held in Bool Lagoon as a result of recent inflows?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that in early October the water rose to a level of R.L. 267.50 and, as far as is known, there has been no appreciable drop to the present time. For the information of the honourable member the bed of Bool Lagoon is at an average level of R.L. 263.50, and water can be ponded in the lagoon to R.L. 267.00 before overflow at the spillway occurs and water discharges to the north. By the end of June the water had reached a level of R.L. 266.25, and at the end of August a level of R.L. 266.90 was registered. As it was expected that a considerable volume of water could be impounded during the season, arrangements were made during August 1971 to install a galvanized-iron inverted V-type structure at the spillway to raise the overflow level to R.L. 268.00. This work was carried out as an experiment to see whether the additional head of water would increase the westerly flow through the lagoon to the outlet drain. The structure did not have the desired effect, but it did contain the water within the lagoon during the September-October period and thereby prevented a discharge of 6in. of water to the north. The regulator gates at the outlet drain have been kept open for most of the season, and it is intended that they remain open until the water has reached a safe level.

WEST TORRENS COUNCIL

Mr. WRIGHT: Has the Minister of Local Government a rep'y to the question I asked on September 30 about award and over-award wages paid to all clerical and administrative staff employed by the West Torrens council?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have discussed the matter of over-award payments with the Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of West Torrens, who has advised that, generally speaking, over-award payments to councils' clerical and administrative staff were abolished some years ago.

CLARENDON RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Premier, has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on October 7 about the Clarendon reservoir?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: The proposed new Clarendon reservoir will flood the present road that connects Longwood with Kangarilla. The department has sought the views of the District Councils of Stirling and Meadows concerning all roads that will have to be closed as a result of the building of this new reservoir, and has conferred with officers of the Highways Department. No finality has been reached on any proposals at this stage, but an amount of \$500,000 has been included in the estimate prepared for the total cost of the scheme. This amount provides for the construction of a new bridge across the Onkaparinga River downstream from Mount Bold and for an unsealed rural road to Highways Department standards to provide an alternative road in place of the section of the present Longwood-Kangarilla road, which will be flooded and made impassable by the new dam.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to my question of September 30 about rural assistance?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the reason for the Rural Industries Assistance Committee acting in the way that it has acted is covered by the provisions contained in the agreement with the Commonwealth that sets out certain methods of operation in administering debt reconstruction. For the information of the honourable member these provide *inter alia*:

- (a) A rearrangement and/or composition may take the form of the authority advancing money to pay off in whole or in part the creditors (whether or not the debts have been written down by the creditors under (b) below), excluding the Crown. There may be

an arrangement by the secured or unsecured creditors to postpone repayments of principal and to refrain from taking action against the debtor for a specified time. Composition arrangements require the agreement in writing of creditors.

- (b) The possibility of creditors, including the Crown, local authorities and public utilities, being asked to defer or write off part of their debts (possibly at a uniform rate but with due regard to priority of security) should be considered. Creditors should not be pressed to the extent that the availability of credit to rural industries is damaged.

The decision whether a creditor is prepared to accept a proposal is one which lies entirely with him. It would depend on the circumstances of each individual case whether acceptance or otherwise would affect the ultimate ability of the committee to assist a farmer. It should be realized that the committee, in considering the means by which it may assist a farmer, must consider a variety of alternatives, including writing down of debts. To call this process blackmail gives little credit to the committee, which is endeavouring to assist farmers. Furthermore, such comments will do nothing to help farmers or their creditors.

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. How many applications for assistance have been received by the Rural Assistance Committee?

2. From what areas do these come and how many have been received from each area?

3. How many applications have been processed?

4. How many applications have been approved?

5. How much money has so far been allotted to successful applicants:

- (a) in total;
- (b) for debt reconstruction;
- (c) for farm build-up; and
- (d) for carry-on finance?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 352.

2. Lower South-East 16; Upper South-East 108; Murray Mallee 28; Lower Murray 13; Upper Murray 12; Southern Ranges 23; Northern Ranges 12; Central Plains 11; Yorke 9; Northern 34; Lower Eyre Peninsula 35; Upper Eyre Peninsula 20; Kangaroo Island 31.

3. 203.

4. 56.

5. (a) \$967,154.44.

(b) and (d) \$902,954.44.

(c) \$64,200.

Debt reconstruction includes carry-on finance.

PRAYERS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Mr. Speaker, will you consider modifying the prayer with which we open each day's sitting? In churches nowadays we no longer maintain to any great extent the language of the King James version of the Bible in addressing prayers or in any form of conversation within the service, yet I note that in the preliminary to the Lord's Prayer used here the word "vouchsafe" is used. I have no doubt that most people who visit Parliament would have to run to a dictionary in order to find out that "vouchsafe" meant "condescend to grant". With this in mind, and as I see no reason why in offering prayers we should use language different from ordinary conversation, will you, Mr. Speaker, consider such a modification?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's request will be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary for a progress report on the use of intra-arterial oxygen in the treatment of arteriosclerosis? The late member for Adelaide asked several questions and also spoke about this subject, particularly about Dr. Möler's apparatus. Replying to a question he asked on September 19, 1967, the then Premier (the late Hon. Frank Walsh) said that a study had been conducted at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on 58 patients with various degrees of arterial disease in the legs, that intra-arterial oxygen had been given, and that the results showed no difference existed between those treated with intra-arterial oxygen and those in a control group. Despite this information, which seems to have been confirmed in various other studies, frequent reports of miraculous cures are written up in the press and, understandably, considerable concern is expressed by patients and their relatives that this form of treatment is not available in South Australia. I understand that a form of Dr. Möler's apparatus was brought to South Australia and that it has been tried. In view of the disturbing effect that this form of press report can have on patients suffering from arterial disease, and as these people are often in a position where their hopes can be unduly raised, will the Minister ask his colleague to obtain a report on the current attitude of the medical profession towards this treatment? It is important, if possible, to save these people the expense of travelling to Germany and back again. As I understand it, although there

seem to be some good results there are just as many bad results.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the information.

SCEALE BAY JETTY

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 7 about the jetty at Sceale Bay?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The old jetty at Sceale Bay is in an advanced state of decay and in danger of collapse. It has not been used commercially for over 20 years, and the Director of Marine and Harbors is sure that it is not used by tourists, as besides being relatively unknown it is over 20 miles by dirt track from the nearest main road, which is unsealed. The Director has visited this jetty at least six times in the past 13 years and has never seen anybody either on or near it. Current financial stringency dictates that Government funds must be conserved and expended only on urgent and worthwhile works. The repair of the jetty would cost at least \$20,000. There are about 60 jetties around the South Australian coast, and the current policy is to retain and repair only those that are used to any significant extent. There are no refuelling facilities at the jetty and there never have been.

COOPER CREEK

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the proposed causeway over Cooper Creek?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Cooper Creek does flood the Birdsville track but only infrequently, the last two occasions being in 1956 and 1963. However, it is considered unlikely that the present flood in the Cooper Creek will reach the Birdsville track. The Highways Department has a pontoon ready for use as a ferry upstream of the present crossing, and this will be used if and when the depth of water is great enough to allow the pontoon to float. However, it is realized that a lesser depth of water could still prove a hindrance to vehicular traffic on the Birdsville track at the existing crossing. For this reason, designs are being prepared to provide for the crossing, which is about 2½ to three miles long, to be constructed as a sealed causeway and to be used during moderate flows in the Cooper Creek. It is expected that the causeway will be constructed during next year.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about co-ordinating work associated with the reconstruction of Brighton Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Survey staff are presently engaged in collecting and plotting all available information concerning the location of drains, sewers, gas mains, Postmaster-General's Department cables and Electricity Trust cables in the vicinity of Brighton Road, as the location of such services could influence the selection of the site of the Seacliff to Port Adelaide trunk main. Once plotting has been completed and various alternative routes have been determined, it will then be necessary for officers to examine and check all other influencing factors on the ground before a firm decision can be taken. The Minister of Works informs me that finality in these investigations can be expected in December, 1971. If at that time it is decided to utilize Brighton Road to accommodate the main, every effort will be made to co-ordinate the work with the reconstruction of the road which will commence as soon thereafter as right of entry can be obtained.

MYER OVAL

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent request about Myer Oval?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Education Department is negotiating for the purchase of part of Myer Oval at Plympton. As the honourable member would appreciate, Plympton High School adjoins the oval and over the years has had use of the facility which is owned by Myer (South Australia) Stores Limited. The site of the school is a restricted one for its enrolment (1,463 students at the beginning of the school year). I understand that Myers has indicated its wish to sell the land that it has held in this area and to discharge any interest it has had hitherto in maintaining a sporting facility. As a consequence, the Education Department has (or I as Minister have) now served notice of intention to acquire about seven acres at the eastern side of the oval. I have suggested to Myers as a more desirable alternative that a joint scheme should be worked out for ownership and use of the oval between the company and the Education Department. In view of the company's action over the years in providing a facility available

for use by Plympton High School, it would be a great pity if the interest of Myers in the area was vacated entirely.

GRAIN DIVIDENDS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on October 12 about dividends payable on the 1969-70 wheat pool and on the 1970-71 barley pool?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Australian Barley Board has applied to the Reserve Bank for funds to enable a second payment to be made for the No. 32 barley pool season 1970-71. Subject to bank approval it is expected that payment by the board will be made at the end of November, 1971. No further payment is expected to be made for 1969-70 wheat before July, 1973, when a payment of about 7½c a bushel is expected.

TENDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 7 about South Australian contractors who tender for work on freeways and highways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When comparing tenders for contract works arranged by the Highways Department, two aspects are carefully considered: (1) the capability of a tenderer satisfactorily to carry out the work as specified; this involves an assessment of his experience on similar work and an assessment of his resources, both technical and physical; and (2) the tender prices submitted. Contracts are awarded to contractors who can confidently be expected to carry out the required works in a satisfactory manner at the least cost to the department. In the event of equality in capability and price between South Australian and interstate contractors, preference is given to South Australian contractors. However, it is seldom necessary to consider preference, as the majority of South Australian contractors suitable for the works specified submit satisfactory prices. It is only on rare occasions that a contract is awarded to an interstate contractor, and then only if special expertise or machines are required which are not available from local contractors. With regard to the hire of 30 cub. yd. scrapers for the South-Eastern Freeway, no tenders were received from South Australian contractors for the hire of the machines as specified. This specific size of machine, which is commonly used in contract works throughout Australia, was selected by the department to provide optimum output on the

freeway, and to complement and balance the other machines being used in the overall operation.

MANNUM PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about sealing the yard at the Mannum Primary School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A firm of consulting engineers has been engaged to make ready detailed documents for calling tenders for paving work at the Mannum Primary School. These documents have been completed. However, the final estimated cost greatly exceeds the original approval, and the department is critically examining costs before seeking further funds and calling tenders.

GEPPS CROSS SCHOOL

Dr. EASTICK: Following the question I asked the Minister of Education last Thursday about the Gepps Cross school, I now ask the Minister whether he can say from which areas will be drawn the students who will benefit by the opening of the new special senior school at Gepps Cross and what preliminary transport arrangements have been made for those students.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure that, bearing in mind the stage that planning of this school has reached, the honourable member will appreciate that no special transport arrangements have yet been made. After all, it will be some time before the school is actually operating, and I am sure that even the honourable member will appreciate that there may be significant changes in the conditions governing transport at that time. Further, I think that between two-thirds and three-quarters of the students who attend the Kensington Special School travel by public transport, it being part of the policy of that school, a policy supported by the Education Department, to encourage these students, so far as they are capable of doing so, to travel by public transport. If that can be done, the chances of students from the school being integrated into some form of work in industry is so much the greater. I assure the honourable member that that policy will be followed at Gepps Cross. No final determination has been made on the area that this school will serve. However, I think that the honourable member will understand that, with three special senior schools (namely, Gepps Cross, when it is completed, Kensington and Minda Home), the area that each will serve will be governed partly by normal commonsense geographic

considerations, and I imagine that Gepps Cross will serve the area to the north, extending to the fringes and into the district represented by the honourable member.

LAURA SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say what future plans the department has for replacing the primary school at Laura, and what are the present plans for levelling and grassing the playing area at the school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Offhand, I cannot give the honourable member any information about the Laura school. I am not even familiar with the size of the school or the number of children attending it, nor can I say whether it is a school that we would be replacing. I will examine the details of the honourable member's question and obtain the information he seeks.

MAGAZINE PROSECUTIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General yet say whether he intends to authorize the prosecution of those concerned with producing the *Empire Times* and the *Prosh* rag? Last week, when I asked a question about the *Empire Times*, the Attorney-General said he could not give me any information at that time. Subsequently I heard on the Australian Broadcasting Commission news (I think on Friday morning) that he had made an announcement on Thursday evening to the State Council of the Australian Labor Party. Therefore, I ask whether he can give this information to the House, where it has been requested.

The Hon. L. J. KING: On Thursday evening, I gave to the State A.L.P. Council precisely the information that I had given to this House, namely, that if the police established responsibility for the authorship of the issue of *Empire Times* I would authorize a prosecution. That was the position when I replied to the question in this House; it was the position when I spoke to the A.L.P. Council meeting; and it is still the position. I have not yet received a submission or request for me to authorize a prosecution with regard to the *Empire Times*. Regarding the *Prosh* magazine, I have said in this House that I did in fact authorize a prosecution; two students pleaded guilty, last week I think, in the Adelaide Magistrates Court to charges of selling or distributing this publication. I have authorized another prosecution on a charge of printing the publication.

STURT STREET SCHOOL

Mr. WRIGHT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about upgrading the classrooms at the Sturt Street Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Sturt Street Primary School has an enrolment of 217. It consists of a two-storey solid-construction building in which the primary grades are housed in six rooms, together with three timber frame rooms. The school has an activity room and a library and one of the timber rooms is unoccupied. The music branch of the Education Department occupies six of the seven rooms on the upper floor. Attempts have been made from time to time to find alternative accommodation for the music branch but without avail. When alternative accommodation has been found, it is planned to remove the five wooden classrooms and to make all of the solid construction buildings available for the primary school. No requests have been received from the school for the upgrading of classrooms or similar work. Maintenance is handled directly by officers of the Public Buildings Department. In order to determine the extent of any work required, the district inspector has been requested to call at the school in order to discuss requirements with the headmistress for the upgrading of classrooms. The replacement of the school is unlikely in the foreseeable future.

MUSEUM

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Education obtained a reply to my recent question about additions to the museum?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and I hope that I will not offend the honourable member with this reply. Over the past two or three years, in addition to more routine maintenance, the Public Buildings Department has floored the west wing; repainted the museum internally, including the display cases; installed a new freight lift in place of one rendered useless when the D.C. electricity supply was cut off; constructed and supplied a number of storage cabinets for the collections; put air-conditioning into a small area of the east wing; installed lighting in the education information centre and the lecture theatre; and generally improved the security of some of the buildings by fitting grilles to various windows. In addition, that department has supplied and installed fire extinguishers, exit lights, non-slip coverings on some stairs, and a warning and intercom system between the public galleries for use in emergency. Over the same period members of

the museum display staff, advised by the scientific, educational and information staff, have designed and installed a new display of fish covering one-half of the ground floor of the east wing; have refurnished much of the Aboriginal display; installed new displays on australites and tidied up the meteorite display; have emptied the ground floor of the west wing and restored some of the displaced specimens in a large temporary display in the east wing; and they have completed the display of whales and other marine mammals in the shop-window display outside the west wing, as well as generally improving the appearance of displays by installing new labels and tidying up backgrounds. In addition, they have prepared several temporary displays and have completed detailed design studies for those which will occupy the ground floor of the west wing.

Work on the reconstruction of the interior of the west wing and the preparation of new displays in that area will start in January or February, 1972, and continue at a cost of \$30,000 to \$40,000 in the current financial year. Internal reconstruction should be completed early in 1973, so that a further \$120,000 will be expended in the financial year 1972-73. During the reconstruction, the light-well on the first floor will be filled in by a load-bearing floor, so extending the available display area and enabling it to be modernized. The ground floor will be used for a display of the museum's excellent and, within Australia, unique collection of mammal display specimens, with the western end given over to Australian animal life and the east end to the rest of the world. This gallery is intended to form the main entrance of the museum leading on to displays, in the upper floor of the same wing, of fossils and minerals and part of the museum's superb collection of New Guinea and other Pacific ethnographic material. All this, it is intended, will form a sequence culminating in the proposed extension to the existing buildings, and in displays of the South Australian Museum's huge, unique and world renowned collections of Aboriginal cultural and other material reinforced by displays on the life and culture of regions of South-East Asia and the Western Pacific.

AWOONGA ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 7 about Awoonga Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department will meet the total cost of reconstruction of Awoonga Road from the Lower

North-East Road to the point where the previous work was terminated. The work already in progress will probably be completed in the current financial year. The estimated cost is \$75,000.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question about reconstruction of the Islington sewage farm and plans that the Government may have for eventual development of the farm, which matter is of great interest to the people of South Australia?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Recently I gave the member for Ross Smith a fairly detailed reply on this matter. Regarding the matters that the member for Torrens has raised, in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Works Committee a subdivision has been designed for use of the Islington sewage farm for industrial and other purposes. Estimates have been made for provision of essential services (water, sewerage, roads, and stormwater drainage). The cost of stormwater drainage is posing major difficulties on account of the low-lying nature of the area. The stormwater drainage system is to be tied into the system operated by the Enfield council with which negotiations are proceeding.

MURRAY PARK TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about work being done at Murray Park Teachers College and the expenditure on such work?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The contract for the erection of Murray Park Teachers College building was let to A. V. Jennings Industries (Australia) Limited on April 8, 1971. Work commenced on the site on May 3, 1971. The estimated time of completion is mid-1973. The first part of the building project was the renovation of the mansion house. This work is almost complete and I understand that, when it is completed, this building will be occupied and used by Wattle Park Teachers College. Earthworks for the major buildings have now been completed and, weather permitting, foundations will be poured during this week. The funds indicated in the Loan Estimates include provision for both renovation of the mansion house and a substantial beginning on the main college. I may add that wet weather has caused a set-back to the expected rate of work on this project.

WEEDS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about noxious weeds, particularly in the Happy Valley area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The control of noxious weeds is a major problem for the Engineering and Water Supply Department on its reservoir and tank reserves, and each year, in co-operation with the weeds officers of the various district councils and the Agriculture Department, the best possible steps are taken to eradicate or control noxious weeds. Cape tulip is particularly bad at the Happy Valley reservoir reserve this year, owing to the extremely wet winter. This has delayed cultivation, which has been successfully used in the past to control this weed. About \$16,200 will be spent in 1971 in the metropolitan area on the control of noxious weeds on reservoir and tank reserves.

ABATTOIRS INSPECTOR

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked recently about inspection at the Gepps Cross abattoir?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As promised, my colleague took up with the Commonwealth Veterinary Officer in Charge in South Australia (Mr. W. K. Marshall) the problem of ante-mortem inspections of stock at the Gepps Cross abattoir. This matter has been the subject of negotiation between the Commonwealth Veterinary Service and the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, which sought to have inspections carried out at any location on the board's property at Gepps Cross, in cases where emergency slaughter was considered warranted. The honourable member will appreciate that the Gepps Cross complex covers a vast area and, having regard to the availability of veterinary staff, it would be impracticable to have veterinary officers available at all times in widely dispersed localities throughout the area for this purpose. In these circumstances, it was agreed that the activities of a departmental veterinary officer located at the Gepps Cross establishment would be confined to that portion of the board's property located south of the railway line running between Cavan and Northfield. This area excludes the abattoirs markets, but embraces the new cattle yards. The Veterinary Officer in Charge is anxious to provide the best possible service to the metropolitan abattoirs commensurate with the staff at his disposal,

but he points out that the standard of inspection may well be prejudiced if one of the two veterinary officers stationed at Gepps Cross is called away to locations beyond the agreed area for long periods. It would appear, then, that a solution to the problem depends on additional veterinary staff and a redefinition of the area of responsibility of veterinary officers. These are matters which come within the purview of the Department of Primary Industry.

LAMB CARCASSES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question about lamb carcasses?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has obtained further information from Mr. J. D. Habel, who was mentioned by the honourable member in his question. Mr. Habel, who is also a member of the Port Lincoln Abattoir Operational Committee, has reported that by far the greatest reason for rejection was dark bruising. This indicates that the injury was several days or more old, and therefore occurred on the farm. The bruising would be from a number of causes, such as rough handling, prodding with sticks, dog bites, and poorly constructed yards. In most cases the identity of the seller is lost but, where the buyers can identify the owner, future purchases are avoided or the price is discounted. Because of the good season, many merino lambs have finished well and have been sent for slaughter. Often such lambs have been mulesed, and this resultant scarring has led to rejection for export. Dressing damage, often associated with merino type, has also contributed to rejection. As the season advances, the rejection rate will probably increase because of grass seeds. Departmental officers on Eyre Peninsula carry out as much extension work as possible to educate stock-owners on precautions to avoid carcass damage.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister ask his colleague whether the percentage of lamb carcass rejections at the Port Lincoln branch of the Government Produce Department bears any relationship to the percentage of rejections at each of the abattoirs at Peterborough, Noarlunga, Murray Bridge, and Gepps Cross, and whether the reasons for rejection are consistent at each centre? The reply given on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture today reveals the belief that the major problem is on the farm property. It would be of interest and benefit to people associated with livestock, particularly lambs, to know whether this is a problem on

the West Coast alone or whether there are varying problems associated with lamb production throughout the State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain the information.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about when the South-Eastern Freeway will be completed to Verdun?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member will be pleased to know that it is expected that the freeway to Verdun will be opened to traffic in May, 1972.

DISNEY ON PARADE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the accident at *Disney on Parade*?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have the following report from the Inspector of Places of Public Entertainment:

At about 11.15 p.m. on Friday, October 8, 1971, a police officer from the radio room at police headquarters rang me at home and said that there had been a serious accident at the *Disney on Parade* show in the west parklands. I proceeded to the site and found that part of a mechanical device known as a carousel trapeze had collapsed and the lower section had broken away from its mounting and fallen a distance of about 30ft. The lower section of the carousel trapeze consisted of a large hexagonal-shaped steel frame built in the form of a low pyramid and somewhat similar to a rotary clothes hoist in appearance. I estimated the frame to be about 20ft. in diameter and possibly 7ft. in height. The carousel frame was mounted into the fixed frame by means of a steel shaft passed through two roller bearings and held captive by a $\frac{3}{4}$ in. diameter steel nut. The shaft supporting the carousel had fractured in between the two bearings and the bottom section of the shaft and the carousel frame crashed to the floor. At the time of my inspection, the six girls injured when the carousel collapsed had been transferred to hospital. I took possession of the two sections of the broken shaft for the purpose of conducting a more thorough examination at a later date.

PROPER BAY

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about installing an effluent pipeline at Proper Bay?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been informed by the Director of Marine and Harbors that his department installed a new effluent pipeline into Proper Bay on behalf of the Government Produce Department in October, 1970, at a cost of about \$4,500. Pre-

cautions are taken to ensure that solids present are kept at an absolute minimum and that the effluent is diluted as much as possible. The discharge occurs below low water mark. Having received correspondence on this matter, I am pursuing further investigations through the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Minister of Agriculture.

POLICE STATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to the question I asked on September 30 about closing small police stations in my district?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that it is not the policy of the Police Department to close small police stations simply because they are in that category. The staffing of stations is based on their respective workloads, which are assessed regularly as part of a continuing work study programme, with the information gained enabling personnel to be deployed to best advantage. In some cases, reductions become necessary, whilst in other circumstances increases in strength are indicated and required. Eyre Peninsula is scheduled to come under review within the next few months as part of a total survey being conducted to determine policing requirements throughout the State. This programme includes establishing and assessing relevant workloads, and also takes into account community development. Results of such surveys are carefully studied and influence policing arrangements in areas under review. However, the police establishments on Eyre Peninsula will remain unchanged.

GLENSIDE CHAPEL

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Glenside Hospital chapel?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Funds were originally approved for the construction of a new chapel at Glenside. However, the project was deferred following a request from the Superintendent that the old chapel be reinstated. The structure, which is about 100 years old, has not been used as a chapel for about 70 years. An estimate of the cost of conversion and repairs revealed that it would cost about \$81,500 to provide seating for 121 persons. Further investigation showed that present congregations were about 50 to 60 persons. Sketches were then prepared for a smaller, more compact religious centre, which is estimated to cost \$55,000, a saving of \$26,500 on the conversion proposal. The new

scheme has been approved by the Chaplains Advisory Committee, and it is expected that construction of the religious centre will commence in April, 1972, and be completed in October of that year.

SHIPPING LINE

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what stage negotiations have reached with the Western Australian Government concerning the entry of South Australia into a joint shipping line agreement, and what provisions are contemplated in making that agreement? As I understand it, Mr. Hawke first announced that there would be some negotiations along these lines, but since that announcement the Premier has followed up with a more detailed announcement, saying that he has asked Government officers to investigate such a shipping line. As the Premier will be aware that the Western Australian shipping line has suffered substantial losses for some years, can he say whether, if there is to be an amalgamation with that line, there will be any prospect of this State's having to take over the accumulated deficits that may exist?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage there have been no negotiations with the Western Australian Government. Mr. Hawke had told me that the Israel trade union organization, the Histadruth which is the biggest entrepreneur in Israel, was interested in financing a shipping venture by the Western Australian and South Australian Governments. Because shipping to South Australia is a continuing problem to us industrially and a matter that has been constantly raised with me by the exporters association and by industries in this State, I was interested in the possibility of providing finance for such a venture in South Australia, and I directed Government officers to investigate the Western Australian venture to ascertain whether there was any possibility of a joint operation with it. There would certainly be no proposal that we would undertake to meet accumulated losses on that venture: it was simply whether, given the fact that they had a shipping organization, there could be some effective co-operation between the two Governments.

SHELLTOX STRIPS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct my question to him who represents the Minister of Health in this Chamber.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't you know him?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are you the Minister?

The Hon. L. J. King: Yes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're not dead from the neck up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what that interjection means.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Everyone in the House knows who represents the Minister of Health.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham was called on to ask his question, and he should ignore interjections and address the Chair. I call on the honourable member to ask his question: if he does not, he should occupy his seat and not deprive his colleagues of the opportunity of asking further questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Have any further investigations been made into the possible dangers following the use of Shelltox pest strips? I have put it in this form because I believe a question was asked by the member for Bragg about this matter during the last session, but it has been brought to my notice again, and I have been reminded of the investigation and inquiries that were carried out by the consumer association and published in the March 1970 issue of *Choice*. I understand that the active ingredient in Shelltox pest strips is dichlorvos, which is an organo phosphorus insecticide.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You didn't say that very well.

The Hon. L. J. King: The member for Bragg would do it much better.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Bragg would do that. I remind the Minister concerned that *Choice* states that during half the life of a strip it will give off more than the World Health Organization's recommended safety level of the chemical.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall obtain a reply from the Minister of Health, whom I represent in this place.

OBSCENE PUBLICATION

Mr. BECKER: Is the Attorney-General aware that copies of an overseas publication containing a frontal photo of a nude male and female on the cover are being openly displayed by a leading Adelaide bookstall? What action will the Government take to curb the growth of this and similar type publications, some of which include so-called "blue" jokes?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am unaware of the information the honourable member has conveyed. However, if he will furnish me with the particulars, I shall make the necessary inquiries.

PUBLIC STORES DEPARTMENT

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about comments in the Auditor-General's Report regarding the Public Stores Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The system of recovering Public Stores Department charges was considered some years ago and reconsidered again in 1966 after correspondence between the Auditor-General and the Supply and Tender Board and examination by the Treasury. It was decided then that the existing method of recovery by percentage charge against user departments should continue. Recently, the Supply and Tender Board approved introduction of a service charge for non-Government organizations using Public Stores Department facilities. This recommendation is presently being considered by the Under Treasurer, together with the Auditor-General's comments.

STRUAN FARM SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture why the sign on the property under the Agriculture Department's control at Struan has not been removed? I spent last Friday and Saturday in the district of the member for Victoria (and I can say here that in his district the honourable member is held in high esteem). As I drove past the old Struan boys farm school I was amazed to find the sign still there, even though, as I understand it, the fine old building, which was one of the early mansions in the district, is to become a regional agricultural centre. On inquiring, I discovered that the sign leads to much difficulty for visitors who, having heard of the Struan farm school, enter and ask whether they can be shown over the school. I believe, too, that some residents in the district are concerned that the sign is still there and that it is misleading. I ask my question as a former Minister, because it was during our time in Government that it was decided to close the farm school and to make it a regional agricultural centre. If the sign has not already been removed, will the Minister of Works ask his colleague to have it removed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up this matter with my colleague. I am surprised to think that the member for Victoria, who lives so close to the property in question, has not himself noticed the presence of the sign.

CHERRY GARDENS SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about work on the toilet blocks at the Cherry Gardens Primary School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The assumption of the honourable member that work partly undertaken at the Cherry Gardens Primary School was carried out at the wrong school is incorrect. This work was intended as an overall upgrading of the facilities at the school and residence. The school was officially closed in December, 1970, and no additional work has been undertaken since that time.

EGGS

Mr. McANANEY: Now that Victoria has refused to join the other States in some form of control on egg production, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to hold a referendum in South Australia with the aim of regulating egg production, as a result of the successful poll in Western Australia to set up an egg control authority on a State basis and a move by New South Wales to do the same?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up this matter with my colleague and ask him to consider the request. My understanding is that, in order to control the industry effectively, there needs to be agreement by all the States. I think it would be possible for an individual State to achieve something in this regard, but the action would not be as effective as if all other States agreed.

ABATTOIRS OVERTIME

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about overtime at the Gepps Cross abattoir?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that it is in the sheep and lamb slaughtering section where considerable overtime at weekends is worked in order to meet seasonal requirements. The chain slaughtermen's daily tally, as prescribed by the Abattoirs Conciliation Committee Award, is considered reasonable. Clause 17 of this State award provides that sheep and/or lamb chain slaughtermen shall not be required to work overtime on weekdays (Monday to Friday inclusive). The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board's employees are prepared to work overtime on Saturdays and Sundays when required and the board considers that any move

to alter existing arrangements may be detrimental to future weekend slaughtering programmes.

TOMATOES

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the hormone spraying of tomatoes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that horticultural and agricultural advisers have examined all reported complaints concerning suspected hormone damage to tomato crops in the Murray Bridge area this season: in no instance have they seen symptoms consistent with drift of hormone sprays. Stunting and distortion of tomatoes can be caused by problems of cultural technique, cold weather, disease and the use of high rates of poultry or animal manures. Some plant distortion earlier this year was found to be the result of 2, 4-D contamination of the soil, probably as a result of using contaminated animal manure. Recent symptoms, which could not be attributed to hormone damage, are considered to be associated with cold weather conditions. The effectiveness of legislation to protect growers against drift from hormone sprays is being continually reviewed, but at present the introduction of this type of legislation, which would be very costly to administer, does not appear to be warranted. Departmental efforts are directed towards the education of landholders and spray contractors in the safe use of all agricultural chemicals in an effort to minimize the possibility of damage from the unwise use of a spray material.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on September 28 about mercury contamination?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that it is not possible to say that there is no mercury pollution of fish caught here. Following reports earlier this year of the presence of mercury in various types of fish in other countries, 13 samples of canned fish were examined in January, 1971. Six cans of tuna, four being packed in Australia and two imported from one other country, contained mercury ranging from one part a million to less than .1 part a million. Fresh local tuna has not been examined. Each sample of Australian-packed tuna contained less than the .5 part a million of mercury now generally agreed to be an acceptable upper limit. Five cans of salmon, one packed in Australia and four

packed in three overseas countries, contained mercury in the range of less than .1 to .2 part a million. Two samples of herrings, one packed in Australia and the other imported, contained less than .1 part a million of mercury. In July local garfish and prawn examined did not contain detectable amounts of mercury. The paper and chlorine industries in this State do not use mercury in their processes. Mercury is used as a seed dressing. Fish caught and packed in South Australia has not been found to contain dangerous levels of mercury. Further samples will be examined from time to time.

MILE POSTS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about distance posts (either mile or kilometre)?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In view of conversion to metric units within a few years, the erection of mileposts on new roads wherever possible has been deferred. This will reduce the costs necessary to alter name plates and relocate posts. The roads between Port Lincoln and Elliston and between Arno Bay and Cleve are two roads where it is considered that lack of mileposts is not serious, and erection has been deferred, pending metrification.

WIRRULLA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say why certain schools will receive less this year under the new grants scheme than they would have received last year under the subsidies scheme? I have received a letter on behalf of the Wirrulla school which states:

A letter from the school inspector . . . dated April 10, 1971, set out and envisaged grant schemes to schools under which this school stood to collect a grant of \$820.49 on our present enrolment. Under the scheme in your letter, as mentioned above, this school would receive only \$309. We consider this to be grossly unfair especially in the light of the fact that the annual grants expenditure by your department is to be increased by approximately 36 per cent.

In fact, this school is receiving 32 per cent less.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure of the enrolment at the Wirrulla school, but perhaps the honourable member may know.

Mr. Gunn: I couldn't say.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Wirrulla school is a special rural school, and I think the formula that applies to a special rural school is \$150 plus \$3 a student. The honourable member can work it out from whatever knowledge he has of the enrolment. The figure

of \$309 would suggest that the Wirrulla Special Rural School had an enrolment of only 53 students, if the honourable member thinks that that is about the mark. It may well be that the grant to the Wirrulla Special Rural School is only \$309.

Mr. Gunn: The letter says—

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The inspector of the district would have had no authority to provide the formula in respect of any school either in his area or in any other area at that time. I point out to members that the subsidy allocation that applied in 1970-71 throughout the State was \$550,000, and that over the last couple of years, prior to the introduction of the grants scheme, the subsidy allocation has been between \$500,000 and \$550,000. As there are about 220,000 students throughout the State, the previous subsidy allocation permitted an average rate of subsidy over the whole State of only \$2.50 or even less. Certainly, some schools would have received a rate of subsidy considerably higher than that figure, and it is conceivable that, if a school were receiving subsidy at the rate of \$6 or \$7 a head, as a consequence of the change in formula it could be receiving less, even though the total grant allocation had risen from \$550,000 to \$750,000 a year for the first full financial year of operation, namely, 1972-73.

The honourable member will appreciate from the circular that was sent to all members that the per capita rate varies from \$2.25 a student in respect of infants schools to \$50 plus \$2.50 in respect of primary schools and, at the highest rate, \$250 plus \$3.75 a student at high schools and technical high schools. This is certainly a higher average rate of assistance than that which applied under the old subsidies scheme. However, it is perfectly conceivable that a school that was doing well in relation to other schools under the old subsidy arrangements could, under the new grants scheme, be getting somewhat less than it received previously, and there would be a few instances of that. Having received the same letter as the honourable member received, I have asked for a check on the enrolment at Wirrulla to determine the accuracy of the figures and, when I have that information, I will see that the honourable member has it.

KADINA ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. HALL: I ask the Minister of Education whether, after the lengthy period during which the provisions relating to the new adult educa-

tion centre at Kadina have been discussed, the Minister has at last been able to come to a decision regarding the building to be erected at this centre.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I understand that this matter has been finalized, I cannot offhand say when the building will be erected, but I will check the information and let the Leader have it as soon as possible.

WHEELCHAIRS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider introducing legislation to provide that motorized wheelchairs may travel otherwise than on a carriage-way? I have been approached about this matter by organizations with which I am connected. I was originally asked whether or not motorized wheelchairs were permitted to travel on the footpath. Having made certain inquiries and consulted others, I replied that in fact at present, under the provisions of the Road Traffic Act, it was necessary for a wheelchair, if it was motorized, to travel on the carriageway, and that it was an offence for it to travel on the footpath. Obviously this could be extremely dangerous for people travelling in wheelchairs. I should have thought it desirable that, provided there was a limit on the speed at which wheelchairs could travel (and they usually travel at a low speed), they should be able to travel on a footpath. I suggest that this has been an anomaly in the law for a long time—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: — and I do not suggest that it is entirely the result of inaction by this Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be happy to examine the point raised by the honourable member.

FITZROY INTERSECTION

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 5 about a traffic control system at the intersection of Jeffcott Road, Torrens Road, Park Terrace, Fitzroy Terrace, and Cotton Street, near Fitzroy?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Traffic signals are currently being installed at the intersection in question by contract, and it is estimated that work will be completed early in November. The Highways Department will contribute two-thirds of the cost. The remaining one-third will be shared by the Prospect and Hindmarsh

councils. The intersection is also being resurfaced and the cost of this, together with minor roadworks and relocation of services, will be borne by the Highways Department.

DRUG ADDICTS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to obtain from officers of the department a report on the statement, reported to have been made by a solicitor during court proceedings, that there is no institution available in South Australia to give the mental treatment that his client so seriously needed as a drug addict? Most people fully believe that the mental health services of this State are as good as any others available in Australia, and I refer especially to the facilities of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board. The new hospital has up-to-date equipment and members of the staff are well qualified to deal with people suffering from drug dependence. I believe some reassurance should be given to the community on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I admit that I was very surprised to read that comment. I will obtain a detailed and considered reply for the honourable member.

INFLATION

Mr. McANANEY: Does the Premier agree with the statement made by the member for Spence last week that the Premier would agree with the Labor movement that moves for higher pay arose from the unstable and inflationary economic situation which the Commonwealth Government had made no effort to prevent, when the recent increases in the average weekly wage have been 36 per cent and in the average minimum wage 27 per cent, whereas the increase in prices has averaged only 15.4 per cent, being made up of increases in the cost of such items as food, 11.5 per cent; clothing, 15.8 per cent; housing, 18.5 per cent; and miscellaneous, 21 per cent?

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LAND ACQUISITION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the site of each land acquisition for freeway purposes purchased for a total of \$12,007,000 between 1966-67 and 1970-71, and further identified at page 73 of the Auditor-General's Report for 1970-71?

2. What use is currently being made of each of these purchases?

3. What are the annual costs to the Government of ownership of these properties?

4. What financial return is the Government receiving for each of these properties?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. On August 10, 1971, in reply to a Question on Notice by the member for Mitcham, I informed the House that the Commissioner of Highways was, at that time, the registered proprietor of about 1,250 parcels of land in the metropolitan area, the purchase price being about \$15,000,000. At the same time, I said that it was not practicable to provide a list showing the exact location of each of these properties and I reiterate these earlier remarks, as I believe the expenditure of public funds to provide such a list is not justified.

2. Where possible all land owned by the Commissioner is being leased.

3. The only costs involved in retaining this land comprise rates, taxes and maintenance amounting to about \$200,000 a year.

4. It is not practicable to provide an itemized list showing the return from each property registered in the name of the Commissioner. However, for the current financial year it is expected that the aggregate return will be about \$500,000, although this figure may vary, depending on the status of tenancy agreements.

INDUSTRIAL FINES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is the policy of the Government regarding the imposition of fines on persons, either employers or employees, who break industrial agreements?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have never had the occasion to consider imposing any penalties on a party to an industrial agreement for not honouring its agreement. We believe that there is no industrial matter which cannot be resolved by conference either between parties or before the appropriate industrial tribunal.

LEARN-TO-SWIM CAMPAIGN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many school children were instructed in swimming during the third term in 1970?

2. How many were so instructed during the summer holidays of 1970-71?

3. How many instructors were there during each of these two periods?

4. How many of these were schoolteachers and how many were otherwise recruited?

5. What was the total amount paid for their services, to those instructors who were otherwise recruited?

6. How many schoolchildren is it expected will be instructed during the present term?

7. How many is it expected will be instructed during the coming summer holidays?

8. How many instructors is it expected will be employed during each of these two periods?

9. How many of these is it expected will be schoolteachers?

10. How many will be recruited from other sources?

11. What is the total amount expected to be paid for their services, to those instructors otherwise recruited?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. During the third term in 1970, 69,858 children were instructed in swimming.

2. During the summer holidays of 1970-71, 41,686 children were so instructed.

3. 243 swimming instructors were employed during the third term in 1970, and 682 swimming instructors were employed during the summer holidays, 1970-71.

4. The number of teachers involved in term-time swimming is not recorded, but during the third term, 1970, 243 outside instructors were employed. During the summer holidays, 1970-71, 682 swimming instructors were employed, and, of this number, 579 were teachers and 103 were otherwise recruited.

5. The total amounts paid to instructors other than teachers were: third term, 1970, \$31,658.75 and summer holidays, 1970-71, \$8,317.50.

6. It is expected that about 70,000 children will be instructed during the present term.

7. It is expected that about 45,000 children will be instructed during the coming summer holidays.

8. During the present term, it is expected that about 180 outside instructors will be employed and, during the coming summer holidays, a total of about 700 instructors will be needed.

9. It is present policy to make use of as many teachers for term-time swimming as possible, but a definite number cannot be given because returns from schools are still being received. Of the 700 instructors who will be employed in the coming summer holidays, about 600 will be teachers.

10. About 180 instructors from outside sources will be recruited for swimming in the present term, and 100 instructors from outside sources will be recruited for the coming summer holidays.

11. It is expected that about \$23,000 will be paid to instructors from outside sources in the present term and \$15,000 during the coming summer holidays.

REFERENDUM PROSECUTIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many persons have been prosecuted for not voting at the referendum on September 19, 1970?

2. How many of these complaints have been heard?

3. How many are awaiting hearing and when will they be heard?

4. How many of those prosecuted have been convicted?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Nil—No elector has been recommended for prosecution for not voting at the shopping hours referendum September, 1970.

2. Nil.

3. Nil.

4. Nil.

For the information of the honourable member, the number of electors who consented to have their cases dealt with by the Returning Officer for the State was 117. It has been recommended that 197 electors be prosecuted for failing to reply to a notice sent to "electors who appear to have failed to vote at the referendum". Forty-five of these complaints have been heard. This figure includes cases which have been withdrawn for a number of reasons, and where summonses could not be served. One hundred and fifty-two complaints are awaiting hearing; of these 107 have been set down for various dates in October and November. In the remaining 38 cases summonses for complaints already laid are yet to be issued. Sixty of the 107 cases are being heard during this week. Of those prosecuted, 26 have been convicted.

POLICE PENSIONS BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make further and better provision for police pensions, and for that purpose to

repeal the Police Pensions Act, 1954-1968, and enact other provisions in lieu thereof. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The police pensions scheme provided under the Police Pensions Act, 1954, as amended, has been the subject of a detailed examination by the Government. In these times of inflationary pressures giving rise to continuous upward movements in wages, certain aspects of the scheme seem undesirable. Since it depends on a fixed benefit for a fixed contribution, it has on several occasions been necessary to increase both the contribution rate and the benefits by amendment to the Act. This is not only a cumbersome procedure but has involved delays inherent in drafting amendments and finding Parliamentary time to deal with them.

Accordingly, it seems desirable that the whole scheme should be reviewed and a pension scheme more in keeping with the times be enacted. At the same time, we have tried to preserve for serving police officers the desirable features of the old Act. On the face of it, this measure is a complicated one; for instance, it is liberally sprinkled with tables comprised of lengthy formulae. I do not apologize for its complexity, as it is a legislative attempt to solve some complex actuarial problems and, while any given formula can be worked out by the application of simple arithmetic, the actuarial basis of the formula would require considerable explanation. Accordingly, in dealing with the clauses containing a table I will at this stage do no more than indicate its general purpose and effect. Should any honourable member wish to be apprised of the actuarial basis of the formula, I will, of course, arrange for it to be provided.

In summary then, this measure provides (a) for the establishment of a pension scheme based on contributions related to the contributor's salary with benefits also related to salary; (b) for the preservation of certain features of the previous police pensions scheme; and (c) for the preservation of the purchasing power of pensions payable under the scheme by a system of automatic adjustment. In one sense at least, the scheme represents something of an experiment and its significance in relation to other Government pension schemes will, I am sure, not be lost on honourable members.

To consider the Bill in some detail, clauses 1 to 4 are formal. Clause 5 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this

Bill, together with appropriate provisions to facilitate the working of the measure. Clause 6 continues in existence the old Police Pensions Fund and provides for payments to and from the fund. In essence, all pensions and benefits are paid from the fund, the income of which is derived from contributions of contributors, interest on investments mentioned in clause 7, and contributions by the Government provided for by clause 9. Clause 7 empowers the investment of the fund in the named securities. Clause 8 provides for an actuarial examination of the fund at least once in every three years to determine its "state and sufficiency".

Clause 9 provides for the fixing of the Government's contributions to the fund. Clause 10 formally provides for the payment of benefits from the fund. Part III deals with the comparatively simple matter of contributions, pensions and benefits for "new entrants"; that is, members who join the force after the commencement of this measure. Clause 11 provides that all such members shall contribute to the fund until their sixtieth birthday.

Clause 12 sets out the rate of contribution, which is $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent of the salary from time to time payable to the member. In fact the rate of contribution for a member will only be determined once in each year by reference to his salary or his day even though his salary may be varied more than once in that year. This follows the procedure established in relation to the Superannuation Act, 1969, which has worked quite successfully and has resulted in considerable administrative savings which in turn will be of direct benefit to the fund.

Clause 13 provides for the calculation of the pension of a new entrant who attains the age of retirement and retires or becomes incapacitated from performing his duties and retires. The pension payable is based on the years of service of the member (except in the case of an invalid pensioner, when it is based on the years of service the pensioner would have had, if he had not become an invalid pensioner) and generally on the annual salary averaged over the three years immediately before his retirement.

The maximum pension payable under this provision is 40 per cent of that averaged annual salary. Since most police officers join the force at or under age 20, most would receive this maximum pension. However, the pension would necessarily be scaled down for officers joining at a later age, since their contribution period would be less. All normal entrants from the Police Academy at Fort

Largs are deemed to have joined the force at age 20 and would hence receive the maximum pension.

Clause 14 provides for the payment of a lump sum in addition to the pension, since this was a feature of the previous pension scheme and its retention was desired by the participants. The lump sum ascertained by reference to this clause is the lump payable to an officer who retires having attained the age of retirement. It would, on the application of the table, be a maximum of one year's averaged salary, again scaled down for officers of less than the maximum service.

Clause 15 provides for the payment of a lump sum for an officer who retired due to invalidity and here I am afraid the tables become a little more complex and it is sufficient to say that the lump sum in this case may in any particular case be ascertained by reference to the appropriate table, which provides for a lump sum progressively increasing in size as the age at which the officer retired on grounds of invalidity approaches the normal retiring age.

Clause 16 provides for the payment of a widow's pension on the death of a new entrant contributor. In summary this pension would be 65 per cent of the pension that her deceased husband would have been paid had he attained the age of retirement and retired on the day that he died. Clause 17 provides for the payment of a lump sum to the widow of a deceased contributor. Again, the tables become a little more complex, although in any particular case it is quite a simple matter to ascertain the amount of the lump sum payable. It is perhaps sufficient here to mention that the lump sum increases as the age at which the contributor died drew close to his normal retiring age.

Part IV of the Bill deals with what are referred to as "transferred contributors"; that is, those officers who were already contributing under the old Act to the fund when this Bill becomes law. The difficulty that has to be resolved here is that for sound actuarial reasons parts of their benefits have to be ascertained by reference to the old scheme and parts have to be ascertained by reference to the new scheme. The legislative solutions offered here have resulted in some extremely complex tables. Although they should not cause any great difficulty in working out individual pensions or benefits, they do present some difficulties in explanation.

Clause 18 defines a "transferred contributor", and limb (b) of the definition merely provides,

from an abundance of caution, for a person who joined the force before the commencement of the proposed Act but had not actually commenced to contribute under the old Act. Clause 19 provides that contributions to the fund shall continue. Clause 20 sets out the rates of contribution for transferred contributors. Since the amount of contributions required will be rather larger than the amounts under the old Act, it is thought equitable that transferred contributors should be "eased into" the new scheme, as it were. Accordingly, the full rate of contribution, that is $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent of salary, will only be attained in the third year after this proposed Bill becomes law and it will be reached in steps of $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent in the first year and $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the second year.

Clause 21 provides for the amount of annual pension payable to the transferred contributor who retires either by effluxion of time or by reason of invalidity. The amount of a pension in any particular case may be ascertained by reference to one or other of the tables in this clause. The alternatives are necessary, and they appear frequently in this Part, to ensure that in no circumstances is a lesser benefit paid under this scheme, or under any aspect of this scheme, than would have been payable under the old scheme or any aspect of that scheme. The factors that will determine the amount of pension in any particular case are as follows:

- (a) the averaged annual salary of the member on retirement;
- (b) the age at which the member transferred to the new scheme expressed as the transfer age and represented by the letter "Z", since a transferred contributor who on transfer was aged say twenty-five years would expect to draw the majority of his benefit from the new scheme, in contrast to his fellow contributor who was aged say fifty years on transfer who would draw the majority of his benefit from the old scheme;
- (c) the rank of the contributor on transfer expressed as a rank factor represented by the letter "R": the inclusion of this factor is necessary since under the old scheme contributions and benefits were to some extent related to the rank from time to time held by the member.

Clause 22 provides for the fixing of a lump sum in addition to a pension for those who attain the age of retirement and retire, and

the considerations mentioned in connection with clause 20 apply here also. The alternative table in subsection (2) is intended to ensure that the lump sum payable cannot in any circumstances be less than the lump sum under the old scheme. Clause 23 provides for the calculation of a lump sum for invalid pensioners, payable in addition to the pension of those pensioners and, in short, provides for a lump sum increasing in amount as the age at which such a pensioner entered upon pension nears the age of normal retirement.

Clause 24 fixes the widow's pension of a deceased transferred contributor calculated by reference to the benefits payable under both the old and new schemes, together with a minimum pension of not less than the pension the widow would have received under the old scheme. Clause 25 provides for a lump sum for the widow of a deceased transferred contributor, again increasing in amount as the age at which the deceased transferred contributor died approaches his normal retiring age. Before leaving this Part, which is clearly the most complicated part from the actuarial point of view, I would emphasize that I have done nothing more than indicate in the broadest possible terms the meaning and effect of the provisions. Should any honourable member require, say, the actuarial justification for any of the tables set out, I will, as I have already mentioned, ensure that the information is available. However, I would like as much notice as possible of any such request.

Clause 26 (1) provides for a widow's pension for pensioners under the old Act who die after the commencement of this measure. These pensions, which are set out in the table to the third schedule to this Act, vary according to the rank held by the deceased husband of the widow on his retirement, and reflect the arrangements for widow's pensions under the old scheme. Subclause (2) provides that these third schedule pensions will reflect any "cost of living" variation granted under clause 34. Subclause (3) provides that, in the case of future pensioners, the widow's pension will be a flat 65 per cent of her deceased husband's pension at the date of his death. However, special provision must be made for "prescribed pensioners", that is, pensioners who under the old Act or under this measure have elected to so adjust their pension that until age 65 they will receive a higher pension than normal and after that age a lower pension than normal.

In the case of pensioners in this group the widow's pension will be based on 65 per cent of the normal pension; that is, the pension that the pensioner would have received had he not made such an election. In the Bill this "normal pension" is referred to as a notional pension and defined accordingly. Clause 27 is a fairly standard provision for a widow's pension to cease on her remarriage, but to recommence on her subsequent widow-hood. Clause 28 provides for the payment of a child's allowance and a standard rate for all eligible children, and clause 29 makes a similar provision for eligible orphan children. Clause 30 provides for the continuation of pensions under the Acts proposed to be repealed.

Clause 31 provides for an increase of all clause 30 pensions of $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent to, in some measure, counteract the erosion of the purchasing power of these pensions. Again in the case of prescribed pensioners referred to earlier, this increase is based on the notional pension of that pensioner. Clause 32 is intended to honour an undertaking given by the Government in relation to certain pensioners who entered on pension in June of this year. Although this Bill has been long in contemplation by the Government, its introduction has been necessarily delayed because of its complexity and the problems involved. In the Government's view the pensioners who retired or became entitled to a pension recently should not be prejudiced by this delay and, accordingly, in the case of those pensioners this Bill has, in substance, retrospective effect so as to confer on them the benefits of the proposed Act.

Clause 33 makes appropriate provision for the special case of the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Police, who alone amongst the members of the force are permitted to serve until age sixty-five. It is considered appropriate that these additional years of service should be recognized by an increase in pension, since payment of their pension has necessarily been delayed. Clause 34 is a most important provision, in that it is the first attempt in this State to find a workable solution to the serious problems faced by pensioners in relation to the decline in the purchasing power of their pensions. The effect of this clause will be to ensure that the pensions will be automatically adjusted in accordance with variations in the cost of living index. Provision is made to ensure that an automatic variation will only occur when there has been a variation of plus or minus 1 per cent since the last period in respect of which the pensions

were varied: this is to guard against a multiplicity of small adjustments of pensions. Again, in relation to prescribed pensioners, the variation will be related to the notional pension of the pensioner, not to his actual pension.

Clause 35 formally sets out the retiring age for a member of the force, and pays due regard to the special position of Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner adverted to earlier. The old provision for optional early retirement has been included, and provision for appropriate pension and lump sums has been included at clause 36 to cover optional early retirement. Clause 37 provides options, in the same form in which they were included in the old Act, for pensioners to vary their pension by taking an initial higher pension for a later lower pension, or for a pensioner to exchange portion of his lump sum for a higher pension until age 65 years. These provisions have been retained at the express request of the participants in the old scheme, and persons taking advantage of them will be subject to the provisions relating to prescribed pensioners adverted to earlier.

Clause 38 re-enacts section 17 of the old Act and makes provision for the situation where a present contributor under the Superannuation Act is appointed Commissioner of Police. Clause 39 substantially re-enacts section 23 of the old Act, and excludes from benefits persons whose incapacity is due to their misconduct. Clause 40 provides for the re-employment of invalid pensioners restored to health, and further provides that no further invalid pension will be payable to such a pensioner who does not resume the suitable employment offered him. Clause 41 limits the amount that an invalid pensioner may earn before his pension is subject to reduction. At subclause (2) it is provided that the reduction shall be subject to review and shall be lifted on the pensioner attaining the age of 60 years. Widow's pensions are not affected by any reduction for the time being imposed under this section.

Clause 42 is a standard retrenchment clause and re-enacts section 26 of the old Act. Clauses 43 and 44 provide for a refund of contributions in the circumstances set out. Clause 45 provides a method by which a member may, if reduced in rank on grounds of ill-health, qualify for a pension at the rate appropriate to his old rank. Clause 46 is a standard provision relating to the accrual of pensions, etc. Clause 47 provides for a refund of part of a contributor's contributions where benefits paid are less than the total of contributions.

Clause 48 provides that contributors shall continue to contribute to the fund notwithstanding that they are on leave. Clause 49 provides that there shall be no duplication of cash payments under the Bill, and re-enacts section 33 of the old Act.

Clause 50 provides for questions as to dispute under the Act to be determined in the first instance by the Public Actuary with an appeal to the local court of full jurisdiction. Clause 51 re-enacts section 35 of the old Act and is generally self explanatory, and clause 52 re-enacts section 36 of that Act. Clause 53 deals with the position where a pensioner is imprisoned, and clause 54 deals with the situation where a pensioner becomes insane. Clause 55 provides that, except as provided elsewhere in this Bill, pensions are payable for life. Clause 56 re-enacts section 43 of the old Act and discourages false claims. Clause 57 is a fairly standard regulating-making provision.

In conclusion, it is clear that in form and content this Bill is by no means a simple one, although the premises on which it is based are quite simple and straightforward. In short, it is an attempt to secure fair and adequate pensions for an important section of the community. It has, I understand, been the subject of examination by representatives of those immediately concerned.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill, which amends the Barley Marketing Act, 1947, as amended, has been brought forward as a result of representations from the Australian Barley Board and the authorities of the State of Victoria. Honourable members will be aware that the legislative framework of the board is found in two Acts, namely, the Barley Marketing Act of this State and the Barley Marketing Act of Victoria, and by virtue of these Acts the board is empowered to act in both this State and Victoria. As a result of discussions between the appropriate authorities in this State and Victoria, it was decided to increase the Victorian grower representation on the board from one to two. Such an increase, of course, requires amendments to the

Acts of both States, and although Victoria moved in this matter some little time ago it cannot formally appoint its additional representative until this Bill becomes law. In addition, there are some disparate matters that have from time to time arisen for attention by amendments in this Bill but these can conveniently be discussed when the Bill is examined in some detail.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 corrects an incorrect reference to the principal electoral officer in this State. Although he could in one sense be correctly described as the chief electoral officer, his statutory title is properly the "Returning Officer for the State" and he is now so referred to by that title. Clause 4 extends somewhat the definition of "barley" by having the expression encompass growing crops of that grain as well as certain products of that grain. The purpose of widening this definition is to achieve a measure of control over the practice of leasing areas planted to barley for short terms, and by this means effecting a sale of barley outside the scheme of orderly marketing. Practices such as this appear to be detrimental to the industry as a whole and hence should be prohibited.

Clause 5 is the provision complementary to the Victorian provision to enable the appointment of an additional representative from Victoria, bringing that State's grower representation to two, but the number of South Australian grower representatives remains at three. Clause 6 will enable the board to keep its accounts in relation to barley of this State separate from its accounts kept in relation to barley grown in Victoria, and this provision has been inserted at the board's request. Clause 7 is intended to ensure that the board will never be subject to conflicting directions from the responsible Minister of each State. So far this has, in fact, not happened, but it seems prudent to guard against this contingency. Clause 8 is intended to strengthen the board's hand in dealing with illegal sales of barley. It will enable some control to be exercised over the transport of such barley. The placing of the burden on the defendant by proposed subsection (1b) is not, in the circumstances, unreasonable, since it is surely "a fact within his knowledge" whether or not the sale was legal.

Clause 9 is a provision included at the board's request. For some time the board's forward export sales policy has been somewhat inhibited by the need to pay regard to the needs of domestic users of barley in South

Australia and Victoria. In the board's view, its inhibition will be lessened if each State can, from this point of view, be treated separately, and this is the effect of this amendment. Clause 10 will enable the board to make proper provision for the establishment of reserve funds and the amortization of the costs of the provision of storage facilities, as well as ensuring that to some extent deductions from amounts payable to growers can be equalized. Clauses 11 and 13 merely increase the maximum penalties for breaches of the Act or regulations to bring them into line with those applicable under the Victorian Act, since in this area consistency seems desirable. Clause 12, which has been included at the board's suggestion, is designed to avert a situation in prosecutions under the Act where some difficulty arises in formally proving that grain which in all respects appears to be barley is in fact barley as defined.

Mr. FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 2262.)

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): As my colleague the member for Kavel has dealt ably and in detail with the provisions of the Bill, I do not intend to take up the time of the House by elaborating on the points he has made. The first three clauses of the Bill are straightforward and clarify some doubts on the continuance of university statutes and amend the definition of "university grounds". It was only clause 4, and to a certain extent clause 5, which caused us any real concern. However, further discussions and research have clarified this matter, and our doubts have been resolved to a great extent. As the member for Kavel was charged by the Leader of our Party to speak to the Bill on behalf of the Opposition, I only wish to say that I support him.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Constitution of Council."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Minister of Education know how many people employed by the university earn less than \$1,000 a year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I think the point is that there are certain courses where occasionally a visiting lecturer is asked to give a lecture. For

example, there have been occasions on which visiting lecturers have given a lecture to a History IIA class, and there could be occasions when a person such as the General Manager of the Housing Trust or a distinguished surgeon or physician, or someone in this general category, would be asked to give a lecture, either in a specific course or as a general university lecture. If any payment were made in those instances (and some payment would normally be made), under the old definition it was considered that such a person would then be in the employment of the university and could seek election only in the category of those in the employment of the university.

Furthermore, it was argued that such a person would have no chance of gaining election in the category of those in the employment of the university and would therefore, in practice, be debarred from membership of the University Council. I think this is a valid point, which was not thought of when the matter was first considered as a consequence of the amendment, moved in another place, to the original Bill. Some discussion took place on the most appropriate way of providing an amendment, and it was thought that the most appropriate way was the one that gave the council the power to determine appropriate limits. It is difficult to say what should or should not be the figure, although in its discussions on the matter the council thought that \$1,000 would be appropriate and that this should at least be the limit set initially once this provision was enacted.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't know how many people are involved?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Many could be involved in this situation, depending largely on the extent to which outside lecturers were used. For example, in the History IIA course it was customary for a visiting lecturer to be used, and provision was made for one lecture a week for one term, so about nine visiting lecturers were used. In addition, part-time tutors in certain subjects would be caught by this amendment.

Mr. Simmons: That applies to adult education, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, that would be another category. The argument that I have accepted was that most of the ordinary part-timers who were doing regular part-time work, if they came below the \$1,000 category, probably would not be the kind of people elected to the University Council, either by Convocation or by the full-time staff of the university. However, there could be the

occasional situation where a relatively distinguished and wellknown graduate of the university would qualify for election to the university by Convocation but he would be excluded because of the provision in the principal Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has described me perfectly in the last sentence: I am precisely in this position, having been doing a little work in the Law School, setting and presiding over the students' moots. I hasten to assure all members that I have been paid well under \$1,000 for the work I have done in this regard. No-one would suggest that, because of this, I should have to be elected by the staff of the university if I had the ambition to serve on the University Council. It is wildly unlikely that I would be accepted, and rightly so. I do not think, therefore, that the reservations I think I detected in the member for Kavel's remarks are really justified, and I think this is a proper amendment. However, I wonder whether the \$1,000 is a matter for the University Council itself. In times of inflation, there are obviously good reasons for not referring to the figure. On the other hand, there are good reasons why it should be referred to, and I wish it had been inserted in the Bill. The sum of \$1,000 has simply been bandied about, and I should like further information.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The sum of \$1,000 is referred to in the appropriate minutes of University Council meetings. It would probably be preferable to have this sum spelt out in the Bill. Although it is improbable, under the Bill the council could fix a sum of \$5,000. Therefore, it would be better for Parliament to have this power. It was felt that the major body from which members of the council would be elected would comprise people having a close association with the university. Everyone employed by the university receives a vote. It was felt that, in these circumstances, people who were said to be eminent in their field could stand alongside full-time university employees and still have a chance of election. The other point raised was that people who had some part-time association with the university could occupy the whole 12 places of those who were meant, in the spirit of the legislation, to come from outside the university. I agree that this is a question of balance. I consider that the sum of \$1,000 is generous.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The point of disagreement is whether the sum should be spelt out or whether the University Council should have the power to determine it. My attitude is governed very much by the fact

that I am doubtful about the figure of \$1,000. Therefore, as at this stage I would not really know what sum to state, I believe there is a strong case for leaving it up to the council to determine the sum as a consequence of its own experience and knowledge of what kinds of payment are being made to part-time employees. I expect that the sum of \$1,000 was an initial stab at a sum by the council, which may later think that the sum should be \$500. I believe it would be difficult to fix a precise sum and still have the necessary balance. Therefore, we would be forever subjecting the legislation to possible amendment by Parliament just to alter the figure because it was inappropriate because of inflation, or because of a change in the employment practice at the university regarding visiting lecturers.

The fact that the sum may be subject to change seems to strengthen the case for leaving it up to the council to determine. The council knows that Parliament believes that those part-time employees of the university who are actively associated with it but not actively associated with any other organization (for instance, a writer in part-time employment) should be elected to the council, if elected at all, as part of those in the category of employees of the university. On the other hand, someone such as the former Attorney-General (Mr. Millhouse), who is known for his political and other interests outside the university, if elected, should be elected in that connection. I suggest that the University Council is best able to exercise this judgment and to change the sum as circumstances vary.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS AND ACTS INTERPRETATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2066.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): As the Opposition is not happy with this Bill, I oppose it. Having read the Bill and the explanation of the Minister Assisting the Premier, I understand that it provides that a Minister may delegate the administration of an Act to one of his colleagues, and that there must be notification of that fact in the *Government Gazette*. I believe that, if we allow this to be done generally, confusion in this State will be widespread as to which Minister is respon-

sible at any one time for any Act. In other words, it could make the administration of Acts chaotic. We do not believe that this should be done. Let me give one example of why I feel this way. The operative clause is clause 2, which inserts in the Acts Interpretation Act new section 6, relating to the delegation of powers by a Minister. If we look at the new section to be inserted, we find in the first subsection that the Minister may delegate, by notice published in the *Gazette*, not all of his powers but any powers or functions under the Act to any other Minister.

Subsection (2) provides that that other Minister may exercise a discretion, but subsection (3) sets out clearly that the delegation of a power or a function by a Minister under this Act shall not prevent that Minister from himself exercising or performing that power or function, so, in fact, two Ministers could be, at the same time, responsible for exercising the powers and functions of a Minister under the Act. Obviously, this can give rise to much confusion.

The only reason that the honourable gentleman gave in his short explanation of this matter concerned the administration of the Underground Waters Preservation Act. I concede that, in that case, some exchange of function between Ministers may be desirable, although professionally I have had something to do with the administration of this Act. That was not in this House or when I was in the Ministry but subsequently, in a professional capacity, and I did not detect any difficulty then in the exercise by the Minister of Mines of his functions under the Act.

If there is any problem, I suggest that the better way to tackle it would be by amending the Underground Waters Preservation Act. That is how we can solve any problem that may arise. That is the only Act that the Minister mentions in his second reading explanation, and it is not good enough to use only one example as a vehicle for a very radical departure from the present situation. Parliament would not know to whom to look to sheet home responsibility for a specific Act.

It may be that the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is responsible for the administration of an Act, could delegate some or all of his powers to a Minister in another place, and then both Ministers would have that responsibility and no-one would know to whom to look for the exercise of those powers if there was any mistake or, if another Government came into office, to whom to look to praise

any action taken. I think that sums up my opposition to the Bill. It is undesirably wide and undesirable in principle, and no real justification has been given for it.

I could not but remember the experience I had in office when I introduced a similar measure, but not the same one. When I was Attorney-General, I introduced a Bill to amend the Acts Interpretation Act to allow the delegation by a Minister of certain functions to a public servant. In the Bill before us we are dealing with a delegation by one Minister to another Minister, so the position is not quite the same. The then Opposition (and you, Sir, even made a speech on this matter: it was one of the late speeches in the debate, but you made one) bitterly opposed that Bill on the grounds that I have put forward for my opposition to this Bill.

Mr. Coumbe: Why the change?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One wonders why members opposite have changed. I shall quote what members of the present Government said when dealing with the Bill which I introduced and which, I may say, I did not proceed with, because I was convinced that it was not wise to go on. The arguments of the then Opposition appealed to me and I abandoned the Bill at the end of the 1968 session.

Mr. Coumbe: That's democracy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is democracy and the influence that an Opposition properly can have on legislation. The then Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier (who is the Minister, I suppose, that the present Minister on the front bench is assisting) spoke about this sort of thing, and I had better read the whole paragraph, in case there is any suggestion that I have misquoted him.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I would rather hear what you said in the second reading explanation when you introduced it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I have said, I was convinced by the arguments put by the then Opposition. The present Premier said:

In numbers of Acts, including some passed during our time in office, the House specifically retained the authority to do certain things either to the Minister or to a director and, where it thought there were appropriate cases for delegation, wrote the provisions for delegation of authority into the Act.

That is what I am suggesting should be done in the case of the Underground Waters Preservation Act. That is the only Act that is worrying me. The then Leader of the Opposition continued:

To clear up anomalies, as has been done in some other amendments introduced to other legislation at the same time as this general amendment was introduced, is, I think, reasonable enough where the House can be shown that there is a reasonable case, administratively, for delegation to take place; but to provide in the Acts Interpretation Act a general right of delegation for practically every purpose is going far wider than Parliament ever intended. I do not think we should write such a provision into the Acts Interpretation Act.

The Government intends to do something similar in providing for a wholesale power to delegate by one Minister to another. The present Premier stated what I have read from his second reading speech on the Acts Interpretation Act Amendment Bill that I introduced. I shall also refer to what he said some months later: there was no question of his having spoken on the spur of the moment on the earlier occasion. In the debate in the Committee stage, he said:

We need to be most careful about the delegation of authority specifically to specific personages, either Ministers or persons appointed under the Act.

He mentioned Ministers particularly. The present Premier also said:

What is the basis for this blanket provision for the delegation of authority? No cases have been cited to us. The case under the Motor Vehicles Act has already been coped with, so the lengthy remarks we heard from the member for Light earlier bear little relation to this Bill.

That was the predecessor of the present member for Light. The Premier continued:

What is the justification for this? What are the cases to which the Attorney-General can point to justify an action of this kind? If he is simply doing it in the dark because he thinks there may be something coming up at some time, my comment is that that is not good enough. Nor is it good enough for the Attorney to say, "Well, under our Government we merely intend, as a matter of policy, to go so far", when in fact the Act goes much further. Who can say what Government will be in power in the future or what Minister will take action under this?

He went on in the same vein, opposing that Bill. That was the position during that debate and the present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, was by no means the only member on the other side (indeed, of the present front bench) who spoke on that Bill. The member for Millicent spoke (at page 2932 of *Hansard*). I was going to quote something of that, but I do not think it worth quoting. His comments were to the same effect. The

present Minister of Education (then the member for Glenelg) in a tediously long speech said much the same thing: he said, "I believe this legislation is particularly ill-considered and unnecessary." That was only one of the many things he said. The previous member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), whom we all remember, made a shorter speech than did the then member for Glenelg, in which he opposed the Bill. You, Mr. Speaker, opposed the Bill and said that I had introduced it on August 13; you said how unlucky it was. I do not know what that had to do with it, but that was what you said. The present Minister of Roads and Transport (then the member for Edwards-town) opposed it, and the then member for Enfield (now the member for Ross Smith) opposed it and spoke in the same way. Why, a couple of years later, is the Government turning its coat and introducing a Bill—

Mr. Venning: When things are different they are not the same.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. It is introducing a Bill to substantially the same effect, although the difference is that this is a delegation from one Minister to another. I do not know whether it would stop at one Minister: matters may be delegated to more than one Minister, but if there are only two who had the responsibility that would be one too many. Parliament wants to know which individual is responsible so that the responsibility can be sheeted home to him or her, and not to have to cast around to find out by reference to past *Government Gazettes* whether there has been any delegation of the functions of a Minister under the Bill. That is completely foreign to the traditions of Parliamentary Government, and I suggest that, in this case, the Minister should do what I had the good sense to do after listening to his colleague's speech in the other case: that is, not to go on with this Bill. Certainly, it should be re-examined in the light of the arguments used by members of his own Party and those that I have used today. If he goes on with it, I will feel bound to oppose it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I oppose the Bill for the reasons set out by the member for Mitcham. The Government has created more Ministries, and it is now showing a tendency to superimpose one Minister's activities on the activities of another. As more Ministers are created, that type of occurrence is inevitable. In a Government with three or four Ministers, the actions of each can be defined and there is little or no overlapping of duties, but, with eight or nine

Ministers, the overlapping of duties becomes more common. In the past, more Ministers have been added to the Government and, as this has occurred, more than one Minister has frequently been involved in the administration of a specific Act.

This Government has shown a tendency to go further, because it has set out on a two-policy course, which has not yet been clearly defined. The first part is the creation of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. We have some idea of what his duties will be, but we do not know specifically his duties in all respects. Undoubtedly, legislation will be introduced to give force to his duties. Probably a more dramatic example of this superimposition will occur by the creation of the Ministry of Transport. An appointment has already been made but has fallen through for reasons that need not be canvassed now, yet this Parliament has not considered Statutes that it would be necessary for this officer to administer.

With this kind of superimposition on the older administrators of the State it is obvious that there will be overlapping of responsibility, and the Government's way of getting out of this difficulty is to say, "Well, one Minister may delegate to another." However, that system is not good enough. If delegation is to be done, it should be done by Executive Council. It is important to every citizen affected in any way by these Acts that he should know who the Minister is who administers the legislation. Executive Council makes it clear, but the mere publication in the *Gazette* by one Minister stating that he has passed over his responsibilities in, say, the Underground Waters Preservation Act to another Minister, or some similar statement, is by no means satisfactory. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated:

The Underground Waters Preservation Act provides a good example of a case in which the delegation of powers under the provisions of the Bill might be desirable.

I suggest that Executive Council may well be the body to decide whether it is desirable or not. The Minister continued:

That Act falls generally within the administration of the Mines Department. However, certain aspects of the administration impinge upon the work of departments under the control of the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Works. A delegation of powers between Ministers could in such cases conduce to the effective administration of the Act.

One should place oneself in the position of a person trying to understand this Act. Perhaps a lawyer may be trying to work out for

a client who is administering it, but he can no longer go to the Minister who is nominally in charge of the Act. Through the *Gazette* he would have to ascertain which Minister had been given charge of a certain section of the Act and, as the Minister has already pointed out, it could be one or two other Ministers. If one studies other Acts one will find many references to other Ministers; for instance, in the legislation dealing with boat havens, and the Mining Act and other Acts relating to it. The situation could become a bird's nest of confusion. The only proper way is for Cabinet to discuss this matter and, by Executive action of the Governor-in-Council, decide who should administer an Act.

If a Minister is travelling to another State, and it is possible that he will be absent for more than one day, Executive Council should place another Minister in charge of his responsibilities. This action is taken all the time. I have acted in most of the portfolios of the Government at one time or another, and I know that the delegation by Executive Council is not only a reference in the *Gazette*. I was appointed acting Attorney-General, and this was a period I found most memorable, because I am sure that I instituted many good reforms during that period. After Executive Council has decided to appoint another Minister acting Minister in charge, he is presented with a commission signed by the Governor in Executive Council. This document gives him the legal authority to sign documents under the statutory requirements of the Act. If I were the Minister of Lands, for example, I do not know that I would be satisfied just to be told by the Minister of Mines or the Minister of Works that I was to have charge of, say, a certain section of the Underground Waters Preservation Act and that the necessary gazettal would appear next week. I would much rather have a document signed by the Governor in Executive Council commissioning me to the task, because that would give me a greater sense of authority than having a colleague tell me, "It will be in the *Gazette*."

This is not good enough, and there is no need to introduce shoddiness into the administration of government just for convenience. The one example given by the Minister of Environment and Conservation does not seem to me to be a problem, and I do not think it has much bearing on the case he was trying to argue. I think that if the Government wants this legislation it should put forward a good

argument in favour of reducing the system from what it has been in the past. After all, there is no need to change the traditions of the State's Administration, unless it is shown to be faulty. If the Government thinks it is faulty, it should demonstrate that it is faulty, and that has not been done yet.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the second reading. It takes a good administrator to delegate authority and to listen to the opinions of those under him. It is not practicable to give two people the same legislation to administer. I cannot see how the idea of having two Ministers with power to do the same thing will work in practice. When two Ministers (say, the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education) are involved in the same building project, they each have their own departments to administer, and as a result dockets are lost between the two departments and the lack of liaison between them is evident. It would be better to have the same activity under one Minister, because it is bad business practice to make two people responsible for the same matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am surprised that the Government has seen fit to introduce this measure in the light of the rather strong arguments that members opposite advanced in 1968 when a similar Bill was debated, because the 1968 Bill contained clauses which are contained in the present Bill. I cannot see how the present Bill will do anything to improve the current position and lead to greater clarity or efficiency, as appears to have been claimed by the Minister in his second reading explanation. The justification advanced by the Minister is particularly tenuous: I do not think he made any genuine attempt to justify the Bill. Some obscure reference to the underground waters agreement in the South-East does not seem to be a weighty enough argument to introduce this far-reaching Bill. If one examines its clauses, one sees that it could lead to utter confusion. New section 6 (3) provides:

The delegation of a power or function by a Minister under this Act shall not prevent that Minister from himself exercising or performing that power or function.

This provision could lead to two or more Ministers deciding some matter. The Minister could delegate power to another Minister, but he would still retain the power for himself to decide. So, two people could be involved in the day-to-day running of Ministerial matters, namely, the Minister and the one to whom he had delegated the power; this provision seems

to be contradictory. The Minister can delegate the power, yet he has not really delegated the power.

I can see the rationale of the Government's wanting, in some of the sticky situations in which it finds itself, to spread responsibility, but I think that the provision is nonsensical in its implications: not only could two people be deciding the same matter but no-one would know who was in charge of it or who was responsible for it. I do not consider that the Minister has advanced a sufficiently strong case for me to support the Bill. The whole essence of government is that Ministers, in the ultimate, must be responsible for decisions made by their departments, but the Bill negates that fundamental principle. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, a lengthy debate took place in 1968 on this matter. I refer to some of the comments of the present Minister of Education and, for once, I agree with the import of his argument. He said:

The whole business makes nonsense of any future attempt by this Parliament to write into any Bill a provision that the Minister or Director shall do something, because it will require only a gazettal—

and the following refers to another provision in the original Bill—

or, in relation to previous enactments, a proclamation and a gazettal, to change "Minister" to "Director", "Director" to "Deputy Director", or whoever one likes.

Or, in this Bill, to another Minister. He continued:

The whole presumption behind this legislation is that, when Parliament provides that a Minister shall have authority to do something, Parliament does not mean what it says and there is no need to ask Parliament whether an intended change should be made.

The following passage records the exchange that took place on that occasion between you, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Semaphore, and the member for Glenelg at that time:

Mr. Hurst: This is Moscow tactics.

MR. HUDSON: I would not describe it as that, but I would describe it as a move in the Moscow direction, a move towards—

Mr. Hurst: The suppression of individuals.

MR. HUDSON: No, that is too strong. It is the first step along the road towards possible removal of certain freedoms from individuals. It is the first step along the road to Moscow tactics.

Mr. Hurst: It takes the freedom of discussion from this Chamber.

I must concur in the sentiments you expressed on that occasion, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the member for Mitcham and the member for Alexandra have made valid points in opposi-

tion to the Bill. The member for Mitcham has been gracious enough to say that on an earlier occasion he changed his mind about the original Bill which, similar to this measure, provided for the delegation of authority and for such delegation to be gazetted. I do not consider that there is any merit in the argument advanced by the Minister Assisting the Premier in his second reading explanation and, unless the Government can advance a better argument than it has advanced thus far, I intend to oppose the measure.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): As I do not like the Bill, I oppose it on principle. Indeed, I do not believe that it will provide what Parliament originally intended when responsible government was set up in this State and certainly when the Acts Interpretation Act was enacted. Responsible government is a precious and cherished principle, each member of Cabinet being responsible, both individually and collectively, for administering certain Acts. This measure impinges on the responsibility of Parliament itself and may result in confusion among members of the public. The Bill provides for certain delegations to occur at a time when the Cabinet is larger than any previous South Australian Cabinet. Even though an additional portfolio was created last year, the Government persists with this Bill, which seeks to delegate certain powers. The Minister Assisting the Premier may well find some difficulty in administering certain Acts on behalf of the Premier, but this measure gets away from the concept of responsible government. Having been a member of Executive Council, I know the procedures that are adopted in providing a commission for an acting Minister and, to my knowledge, ever since responsible government was introduced in this State, that system has worked admirably and efficiently. When a Minister has been absent, perhaps through illness, another has been appointed in his stead to be acting Minister.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you claim that this Bill prevents that?

Mr. COUNBE: No. The Acts Interpretation Act provides for this, and I maintain that that custom should prevail.

Mr. Millhouse: There is only one Minister at a time then, when the principal Minister is out of action for some reason.

Mr. COUNBE: When an acting Minister is appointed by commission in Executive Council, that acting Minister assumes the responsibility that was formerly held by the other

Minister. The Acts administered by the principal Minister then come under the control of the acting Minister. There was also the position on several occasions previously when certain Acts were administered by more than one Minister. As a former Minister of Marine, I know that certain Acts were administered by the Minister in charge of fisheries, and there was no problem in this regard. The examples cited by the Minister in his second reading explanation involved the Minister of Works, the Minister of Mines and the Minister of Lands, but there was no difficulty regarding the administration of the Acts concerned. There are certain procedures whereby the administration of certain Acts can be transferred from one Minister to another who is not specifically named in the legislation.

Furthermore, all Ministers have the obligation now to sign cheques drawn on the Treasury if the Treasurer is not available. What I object to mainly is the delegation of powers as proposed in this Bill. This is contrary to what Parliament originally intended. I believe it was originally intended that Executive Council should be a responsible body comprising responsible Ministers (and that is the basis of responsible government) under which each Minister should stand alone regarding his responsibility for the Acts committed to him by Parliament. Contrary to what applies in the Act at present, we now have a division of power and a division of responsibility, this being a responsibility not only to the House but also to the people of South Australia. In clause 2, new sections (1) and (2) clearly relate to delegation, and new subsection (3) prevents such delegation from affecting the power of the original Minister. There is therefore this confusion, which is not good enough and which was not what Parliament intended when this system was originally introduced. The member for Mitcham admirably cited a precedent when he quoted the remarks in *Hansard* of the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier) regarding the delegation of power to other Ministers, although at the time there was reference to the delegation of powers to certain officers. In this context, surely this must be embarrassing to the Government. I have no option but to oppose the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): For the reasons that have been well set out by other Opposition members, I, too, oppose the Bill. Today, Opposition members have expressed a similar attitude to that expressed on an earlier occasion

by members opposite, whose changed attitude on this occasion appears to be a matter of convenience. The Administration of Acts Act, which was originally passed in 1910, has not been amended since. Although I do not suggest for one moment that, where more effective administration can be achieved, a Bill should not be amended, in his short explanation, the Minister gave no real reason for this legislation.

As has been said, the Bill is undoubtedly the means of giving teeth to the Minister to enable him to undertake activities assisting the Premier. In the short time since I have been a member, I have seen the result of confusion caused by the press secretary of one Minister making available to newspapers a story on which an embargo had been placed by another Minister. One Minister categorically denied that a certain thing was happening, whereas another Minister, through his press secretary, released the information that the Government was taking action in that area.

If the Bill is passed, we could find one Minister saying something that would be flatly denied later by another Minister. It is inconceivable that on every occasion both Ministers would know that they were singing exactly the same tune, as their activities would tend to draw them apart at certain times. If such confusion were permitted to arise, it would do nothing to help the governing of the State or the people at large.

I do not suggest that any present Minister would do this, but the Bill would permit a Minister to opt out of his responsibilities, more particularly in his own district. Where the provision is made that a Minister may delegate powers, the action to be taken on certain matters in or near a Minister's district could be made the responsibility of another Minister. I do not consider that such a situation would arise at present, and I would hope that it never arose. However, the Bill would create a situation in which that could be done. On the basis of the information given by my colleagues and on the matters that I have canvassed, I cannot support the Bill and will not do so.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I also oppose the Bill. I think that the division of responsibility amongst Ministers and their departments can do nothing to further the workings of government. The delegation of a power or function to another Minister does not affect the power of the Minister primarily concerned, who maintains an overriding authority. What a laughable but tragic situation could develop if, as

the member for Light has said, we had actions and statements followed by denials and excuses!

The member for Light has been more than charitable to Ministers of the present Government, because I think it is very likely that the Ministers possibly would use every excuse to dodge the responsibility for some of the mistakes they have been making. We have an example on the front bench now. The Minister of Environment and Conservation and Minister Assisting the Premier, having introduced a Bill for a referendum while he was Minister of Labour and Industry, was then transferred to another portfolio after the debacle and taken away from his responsibility.

If we take the indications in this Bill to their logical conclusion, why have Ministers responsible for separate departments? I can see the time coming when we may just have a Cabinet responsible for every department, with every Minister responsible for every department. This legislation is leading to that position, and that would be a stupid state of affairs. The Minister may laugh, but I hope he has the good grace to move that the Order of the Day for the second reading of the Bill be read and discharged. The member for Torrens has hit the nail on the head. The keynote of responsible Government is responsibility, and this requires the responsibility of individual Ministers for their departments. The proposed move will promote irresponsibility and leave the way open to irresponsible Ministers to dodge their responsibilities.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister Assisting the Premier): I am surprised at some contributions from the other side, but not at all of them. Obviously, one or two members have opposed the Bill simply because the Government has introduced it, and I consider that those members would oppose anything this Government introduced. Some of the reasons given for opposing it were almost laughable. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was at his best in trying to mislead the House. He attempted to show that, because of some poor legislation which he was responsible for introducing some years ago and which, because of valid and strong objections, was withdrawn, this Bill should receive the same treatment. The honourable member knows full well that the strength of the opposition to his Bill at that time arose because the delegation of power then was not from one Minister to another but from a Minister to a departmental head. This was the significant difference between that proposal and the

present proposal. Although it is true that in my second reading explanation I referred to the Underground Waters Preservation Act and the conflict of interest between the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the fact that there was a need for delegation in this respect, I thought that members would have realized that this situation had occurred before and would occur again.

Mr. Millhouse: Give us some examples.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to do that if the honourable member can control himself.

Mr. Mathwin: You are drawing red herrings across the trail all the time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It seems that the member for Alexandra summarized the position when he complained that the Government now had an extra Minister and, with his typical reluctance to change anything, he seemed to think that what had operated for many years should remain unchanged. I point out to the honourable member that there have been many dramatic changes in Government in recent years, and one change was my appointment as an additional Minister with a new portfolio. Last week we passed the Mining Bill, and it was made clear that many powers under that legislation had been delegated to me by the Premier, because it was considered that, as several environmental matters were referred to in that legislation, it was important that I—

Mr. Millhouse: That is written into the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is not written into the Bill: the honourable member did not read that Bill and he has obviously not read the present Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: What delegation has been made?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The delegation that has been made to me gives me complete control of the terms and conditions under—

Mr. Millhouse: Under what legislation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Under the Mining Bill passed last week. This is an example that I am pointing out to the honourable member, and it is necessary for that power to be delegated to whoever may be Minister of Environment and Conservation in the future. Other legislation will come within

my control under the new Environment and Conservation Department. Obviously, there will be some sections of the tourist industry that will require jurisdiction of legislation to be transferred to me. Members have drawn attention to the fact that it was some honour for a member to be appointed an Acting Minister by Executive Council. He would receive his commission from the Governor, so that it could be shown during this period that he was an Acting Minister. There will be no change in this aspect: when a Minister is absent for some time, the same action will be taken and Executive Council will appoint an Acting Minister in that portfolio. In this Bill we are providing the Government with the power to allow another Minister to be responsible for various Acts. In most cases, this legislation will operate within my own jurisdiction. This legislation has been brought about by the changes that have taken place from time to time since the new department has been established, and the department will probably grow in the future.

Mr. Millhouse: Then this is in regard to your appointment, is it?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Not entirely.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham is out of order. As he has contributed to the debate, he must allow the Minister to reply.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is fair to say that in most cases it will help me as Minister of Environment and Conservation. However, there could be other areas, such as the one to which I referred earlier, and there could be other occasions when the legislation might well apply. What is wrong with the provision? The need to provide that a notice shall be placed in the *Gazette* whenever the Minister delegates authority will give members every opportunity to object if they consider that the power is being used incorrectly or too widely. There is no need for Ministers to deliberately try to place powers under the control of another Minister for no sound reason; no Minister would do that. Surely that is obvious. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 20, at 2 p.m.