

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday, April 5, 1972.

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

**PETITIONS: SEX SHOPS**

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a petition signed by 191 persons drawing attention to the recent appearance of sex shops in the community and expressing concern about the probable harmful impact of such shops on individuals and consequently on the community. The petitioners requested that Parliament would, if necessary, amend the law to put these sex shops out of business.

Mr. FERGUSON presented a similar petition signed by 41 persons.

Mr. HOPGOOD presented a similar petition signed by 35 persons.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 184 persons.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: MAIN ROAD No. 15**

Mr. McANANEY presented a petition signed by 70 residents of the Bletchley and Langhorne Creek districts stating that they were gravely concerned at the severe hazard to life and crops caused by the extremely dusty condition of the unsealed section of Main Road No. 15 between Woodchester and Langhorne Creek. The petitioners prayed that the House would take immediate action to have this seven-mile section of road sealed.

Petition received and read.

**QUESTIONS****PARKING FEES**

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he supports the suggestion made in this afternoon's press regarding Government-sponsored amendments on behalf of the Adelaide City Council authorizing a \$10 ceiling for expiration fees in connection with permitting vehicles to stand illegally in loading streets and zones? An article on page 3 of today's *News*, under the heading "It May Soon Cost You \$8", states:

Motorists who leave their cars in "No Standing" areas might face a fine of \$8 in future. Penalties for over-staying parking meters could be \$3, and \$4 for standing illegally in loading streets and zones ... It is understood the committee supports asking the Government to sponsor Act amendments to authorize a \$10 ceiling for expiation fees to replace the \$2 now ruling.

A comment is then attributed to Alderman G. W. L. Spencer, as follows:

Alderman G. W. L. Spencer said today illegal parkers were causing traffic congestion and the \$8 penalty was proposed for motorists preventing buses pulling up at and leaving stopping places.

This last reference is especially important, because it is conceivable that any action that causes difficulty in connection with buses represents a potential danger to traffic and, indeed, to life.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Adelaide City Council has made no approaches to me on this matter but, when it does, the matter will be considered. A proper and considered reply will be given to the council when it sets out precisely what it desires and the reasons for its attitude. I am sympathetic regarding the points I have quickly scanned in the press regarding private motorists inhibiting the normal free flow of public transport. However, I think that the question goes much deeper than the few points mentioned in the press or raised by the Leader. I have discussed the matter of traffic in the city of Adelaide two or three times recently with the Lord Mayor, the City Engineer and the Town Clerk but, at this stage, no finality has been reached. If and when the City Council makes an approach, as it is required to do, I shall be happy to consider and make a decision on the merits of the matter.

**LOCUSTS**

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked last week about the locust plague?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that reports received indicate that relatively small areas of dense infestation and extensive areas of light infestation were located in the North-East pastoral areas by the Agriculture Department in March surveys. The densest areas were south of the Broken Hill line, from near Burra to Broken Hill. The latest information on the course of plague development is that very significant night flights of locusts occurred on Saturday, March 18. Cool weather since then has reduced locust activity and limited the information available on their present whereabouts. For example, a swarm five miles wide, which took four hours to pass a given point, has disappeared near Mutooroo. It is not clear whether the locusts have simply dispersed over very extensive areas. If this has happened, then their offspring, together with

the dispersed populations already present in the North-East pastoral areas and Eyre Peninsula, are still expected to produce a lesser locust plague in spring, more like that of 1947.

On the other hand, the locusts are expected to survive for at least another four or five weeks and could reappear even in the northern agricultural areas, the Murray River, Murray Mallee and Eyre Peninsula at any stage during that time. Problems of maintaining full information on the whereabouts of locusts in the pastoral areas are considerable. The Broken Hill locusts could not be located for the month of December, 1971, and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has temporarily lost the Charleville to Longreach locusts. Landowners are required to inform the authorities of locust activity, and further extensive surveys of suspect areas are in progress.

### TRADING HOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government now has any plans for introducing Friday night shopping in South Australia and, if it has, what they are? All members will know that last week the Government-sponsored Bill on this topic failed to pass after a conference. Soon afterwards, I think on Thursday, the Premier said that an announcement would be made about the Government's plans on this matter during this week. So far as I am aware, the only statement that has yet been made was a rather negative statement by the Minister concerned, discouraging certain members of the Upper House from introducing legislation on this topic. I imagine that Caucus met this morning and discussed the matter, and I therefore—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I would be amazed if Caucus did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Legislation relating to shopping hours will be introduced by the Government in the next session. That legislation will provide for the proper industrial protection of shop assistants so that there will not be a decrease in the standards that they have already obtained in remuneration and welfare.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you spell out the details?

The SPEAKER: Order! One question at a time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will be informed of the precise nature of the Bill when it is introduced: suffice to say that it will meet all the requirements of every section of shop assistants and, I believe, of retail traders in South Australia and give due protection to the public. The situation was, of course, available in the proposals put to the conference last week, and the honourable member is wrong in saying that the measure merely failed to pass. Even though all the proposals of shop assistants and retail traders were offered by the Government during the conference with the Legislative Council, the Legislative Council refused to accept any of them and the Bill was laid aside. The Legislative Council has rejected late night shopping, rejecting the very conditions that were asked for by people in the trade. We intend to introduce a measure that will provide that those very conditions are once more put forward in this Parliament. It will become even more patently clear that the Government is intent on ensuring that Friday night shopping is introduced, but introduced in a way that will ensure to every section of the trade the necessary conditions of service that will protect the people who will have additional obligations put on them in hours of trade by any extension of late night shopping.

### SWIMMING POOLS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of February 29 regarding safety provisions for swimming pools?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Local Government states that the Government is concerned regarding fatal accidents which have occurred in private swimming pools. The Minister has discussed the problem with the Swimming Pool Institute of South Australia and is studying safety provisions which apply in other parts of Australia. My colleague will hold discussions with other Ministers, and it is expected that a recommendation will be forthcoming soon. The matter will be discussed in Cabinet and, if it is considered desirable, an appropriate amendment to existing legislation will be introduced.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education review the present policy of his department relating to subsidies on the cost of Swinburne-type swimming pools? I understand that the Meadows school applied for such a subsidy, but it has been refused up to the present. These pools are now in common

use and I believe that the Department of Interior has installed many in Alice Springs. They appear to work satisfactorily and are much cheaper than the normal type of pool.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been approached about this matter, which is now being investigated. This involves the Public Buildings Department just as much as it does the Education Department but, when the results of the inquiry are known and a decision has been made, I will see that the honourable member is informed.

### GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the possibility of establishing a special export abattoir at Gepps Cross?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the honourable member will be aware that a thorough investigation of the meat industry in South Australia is now being undertaken. In view of the complexity of the problems associated with slaughtering and marketing, it would appear to be pointless, and indeed most unwise, for the Government to make decisions in isolation on these matters until the whole system of the meat industry has been carefully studied.

### MYER PROFITS

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what are the half-yearly profits declared by Myer South Australian Stores Limited or by the Myer group as a whole?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: On the mid-day news today it was announced that the Myer half-yearly net profit was \$11,000,000, an increase of 14.8 per cent on the position for the previous year. This would include the Melbourne, Adelaide and other stores. Considering these huge profits over half a year, one would think that such a profitable organization would be prepared to pay its staff a fair and reasonable wage, and that it would not try to influence legislation in another place to—

Mr. Coumbe: You're commenting now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must answer the question. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am not commenting. I was asked a question about shopping hours, and I am entitled to reply to it. I think it would be reasonable to assume that an institution such as Myers would not try to influence legislation in another place so

that staff could be employed at under-paid rates, and it would not employ juniors at the rate of 38c on a Saturday morning. That is appalling, when one reads that the organization is making such huge profits.

### LIBRARY SERVICES

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Minister of Education recall my asking him on several occasions for information about the Mander-Jones report on library services in South Australia? As this report was initiated by the member for Davenport, who was my predecessor as Minister of Education, and was presented to me about two years ago, when I was Minister of Education, I now ask the Minister whether he has considered the report and what action, if any, he intends to take on it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The shorter answer to the question is that the recommendations in the report have not been accepted by the Government. An alternative scheme that will establish a subsidized library service throughout the State is being considered. There are obvious complications in the organization of such a scheme but, when I am able to make an announcement, I will do so.

### POLLUTION

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my recent question regarding regulations to be made under the Clean Air Act?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The proposed regulations prepared by the Clean Air Committee were forwarded through Cabinet to the Crown Solicitor for drafting in November, 1971. A number of recommendations have been made by the Crown Solicitor for variations. These variations are almost complete and it is anticipated that the necessary consideration by, and subsequent recommendation of, the regulations by the Clean Air Committee could be made in about three weeks.

### WOOLLEN FABRICS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to investigate the promotion of synthetic fabrics in shops in preference to woollen fabrics? Will he ask the Minister of Agriculture to ensure that the qualities of wool are not denigrated to the detriment of the industry? Mrs. Fay Reilly of Penola, who contacted me about this, and who is known to the Minister, is prepared to back up her comments. She went into a shop in Mount Gambier (I am not denigrating that

district, as this could have happened anywhere in Australia) and asked for a washable material from which she could make a frock. She was shown a synthetic fabric at \$5.70 a yard. She was not very happy with it and asked to be shown some woollen fabrics which were at the back of the counter and not on display. Mrs. Reilly believed that this was a far more suitable fabric and as it was at an economical price (\$3.70 a yard) she purchased some of it. She believes this matter is of vital importance to the economy of this country and to many people who depend on the industry. I will give the Minister samples of the two fabrics mentioned and I shall be pleased if his colleague will take steps to ensure that synthetic fabrics are not promoted to the detriment of sales of woollen fabrics.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague, who I am sure will be interested in doing anything he can to right what is obviously a wrong in my view as well as in the honourable member's view and certainly in Mrs. Reilly's view. As the honourable member said, Mrs. Fay Reilly is well known to me; she was a neighbour of mine prior to her marriage. I only mention that, because I have every faith in the facts as related by Mrs. Reilly to the honourable member, as I am sure she would be completely fair and factual in what she had to say. I shall be delighted to use my good offices with the Minister of Agriculture to impress on him seriously the need to try to do something to promote what is, as the honourable member has described it, a product that is most important, particularly to our own part of the State as well as to the whole State and nation.

### **FLIES**

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to obtain from the Public Health Department a report on what measures would need to be taken to eliminate flies from the Australian environment? It has been suggested to me that one thing that is holding this country back from being a great mecca for tourists is the fly (both the house fly and the bush fly), and various suggestions have been made as to how the fly could be eradicated, such as covering sheep carcasses, and that sort of thing. However, I consider that we should have expert advice on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

### **NATIONAL PARK PROPERTIES**

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question, which I asked during a recent debate, regarding Melville House and Old Government House at the Belair National Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Melville House was acquired in 1961 with the purchase of 66 acres on the eastern boundary of Belair National Park. It had previously been used as a farm and orchard. The land had been offered by the Melville family and it was agreed that it be acquired to prevent subdivision of the area and a probable pollution problem. It was decided by the then Commissioners of the National Parks and Wildlife Reserves that Melville House be repaired and used as a holiday house, with conversion of nearby buildings as dormitories, and that a nominal charge be made to cover operating costs. Since the official opening in February, 1964, Melville House has been used as a youth camp and conference centre. Melville House, being unsupervised for a large part of the year, has become a target for vandals. It is now occupied by one of the National Parks Commission Rangers, and the dormitories are being converted to provide for visiting Rangers' accommodation. This move has overcome the many management problems associated with this area.

### **GOVERNMENT PRODUCE DEPARTMENT**

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question about the inquiry being conducted into the Government Produce Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has received the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Government Produce Department, but he has told me that he has not yet had an opportunity to study it. In due course the matter will be discussed in Cabinet, which will decide whether the report will be tabled.

### **ROAD SAFETY**

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport now take immediate action to support the statement by the Deputy Commissioner of Police (Mr. G. M. Leane) on the use of Q cars? In today's *News* Mr. Leane is quoted as saying that he would put as many Q cars as he could on the road and that the Police Force needed a minimum of 30 per cent more men. Mr. Leane said the budget was much too small. He also said,

"We need more money to pay salaries and wages." He further said he believed that the Police Force needed as many Q cars as it could get.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reading the complete statement.

Mr. Millhouse: He's explaining his question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order in interjecting when I am trying to direct the attention of the honourable member for Glenelg to the fact that he is reading the statement by the Deputy Commissioner of Police from the newspaper. The honourable member sought leave to explain his question, and he should confine his remarks to the explanation.

Mr. MATHWIN: With due respect, I am trying to explain the question by quoting from this report. I have just another few words.

The SPEAKER: Comments by the Deputy Commissioner of Police are out of order. The honourable Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I recall the question that was asked before the member for Glenelg sidetracked himself, it was whether I would now give immediate effect to the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner of Police (Mr. Leane). I refer the honourable member to my reply on this matter yesterday, when I said that this was one of the matters being considered. The fact that Mr. Leane has come out and made his comment rather strengthens the view I have previously expressed, but I do not think it calls for the immediate action for which the honourable member is asking. The second point I want to make is that I always have adopted the attitude of regarding one person as being the boss, and, although I have great respect for Deputy Commissioner Leane, I would first want the view of the Commissioner of Police, not that of his understudy. My third point is that the police are under the control of the Chief Secretary, not under my control, and therefore the matter would require discussion by the Chief Secretary and me.

Mr. Venning: But you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure that we will not need to have the member for Rocky River at those discussions, because he would not contribute anything. The other party to the discussions would be the Road Traffic Board. We will make proper and considered decisions: we certainly will not take off at a tangent as apparently the member for Glenelg wants us to do.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not so.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I ignore the little puppy from Mitcham, because the member for Glenelg has asked a question and I am trying to reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, and that is why I am ignoring the member for Mitcham.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Glenelg is entitled to hear the reply to the question that he has asked. Because of this audible conversation I cannot hear what is being said.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The other point contained in the rambling explanation by the honourable member referred to the lack of staff, the need for money, and other factors associated with running the Police Department. I should have thought that the correct procedure for the Deputy Commissioner of Police to follow in this case would be to report to his Commissioner, with a request that that report be forwarded to the Minister for consideration. I do not think that the columns of a newspaper are the proper place for departmental officers to communicate with their Minister.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister, as a means of exercising at least some control over accidents on the roads, consider the suggestions that I shall make? The first is that all drivers involved in notifiable accidents be asked to report to the driving school to undertake a driving test and examination within a prescribed number of days. The period would have to depend on the capacity of the driving school to test drivers. Secondly, could consideration be given to re-testing drivers every five years? Some members of this House have never had to pass a driving test, because their licences were issued before 1961. Thirdly, I should like to know whether consideration will be given to the factors applying in New Zealand, where cars over a certain age are required to undergo a compulsory mechanical test. I should be interested to hear the Minister's comments on these matters, for I believe they have some substance and may, if implemented, result in eliminating various causes of road accidents.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that all three matters have substance and are well worth considering. I shall be happy to have investigated this question, together with the many other suggestions made to me both by

telephone and in letters. I repeat what I said yesterday, namely, that full and serious consideration will be given to this whole matter once we can see a little daylight after the House rises. However, I thank the honourable member for his suggestions and will have them considered as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will be considering the suggestions dealing with traffic matters made by the Deputy Commissioner of Police?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That question has been asked.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, it has not. I am asking whether the Government will be considering these suggestions. The Minister of Roads and Transport, when answering a different question about the same statements, seemed to resent the way in which the statements had been made.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is factual. I am explaining that the Minister expressed resentment at the way in which the statements had been made. As the Minister of Roads and Transport pointed out, this matter affects more than one Minister (both the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Roads and Transport are involved), and I am asking the Premier whether these suggestions will be discussed by Cabinet, because they seem to me to be far too important to be brushed aside merely because of some resentment about the way they were made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Roads and Transport has made it clear to members opposite that on matters of this kind there will be proper consultation.

Mr. Millhouse: He didn't answer the question, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable Deputy Leader did not listen.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order in interjecting all the time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister outlined the method of proper consultation used to arrive at decisions on such matters, and that procedure will be followed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I seek leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Several questions were asked yesterday and today about the use of unmarked cars or Q cars, and an article

on this matter appearing in today's *News* has been referred to by two Opposition members. I have said that this matter has already been considered by the State Government and I have now obtained a copy of the report of the committee which comprised top officials of various departments, including the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner of Highways, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and representatives of the South Australian Railways and of the Electricity Trust. This committee was asked to investigate the application of the Pak Poy committee's recommendations and other matters which I referred to it, including the use of unmarked Q cars. The committee made this decision:

This committee is of opinion that plain-clothes patrols have a role which is best decided by the Police Department and its traffic administration according to the nature of particular policing commitments and problems as they occur from time to time. Their use is felt to be an entirely domestic policing measure which should not be decided or dictated by outside authority. This committee has ascertained that the personnel presently employed are specially selected to deal with the "larrikin element" and with "excessive speed" in areas where detection by ordinary patrols and more conventional means is difficult or impractical. However, their use in the country would be ineffective unless an absolute speed limit is set by legislation. There is, unfortunately, a certain class of offender who only complies with the Road Traffic Act and drives within the limits prescribed by law when there is a policeman at his elbow.

That report was made about 12 months ago and I am sure I am correct in assuming that that would have been the view of Mr. McKinna. Now, however, his second in charge is expressing a different view. Nevertheless, I repeat the undertaking I gave yesterday and again today that this matter will be considered again along with other matters.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider having the 35 mile-an-hour speed limit area extended at Verdun? This question is supplementary to a question I asked earlier this session concerning speed limits in the town. The busiest part of Verdun is near the hotel and near where schoolchildren cross the road after being deposited by the school bus. Will the Minister extend the 35 m.p.h. area by about 100yds. to include this location?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am disturbed that such a danger is apparent near the hotel and I shall be pleased to look at the matter and, of more importance, to safeguard the interests of the children.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister have the steep section of Myrtle Road, Hawthornedene, closed to through traffic? Officers of the Road Traffic Board, the Mitcham council and the Minister's department are aware of the dangers that exist on this road. Since negotiations have been taking place with the Minister and the board, two cars have rolled over on this section of road. One of these cases occurred last Monday afternoon, and the four young people involved were lucky to escape without injury. At this stage, agreement has virtually been reached with the authorities with regard to this steep section of road. Will the Minister seriously consider having the board agree to closing this section of road, so that we may possibly save the lives of several people, because accidents occur there at frequent intervals? I put this question to the Minister so that the action being taken on the matter can be speeded up. If the Minister does not have time to bring down a reply by tomorrow, will he give me a reply in writing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be happy to obtain a report and, if necessary, send it to the honourable member by post.

#### **STRATHALBYN COURTHOUSE**

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding progress made on the Strathalbyn courthouse project?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: Sketch plans and estimates for a new police station and courthouse complex at Strathalbyn have been completed. It is expected that tenders will be called in October, 1972, and that the work will be completed by July, 1973.

#### **ABATTOIR REPORT**

Mr. VENNING: In the temporary absence of the Premier, I ask the Minister of Works when it is expected that the report of the investigation by Mr. Gray into the activities of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board will be completed. In reply to questions asked in this House over the last week or two, I have been told that the Government is reluctant to take action until Mr. Gray has presented his report. I have been asked by my constituents, because of the urgency—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is supposed to explain his question.

Mr. VENNING: I am doing that, Sir. I should like to explain to the Minister how urgent is the situation. It was pointed out to me only yesterday, that, in the week leading

up to Easter, 2,500 head of cattle were yarded at the Gepps Cross abattoir and that, on the basis of a drop of \$10 a head, there was a total loss of \$25,000. This has been going on for some time because of a delay in improving the set-up while awaiting the report from Mr. Gray.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member would be fully aware that the Government is as concerned as he and his constituents are about the situation developing at the Gepps Cross abattoir, and I think the Government's concern has been indicated to him and to other members on several occasions. Only yesterday, I said in reply to a question, I think from the honourable member, that the Government believed it was prudent to await Mr. Gray's report on the total set-up and to wait until any recommendations he makes are examined and decided on. That is the proper course to take, and it is the course the Government is following. Replying specifically to the honourable member's question, I am informed that the Government should receive the report within the next month or six weeks. However, I will check that.

Mr. McAnaney: Why would it take that long?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Heysen—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: He just made a comment which I believe was meant to be sarcastic and which concerned the length of time being taken to complete this report. If the honourable member casts his mind back, he will realize that it has not taken much time. I think it was only about two months ago that Mr. Gray was commissioned to undertake this fairly complex and extensive examination, and I think he is proceeding with all possible haste. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture when he expects to receive the report. As I said, I think it will be a month or six weeks before it is received but, if the period is substantially different, I will let the honourable member know tomorrow.

#### **DENTURES**

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Attorney-General have an investigation made into, or will he take up with the Prices Commissioner, the case of unsatisfactory service received from a dental surgeon? A constituent of mine, who visited a dental surgeon on October 29 last, paid \$100 for a set of dentures and, following that visit, he made seven trips from the country to the

city for fittings. On the seventh occasion, he telephoned the dental surgeon and was told that the dentist would not see him again in future and that he should go home and buy a tin of "fast-teeth". My constituent has persevered but just cannot succeed. He wrote to the Australian Dental Association, which contacted the dental surgeon but, as that dentist was not a member of the association, nothing could be done by it. The dental surgeon concerned did not reply to the association's letter. My constituent then wrote to me, and I wrote two letters to this dentist, pleading with him again to contact my constituent and to try to meet his requests. However, I received no reply at all to those two letters. My constituent has paid \$100 in cash to the dentist concerned and has travelled over 1,000 miles in connection with this matter, but he has received no satisfaction at all. I will give the Attorney-General the name of the dentist concerned if he wishes.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter examined.

### SUPREME COURT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Attorney-General. Does the Government intend to appoint any additional Supreme Court judge or judges soon?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No.

### KANGAROO IDENTIFICATION

Dr. EASTICK: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't the Minister answer the previous question?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He did.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not be continually calling members to order. It is most disrespectful of the member for Mitcham to his Leader to be engaged in conversation and crossfire across the Chamber while his Leader is asking a question. The honourable Leader deserves courtesy and he is going to receive it.

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question on kangaroo identification?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I have had this reply for some time, and I did not know whether the Leader was reluctant to ask for it. My colleague has been advised by the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation that the use of special type collars for marking of wild animals is world-wide. In Australia the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the Western Australian Department of Agriculture have con-

ducted research projects on movement of kangaroos based on this method. No injuries related to the use of collars are known to the South Australian department. In South Australia the department is marking only adult red kangaroos and, as these animals inhabit the open plains, it is considered there is only a slight risk of a twig or branch being caught in the collar. The collar is carefully fitted and no large branch could fit between the collar and the animal's neck. The use of collars in marking kangaroos for later identification is the most suitable method available at the present time; ear tags are too small and are not easily observed, and coloured dyes are unsuitable as they either fade or are lost during the growth of new fur.

### GRANTS COMMISSION

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Treasurer the information I sought last week concerning special grants that have been recommended for South Australia by the Commonwealth Grants Commission?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In replying to the honourable member's question about the operations of the Grants Commission as they affect South Australia, I think it would be useful if, in the first place, I were to repeat the brief description given by me on February 23, 1971, in explaining supplementary revenue raising measures, and set out again in the most recent Budget speech given on September 2, 1971. I quote the relevant paragraph from the Budget speech, as follows:

Members will be well aware from previous explanations of the role of the Commission that South Australia cannot ordinarily expect grants sufficient to meet its deficits in full, irrespective of the level of financial effort we make to help ourselves. Under the Commission's procedures we may expect a recommendation for grants sufficient to put us in much the same position as the "standard" States, presently New South Wales and Victoria, provided that our overall efforts in raising revenues and in providing services are comparable with theirs. It follows that if those two States are placed in a difficult situation because of Commonwealth policy then the claimant States of South Australia and Tasmania will also face a comparably difficult situation. If we wish to provide services of a level comparable with the standard States and not record deficits any greater than theirs, then we must be prepared to tax and to charge overall equally as heavily. If we wish to hold revenue deficits to levels below those of the standard States then we must be prepared to tax and charge more heavily or to provide social services and otherwise function more economically.



The comment about the claimant States of South Australia and Tasmania will now apply to Queensland, which has recently become a claimant State. It seems to me that, having regard to the pressures on all States to provide social services and other services, to the difficulties of States increasing revenue yields in areas under their own control and to the limited assistance being given by the Commonwealth out of income tax and other taxes, the States generally may expect the situation of Revenue Budget deficits to continue for some time. Against this background of continuing deficits it may be helpful if I were to give an example to illustrate the possible effect on South Australian finances of the Grants Commission's procedures. If we assume that in a particular year the revenue deficits of the two standard States, New South Wales and Victoria, are equivalent to \$5 a head of population, and we further assume that the Grants Commission, after full inquiry, is satisfied that South Australia's effort in raising revenues and in controlling expenditures is comparable with the efforts of the two larger States, then the Commission might be expected to recommend such a level of special grant as would leave South Australia with a deficit in that year equivalent to \$5 a head of population. In the current year, 1971-72, that assumed per capita deficit would mean an actual deficit approaching \$6,000,000.

However, if South Australia is able to show that in its taxes and charges, in its provision of social services, in its conduct of business undertakings and in Revenue Budget activities generally, its efforts overall are greater than in the two standard States, and the measure of that effort is \$1 a head of population, the Commission might be expected to recommend such a level of grants as would leave South Australia with a smaller deficit of, say, \$4,800,000 instead of \$6,000,000 as above. Conversely, if our efforts fall short of those of the larger States, we cannot expect that Jack of effort to be made good by additional special grants, and our revenue deficit would be expected to be larger than the standard. If the measure of our shortfall in effort overall were, say, \$1 a head of population, the special grants would be such as to leave a deficit of about \$7,200,000 instead of the "standard" deficit of \$6,000,000. Let me make it clear that the Commission does not say that we should increase this tax or reduce that service or take such and such a course of action. The Commission by its procedures merely says, in effect, "If the claimant State,

by its own efforts, reduces its deficit below what it would otherwise be, it may expect to retain the benefit of that effort and the special grant will not be reduced merely because of the smaller deficit recorded. On the other hand, if a claimant State, through its lack of effort, has a deficit greater than it would otherwise be, it must expect to bear that heavier deficit because the special grant will not be increased accordingly." If we turn from the procedure now to the actual situation in South Australia we know that the special grant received in 1970-71 was \$5,000,000 and the grant being received in 1971-72 is \$7,000,000. We also know that each of these grants is an advance grant subject to subsequent variation, either up or down, following an investigation by the Commission of the State's final accounts for the two years. What we do not know is the extent of that probable variation although, as I have previously reported to the House, the Government believes that the commission, in recommending the advance grants, would have taken a rather conservative view of the State's needs, and accordingly we are hopeful that a further grant, known as a completion grant, will be received in respect of each year. During this year, 1971-72, the Commission is carrying out its review of the 1970-71 accounts of the claimant States, and in the course of that review it has visited South Australia and had discussions with Treasury officers about many aspects of our finances, including the actual Budget results and the measurement of effort in the various fields. As a result of the work done for this review, the Treasury believes there are good grounds for expecting a further grant in respect of 1970-71, but the Commission will not make its determination and its report until the early months of 1972-73. When that report is received we will know the final grant for 1970-71 and from that will be in a better position to estimate the probable final grant for 1971-72, and also the prospects for grants in future years.

I regret that I cannot be any more specific at this stage. However, I can say that it is clear that revenue-raising measures in areas under our own control will continue to be necessary if large revenue deficits are to be avoided, or even kept to manageable levels. As to the question of what assistance the State has sought from the Commonwealth Government, I must say that at each Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meeting I and each of the other State Premiers invariably put as strong a case as possible in an attempt

to convince the Commonwealth that greater general purpose grants are essential if the States are to meet their inescapable commitments. I propose to continue these efforts until such time as we are able to work out an equitable sharing of financial resources, a sharing which has full regard to the heavy and growing costs of educational and health services and all the other facilities for which the States are responsible.

### HELICOPTERS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the possible use of helicopters by the Police Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no helicopter available for hire at short notice in South Australia at present. However, the Police Department is aware of the advantages of using helicopters and light aircraft, and on separate occasions has used both with success for traffic surveillance. Light aircraft have also been used to trace fugitive offenders and at the present time feasibility to improve efficiency is being tested in northern areas with the use of hired aircraft flown by members of the Police Force who are pilots. Research and reported oversea police experience in the utilization of helicopters in combating major crime has shown that the success rate of a helicopter patrol is directly related to speed of response, as applies in the case of motorized patrols. Response time can only be reduced to a successful level by the maintenance of continuous patrol activity at least during daylight hours, because need in regard to time and location cannot be predicted with accuracy, if at all. The requirement for continuous patrol brings into sharper focus the factor of frequency of routine servicing. Generally this type of maintenance is required after every 100 hours flying time and must be performed by a certifying engineer. Melbourne is the nearest centre at which such a facility is available. Based on an average daily flight period of 12 hours, servicing would be required about every eight days.

Such frequent absences from operational availability would significantly reduce the efficiency and value of such a unit, or suggest the need for a back-up craft. Another matter of concern is in relation to existing flight path restrictions, which apply to aircraft of this type. Some of these could probably be overcome or reduced, but those necessarily remaining restrict flying in areas of potential value from a policing point of view. The purchase of a helicopter would

involve capital expense of about \$60,000 to \$70,000 depending on type and specifications. Whilst cost is not the overriding factor in determining the need for purchase, the other problems outlined inhibit serious consideration of providing such equipment at this time. However, it is expected that the use of light aircraft for police purposes will increase in future and the feasibility of adding a helicopter service to police resources will be kept under review.

### RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands why the Murat Bay council's request for a further grant for Commonwealth rural unemployment relief was refused? The council has informed me that it has been requested by the department to make further applications for assistance. The council had submitted a plan which would have cost \$19,000 and which would have employed about 20 men. However, this scheme was refused. The council believes that the fact that certain areas of South Australia, which could hardly be called basically rural areas, have received substantial grants has in some ways been detrimental to the case for grants put by other areas, such as Murat Bay.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I saw in this morning's newspaper that the Murat Bay council was complaining about what it termed to be preferential treatment received by certain areas, one of which was said to be Millicent. The inference behind this was that I had influenced the Minister of Lands to make sure that the Millicent area received special treatment. I categorically deny this here and now. The District Clerk at Millicent has been most assiduous and efficient in preparing applications for rural unemployment relief, and the unemployment figures in Millicent point to the need for the funds to have been made available to that council. I do not think that the statements made by the Murat Bay council will enhance any chance it has of having its request granted, although the decision will be based purely and simply on the facts placed before the Director of Lands, and his judgment of them. I will ask my colleague to examine the matter.

### PARACHUTE SAFETY

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of March 14 about safety requirements for parachute jumping?

The SPEAKER: Order! I notice that a stranger in the Strangers Gallery is smoking. He must leave the gallery immediately.

*The stranger having left:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to the member for Tea Tree Gully, I point out that investigations have revealed that the law governing sport parachute activities, including sky diving, is contained in air navigation regulations. Regulation 128 of those regulations provides:

Parachute descents, other than necessary emergency descents, shall not be made unless authorized and conducted in accordance with the written specifications of the Director-General (of Civil Aviation).

Written specifications setting out the conditions under which parachute descents, other than necessary emergency descents, may be made are stated in air navigation order, part 20, section 29.1, which will be available to the honourable member in the Parliamentary Library.

### SEWERAGE FINANCE

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether, at the meeting of the Environment Protection Authority in Sydney next Friday, he or his officers will be seeking a special grant to be used to catch up on the backlog in sewerage work in this State? In today's *Australian* I saw an article stating that the Victorian Minister for State Development (Mr. Dickie) would be seeking a special grant at this meeting for the sewerage connection of some tens of thousands of houses in Victoria. In this State, the members for Mawson and Tea Tree Gully and I, and other members who represent parts of the outer metropolitan fringes, know that in certain areas effluent from septic tanks is a problem and a health hazard. All one can see is street gutters running with putrid green slime, which is most objectionable to people who have to live in that environment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am aware that this application has been put forward to be considered at the Ministers' conference. I point out to the honourable member that we have a submission to be put before this conference asking for a substantial sum from the Commonwealth Government in relation to environment matters. We are seeking assistance in relation to decentralization, and the purchase of land for national parks and open spaces. At previous conferences, we have met with no success in this regard. I am aware that, having had a Liberal Government for many years, Victoria is now in a desperate situation with regard to sewerage, as only a small

proportion of its houses is seweraged compared with the situation in South Australia. However, these matters will be dealt with at the conference on Friday, and I will inform the honourable member on what progress is made.

### BROUGHTON RIVER PARK

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he intends to accept the invitation of the Spalding council to inspect, with his good officers, the site proposed for the recreation lake and national park on the Broughton River? I have received from the Clerk of the Spalding council a copy of a submission forwarded to the Premier and the Minister concerning the plan that has been prepared for a recreation lake to be built on the Broughton River. I have a copy of the letter, sent by the Spalding council to the Premier and the Minister, wherein it is suggested that the Minister might inspect the area so that he would know what is in the proposition.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I received an invitation to visit this area and, after receiving the letter, I asked the Director of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves to examine the proposal generally. I indicated to the council that I should be happy to visit the area, and a date will be arranged when I receive the report from the Director.

### VETERINARY SURGEONS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question concerning veterinary surgeons?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Veterinary surgeons in practice are now located in nearly all country centres which could reasonably be expected to provide a financial return commensurate with the financial outlay and training necessary to obtain a degree in veterinary science. It would be unreasonable to direct a recent graduate to set up a practice in a country centre where he could not make a living. The present development in rural areas is to set up branch practices which, although they may not give an adequate return at first, may build up over three or four years. It has been suggested that a system of subsidizing branch practices over a period of three to four years by local stockowners may be a more acceptable method of getting practitioners into marginal practice areas such as Cummins or Cleve.

**HEYSEN TRAIL**

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of March 14 regarding the Heysen Trail?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The first section of the proposed Heysen Trail, from Cape Jervis to Mount Bold, is currently being investigated. The State Planning Authority's Long Distance Trail Committee has selected a tentative route and the appropriate local government authorities are being consulted. The committee has given preliminary consideration to all the points raised in the question. It is envisaged that "right of way" easements could be most appropriate in many areas but that purchase of a strip of land would be desirable in some cases. Fencing will only be necessary where land is purchased and adjoining owners require it. Facilities will have to be provided at intervals along the trail, especially for fires and rubbish disposal. These will reduce the risk of fire and litter, but it is recognized that patrolling will be necessary on a regular basis. The possibility of prohibiting the lighting of fires has been discussed but no recommendation is proposed until further consultations have been completed. It is expected that the State Planning Authority will be the body responsible for securing and maintaining the trail, with the possible delegation of certain powers to Government departments and/or local councils where appropriate. Discussions with these bodies are proceeding, and, when the Cape Jervis to Mount Bold section has been fully investigated, it is expected that firm recommendations will be made regarding the route for this section and methods of management.

As this is a completely new venture in South Australia and very little experience exists in other States, every endeavour is being made to fully consult all relevant bodies before policies are formulated. The trail will have no standard width. Sufficient width will be provided for both walking and horse-riding tracks. In most cases these will be established side by side, so that horses will not damage the walking tracks.

**STRUAN RESEARCH CENTRE**

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture concerning the Struan Research Centre?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has given me a detailed report in answer to the questionnaire which the honourable member presented to me on a multiplicity of subject

matters related to Struan Research Centre. I shall be happy to make available to him a copy of this report, which I think will satisfy his inquiries.

**CIGARETTES**

Mr. MATHWIN: The Attorney-General has warned me that he has a reply from the Minister of Health concerning the placing of warning labels on packets of cigarettes. Will he now give me that reply?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that the Cigarettes (Labelling) Act passed both Houses of Parliament in November, 1971, and provides that the Act will not come into operation until a day fixed by proclamation. Under the provisions of section 2, a proclamation cannot be issued until at least three other States enact similar legislation and until such legislation has, or is likely to, come into operation. Action to require labelling of cigarette packets will be taken when the provisions of section 2 of the Cigarettes (Labelling) Act, 1971, have been met.

**LITTERBUGS**

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has any plans to curb litterbugs? A report in today's *News*, under the heading "Litterbugs will be Stamped on", states that the New South Wales Minister for Environment Control (Mr. Beale) says that the State Government will begin the most intensive anti-litter campaign in New South Wales on May 1 and that the campaign, which has the support of Government departments, local government and industry, will end on September 22.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: At this stage we have no on-the-spot fines as they have in New South Wales. I understand that Mr. Beale will undertake his campaign during Earth Week later this year. At this stage no decision has been made as to what activities we will sponsor in this regard in South Australia. I will discuss later with Mr. Beale what has been the effect and impact of the legislation in New South Wales in order to determine whether the implementation of on-the-spot fines should be considered for South Australia.

**NATIONAL PARK RANGER**

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether his department intends to station a ranger on Eyre Peninsula? One of my constituents has told me that he heard a statement on a radio programme that the Government intended to

station a ranger in the Kimba area. Therefore, I should like the Minister to confirm or deny this.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In recent weeks arrangements have been made to increase the activities of the national park rangers, but I cannot tell the honourable member exactly where they will be located. However, I will get that information and give it to the honourable member tomorrow.

### **NARACOORTE HIGH SCHOOL**

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about completion of the change rooms and showers at the Naracoorte High School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I have told the honourable member previously, I authorized the Public Buildings Department to negotiate with the firm of S. J. Weir Proprietary Limited, which has offices in Mount Gambier, to complete the work started by a previous contractor. This has been done and, in addition, E. & L. Constructions, of Penola, has also indicated an interest in completing the work, so the details have been forwarded to that company as well, to try to obtain the best possible deal for the Government. Prices have not yet been received from S. J. Weir Proprietary Limited or E. & L. Constructions. Representatives of these firms will have to visit the site before they can submit prices and I think it will be about a week before the quotations are received. I assure the honourable member that I will watch the situation closely, because I know that he and the school committee are concerned about the delay.

### **ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE**

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question about the salaries of diplomate employees at Roseworthy Agricultural College?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Chairman of the Public Service Board has told my colleague that the salaries of officers at the Roseworthy Agricultural College, referred to by the honourable member in his question, are at present being reviewed by the board.

### **HOUSE TRANSACTION**

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General investigate a house property transaction to find out whether an offence under any Act has been committed and to see whether he can assist the purchasers in the predicament that they are now in through no fault of their own? Constituents

of mine purchased a house property and all the vendor's improvements thereon, as seen and inspected by the purchaser on April 4, 1970 (two years ago). Included in a schedule to the contract note under "appliances" were the following: "cooker type gas stove supplied by builder; hot water service, gas, 45 gall. roof position, supplied by builder." It is alleged that the land agent acting in the sale told the purchasers that the gas appliances were included. In addition, the cost of the appliances, plus installation costs, were added to the house price. On October 1, 1971, after 18 months had passed, correspondence was received from the South Australian Gas Company to the effect that the gas appliances and installations had been ordered by the builder on the company's builders' hiring agreement and remained the property of the company. A payment was requested by the company, and it is still being requested. I point out to the Attorney that the South Australian Gas Company is acting correctly in this matter, in those circumstances. The company that built the house is, I understand, now in liquidation, but the firm of land agents involved is still operating. Although I could name the firm, I will not do so, because of innocent persons who may have been or still are employed by it. It has been further alleged that one person, if not more, was the main shareholder in both businesses. In other words, there was duplication regarding the persons running both businesses. In these circumstances, it is Understandable that my constituents presume that they have been cheated in this transaction. I can give the Attorney-General all relevant documents in this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member gives me the documents, I shall refer the matter to the Land Agents Board, asking it to investigate the conduct of the land agent involved.

### **PREMIER'S STATEMENT**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had a question for the Premier, but he has been flitting in and out of the House. I had another question for the member for Playford, but he has not been here for some time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Well, sit down.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: While waiting for these two gentlemen to return, I will ask a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where's your own Leader?

Mr. Clark: The only time we see him is on television.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Who? The Minister of Roads and Transport?

Mr. Clark: You misunderstood.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not misunderstand.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was calling honourable members to order so that the member for Mitcham would get the courtesy that he deserved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to see that the Premier has returned and I shall address the question to him. I hope that the Minister of Roads and Transport will be prepared to wait. Is the Premier prepared to disclose the source of his information that Mr. Glowrey had been a member of the Australian Security Intelligence Organization? Yesterday the Premier was invited to withdraw and apologize for the remark that he had made publicly in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* that Mr. Glowrey should go back to A.S.I.O., a remark which was meant, I am sure, to be derogatory to both Mr. Glowrey and A.S.I.O.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the only inference one can draw from the remark.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now he is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday I gave the reply that I intended to give, and I have nothing further to add.

Mr. Millhouse: You won't disclose it, eh?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not disclose it any more than the honourable member would disclose confidential information he gets from time to time, other than to say that it was from an impeccable source.

#### NORTH ADELAIDE ROADS

Mr. CUMBE: As the Minister of Roads and Transport, in a previous reply to me, said that he was having discussions with the Adelaide City Council about certain road reconstruction in North Adelaide, will he now say whether he has discussed the question of declaring O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, a clearway? Although I am not advocating that O'Connell Street be made a clearway at this stage, I point out that this matter is of great interest to many traders and people who use O'Connell Street for shopping purposes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board is at all times considering many streets in and around the metropolitan area in regard to creating clearways and to other matters of general traffic flow, and so on. Without having any knowledge to the contrary, I believe that O'Connell Street would certainly be one of the streets being considered. I do not want it to be taken from that statement that in, say, three weeks we will be declaring O'Connell Street a clearway within perhaps three months or three years. All of these thoroughfares are watched, traffic flows are noted, records are kept, and decisions are made whether or not a certain clearway should be created.

#### CHIROPRACTOR ACCREDITATION

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on March 28 about chiropractor accreditation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that, as the honourable member may be aware, the Government established the Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in South Australia, and major changes in health legislation in South Australia will be dependent on consideration of this committee's inquiries and recommendations. However, this does not imply that the Government will not introduce appropriate health legislation in the meantime. A difficulty in considering legislation to register chiropractors is the absence of any training course in Australia and the variety of courses existing in the United States of America. There is no unanimity among chiropractors themselves as to a common qualification which would be acceptable. I assure the honourable member that the Government is well aware of the problems and is conducting inquiries to establish both the need for registration and the standard of qualification required to effect registration.

#### SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the granting of scholarships?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Commonwealth technical scholarships are available for students who have successfully completed a Leaving year and wish to study at post-secondary level. No Diploma in Foods and Food Service is available in South Australia, but a Diploma of Food and Food Studies is provided in Victoria. Application for such a scholarship must be made in South Australia if the student resides here, and approval would have to be sought from the Commonwealth

Department of Education and Science if the student, if successful, wished to use his scholarship in Victoria. I understand that the student to whom the honourable member referred did not apply for a Commonwealth technical scholarship, but she could do so at the end of this year. Award of the scholarship would be based on the results achieved in the preliminary year. There is no provision for State scholarships to study at post-secondary level.

**NORTH ESPLANADE**

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on March 28 about work to be carried out at North Esplanade, Glenelg North?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: On March 23, 1972, I informed the honourable member that tenders for the work at North Esplanade, Glenelg North, would be let shortly. In providing me with the basis for this reply, the Foreshore and Beaches Committee reported that the letting of tenders by the Glenelg council had been referred to that committee for appropriate endorsement. However, the tenders were called by the council and it was within the power of the council to award the contract to whomsoever it considered suitable. On approaching the nominee of the Foreshore and Beaches Committee to confirm the letting of the contract to the lowest tenderer, advice was given to the council that the committee would be prepared to endorse or confirm the action taken by the council in letting the contract to the lowest tenderer. Because of the urgency to complete the works as soon as practicable and certainly before any major winter storms, the council proceeded to let the tender and, at its meeting held on March 29, 1972, the Foreshore and Beaches Committee endorsed the action taken by the Glenelg council and the acceptance of the lowest tender. Cabinet has approved of the tender as recommended by the committee earlier this week.

**UNDERGROUND RAILWAY**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unfortunately, the member for Playford has not returned to the Chamber, so I will ask a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport. Will he say whether any decision has yet been made regarding the underground railway along King William Street? The plan for this underground railway was one of the key proposals regarding the rail rapid transport system under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. Since the Minister came to office nearly

two years ago, other members and I have several times asked him what is proposed regarding this railway, but we have not had any reply from him. I am prompted to ask the question today because I notice that last week it was decided to go ahead with plans for a similar undertaking in Perth.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer is "No".

**HOLDEN HILL HOUSES**

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about certain Housing Trust houses at Holden Hill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Should one of the original purchasers still remaining as a tenant desire to repurchase, the trust would be prepared to negotiate a sale under the present rental-purchase terms, provided that an indemnity was signed that the trust would not be liable for any further responsibility relating to the effect of any future soil movement.

**PRICE CONTROL**

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about a report on price control?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report to which the honourable member has referred concerns the consumer protection functions of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs as set out in section 18a of the Prices Act. Applications and submissions received from either industries or firms for price increases during 1971 for goods and services are as follows:

Under Price Control			
Number of Applications	Approved as Requested	Approved in part	Refused
149	97	47	5
Not Under Price Control			
Number of Submissions	Accepted in Full	Amended by Negotiation	
69	57	12	

It is considered that the price control policy has had a limiting effect on the size of a number of the increases sought.

**TREE FUNGUS**

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has seen a report in the *Financial Review*, of March 30, indicating that a new fungus disease has been introduced into Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: —and that this fungus may be attracted to radiata pine plantations in

Australia, including South Australia? On the front page of this publication an article headed "Imported Disease Decimates Poplars" states:

Golden dreams of Pitt and Collins Street tree farmers are rusting away as a new fungus disease hits poplar plantations in eastern Australia. The cause is a disease, poplar rust or "golden glow", caused by the fungus *melampsora medusae*.

The report goes on to state that poplar plantations in eastern Australia are heavily infested with this fungus, and the following statement appears:

In North America serious damage has been caused to plantations of *pinus radiata* by *melampsora medusae*. A similar pattern of the disease here would pose a serious threat to a major timber resource.

The article goes on to indicate that there is a form of biological control that may counteract this infection. It continues:

There is also a possibility of biological control in the form of an insect, the gall midge. It is obvious that if this fungus becomes rampant in South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: —we will have a serious threat to the pine plantations of this State. I therefore draw the Minister's attention to this article and to the serious threat indicated. I should be grateful if he would inform his colleague and obtain a report on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am delighted to hear from the member for Gouger. I thought we had lost him, but he is back in action again and has referred to the importation of a new fungus. I agree with the honourable member that this is a serious matter. I know that the Minister of Agriculture will be equally as concerned as the honourable member to see that the fungus does not become rampant in South Australia. There are other things that some people hope will not become rampant in South Australia.

#### NON-FAULT COMPENSATION

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question on non-fault compensation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Labor Party has announced as its policy the establishment of a non-fault compensation scheme on a nation-wide basis. It would be difficult to establish such a scheme within one State. I have indicated by answer in the House that I felt sure that the South Australian Government would be prepared to co-operate by way of complementary legislation if necessary to ensure the establishment of such a scheme.

#### EGGS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question on eggs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that, following requests from the South Australian Egg Board and the two main egg producer organizations, a detailed examination of the Egg Marketing Act has been undertaken during recent months. Amendments have been drafted to provide for most of the alterations sought by these organizations. The draft Bill has been discussed with the Egg Board, and the industry organizations will be consulted before it is submitted to Parliament. It is expected that the amending Bill will be presented to Parliament early next session.

#### ABORTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I now have my opportunity to ask the member for Playford whether he will make public the amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act concerning abortion which he intends to introduce. The honourable member has announced his intention of introducing an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act concerning abortion. That was done some time ago, and I see in the *Southern Cross* of March 24, 1972, an article that states:

Last week Mr. McRae announced he had prepared amendments to tighten the present South Australian abortion laws.

I presume, therefore, that the amendments have actually been drafted. I remind the honourable member and other honourable members that, when the law on this subject was last considered by Parliament, the Bill was introduced in one session and then allowed to lie until the next session to give not only members of Parliament but all in the community interested in this subject an opportunity to consider fully the amendments that were proposed, and to make representations to their members and to me, then the Minister. This was, I suggest, a desirable course to adopt and now that the honourable member intends to open up the matter—

Mr. Jennings: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —I suggest that he follow the same course.

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called. Does the member for Playford desire to reply?

Mr. McRAE: Yes. The draft Bill has been prepared and the context will be made known when I introduce it. Its contents are admirable and I expect that the member for



Mitcham will probably second the motion for the second reading of the Bill after he has heard my second reading explanation.

### TEACHER INSURANCE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Education say whether teachers are covered by insurance in the case of an action for teacher negligence occurring while they are on yard duty or on any similar assignment that may come within the ambit of their profession? I have been told that during the ordinary course of a teacher's yard duty difficult situations arise: for example, if a child climbs a tree or on to the roof of a shed and is instructed to come down and does not, and then has an accident, the teacher could, in certain circumstances be liable. I am also given to understand that the decision in the 1969 case of *Ramsay v. Larson* has given rise to concern in this area.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I can imagine a situation where teachers could be held to owe a duty of care and, if it was found on the facts that they had not exercised that duty, they could be penalized heavily. I imagine that the Attorney-General would agree fairly unequivocally with that statement.

The Hon. L. J. King: I think we should change places.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Possibly, but I am not sure that the change would be for the better.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must address the Chair. It is a breach of the Standing Orders to address the Public Gallery.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My right foot slipped, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that we do not provide any insurance cover in these circumstances, and that we would simply adopt the policy of treating any case that arose on its merits. However, in view of the suggestion made by the honourable member, it could well be appropriate to have a thorough look at the policy in this area, and I shall be pleased to do that.

### CAR TRANSACTION

Mr. WELLS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the sale of a car?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs states that the complainant purchased a 1964 Humber Snipe in March, 1971, for \$1,290. He paid \$320 in instalments but, following loss of employment, voluntarily surrendered the vehicle. The

finance company approached three dealers but none was interested in buying it; two indicated this while the third, which had sold the vehicle in the first place and did not wish to buy it back, placed a ridiculously low figure of \$115 on the car. The finance company used this as the basis for calculating a reserve price of \$140 by adding to it expenses associated with the auction. The vehicle was advertised in the auction columns of the *Advertiser* on February 26 and 27, and March 1 and 2, 1972. The auction was conducted at the sale rooms of Theodore Bruce (Auctions) Proprietary Limited, 231 Pulteney Street, Adelaide, on March 2, 1972. The attendance is not known but has been estimated at about 50 people.

The vehicle was not sold, as bidding did not reach the reserve but it was purchased later for \$140, the reserve price, by a private person. The car has been examined and is obviously worth much more. Following an approach by the branch, the dealer was concerned at the outcome of his company's action in quoting a price of \$115 and as a result undertook to take the matter up with the finance company and arrange a complete settlement of the account. A letter has now been received from the finance company indicating that the complainant is no longer under any obligation to the company.

### SWEDISH MIGRANTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the member for Spence say what evidence he has for his assertion in a letter to the editor of the *Advertiser* today that a group of Swedish migrants "were in the higher income brackets in their country, in view of their opposition to paying taxes towards the maintenance of Sweden's welfare State, which they wrongly called Socialism"? The honourable member is a frequent letter writer to the *Advertiser*. A check with the Immigration Department has revealed that of the 150 persons referred to in this case 62 were breadwinners and only one had a qualification above that of skilled tradesman. From the letter, the plain inference is that, if a Commonwealth Labor Government were elected, we could expect greatly increased taxation. In view of the evidence available from the Immigration Department, I ask the honourable member how he came to make this assertion in the letter and what evidence he had for making it.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable member for Spence, I point out to all honourable members that private members do not have to answer questions in relation to

letters to the editor of a newspaper or to any other matter. Moreover, the subject matter of a question should properly concern the business of the House. However, I have let the honourable member for Kavel ask his question. If the honourable member for Spence wishes to reply, provided he makes his reply short, he may do so.

Mr. CRIMES: I am not necessarily prepared to accept what the member for Kavel has said, because I think that my assumption was logical. I agree that there would be reassessment of taxation in Australia on a just and humane basis in the event of a Commonwealth Labor Government being returned.

### COCKCHAFER BEETLE

Mr. WARDLE: To some degree at least, the question of the member for Gouger prepared the atmosphere for my question. I intended to relate my question in terms of pests and vermin, but perhaps I had better stick to fungus. I have received a letter from a constituent who reminds me that he is a citizen of the Nairne, Kanmantoo and Harrogate area (an area well represented in this place). He states that over the past year there has been a most severe infestation of cockchafer beetles, culminating in thousands of acres of denuded pasture. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any investigations are being made into exterminating these pests and whether any help is available to landholders of a type similar to that which applies in respect of varieties of vermin, grasshoppers and other pests?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report from my colleague for the honourable member.

### ST. AGNES SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on arrangements made for sewerage the housing subdivision bordered by Hancock and Whiting Roads, St. Agnes, including such streets as Eucalypt Parade? Will he say whether the area is connected to the Engineering and Water Supply Department's trunk main sewer? I have received complaints from constituents that offensive effluent is flowing down some streets. This should not occur if all houses are connected to a common effluent drainage scheme, the outlet of which should be connected to an Engineering and Water Supply Department trunk main sewer. Although some houses in this subdivision are newly built, some have been erected about three years ago.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from the department for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible. If I cannot get it before tomorrow, the honourable member may rest assured that I will make sure she gets a report by post.

### EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

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

It makes certain necessary metric conversions to the principal Act, the Explosives Act, 1936-1968. There are nine references in the principal Act to "twenty-five pounds of gun powder" and "five pounds of other explosives". The rough metric equivalent of these amounts is twelve and one-half kilograms and two and one-half kilograms respectively.

It seems that these figures could well be rounded off to "fifteen kilograms" and "three kilograms" respectively without detriment to public safety and the Government's advisers in this matter have recommended accordingly. The enactment of this Bill will assist in the conversion to metric system of measurements of the regulations under the principal Act.

*Later:*

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I was intrigued by the comment in the second reading explanation that "the rough metric equivalent of these amounts is 121 kg and 21 kg respectively". Earlier approximations this session have not been preceded by the word "rough", but they were very rough and it was necessary to amend some Bills.

Mr. Ryan: To smooth them out.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. I agree to smoothing out this legislation by increasing the quantity slightly. I see no problem in increasing 121 kg to 15 kg and 21 kg to 3 kg. That is in accord with present-day trends. These alterations to the principal Act are a series of repetitive actions in a number of clauses. The Bill has my support.

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

### METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference to be held in the Legislative Council committee room at 9.30 p.m.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): moved:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the time and place appointed by the Legislative Council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not want to hold this up, but 9.30 p.m. is an unusual hour. Normally, a conference is held immediately after the dinner adjournment. No doubt the Government has good reason for this and has arranged accordingly. Can the Minister give some indication of the time table for this House and can he say why 9.30 p.m. has been fixed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Two conferences are being held this evening. One was agreed to by the House yesterday, about which I think the Deputy Leader knows, at 9.30 p.m. and this one is merely set to coincide with that.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister has replied to the question but he has not replied to the debate on the motion. In accordance with Standing Orders, when a Minister replies to any debate he naturally closes the debate as the mover of the motion and in accordance with Standing Orders I would have to rule that way. The question before the House is "That the motion be agreed to."

Motion carried.

### **INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL**

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message.

(For wording of message, see page 4547.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be not insisted on.

I regret that the Legislative Council has seen fit to insist on its amendments, which have the effect of limiting to some extent, albeit perhaps not to a great extent, the classes of person who may apply for provision within an estate of a deceased person. I have said many times in this House (and I think my sentiments have been echoed by the member for Mitcham) that the mere fact that the right to apply is extended to a class of person does not mean necessarily that a court will make an order in favour of an applicant from that class: it merely means that the right to go to court is left open. However, those arguments have failed to prevail in another place and we are faced with an insistence by the Legislative

Council on its amendments. As I see little prospect of further advance being made if we have a conference, I do not think we would be justified in laying aside a Bill that makes such a substantial improvement in the law of the State. I accordingly recommend to the Committee that disagreement be not insisted upon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am surprised and disappointed that the Minister has taken this view. I do not oppose his motion, because he is the Minister in charge of the Bill and he has the numbers anyway; but I should have thought that we could go to a conference on this with a fair prospect of persuading our friends in the Council that the provisions of the original Bill were fair and reasonable. I know it may be said (in fact, it has been said in another place) that the retention of the Bill in its original form would mean that our law would be wider than the law anywhere else, even in New Zealand where this legislation originated. To me, however, that is not necessarily a bad thing. I am disappointed that we shall not try to get what this place originally wanted, namely, that the provision regarding the classes of person who can go to the court for relief be as it was when the Bill was introduced. I am sorry that the Attorney-General has taken the action that he has taken.

Motion carried.

### **COMMERCIAL AND PRIVATE AGENTS BILL**

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message.

(For wording of message, see page 4552.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

I think that the three principal amendments are those dealing, first, with the exclusion of loss assessors from the provisions of the Bill; secondly, with the deletion of the provision creating an offence for inquiry agents or agents who are unlawfully on premises without the consent of the occupant; and thirdly, with the alteration in the constitution of the board. I regard all three matters as being of great importance to the Bill and, therefore, I ask the Committee to insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Again I find myself at odds with the Attorney-General, but this time for the opposite reason.

The Hon. L. J. King: You're very hard to please.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney is being a little unpredictable. He gave in to the Upper House regarding amendments to an earlier Bill and now, when he should see the wisdom of the amendments that the Legislative Council is insisting on, he will not give in. I feel strongly regarding the inquiry agents, and I know that many other people also do. I am aware that the Attorney knows that members of the legal profession feel strongly that the clause forbidding inquiry agents and others from going on property is a bad one and will work considerable injustice. That clause should go out, and the Legislative Council has taken it out.

Regarding loss assessors, in my view the Attorney-General has not treated them courteously. There may well be a case of having some control over them, but they should have been consulted as to the proposals for the control of that calling, not just invited to make representations to the committee. Perhaps I would not argue with the Attorney about the constitution of the board but, overall, I feel that the Legislative Council's amendments are desirable and that they improve the Bill. Therefore, I cannot support the motion.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Brookman, Burdon, King, McRae, and Millhouse.

Later, a message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 6.

### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 7, lines 1 to 4 (clause 15)—Leave out all words after "amended" in line 1 and insert—"—

- (a) by striking out from subsection (1) the word 'Every' and inserting in lieu thereof the passage 'Subject to subsection (1a) of this section, every';
- (b) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage 'in quantities of not less than one time than one gallon of spirits, or two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor to be taken away at one time by one person' and inserting in lieu thereof the passage 'to be taken away';

and

(c) by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsections:—

(la) The aggregate quantity of liquor sold and disposed of to any one person on any one occasion—

- (a) where the liquor consists of wine or brandy, or wine and brandy—must be not less than two litres;
- (b) where the liquor consists of spirits (other than brandy)—must be not less than four and a half litres;

and

(c) in any other case—must be not less than nine litres.

(lb) In this section—

'wine' includes mead, cider, perry and any other fermented liquor derived from fruit or vegetables."

No. 2. Page 10 (clause 21)—After line 10 insert new paragraph (aa) as follows:—

"(aa) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage 'half past seven o'clock' and inserting in lieu thereof the passage 'half past six o'clock':".

No. 3. Page 11, lines 2 to 8 (clause 23) — Leave out subsection (1a) and insert new subsection (1a) as follows:—

"(1a) The fee—

(a) for a club licence subject to a condition requiring the licensee to purchase the liquor required for the purposes of the club from a full publican's licence;

or

(b) for a club licence where the club is entitled in pursuance of this Act to purchase liquor from the Returned Sailors' Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Club,

shall be an amount of not less than fifty dollars and not more than two hundred and fifty dollars, fixed in accordance with the rules of the Court."

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The substantial amendments inserted by the Legislative Council relate to the assimilation of the position of the distiller's storekeeper's licence with that of the vigneron's licence as to minimum quantity. The Bill, as it left this place, reduced the minimum quantity that could be sold by vignerons to 2 l. The Legislative Council inserted an amendment making a like reduction, at any rate regarding wine and brandy, in the distiller's storekeeper's licence, and that proposition seems reasonable.

I make no complaint about it and suggest that the Committee agree to it.

The other amendment made by the Legislative Council relates to the provision fixing the fee for a licensed club where the court has imposed a condition that the club purchase from a retailer. That provision in the Bill is that in such a case the court may impose a fee between \$50 and \$250. The amendment made by the Legislative Council extends this provision also to the case of a Returned Services League sub-branch which is a licensed club and which has a right under the provisions of the Act to purchase its liquor from the R.S.L. headquarters club, instead of from a licensed retailer. No R.S.L. sub-branch is a licensed club now and it is therefore not a practical matter at present. However, the situation could arise, and I have no objection to the provision.

Motion carried.

#### **LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 29. Page 4457.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In explaining the Bill, the Attorney-General said:

One of its principal objects is to make provision for the establishment of funds for the development of racecourses for horse-racing, trotting and dog-racing in this State. The moneys from these funds will be derived from double, treble and jackpot totalizator pools where the Totalizator Agency Board operates on or off-course.

He added that to finance this scheme the sum deducted from the pool of the double, treble and jackpot totalizators would be increased 1 per cent, that is, to 15 per cent. It is estimated that this will yield about \$115,000 a year, and that sum. will be paid to a board to be known as the Racecourses Development Board. The establishment of this board and of various other boards contemplated under the Bill will be of immense value to horse-racing, trotting and greyhound-racing, and it will enable the respective organizations confidently to plan for the benefit of their industry. Indeed, racing has grown into a large industry, from the breeding aspect to the racing aspect, and it is a valuable industry to South Australia. The industry has grown especially since the inception of several studs in this State that are now well known throughout Australia. Horses bred here have been purchased by oversea buyers and exported to Asian countries. I point out, too, that trotting horses have gained world-wide fame, and it is

expected that a similar situation will apply soon in respect of greyhounds.

The sources available at present to the various bodies for capital development purposes are limited, and at present capital expenditure is financed from profits. However, it is difficult in the present circumstances to make a substantial profit from horse-racing and trotting in order to provide increased facilities. When we are talking about providing certain types of accommodation on a racecourse, we are talking in tens of thousands of dollars. Any board established to administer moneys used in this regard must be soundly administered for the benefit of whichever aspect of racing is involved. However, I have full confidence that the members of the board established will use common sense in planning and in developing racecourses and trotting courses, as well as greyhound tracks.

Worthwhile improvements will have to be made by various clubs. Unfortunately, over the years we have seen the smaller country clubs disappearing, and it has been widely suggested in racing circles for a considerable time now that the situation concerning metropolitan racecourses may have to be rationalized. It is a matter of determining whether a city the size of Adelaide can profitably maintain three racecourses. I should not like to suggest which course should disappear.

The Hon. L. J. King: I know one that you wouldn't suggest should disappear.

Mr. BECKER: Perhaps capital expenditure required, together with the increasing costs of maintaining courses, will force the racing industry to consider this matter more seriously. However, I hope that what I have suggested may occur can be avoided. The various clubs will benefit substantially from the provisions of this Bill. All clubs must continue to attract spectators, because they represent the bread and butter of these clubs. Young people must be attracted as patrons and facilities provided that will be suitable for members of the family unit who may care to attend meetings and have a pleasant day out, at the same time perhaps making moderate investments on the totalizator or with book-makers, depending on their means. I believe that no club desires to attract patrons simply to encourage them to fritter away all their money by gambling. Indeed, we do not wish to see the Americanization of our racecourses. We do not wish to see provided absolute luxury that only a few can afford.

Racing events must be of a high standard, and we must do everything we can to ensure

that the stake money provided by the clubs and the competition that exists are sufficiently high to attract spectators. I believe that at some stage stake money must be increased and that we must reverse the present situation wherein our best horses and greyhounds are taken to the Eastern States by their owners, who are attracted to the conditions applying in those States. It is generally considered today that after a race horse has won one or two races in South Australia it is taken to Victoria where it spends the rest of its racing life, and this is a pity especially for those who loyally support the sport but who miss the opportunity of following the success of their favourite horses. I am pleased to see improved facilities being provided for the punters, who are basically the ones who support the racing industry.

The average working person who visits a course makes win, place and quinella investments. By investing on the win and place totalizator, punters have the opportunity of receiving a place dividend if the horse is in one of the first three placed. The double, treble or jackpot totalizator could fit into the luxury class of investment and I consider that the additional 1 per cent reduction from this source will have a small effect on the overall

dividend, whereas an increase on the win, place, or quinella of 1 per cent could have a considerable effect. If a racecourse development fund is to be established, an area should be selected that can afford the additional 1 per cent and the former area may attract also the larger investor, the speculator, especially when a jackpot builds up. This is unfortunate for the average punter who may like to have only one or two units, especially when he is faced with competition from larger punters investing in 1,000 or 2,000 units.

Concerning the method of financing the racecourse development board, I ask why the Government has not looked at the area from which it receives considerable benefit, such as fractions and unclaimed dividends. I refer to the Fifth Annual Report of the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board for the financial year ended June 30, 1971, which states:

It is most unreasonable that fractions amounting to \$883,089 (0.92 per cent of turnover), which form part of investors' funds, should be taken from the pool by the Government and absorbed as Government revenue.

The report also sets out the amounts received by the Government from the operations of the board, as follows:

	Amount (\$)		Per cent of turnover
	This year \$	Total to date \$	
Stamp duty.....	1,513,008	4,252,268	4.43
Fractions.....	285,050	883,089	0.92
Unclaimed dividends.....	58,907	249,565	0.26
Commission on New South Wales investments (Broken Hill).....	2,779	7,305	0.01
Total.....	\$1,859,744	\$5,392,227	5.62

The Chairman also states in his report that, during the year, off-course turnover received was \$31,465,762.50, an increase of 23.49 per cent over the figure for 1969-70. Of this turnover, 79.63 per cent (\$25,057,654) came from cash agencies, that is, T.A.B. agencies, 16.59 per cent (\$5,219,209) came from telephone betting accounts and 3.78 per cent (\$1,188,899) came from subagencies. Members will know that in about September last year the T.A.B. turnover exceeded \$100,000,000. The report highlights the fact that the Government has received a huge amount in fractions, a total of \$249,565 in unclaimed dividends, which represents 1.18 per cent of moneys invested by the public. If an investor invests a dollar with the T.A.B.,

he loses 14 per cent (the percentage the Government takes from the investment pool), and a person must always lose 14 per cent from his \$1 bet. If the amounts of fractions and unclaimed dividends are taken into account (another 1.18 per cent) then, from the \$1 outlaid, 15.18 per cent is lost. If a person invests in doubles, trebles or jackpot systems there will be an additional 1 per cent taken out making, in total, 16.18 per cent. The State cannot but gain from this. A similar percentage goes back to the racing clubs but overall the punters using the services and the facilities of the T.A.B. lose; yet it is they who keep the business going, and who are again being asked to provide racecourse improvement funds.

Although fractions and unclaimed dividends received from the T.A.B. go to the Hospitals Fund, the Government could have considered another method of financing development by making a contribution directly to the board, thus leaving the percentage taken from the pool as it is. That would mean that the State would be subsidizing the development of race-courses and that the overall cost would be shared among the taxpaying population, instead of being met by a small number of people who loyally support racing and who have invested with the T.A.B.

The Bill also introduces the system of the same-day pay-out, which is in line with developments in other States and is something that has had to come. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

... dividends on off-course betting are paid out after each race. However, the Government believes that this is a system which could lead to loitering in T.A.B. premises and so the idea has been discarded. The Bill provides that the T.A.B. may pay out dividends on off-course betting after the conclusion of the particular race meeting and that such payment shall be made in accordance with the rules of the board.

The T.A.B. agencies will remain open late in the evening to accommodate punters who wish to collect their dividends that they were fortunate enough to win during the day. But there is another reason for this: if there is a race meeting during the day and a greyhound or trotting meeting in the evening, it is reasonable to assume that some people will go, at the completion of a race meeting, to collect their dividends and they may immediately reinvest them on trotting or greyhound events to be held that evening. The Minister virtually spelled this out in explaining the Bill, when he said:

The Government believes that such an increase in turnover will occur in this State if this Bill becomes law. The obvious benefits that would flow therefrom are as follows:

- (1) An increase in State revenue.
- (2) An increase in revenue for the various racing bodies.
- (3) A reduction in the present security problem which results from the large sums of money held in agencies at the end of a race day.
- (4) More active competition with the licensed betting shops in Port Pirie which of course can pay out after each race.
- (5) Further discouragement of the activities of illegal bookmakers.

We realize that the more money that is put through the T.A.B. the greater will be the turnover and the benefit to the State. We also realize that in some cases there will be

a greater payment to racing bodies in their share. Moreover, this move will help to overcome the unfortunate problem facing society today of armed holdups and other robberies from T.A.B. agencies, banks and any other organization that handles large sums of money. I hope that this move will reduce the occurrence of robberies from T.A.B. agencies.

It may be a good thing for there to be more active competition with betting shops in Port Pirie, although on my two visits to those betting shops I have never seen anything untoward. I believe they have served a good purpose, and the fact that they are well conducted is to the credit of those who operate them. I cannot really recall anyone being charged recently with being an illegal starting price bookmaker. One would hope that the establishment of the T.A.B. has brought about the virtual disappearance of S.P. bookmakers. The only advantages those bookmakers would have over the T.A.B. is that they deduct nothing from a dividend, whereas a punter loses 14 per cent, or 15 per cent in the case of jackpots, doubles, and trebles, with the T.A.B. Of course, there is a chance that an S.P. bookmaker will not pay at all but, as I have never had a bet with such bookmakers and as I do not intend to do so, I guess I am unqualified to speak about that.

The main purpose of the Bill is to boost T.A.B. revenue. The Government is using this as a simple way of obtaining more revenue. We cannot blame the Government for this, because gambling in the Eastern States is big business. The revenue that the other States, especially New South Wales, receive from illegal gambling is considerable. When reimbursements from the Commonwealth Government to this State through the Grants Commission are considered, we are in some difficulty because New South Wales, which is one of the standard States, claims that it boosts its revenue from taxes on gambling operations. We are considerably behind in this category. At the same time, I do not advocate at all that poker machines should be licensed. The Bill provides for ploughing back into the fields of horse-racing, trotting and greyhound-racing the sum derived from the additional one per cent, and this will assist with racecourse development. The racecourse development fund will grow in time and we will see the benefit at future meetings.

On the other hand, I can see certain dangers in respect of this Bill. We must be a little

careful of the future operations of the T.A.B. I am sure that when the T.A.B. was originally planned, the idea was to take over to some degree the illegal activities of S.P. bookmakers, but it was never intended that the T.A.B. should take over the role of betting shops. It was intended that the T.A.B. would conduct off-course totalizer agencies, but not that it should conduct on-course agencies as well. It was never intended that the T.A.B. should become an investor or money-lender. We should consider this matter carefully, because the T.A.B. has been able to build up investments and also make loans to various clubs in the racing field. The latest case is that of a proposal for the T.A.B. to lend \$450,000 to the South Australian Trotting League to establish Bolivar. One can argue that perhaps that money should go direct to the horse-racing, trotting and greyhound-racing clubs. It could be said that it is wise to have certain investments to back up the T.A.B. but, at the same time, it is hard to understand why all the profits of the T.A.B. are not being passed over to the various organizations.

I think that the time has come when we must look closely at the activities of the T.A.B. We have seen the T.A.B. now operating on-course totalizers. In vigorously pursuing this policy, it is providing some competition for automatic totalizers. Whether we want a nationalized totalizer system in South Australia is something we must consider at a later date. It is another matter whether the racing clubs should have the right to conduct their own totalizers. In the T.A.B., we have created a giant organization, which is very successful and well run. This organization may be prepared to use its resources to take over all totalizers in the State. At present, the T.A.B. operates on all metropolitan trotting, dog-racing and horse-racing meetings, as well as at country meetings, Victorian metropolitan and country meetings, New South Wales meetings, Queensland meetings, New Zealand meetings, Tasmanian meetings, and even meetings in the United Kingdom.

The Hon. L. J. King: You can get a bet on a meeting in Djakarta.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. I wonder whether we will get to the stage where we can bet on two flies crawling up the wall. The T.A.B. appears as though it will stop at nothing in increasing its turnover. It has also used the advertising media, and advertises in its agencies to promote legal gambling. The other side of this coin is that this could be fast becoming a social issue in South Australia. We should

consider whether legalized gambling is getting out of control. It could be said that the T.A.B. has an effect on the economy in certain areas. With a pay-out on the same day, people will be encouraged to reinvest their winnings at a faster rate than was the case when they collected their winnings on the next day, and possibly had them during the following week. Moreover, from every \$1 invested on the T.A.B. the punter loses 14 per cent. The State always wins and it will continue to win through the increased turnover of the T.A.B. as a result of this Bill, although there is the provision for this 1 per cent to go to the racecourses development fund. The punter is being asked to carry the brunt of establishing new facilities. He cannot escape: he is being asked to pay the extra 1 per cent levy.

I thought that when the T.A.B. was first established all profits would be ploughed back into racing and that we would follow the other States, particularly New South Wales where the profits from the T.A.B. were to be handed on to the racing clubs and a certain percentage was to be spent on racecourse development, a certain percentage on administration where the racing clubs were having difficulty in making a profit, and a certain percentage on prizes. In South Australia this is not done: the racing clubs here can do what they wish with the money and they are putting it into administration and stake money. In New South Wales the racing clubs are spending much more money out of the T.A.B. profits on racecourse development and the provincial courses have excellent facilities.

Perhaps we should look at the whole structure of the T.A.B. and consider whether we should not amend the Act to ensure that clubs do this. Bookmakers are finding it extremely difficult to maintain their turnover and they have been asked to increase their contribution to the State. They also contribute to the Government through unclaimed dividends. The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1971, states that all unclaimed dividends by bookmakers amounted to about \$60,000.

The unclaimed dividends from the T.A.B. are paid direct to the Hospital Fund. This is unusual because normally unclaimed dividends should go to a special account in the Treasury and remain there for the statutory seven years before going to Consolidated Revenue, similarly to the way unclaimed bank balances are disposed of.

The T.A.B., like most other organizations, is facing increased costs and we do not want



to see 20 per cent being deducted from the investment pool of the races, as is done in America. If that stage is reached, the punter will have to consider other means of betting. The Bill is straightforward in establishing a new board and several sub-boards. It establishes a board of seven for racecourse development and it also establishes three other boards to deal with horse-racing, trotting and greyhound-racing. I have an amendment on the file dealing with the composition of the board.

Another clause amends the rule where the Betting Control Board controls the licences for bookmakers, bookmakers' agents and bookmakers' clerks. At present an applicant must be resident in the State for 12 months prior to his application. Bookmakers are finding that clerks are being transferred to this State because of their employment. Although they have operated in other States as bookmakers' clerks, they must wait 12 months before they are able to seek similar employment here. By our amending this provision, a licensed bookmaker's clerk who is transferred to this State because of his employment can immediately carry on as a licensed bookmaker's clerk if he so desires.

The Bill also makes certain alterations in respect of metric conversion, and I know that the signs around the race tracks are being altered to read 100 m, 200 m, and so on, and clubs are putting metric measurements in the race books. Looking at it from a realistic point of view, this Bill had to be introduced and it is one we have to accept but I give warning that I think we are creating an enormous giant—the T.A.B.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I will not say very much, because the member for Hanson has discussed the Bill thoroughly. However, I do believe he has missed the point about bookmakers. I will not say very much about the contributions made to racing by the bookmakers compared with the large amounts that are taken from the smaller punter who bets with the T.A.B. We have heard that racing clubs will not thrive under these conditions. There is much talk about the glamour of betting with bookmakers, but I tried it out at Oakbank last Monday and I could not see anything glamorous about being trodden on in the hurly-burly of the betting ring. I believe it is much better to queue up in a short well-ordered line at the tote.

If we had a computerized system of showing the odds immediately as they have in other countries where they rely on the tote, I think it would be a much more attractive system.

In the countries that have only totalizator betting, horse-racing is thriving. In England, where there is betting away from the course, horse-racing is not up to the standard of other countries.

I believe that taking 15 per cent plus another 1 per cent is a step in the wrong direction. There should be a reduction in the rate collected on the T.A.B. system so that the tote could compete better with the S.P. bookmaker and the bookmaker on the course. This would help equalize the contribution to horse-racing and the sport could get somewhere. I have proved my case but I do not think anyone is willing to listen to it, even though it would mean more justice and prosperity for the racing industry. Although the primary producers have been criticized for many things, they have got around to orderly operation much more quickly than those who are running the horse-racing industry in this State have done. The sooner those concerned try to make horse-racing prosperous and stop asking Parliament for more money to carry on, the sooner the horse-racing industry will thrive.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Enactment of Part IVA of principal Act."

Mr. BECKER: I move:

In new section 48g (2) to strike out "three" and insert "four"; and to strike out "one of whom shall be the chairman or his deputy" and insert "(of whom one is the chairman or his deputy, one is a member appointed to represent the interests of horse-racing, other than trotting, one is a member appointed to represent the interests of trotting and one is a member appointed to represent the interests of dog—racing)".

I consider that it would be far better to provide for a quorum of four rather than three and to spell out that one of the members present be a representative from horse-racing, one be a representative from trotting, and one be a representative from greyhound-racing. If the quorum were three, in terms of the present provision two members could come from, horse-racing and the Chairman could be inclined towards horse-racing. In that case, the racing people could do something without the trotting or greyhound people knowing. I do not think this is likely, but the position should be spelt out.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I am sure that the honourable member has a well prepared speech that could have been edifying. However, I am pleased that he has

accepted my invitation. I see the force of his argument, and I accept the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 29 passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### OATS MARKETING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 28. Page 4358.)

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the voluntary pool that has been operating for several years has certain limitations which permit wide fluctuations in price and which have a detrimental effect on the long-term prospects of the oat-growing industry. After much consideration, the Government has introduced this Bill to set up an oat-marketing board and to bring about some price stability in the industry as well as, we hope, some economic benefit to oat-growers. This action is in line with Government policy to set up boards to market primary produce if desired by the growers concerned. Oat-marketing boards have been operating with some degree of success for some years in both Victoria and New South Wales. The barley-marketing board, an organization comprising representatives from both Victoria and South Australia, has provided much stability in this important primary industry.

Some doubts have been expressed whether the oat-marketing board as it is proposed will be able to operate for the benefit of growers, because of the limitations imposed by section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. In this respect, however, all boards engaged in marketing primary products suffer from the same disabilities arising under that provision, and it is only with the goodwill of growers engaged in a specific industry that they can benefit as a whole. I trust that all oatgrowers in this State will see the benefit that will result from an orderly marketing scheme for their product. It is one of the unfortunate facts of life that, when considering the orderly marketing of primary products, we always must take into account the operations of the rugged individualist who will not be in the overall scheme with the majority of growers, because he considers that he can do better on his own.

Perhaps this person can do better on his own. but the majority of growers are willing to band together for the benefit of all. The Bill sets out in detail the powers, duties and

functions of the board and, as no doubt the measure has been studied by all members, I will not delay its passage. I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Like my good friend from Chaffey, I strongly support the Bill, which I am pleased the Government has seen fit to introduce. I hope the measure will receive a speedy passage through both Houses. Largely because of a need to diversify production, many growers in my district have grown considerable quantities of oats over the last few years. This situation has arisen mainly because of the introduction of wheat quotas, a scheme that has not been as successful as many hoped it would be. I was pleased to see that under the Bill a majority of growers would be represented on the board, as should be the case regarding any statutory marketing authority.

Mr. Curren: We don't want them all to be business men.

Mr. GUNN: We must have some business men and, as long as the board is grower controlled, it will function in the best interests of growers generally. We do not want people such as Mr. Cooper, whose recent activities are known to most members, coming from Victoria and trying to foment much strife throughout the industry, especially in this State. We have seen an attempt to undermine the operations of the board as it has functioned in Victoria and in this State, and we have not been able to do anything about trading across the border. Oats have been shipped from Thevenard in my district for some years now, and the people in this area produce large quantities of oats, having been unable to grow barley. I believe that they will continue to grow large quantities of oats because it is a high quality oat.

Indeed, I hope that the board established will see its way clear to ensure that growers are paid according to the quality of their product, whereas at present that is not possible. If there is a separating process and payment is made according to quality, people will be encouraged to produce more oats. Here, I compliment the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited on the assistance it has provided in the past. The co-operative has fine representatives, including my friend the member for Rocky River. We know that this organization always acts in the best interests of growers, and I am sure it will co-operate to facilitate the board's operations. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I, too, support the Bill. Although I have some reservations about whether or not the measure will be successful, I emphasize that that is not the point: we are considering a marketing procedure that is now accepted in respect of all grain produced and, if the growers concerned wish to try this procedure, I believe they should be given the opportunity to do so. Clause 35 (2) provides that a poll shall not be held within two years after the holding of any previous poll under this clause, and a poll can only be conducted if not fewer than 300 growers agree to it. Bearing in mind that wheat production controls have been introduced and that the production of other grains has been diversified, I believe it is interesting to note the following acreages sown to oats: 1966-67, 509,000 acres; 1968-69, 516,000 acres; and 1970-71, 482,000 acres. We see that the acreage sown to oats has been fairly consistent during this period. In 1971, total production of oats was 8,400,000 bushels, which was less than the previous years to which I have referred. Production figures are as follows:

1966-67 . . . .	10,276,000bush.
1968-69 . . . .	11,895,000bush.
1970-71 . . . .	8,408,000bush.

It is interesting to see where these oats are grown. In 1970-71, 1,670,000bush. was grown on Eyre Peninsula; 1,270,000bush. in the South-East; 523,000bush. in the Central area; 771,000bush. in the Northern and Southern Ranges; 747,000bush. in the Mallee, including the Upper and Lower Murray areas; and 1,040,000bush. in the Frome and Northern areas. The major oat-growing area is Eyre Peninsula, which is followed by the South-East, the Northern area, and a smattering of oats is grown through the central area and eastern ranges of the State. It was not easy to obtain these figures.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation going on. The member for Mallee has the floor and this conversation must cease.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have obtained figures from the statistician's office concerning the export of oats in the year 1968-69. The export figure given me for that year was 875,000bush. at a value of \$578,484, or an average price of 66c a bushel. In that same year 11,895,000 bush. of oats was grown and much of the crop was consumed for one purpose or another within the State. We have been told that the board will be involved with the export and handling of oats within South Australia and

that it will act as an agent between the producer, stock food manufacturer and anyone else who wishes to buy oats. However, there is one exception: that is, the Bill provides for farmer-to-farmer dealing. I suggest that most of the oats produced in South Australia over a long period have been used largely on the properties on which they have been grown, or in areas in which they have been grown, for stock feed purposes.

It was for this reason that I questioned earlier the value this board will have in the long term, because it seems that a large part of the oats produced is for local consumption. The Bill provides for local consumption to be covered by allowing sales between producers, not only for stock feed but for seed and hay. Unless there is to be a large increase in the production of oats for export, it appears that the board will not be handling a large volume of production. I hope that, as a consequence of the setting up of the board and as a result of the powers given to the board to obtain export markets and to handle the export of oats, the volume is increased, and that it will provide an alternative avenue of production for many oat producers. At this time, however, there is no indication that this is likely to happen. I am also concerned with the setting up of the board. Clause 21 (b) of the Bill provides that the board may—

borrow money to enable it to exercise any of the powers or functions conferred on it by this Act, and give security over any of its assets for repayment of money so borrowed;

Will the Minister say how the board is able to obtain the necessary assets against which it can borrow in order to become established? I know that a statutory authority can obtain a grant or a loan from the State Bank, because it is a Government instrumentality. I realize that this provision is similar to a provision in respect of the Barley Board, but that board has been established for a long time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It had to begin.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think it began with a larger percentage of its production going for export rather than for local use. I do not disagree with the principle behind the Bill: in fact, I support the principle. I am concerned, however, that I cannot, on the figures available, confirm that there is a large volume of oats that can be handled for export by the board during its initial stages. Unless it is a good year for oat production on Eyre Peninsula, concern has been expressed to me that there may be an insufficient quantity of oats to enable the board to become viable

and fully operational. Undoubtedly these matters have been considered by the Minister. I know that the concept of an Oats Board is not new, because in 1965 a Bill was introduced at the same time of the session by the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. G. A. Bywaters), and that Bill did not provide for farmer-to-farmer trading in respect of either seed or feed. I attempted to have that Bill amended and, as a result, the Bill was lost at that time. I can find no fault at this time, because the provisions I wanted incorporated in the earlier Bill are now incorporated in this Bill. However, problems are involved in the setting up of a board with this volume of trade, because it represents such a small percentage of the total oat production of this State. If the establishment of the board results in improved marketing, the finding of new overseas markets, the reduction of oat contamination caused by the use of too much insecticide while oats are in storage, and a profitable return to the grower as well as encouraging greater production. I am in favour of it because I support the principle of orderly statutory marketing.

Mr. Rodda: Will there be potential in the Bill?

Mr. NANKIVELL: There is potential. Indeed, there has been potential for oat growing for a long time, but figures do not show that growers wish to take advantage of it.

Mr. Venning: The industry has been a shemuzzle for so long.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I hope that it will become a viable and energetic industry as a result of this legislation, which I support.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I oppose the Bill. Many members on both sides of the Chamber have supported the Bill with their tongues in their cheek. There has not been much information given about what the provisions of the Bill will achieve. I do not believe for one minute that, within the foreseeable future, the provisions of the Bill will achieve a better price for oat growers. Not one of my colleagues has shown that a better price will result. I do not say that I am against orderly marketing. However, until the time is reached when it is necessary to get involved in orderly marketing, we should leave this approach alone, and I do not believe that this time has been reached in the case of oat growing. The situation with regard to wheat is entirely different, as the point has been reached where there is over-supply and over-production. Of course, in that case it is necessary to control production

and to have orderly marketing. However, I fail to see that we have reached that stage with regard to oats.

I noticed that the member for Chaffey used the words "some success" when referring to how this Bill had been greeted by people. I think all members have to say that the Bill met with only some success in Victoria and New South Wales. Until it can be proved that this authority can be established on a Commonwealth-wide basis and that it can operate on a similar basis to that on which the Wheat Board operates, I do not believe that South Australia should have a bar of this legislation. It is not difficult to deal with the feasibility of the Bill. No-one has yet explained how the farmer will get access to his oats. This should have been one of the first considerations. My colleagues on my left, who are the spokesmen for primary producers, are always talking about extra advantages for the farmer. I go along with them that we should protect the interests of those engaged in agriculture. However, they have produced no evidence to show that this move will assist farmers. I am sorry that in this case I must speak to some degree from the opposite side of the issue, in that I speak as a fairly large consumer of manufactured quality feed.

Mr. Venning: On whose behalf are you speaking?

Mr. WARDLE: I speak purely on behalf of myself. I do not believe that any economic benefit can be derived from this legislation. I am sympathetic towards the provision dealing with trade between farmers, but I think that this will be a tremendous disadvantage to the remainder of those who buy and sell oats. Why should feed manufacturers be at a disadvantage? Why should a farmer be able to buy oats from his neighbour more cheaply than a manufacturer can buy them? Why should oat growers have this special privilege? I do not see why any section of the community, whether the manufacturing section, the consuming section, or the growing section, should be privileged over any other section. The fact that the price of manufactured feed is controlled has not been appreciated. At present, feed manufacturers work on a fine margin, with many organizations tendering a price for feed. In such a competitive business, the tender margin is fine. When boards are established prices never fall but usually increase handsomely. If there is an increase of 7c or 8c a bushel for oats as a result of this board, feed manufacturers,

who have difficulty making out at present and who have to pay various fees and charges, will be at a further disadvantage, because the board will control the price of the commodity they are purchasing.

In this legislation we are doing two things: we are encouraging feed manufacturers to compete with oat growers by growing their own product, and this has already begun. I believe that in future feed manufacturers will grow a much greater quantity of oats than they grow at present. No-one has said why this will not happen, or even that it will not happen. Secondly, no-one has been able to show that, by adopting this legislation, we will discourage feed manufacturers in other States from sending stock feed to South Australia, and undoubtedly they will send it here. I will not support this Bill in any circumstances.

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): Although I support the Bill, I regard it as being almost as itchy as are oats themselves. Only those who have harvested oats know how itchy they can make the person who harvests them. I believe that, in setting up statutory boards in the past for the marketing of certain agricultural and horticultural products, we have proved that this course is successful. However, whenever a board has been set up to market such products and the total product has not been marketed through the board, marketing of the product through the board has broken down. When the Minister of Agriculture asked me whether I thought this board would be a success, I said that I did not think it would be successful, because I thought it would be too easy for farmers to throw bags of oats over the fence to one another. I believe that this marketing board will not be successful as it will be too easy for farmers to farm a sale.

As a large consumer of another grain, why should I not be able to purchase that grain from my next-door neighbour, just as farmers will be able to purchase oats for their own use from their neighbours, according to the provisions of the Bill? I believe that the board will not function successfully, because the total grain harvested will not be sold through the board we are establishing. I support the Bill because of the principle involved in establishing a board for the marketing of the grain.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Composition of the board."

Mr. VENNING: I move:

In subclause (1) (b) to strike out

"biennially" and insert "triennially".

I consider that two years is not sufficiently long for a member of this board fully to understand the work of the board and the business of marketing, and I think that in fairness to members they should be given at least three years' experience before being subject to re-election.

Amendment carried.

Mr. GUNN: The Bill provides that three members shall be elected by the growers. Will the State be zoned into three areas such as Eyre Peninsula, Mid-North, and the South, or will members be elected from the whole of

the State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I am not aware of the method that will be employed or whether the State will be divided into three zones.

Mr. Venning: It is zoned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of this. Just to be sure, I will check and let the honourable member know.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Sale and delivery of oats."

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say whether it will be possible for the board to impose a levy on sales made by primary producers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as I know, that is not intended. All that is required of a producer who is selling is that he register the sale and report only on the quantity of oats involved in the transaction. As far as I know, that is for statistical purposes only and not to impose a levy. However, I will check with the Minister of Agriculture and let the honourable member know privately afterwards.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 to 34 passed.

Clause 35—"Polls on continuation of this Act."

Mr. VENNING: I move:

In subclause (1) after "after" to insert "the expiration of a period of two years next following".

As the subclause stands, the required number of growers could undertake a poll and throw the Act out long before the scheme had an opportunity to develop. I consider that it is necessary to provide for at least two years of operation so that the scheme can establish itself.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I support the amendment. Initially I was confused, believing that

existing provisions prevented a vote from being taken within two years. I am speaking now to qualify my remarks in the second reading debate and to say that I agree with the amendment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has no objection to the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 36 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### **LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### **DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 28. Page 4349.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I am in a slightly different situation in relation to this Bill from the position I was in a short time ago on another measure. I support this measure and am sure that my colleagues will be pleased about that. The Bill is short, and I understand that the dairy industry representatives have been in touch with the Government about it.

The measure does only four small things. First, it takes the matter of registration of bulls away from the Police Department. In the Committee stage, I will ask the Minister how this will be done. Secondly, the charge of 5c a year on dairy cattle, which has applied over the years, will be deleted and each registered dairy will be charged \$4 a year. The funds will go to the funds under the Cattle Improvement Act. The fourth provision regulates the powers to ensure that the standards of dairy produce are at least maintained if not increased.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Power to make regulations."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): For the information of the member for Murray. I point out that officers of the Chief Dairy Adviser will be responsible in the various districts for collecting the fees to which the honourable member referred.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 28. Page 4350.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support the Bill. As in the case of the measures with which we have just been dealing, the contents of this Bill have been discussed with the appropriate body (in this case the Dried Fruits Board), and obviously agreement has been reached concerning these provisions. As a result of increased costs, the fees to which this Bill refers are increased accordingly. The contribution required to be made in regard to packing sheds is increased from \$1.20 a ton to a maximum of \$3 a tonne. In those premises where fruit is not packed, a licence will not be required at all, but I point out that dealers, who previously were not charged a registration fee, will now be charged a registration fee of \$25. In addition, the annual fee of \$2 paid previously in respect of packing houses is increased to \$10.

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

### **DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 29. Page 4447.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support the Bill which, again, has met with agreement among all members of the industry. Because of a change in the system of collecting certain fees under the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill, with which we have just dealt, changes must be made under this measure, which is contingent on certain aspects covered by the other legislation.

Mr. Nankivell: It is complementary legislation.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes. In addition, this Bill alters from six months to 12 months the age at which a bull must be licensed. The licence fee is accordingly increased from \$2 to \$4.

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

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to p.m.]*

### **FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 29. Page 4447.)

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I support the Bill, which is in substantially the same form as other Bills that have come before this House in past years. Large areas of fruit and vines

are grown in South Australia and are susceptible to possible widespread outbreaks of infestation but, by prompt action, all outbreaks have been controlled. This has been at high cost to the Government but, when this cost is compared with the cost of an outbreak to the fruit and vine industry, the cost is not so high.

South Australian orchardists are well aware of the dangers of any widespread fruit fly outbreak, and I know I speak for all growers when I say I approve of the prompt action taken by the Agriculture Department, the Government, and all previous Governments in curbing outbreaks. I particularly commend the Agriculture Department on the promptness with which it deals with an outbreak. Some property damage is inevitable, and I believe it proper to provide compensation for those people affected by eradication measures. I understand also that, for the first time this year, commercial vineyards were affected by an outbreak of fruit fly: I refer to those in the Morphett Vale area. We can therefore expect that the compensation payment under this Bill could be a little higher this year than in the past, although the Minister has said that steps have been taken to minimize the amounts payable. I hope those people who receive compensation will accept it in the knowledge that the action taken by the Agriculture Department is for the benefit of a major industry in this State. I support the Bill.

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

Later, Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## **METROPOLITAN AREA (WOODVILLE, HENLEY AND GRANGE) DRAINAGE**

### **ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 29. Page 4445.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. This scheme commenced in 1964, but was not completed because of insufficient finance. In the first place agreement was reached regarding the substitution of different types of works. The Public Works Committee in 1967 recommended the construction of part two of stage one but said that the Government should not be involved in any expenditure beyond a 50 per cent subsidy of the \$772,600 provided under the Act. The work could not be completed because the amount was not sufficient. There was a great need for this work because of a lack of underground drains in these areas, and finance was provided for concrete drains in the area. Clause 2 provides:

...“and includes works substituted for the works referred to in the report by arrangement between the councils or with the agreement of the councils.”

I should like the Minister to say what works are to be substituted. I hope the councils involved are agreed on that matter. I support the Bill, but I should like the Minister to explain the point I have raised regarding clause 2.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—“Interpretation.”

Mr. MATHWIN: What work does the Minister have in mind in relation to the substituted works under clause 2?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The substitution would be carried out by agreement with the councils. I think there must be some flexibility regarding this work. I assure the honourable member that this Bill has been introduced at the request of the councils and is entirely in accord with their desires. Otherwise, the Government would not have introduced it.

Mr. CUMBE: I was a member of the Public Works Committee when it investigated this project. Whilst I agree with the Minister that flexibility is desirable and that this Bill has been introduced at the request of the council, can we be assured that there is no radical or major departure from the original scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is certainly no radical departure from the scheme. The matter is governed by the indenture, which has not been amended.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## **COAST PROTECTION BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 28. Page 4349.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): When the Minister introduced this Bill he said:

The Bill provides for the conservation and protection of the foreshore and beaches of this State . . . Clause 4 contains the definition of “coast”, which means the land between high and low-water marks plus land 100 m inland from high-water mark and within three nautical miles seaward of low-water mark. Alternative boundaries can be declared by regulation. The definition of “coast facility” is intended to cover such matters as boat ramps, changing sheds, toilets and other facilities used by the public.

I presume that would include beach shelters as well. This Bill has long been needed, and it has taken the Government some time to introduce it. As the Minister has said, the public over many years has expressed concern about the condition of our beaches and foreshore, and local government has had to bear the cost of maintaining them. It has approached the Government for assistance, but State Governments over the years have failed to respond in this respect. During the Budget session, the Government provided \$250,000 to be allocated for beach protection works in this financial year. If we trace the whole scheme, we return to the Culver report. This inquiry was instituted in 1966, after the formation of the Seaside Councils Committee. In 1953, the committee looked at methods of doing something in relation to our beaches and foreshores. Eventually the State Government and councils contributed \$60,000 over five years to bring down a report known as the Culver report. I believe that the basis of this Bill is contained in the recommendations or suggestions for beach and foreshore protection that come from the Culver report. The findings of the Culver committee were published in December, 1970. It is interesting to note that the Minister says in his second reading explanation that, after the publication of the Culver report, the Government took immediate action. I would dispute that because, as early as August 5, 1970, I started asking questions in the House about foreshore protection, particularly in my district.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're the greatest.

Mr. BECKER: I kept up questions during that year, and before the Culver report was published I moved a motion that a special advisory committee should be formed of representatives of various departments to report to the Minister of Marine on methods of preserving and improving metropolitan beaches. The Minister of Education has made a facetious remark, but he has represented a large length of coastline that has been seriously affected over the years, and I cannot see what he achieved during his term as member for Glenelg.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come off it!

Mr. BECKER: The Government started to move only after the disastrous storm in April, 1971. In March, 1971, I issued a warning when I asked a question in relation to the protection of the foreshore of the Esplanade, North Glenelg, after constituents of mine had expressed concern at the deterioration in the conditions of the Esplanade. We got only a

vague answer then. The Minister of Environment and Conservation said:

The report I was able to give the Opposition yesterday from Mr. Culver of the Adelaide University pointed out that there were several areas along the coast (I do not know whether Glenelg North was included) where the situation required immediate attention. The problems pointed out by Mr. Culver have been directed to the Foreshore and Beaches Committee, which I understand is meeting today. No doubt the problems to which the honourable member refers have already been directed to that committee by the Glenelg council, and I expect that these will be considered when a recommendation is made to the Government.

It is now more than 12 months since I asked that question. After considerable pressure from all areas and numerous questions in the House, the Government has made available \$90,000 for certain works to be carried out at the Esplanade. The contractor has been working now for three weeks. At the rate he is going he will lose one of his tractors or bulldozers, because when we get the first winter storm the work already done will have little effect.

I am pleased to see this Bill because this is the only course we can take to co-ordinate plans for protecting our coastline. I believe this measure should have been introduced much sooner than it has been; it is definitely what we have been looking for. It brings the whole responsibility under Ministerial control. This is one occasion when I do not object to Ministerial control, because I believe that the issue is so vital that the Minister will have his hands full looking after this part of his portfolio. The Bill provides that a board be established under the Chairmanship of the Director of Planning. Although there will be little development with regard to the coastline in the present metropolitan area, as further development takes place south along the coast and in other parts of the State this appointment will be more necessary.

One of the most important parts of the Bill relates to the financial provisions, whereby from now on councils will be able to benefit by up to 80 per cent of the cost of any engineering works. They will be able to receive up to 50 per cent of the cost of any coast facilities used by the public, and up to 100 per cent of the cost of any storm repairs to engineering works. I understand that similar legislation operates in Victoria and Queensland, with the Governments there bearing only up to 50 per cent of the cost overall. This is a worthwhile provision in the Bill. Councils will still have to say what



work should be done in their areas, and this will be brought forward to special consultative committees. I think that the mere introduction of this Bill does not mean that the problem is solved. We have grave problems with regard to the future of our foreshores, which are so important as a tourist attraction. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of April 21, 1971, just after the last storm, states:

Big black holes, rubble and rocks—and a few mounds of sand—where once there were great golden dunes. This is the alarming scene at some of Adelaide's best beaches. Over the years, many of the dunes have gone. And last weekend, a few more disappeared. Why should a heavy downpour of rain, not unusual in winter, cause the destruction which it did at Glenelg and several other seaside areas? Although the waves did their share of the damage, much of it was caused by stormwater scouring.

The Culver report, at present being considered by the State Government, made some sound recommendations to help deal with the waves. Surely Adelaide's local councils have the technical competence and the priority of finance to deal with floodwater drainage. It is neither necessary nor tolerable that every time it rains heavily we lose large sections of beach to flooding stormwater. After all, storms will come and go but a lost beach is gone forever.

That storm was a final warning to all of us to consider carefully what we must do for the future of our foreshores. The most important factor with regard to damage and scouring at North Glenelg and some areas of West Beach has been the lack of stormwater drains or drains along seaside roads in those areas. I hope that in this respect councils will be able to claim under the Bill for financial assistance. Admittedly councils will not receive help in respect of the seaside section of roads in their areas, but perhaps the Government will consider financing stormwater drains on these sites. Much concern has been expressed about the damage to our beaches and the tremendous loss of sand dunes along our coast. Another example is West Beach, where there were once the most infamous beach shacks. When they were removed, we lost more than 35ft. of sand dune.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What sort of shacks were they?

Mr. BECKER: They were infamous eyesores. I also wish to comment on the part of the Bill that refers to future investigation by the committee to be established, and I think that it is a pity that we have lost more than 12 months since the Culver report was published. I consider that the engineering department of the university should have been allowed

to continue its investigations. We should have been making substantial provision for this research work, as it should continue.

The recommendations in the Culver report are not necessarily the correct ones, but they are a sound basis for what should be done. It was interesting to note, in the study area dealt with in the Culver report, that a whole section of the coastline studied fell within the jurisdiction of 10 councils extending from north to south. These were the Salisbury, Port Adelaide, Woodville, Henley and Grange, West Torrens, Glenelg, Brighton, Marion, Port Noarlunga and Willunga councils. I should like the university department to be given sufficient funds and the necessary manpower to work on the whole of our coastline. The main things that the Culver report concentrated on were in relation to sand sources. The report states:

Sand sources: were these available only at establishment or are these continuing to supply the beach?

The Government is now awaiting the result of the survey that has almost been completed, and it will be interesting to see what findings and recommendations are brought down. Speculation is that there will probably be some reserve of sand around the Brighton area. Irrespective of the findings and even if a nil report is submitted, the money allocated for the sand source survey had to be spent. I think the cost was about \$60,000. We must know whether there is sand close to the foreshores in the metropolitan area, and I would not support any critics who consider that the money has been wasted. It is necessary to undertake such survey. The other features of the report dealt with finding out the relative effects of environmental factors, such as wind, waves, tides, mean sea level fluctuations, etc.

The report bears out that in our gulf the sand continually moves north, until it gets to the groyne at the Patawalonga outlet. This groyne is acting as a bar to normal movement, and I consider that action in this area must be taken promptly. We must investigate some matters relating to the sand bar at Glenelg. It has been proved that it is necessary to control this outlet, but unfortunately there is so much sand that the sand is trickling over the groyne and blocking the entrance to the boat haven.

This is presenting a problem for boat owners in that, if they are out at sea when a storm blows up and they head back towards the Patawalonga haven at low tide, they cannot

get in. We saw what happened last Christmas, when the Australian Yachting Championship finals were conducted at Glenelg on a windy afternoon at low tide. Of the 47 yachts that started, only four finished, and most yachts were unable to get into the Patawalonga entrance and finished up along the beach, some being a mile from the clubhouse. The damage caused amounted to several thousand dollars.

We need a point along the gulf between, say, Christies Beach and Outer Harbour where small boat owners can run to safety during a storm. At present, the only place is the Patawalonga boat haven, where the groyne offers some shelter, but there is danger caused by the sandbar on the end of the groyne. This matter should receive urgent attention. The Government may have to take over control of the Patawalonga boat haven entrance for this purpose. It costs the Glenelg council about \$500 to remove the sandbar from the entrance, which it does about every four months, and one feels guilty about asking the council to do the work again.

In the Committee stage, we hope to be able to find out whether the council can be given a special grant under this Bill for that purpose, and perhaps the Minister would favourably consider doing something in that regard. Regardless of whether the basis of assistance is 50 per cent or 80 per cent, it is an expensive operation.

I do not understand why the Foreshore and Beaches Committee will not accept the offer made by a local business man to place a sand pump at the groyne on trial for six months, to pump the sand from the southern side of the groyne on to the northern side. This type of operation has worked successfully in other countries, and I believe that the experiment here would be well worth trying. I know that there is a proposal to move about 10,000 tons of sand from the southern point of the groyne, in the hope that this will also prevent the sandbar from forming, but at present that sandbar is a huge sandhill and, in a reasonably strong wind, the sand will blow up the Anzac Highway, perhaps as far as the Holdfast Bay Bowling Club. It is also estimated in the Culver report that sand may be moving along the beach face at quite a high rate, and it was estimated that the quantity involved could be between 500,000yds. and 1,000,000yds. a year.

This is a tremendous flow of sand along the beach and, therefore, it is necessary to have a depth of sand as a backing. I

remember that, during the planning stage of the West Lakes scheme, a controversy arose about how far a building should be permitted to encroach on the back or front of sandhills. Some said that the Government was a little generous in allowing the West Lakes developers to build where they have done. However, having inspected the area and having seen the restoration work and planting of natural grasses on the land on the dune, as well as the prolific growth of other natural bushes, I consider that perhaps there is no cause for alarm. Whatever may be said about it, I think that, to the extent that it affords protection of the foreshore in the area, the West Lakes project should be used as a model for future development. Mr. Culver recommended that as a matter of urgency we should stop any further encroachment on to the beach or dune areas and that we should now rehabilitate, replenish or protect low areas as a temporary measure, particularly the Brighton, North Glenelg and Henley South areas.

Some months ago 4,000 tons of sand was deposited on the beach at Glenelg North, having been delivered in seven-ton loads. Soon after it was deposited one of my constituents said that it was an absolute waste of sand; he claimed the morning after it was deposited that it had been washed away. In fact, the tide had come in during the evening and had levelled out the sand, spreading it along the beach. This proves in some respects that deposited sand works its way slowly along the beach, and this is one method of restoring an area. However, it is an expensive process: it is estimated that at least 1,000,000 tons would be necessary to restore some of our beaches and, at \$1 a ton, the project would certainly be costly. Mr. Culver also recommended the establishment of a beach protection authority forthwith.

Although his report was submitted in December, 1970, we are only just getting around to discussing the pros and cons of the matter. I want to see beaches in the metropolitan area restored and action taken by the Government in this respect. Although I know that the amount of work undertaken will depend largely on the money available from time to time, I also want to see further studies and research undertaken along the South Australian coast. This work may take 20 years and cost tens of thousands of dollars, but we must start planning and working. As this Bill gives the board the all-clear in this respect, I support the measure.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. It is a pity that this measure is 20 years too late. Indeed, the problems concerning our beaches started longer than 20 years ago, much of the trouble having been caused by man's greed. If people had not been so greedy in the early days, we would have been able to retain some of the area (probably 100 m or so) concerning which the Minister now wishes to provide certain controls. The board to be established is much smaller than its Queensland namesake, which consists of 11 members. Under the Bill, our board will consist of five members, including the Director of Marine and Harbors, the Director of Planning, the Director of the South Australian Tourist Bureau, a person who has extensive knowledge of and experience in local government, and also a person with extensive experience in and a technical knowledge of coast protection.

As this will involve thinking men in the community who have had vast experience in the matter. I have no complaint about the small size of the board. Indeed, I hope that Mr. Bob Culver, who is mainly responsible for the excellent report to which members have referred and who has had so much to do in this matter, will be considered as qualifying in this respect. Much has been said by people, who do not really understand the position fully, about the construction of groynes. Even with my own limited knowledge, I am against the provision of groynes. I have seen them in existence in other countries of the world, and anyone who has visited the United Kingdom and the Continent will know what shocking things these groynes are: they are ugly, and once one is constructed others must be constructed at intervals along the coastline. They ruin the beauty of the beaches.

South Australia has beaches that must be regarded as some of the best in the world. Beaches in certain parts of America are jealously guarded, and members of the public are not even allowed to walk on them; duckboards and wooden platforms are provided for this purpose. The authorities realize that their beaches must be protected, and those beaches are not nearly as good as ours. In his report Mr. Culver says emphatically that we should not by any means construct groynes. The following is an extract from an article appearing in a local newspaper which refers to remarks made on this matter by Mr. Culver:

Mr. Culver says the advantage of the replenishment method is a completely uncluttered expanse of beach without unsightly groynes. He suggests establishing the North

Brighton to Seacliff area as a stockpiling location to supply a northgoing stream of sand to the whole metropolitan coast.

In his report Mr. Culver said:

There is an urgent need for all reserves of sand on the metropolitan coast to be assessed and wisely husbanded so as to rehabilitate, develop and maintain a beach front to this highly desirable area. The tourist potential of this area has never been fully exploited.

I heartily agree with those remarks. We have never exploited the tourist potential of our beaches. As the member for Hanson has said, the replenishment of sand is expensive, but expense is not really of paramount importance, although it must be considered. It is much more expensive to erect groynes. The groyne erected at Glenelg consists of various sizes of rubble, ranging from large stones at the base to small stones at the top. If my memory is correct this groyne costs about \$160,000. If we use one on each of our beaches, because of the destruction to our beaches and seafronts the cost would be colossal in just providing one groyne to each beach. Replenishment of beaches with sand is expensive, but not as expensive as the supplying of groynes to these areas.

The member for Hanson referred to problems faced, as a result of a storm, by the Glenelg yacht club and said that it would be a good thing if we had other harbours for yachting and boating enthusiasts where they could get protection. He referred to the word "haven", and I agree with this, because there is room for further development of such havens along metropolitan beaches. Although havens would be well used, there is still the problem of finance to be solved.

The Culver report stressed that there should be no further encroachment on our sand dunes and we have learned from the past mistakes of using cement structures as seawalls along beaches. These have always caused a problem because, unlike the sand which washes back to the beach during a storm, where concrete walls have been installed they have been undermined by wave action and the seafront has collapsed. At Brighton, during the last major storm, the seafront near the jetty was completely undermined.

I have been (and still am) a member of the Seaside Councils Committee, which was formed in 1953, and I was a member when it approached the Department of Civil Engineering at the Adelaide University. That approach was stimulated as a result of the devastation wrought by the storm. I point out that, whenever there is a heavy storm, the public

is up in arms about the possibilities of losing beaches or sand from beaches. The worst storm in the metropolitan area in recent years occurred on April 11, 1948, when the Glenelg jetty was lost.

Mr. Ryan: Was that when the *Barcoo* ran aground?

Mr. MATHWIN: It could well have been, but the member for Price would know better than I—

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MATHWIN: The Brighton jetty also suffered damage from the storm and a 20ft. gap was torn in the jetty. Winds of 81 miles an hour were recorded and there was a downpour in excess of 286 points of rain. The Glenelg Town Hall lost part of its roof and the Seacliff Youth Centre building was lost in the storm. The cost of work on the seafront was over \$460,000. Included in that figure was the supply of rip-rap along the beachfront. Rip-rap is a type of rock construction that is poured over the edge of the foreshore to prevent further damage. I refer now to the passage in the Culver report under the heading "Coastal Protection and Beach Protection", which states:

Often large wall or rubble mound structures are used as positive protection but the likely effects of these structures on the remaining beach in front of them is sometimes overlooked. While such walls or mounds, if well built, provide excellent coast protection to the adjacent land, they do not provide protection for the foreshore. They aggravate foreshore damage under storm conditions so that the structures themselves may in turn be undermined. The desirability of "building" a dune as a coastal protection structure is all too obvious, but it has been done in all too few situations in Australia. The compromise which has been tried on several beaches is to build a small dune system in front of a positive protective structure.

That was what was suggested: that we should redump sand on the coastal areas of Brighton, Brighton North and Seacliff.

Another storm in 1960 cost, through beach replenishment procedures involving rip-rap, \$200,000. According to the Culver report, the frequency of bad storms is about one in every five years. The Seaside Councils Committee consists of membership of all beach councils, and was established after the 1953 storm in which many beach facilities were lost. This committee later made representations to the Playford Government, which was asked to give financial assistance for a study to be undertaken in the matter. A Canadian (Dr. R. W. Ansley), who was especially interested in this type of investigation, had his

salary provided by the university. He did much work on this project and I take this opportunity of paying a tribute to all members of the staff associated with that study, especially to Mr. Bob Culver, who is perhaps the best informed authority we have in South Australia, if not in Australia.

The Playford Government agreed to provide half of \$12,000 annually for five years, and the rest was contributed by those councils represented on the Seaside Councils Committee. The Henley and Grange, Woodville, Brighton, Glenelg and Port Adelaide councils each contributed \$760 annually, and the Salisbury, Noarlunga, and Willunga councils contributed \$400 annually. This was provided each year for five years as their contribution to this investigation. Therefore, I should say that the councils fulfilled their obligations towards this study, which was completed most successfully. During the study period, I went each year to the university on a special occasion to see for myself the methods Mr. Culver and his staff were using. They had sand and rubble there and an arrangement whereby they made artificial waves to give them some idea of what happened to the sand—whether it went from north to south or from south to north. The committee studied this type of thing, finally presenting its report to us.

Some mistakes have been made only recently. In 1971 a request was made by the West Lakes Development Company to build closer than 25ft. from the reserve alignment on the sea front. The intention was to amend the zoning of that portion of 1-X subdivision, which was zoned R1, to read R3. There was a request from the Seaside Councils Committee that both these matters should be fully investigated and that the proposed amendment to the zoning should be deferred until the position was resolved in a way which would ensure foreshore preservation then and in the future. That course was not followed. The council was more or less forced to rezone from R1 to R3 to enable the erection of high-density buildings of two-storey and three-storey flats right on the foreshore. Despite all the lessons learned in the past, as recently as 1971 a council, under pressure, had to rezone from R1 to R3 to enable private enterprise to build high-density housing on the beach front. This course was completely against the recommendation of the Culver report. It is an absolute shame that this happened, and those responsible should be ashamed for letting it happen.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the board had to have referred to it any work within 100 m inland from the high-water mark within three nautical miles seaward of low-water mark. Although these measurements are reasonable, in some parts of the State the area could have been wider. This would be most difficult to provide for in the built-up areas, where the board would have no chance of acquiring land, because of the expense involved. It is interesting that at Port Phillip in Victoria the distance is 10 chains from the high-water mark, that Victorian Act having been passed in 1966. In Queensland it is wider still, with the beach protection legislation of 1968 for that State providing for 440yds. It seems to me a pity that some general measurement could not have been arrived at, whether metres, yards or chains. The distance we have provided could cause problems in South Australia. In areas such as Aldinga the authority could well have covered an area much wider than the 100m or so as provided in the Bill. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated:

Coast protection districts are to be established for any part of the coast and a consultative committee will be formed for each district comprising mainly representatives of the local government authorities concerned. The board may also appoint specialist advisory committees to advise on any particular aspect of its work.

I should like the Minister, when he replies to the debate, to say how many consultative committees, advisory committees and coastal districts he has in mind. He also stated:

The coast protection board is to have power to carry out works to implement the management plan and any emergency works arising from storm or pollution.

"Pollution" is a wide term and could mean beer cans, seaweed, or oil.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Stormwater drains.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. I ask the Minister to say what he means by this word. I support the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I want to set the record straight with regard to the remarks of the member for Hanson. I congratulate the member for Glenelg on making a speech which attempted to set out in a positive and constructive way the basis of argument for this Bill. He hit the nail on the head well and truly when he said that the Bill was 20 years too late in terms of when it should have been introduced, and when he pointed out that many of our problems have arisen as a consequence of the greed of those associated with the fore-

shore area. That sets the matter straight and makes it clear that what is before us now has little, if anything, to do with the actions of the member for Hanson in regard to the questions he has asked and the publicity seeking he has indulged in since he has been a member of Parliament. The member for Glenelg pointed out that the basic impetus for the establishment of the Foreshore and Beaches Committee, which now has Mr. Culver as a member, has arisen as a consequence of the work of Mr. Culver, and that he and those associated with it deserve much credit for the kind of approach now being made. I should like to point out that we have seen real development in this particular area since conservation and the environment have been identified and a particular person has been given responsibility for this area.

Whilst I do not for one moment detract from the work that Mr. Bob Culver has carried out over the years, not only in this area but also in relation to work that has been done for the Highways Department, I think it is also important to recognize that the promotion, at a Government level, of effective action has followed the appointment of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. In his quiet way, he is as good an urger as one will find. Not only has he been successful in bringing this legislation forward, but he has succeeded in having money appropriated and organizing his colleagues and the State Treasury so that adequate funds are available to carry out the work. What we see here is not just the establishment of another board. It is a board that will have teeth through its powers and it will have money to spend.

Already we see the beginning of work necessary along our beaches. We have much to remember about those of our forebears who have been responsible for the planning, or lack of planning, of the city of Adelaide. We can recognize the contribution made by many people but, in the development of our beach areas and the environment, we have little for which to thank those who have gone before us. In the main, by the development they have permitted, they have contributed to the present problem.

We do not have, in general, a beautiful foreshore along the coastal part of Adelaide, and that is a great tragedy. It is a great tragedy that sufficient area was not reserved along the foreshore for the entire length of the seafront, and it is a pity that our forebears did not foresee the problems that now face us. In this matter, it is important to take the kind

of attitude that the member for Glenelg has taken, recognizing those who have tried to solve the problem and also recognizing the direction that Mr. Culver, in his investigations, has given to the proposed solution.

No question of groynes is entirely an approach in terms of beach replenishment. I should like to be able to claim more credit in this matter than I am able to claim. All I can say is that, since Mr. Culver and the present Minister have been involved in this work, we have seen action and a productive result. Whilst I am a member of the Government, nevertheless, as a member representing a coastal area, I have pleasure in congratulating both Mr. Culver and the present Minister on their initiatives.

I hope that the approach to beach replenishment will work. It seems to me that it will, because the breakwater that was built at Glenelg shows all the signs of what Mr. Culver has been preaching, namely, that there is a northward movement of sand along our coastline. Those honourable members who saw the breakwater when it was first built will recall that the beach at Glenelg had no sand on it and consisted mostly of exposed rock.

Now, apart from Seacliff, the one decent beach that we have is Glenelg, where the sand has built up along the southern side of the breakwater, and the people of Glenelg can point out the extent to which the sand has built up. They point to the number of steps leading up to the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club and they will tell you that a few years ago more than 12 steps were showing. There has been a build up of about 8ft. to 10ft., entirely on the southern side of that breakwater, while on the northern side there has been sand starvation. It seems to me that, as a consequence of experience, it will not be sufficient merely to replenish sand in the Seacliff and North Brighton area but that action will have to be taken specifically in the Glenelg North and West Beach area to ensure replenishment in this area also.

In this Bill, we now have the administrative means of instituting not only beach replenishment measures but also suitable controls over any works carried out on the foreshore facilities. There will also be an allocation of money to ensure that the work can be carried out, and we can look forward confidently to the replenishment of our beaches and the establishment of appropriate administrative machinery to ensure that, in any future storm disaster, immediate appropriate measures can be taken to provide either restoration work, replenish-

ment work, or any additional measures that may be necessary.

I think the legislation is a product not of Party politics but of the combined work of many people associated with metropolitan councils, the University of Adelaide, and the Government, in seeking out an effective solution to a special problem. I think the Bill demonstrates that, where people show a willingness to work together in this way, real results are forthcoming.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill with much pleasure. Members who have spoken have made a real contribution to the debate, bringing out many points germane to the whole question of coastal protection. I do not wish to claim any credit personally, but I was involved in the matter when I was Minister of Marine. I agree with the way in which the present Minister of Environment and Conservation has dealt with the problem. In the former Government, the responsibility fell to the Minister of Marine, and I recall having several discussions with Mr. Culver, whom I know personally, and at that time the Culver report was not complete.

We had a preliminary document and we did not go very far because we had to wait for the final report, which came out after the change of Government. However, the preliminary report went far enough to indicate the way in which the final report was likely to emerge. Following this, I had discussions with the seaside councils, who were interested in the whole question, expressed concern that something should be done, and wished to become involved. With the Director of the Marine and Harbors Department, I discussed the comprehensive United Kingdom legislation on coastal protection. I also had the privilege of examining some of the legislation enacted in other States. The way in which both the present Minister and I have apparently approached this subject is uncanny. Following the discussions I had initially in this matter with the Mr. Culver, the Director of Marine and Harbors, and members of the committee representing seaside councils, I had in mind the setting up of an advisory committee to advise me as Minister on what form the authority should eventually take. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

A committee, known as the Foreshore and Beaches Committee, was established under the chairmanship of the Director of Planning to advise the Government on any matters relating to foreshore and beaches throughout the State.

That was the first positive step taken. Here, I draw the Minister's attention to the composition of the body to be set up: he said that the Director of Planning was to be Chairman and that there would be two other public servants (the Director of Marine and Harbors and the Director of the Tourist Bureau or their nominees; and that is fair enough). The Minister then said two further members would be appointed by the Governor, one knowledgeable in local government and the other a specialist in coast protection. The member for Glenelg then interjected and said, "No member of local government?" and the Minister replied, "No; it is only a five-man board." I consider that there should be a representative of local government. As it reads, the Bill provides for the appointment of someone acquainted with the way in which local government functions. However, I believe that a member of local government, whose area abuts the foreshore, should be a member of the board.

Much has been said about sand and related matters: anyone who has studied this matter knows that the littoral drift is from south to north along St. Vincent Gulf. Those of us who have observed the effect of the cliff at Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga may well be frightened to think what may happen in that area if something is not done soon, because the rather precipitous road running along the cliff will completely disappear (if not the houses with it) if action is not taken soon to remedy the position. The Minister of Education referred to the groyne erected at Glenelg. Having studied this matter, I have observed the effect of correctly designed groynes and how they can result in the building up of sand, but I have also seen the effect of badly designed groynes, which have had the opposite effect. Perhaps the best groyne of all is in your district, Mr. Speaker, namely, at Outer Harbour, which has been dredged to a certain depth to allow oversea vessels to berth. As a result of this dredging, large quantities of sand and seaweed have been deposited from Largs North to Outer Harbour, and this is a clear example of the effect of the littoral drift from south to north.

We have also seen the loss of sand in the Glenelg North area. Several councils have conducted experiments under the aegis of the Culver preliminary report, involving the fencing and grassing of foreshore areas, and I think the results of these experiments are encouraging. Although much work has yet to be done, I am the first to say that it can-

not be done on all beaches. For instance, this sort of work could not be carried out in the area virtually in front of the Glenelg Town Hall, but it can and is being done in the West Beach area, as well as at Henley Beach, where there is sufficient room between the high-water mark and the road.

Action is now being taken based on scientific studies and directly on work carried out by the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Adelaide. The Bill will benefit the metropolitan beaches, although the measure is not confined only to those beaches. I am pleased with the way in which the Minister has handled this matter, and the measure certainly has my support.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I thank members for their contributions to this debate. I think all members agree that the time is long overdue for action to be taken along the lines outlined in the Bill. Most members know that the reason why little has been done in this respect in the past is that insufficient finance has been available. I think my colleague the Minister of Education hit the nail on the head when he said that Cabinet had been generous in its attitude to my approaches to ensure that sufficient funds are available to undertake the necessary work. In addition to funds provided in connection with the storm damage that occurred last year, \$250,000 was made available for work to be undertaken in connection with this Bill, and I expect that over the next three years, when we will have had the result of the sand survey and will be faced with the responsibility of depositing up to 1,000,000 tons of sand back on to our beaches, expenditure will be exceptionally high. However, we are at least taking steps now.

The member for Glenelg asked how many coast protection districts were contemplated, but I cannot give him an accurate assessment at this stage. However, I think this matter will work itself out and that after discussions with local government a coast protection district for the metropolitan beaches will be formed, with a consultative committee almost identical to the current committee comprising seaside councils. In other parts of the State, wherever there can be an amalgamation of the interests of the various councils concerned, coast protection districts will be formed. True, metropolitan districts are those of immediate concern and warrant urgent attention. Nevertheless, country members who represent

districts on the coast will know that I have received requests from several councils seeking advice through the Foreshore and Beaches Committee on problems concerning their beaches. I am pleased that interest has been shown and that we are able to effectively cover all the beaches in coast protection districts in this State.

Reference was made to clause 14 and the duties of the board concerning the restoring of any part of the coast that has been subjected to "pollution or misuse". The honourable member questioned the use of the words "pollution or misuse". The major work of the board will be in restoring any part of the coast subjected to "erosion, damage, deterioration," rather than pollution or misuse. These additional terms were included in the case of an oil spillage or some other occurrence that could pollute beaches and so require the attention of the board.

Concerning the question raised by the member for Torrens, I appreciate his remarks. He questioned a *Hansard* galley concerning the board membership. I point out to the honourable member that I have not checked that galley, but I would think it could be an inaccurate report. I am certain that when I delivered the second reading explanation the member for Glenelg interjected when I referred to the board's membership. I referred to a person with experience in and extensive knowledge of local government. I believe the honourable member said only one would come from local government. At least, that was how I understood the interjection.

Mr. Coumbe: How will it be?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Despite the misunderstanding, it is certainly contemplated that the person will be a person who is active in local government affairs. I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. MATHWIN: Would a building or structure referred to in the definition of "coast facility" include toilets and such types of building?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): Yes. It is intended that this shall include shelter sheds, toilet facilities and showers and kiosks that are usually found on beaches.

Mr. MATHWIN: Would the works referred to in the definition of "storm repairs" include

concrete walling such as we find attached to jetties?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. This definition is tied up with a later clause under the financial provisions, and storm repairs would certainly include the type of civil works and jetties referred to by the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Control and direction of board."

Mr. MATHWIN: It is provided that the board shall be subject to the control and direction of the Minister. We all know that the members of a board are people of integrity and skill who have specialized knowledge. Surely, with that type of person on the board the Minister could trust the members, because their advice must be good. If the Minister handpicks the members of the board he should be able to take their recommendations without wanting to override such recommendations. If he does wish to override their recommendations, the Minister is merely setting up a board of puppets.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am somewhat surprised at the attitude of the honourable member towards this clause, because it is not an unusual provision to be found in such a Bill under which considerable sums must be spent from State revenue. I consider that it is only proper that any recommendations made to the Government by the board should be subject to the control of the Minister and of the Government, because there could be serious repercussions if this were not the case.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"General duties of the board."

Mr. MATHWIN: I take it that subclause (1) (c) will cover cases such as the historical interest in Hallett Cove.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. I pointed out before that when the situation at Hallett Cove has finally been resolved the Government intends to place firm control over the area so that the site of historical interest can properly be preserved.

Mr. BECKER: Does the provision in subclause (1) (e) mean that similar research to that carried out by the Culver committee will be continued?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Since the Culver report has been completed, research has continued. Mr. Culver has continued to be a member of the Foreshore and Beaches Committee. I support all the complimentary remarks that members have made about work



Mr. Culver has done. He has continued to take photographs of the coast so that movements can be observed. It is contemplated that a fairly substantial staff, including people in the engineering field, and so on, will be required to undertake the work envisaged under the Bill. Part of the work of that staff will be research work.

Mr. BECKER: In other words, the Minister envisages that a separate research section will be set up by the board.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Not a separate research section, but research work will be undertaken by members of the staff that is established.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—"Constitution of consultative committees."

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister intend that each seaside council will have a consultative committee, or will certain councils combine and have one committee?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We could have a coast protection district of any area of the State, depending on relationships in that locality. I would contemplate a coast protection district including the area along the metropolitan coast, with each council having a member on the consultative committee involved in that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Constitution of coast protection districts."

Mr. MATHWIN: Regarding subclause (1) (c) does the Minister expect that, in certain conditions, he will embody all the districts as one?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the board and the councils concerned believed that the Glenelg, Henley Beach, and West Beach areas had activities in common, the councils could amalgamate into three coast protection districts, and operate in that fashion.

Clause passed.

Clause 20—"Management plan."

Mr. MATHWIN: Subclause (2) states that a council shall consult with a council. I should

think that that is a drafting error and that the board should consult with the council.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion, as this seems to be a drafting error, and the board and not a council should consult with a council. I ask that "council" be struck out and that "board" be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: As this is a clerical error, it can be adjusted as such.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Temporary occupation."

Mr. MATHWIN: Does temporary occupation mean the building of offices on the site?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes; this is in relation to temporary occupation and there will be proper rights for the landholder where there may be a temporary requirement for any work by the board.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Appeal to Planning Appeal Board."

Mr. MATHWIN: Under subclause (2), will the Planning Appeal Board have authority over the board and also over the Minister?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (29 to 37) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **CROWN PROCEEDINGS BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conferences on the Commercial and Private Agents Bill, the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act Amendment Bill and the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill (Licences) to be held during the adjournment of the House, the managers to report the results thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

At 9.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, April 6, at 2 p.m.