

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 16, 1972

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

NORTH HAVEN DEVELOPMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

EDUCATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment (General),
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment,
Prices Act Amendment,
Unfair Advertising Act Amendment.

PETITIONS: SOUTH TERRACE BUILDING

Mr. WRIGHT presented a petition signed by three persons expressing concern:

- (1) that the Adelaide City Council in October, 1972, gave consent to Breton Holdings Proprietary Limited for the erection of a three-storey office building at 142 South Terrace, Adelaide, and that the land at that address was part of an area termed zone 6 (residential) by the council since May 29, 1972 (wherein the development of offices was not permitted);
- (2) that in representing this matter to the council on October 10, 1972, Councilor Roche (Chairman of the Building and Town Planning Committee) publicly made incorrect statements about the Metropolitan Development Plan and made use of an incorrect interpretation of an important part of the Planning and Development Act;
- (3) that officers of the Adelaide City Council had refused to allow a lawyer to see the transcript of what was said in his presence at a public council meeting.

- (4) that in August, 1971, before the purchase of the property, the council gave Breton Holdings approval to develop 142 South Terrace, subject to six conditions and that, to the best of the petitioners' knowledge, development proposals by Breton Holdings for additions to the existing terrace house had never satisfied all six conditions which the council had laid down;
- (5) that council had had several opportunities legally to reject the proposal by Breton Holdings and that the council was therefore responsible for approving a proposal which was contrary to the council's own planning policy in force from December, 1969, to May, 1972; was contrary to the council's present planning policy which dated from May, 1972; would be destructive of the environmental quality of the adjacent house; would be seriously contrary to the amenity of the adjoining property (as defined by the Planning and Development Act, and interpreted by the Planning Appeal Board); was contrary to the explicit terms of an earlier council decision; was unacceptable under a reasonable interpretation of the Planning and Development Act; contributed to the further deterioration of the residential quality of an area declared strictly residential by council; and was contrary to the spirit of Government and council statements about encouraging the residential repopulation of the city;
- (6) that the council had been seen to be concerned more with the potential financial loss to an office developer (who had clearly failed to meet the council's prior requirements) than with the potentially greater financial loss to the residents of the adjoining house (should they attempt to regain even part of the light they now enjoyed);
- (7) that the council had failed to exhibit any regard for the emotional, financial, social and functional investment the residents and owners of 141 South Terrace had made in the city for more than 20 years and that the council had chosen to place greater emphasis upon the potential financial

loss to a company (none of whose owners were residents of the city) which had failed to fulfil conditions laid down by the council and of which the company was aware before purchasing the property;

- (8) that the council had, by this deliberate act, made a mockery of its concern for environmental quality, historical conservation, and urban design in that it had consciously waived planning standards it required of other developers and had approved a development for offices (substandard according to its own requirements) which would greatly reduce the capacity for enjoyable residential use of a house which many people considered contributed much, by its design and condition, to the quality of South Terrace and of the city of Adelaide.

The petitioners therefore asked the House immediately to institute and conduct a public inquiry into this matter with a view to correcting, by amending the law if necessary, the injustices that had occurred in this matter.

Petition received and read.

Mr. WRIGHT presented a similar petition signed by 1,814 persons.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

NATURAL GAS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier give the House an assurance that the sale of natural gas to other States will not lead to any reduction in the availability of supplies to South Australian consumers, especially if supplies released to other States are permitted to be sold overseas? A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states that the Australian Gas Light Company could be banking on the export of huge quantities of natural gas to the United States of America and elsewhere. This statement was made in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly yesterday. The report went on to say that the proven reserves of the Moomba field, in the north-west of the South Australian supply area for the proposed introduction of natural gas in New South Wales, were two trillion cubic feet, and that the economic capacity of the planned 34in. pipeline was at least double the size required to pipe the reserves over 25 years. It is recognized that the only gas to be released to other States is dry gas, and it is understood that the royalties associated with the sale of the gas will have

been paid before the gas is moved and that the sale price is guaranteed to the industry. However, if gas is sold overseas through ports in other States, the industry, particularly the port handling industry of this State, will be disadvantaged, as it currently is with the export of wool from Port Melbourne, and a commodity produced in South Australia will bring no return to this State through increased port handling costs. I seek an assurance not only about the availability of supply but also that the best interests of this State from a financial point of view will be maintained.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provisions for the licensing of the pipeline to New South Wales, in accordance with the agreement made between the producers on the field and the Australian Gas Light Company, require that certain areas in the field be reserved for South Australian use and that not only dry gas but de-ethanized gas be supplied to New South Wales (that is, the ethane content, which can provide for a satisfactory feed stock for South Australia, has been retained by South Australia). All that will be supplied to New South Wales is gas, which, on present indications, is to be used by the Australian Gas Light Company, not for export but for use in Sydney. Regarding the size of the pipeline, I point out that the Australian Gas Light Company is looking to the possibility (indeed the likelihood) of the eventual establishment of a central Australian grid, which will provide gas from fields other than Moomba-Gidgealpa: that is, from Queensland, where it appears there is a likelihood of further gas from the Cooper Basin, and from Mereenie Palm Springs, in the Northern Territory. It is expected that this will develop in the future. I know that A.G.L. has been looking even farther afield in seeking to eventually pipe gas to that pipeline. The benefits to South Australia from the sale to New South Wales of natural gas are not confined to the provision of royalties or the return that will be made by the producers on the field: the provision of gas to New South Wales makes economic the extraction of wet gas for use in South Australia and will make economic the building in South Australia of a liquids pipeline that will allow us to promote additional industry here. That is important for the State. Further, without a market for proven gas from the field (since in the foreseeable future our own market is necessarily limited to a figure somewhat below the proven reserves of the field to date), unless we can continue to establish markets exploration in the field will cease, simply because

there is no inducement for people to spend the large sums involved in proving the field if there is not a prospective market.

Dr. Eastick: Wouldn't the export product be better through our hands than through someone else's.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the Leader will find that there is little prospect of exporting natural gas products derived from the Moomba-Gidgealpa field. In fact, as the Leader will know, there are restrictions on the export of l.p.g. or l.n.g. from Australia, and I believe that that will be so under any Government.

Mr. Coumbe: From South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From anywhere.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about installing pedestrian crossing lights on Greenhill Road, opposite Methodist Ladies College?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board has given approval in principle to the establishment of a pedestrian-actuated traffic signal crossing in Greenhill Road near the Methodist Ladies College. The Unley council has recently submitted detailed plans which are currently being examined by officers of the board prior to granting final approval. It is expected that the work of installing the signals will commence early in the new year, subject to the availability of funds and the work-load-capacity of the successful signal contractor.

SUPREME COURT HEARING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government will undertake that it will not make any payment on behalf of Mr. Robinson, the Australian Building and Construction Workers' Federation, and the other defendant, arising out of the present Supreme Court proceedings? The Crown Solicitor has made clear that the Government is unwilling to be liable to satisfy any order for costs made against an *amicus curiae*, should leave be given for an *amicus* to appear in the proceedings, and my question is complementary to that unwillingness. The sort of payment I have in mind is \$140 for the union dues (\$14, I understand, for each of the 10 men involved) or the costs of the defendants should any be awarded against them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no question whatever that the Government would be involved in paying sums of that kind in this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: It's different from Kangaroo Island then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants a reply to his question, I suggest that he allow me to answer it.

Mr. Mathwin: You're battling—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Secretary of the union involved has refused to co-operate with the Government or the processes of conciliation in any way. In fact, he has not operated in accordance with the rules of the Trades and Labor Council Disputes Committee. He has taken his union right outside the normal processes of conciliation in the dispute and has been completely unco-operative in the matter. He has refused to talk to me about it, and I see no basis whatever for any suggestion being made to the Government that it should pay any costs on the Secretary's behalf or in respect of any disputed union dues of a union member. We certainly would not consider doing this.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government will pay the legal costs of any person taking legal action against trade union officials who have prevented such a person from exercising the right to make a living? As the Government has made a similar decision to pay the legal expenses of the builders labourers' union in a matter—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's question is too hypothetical.

SULPHUR DIOXIDE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on October 26 about the monitoring of sulphur dioxide readings at Christies Beach?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Director-General of Public Health states that, following a request from the management of Petroleum Refineries (Australia) Proprietary Limited, copies of the results of sampling for sulphur dioxide and smoke density in the metropolitan area and some country centres are forwarded each quarter. No comment as to possible or suspected sources of these pollutants is made with the report. In the letter partly quoted by the honourable member, the General Manager of Petroleum Refineries (Australia) Proprietary Limited stated that an endeavour had been made to correlate sulphur dioxide levels with meteorological conditions recorded at Port Stanvac based on the

assumption that the refinery was likely to be the major source of the pollutant. This assumption was made by the management. Since a satisfactory correlation could not be made, the accuracy of the monitoring method used by the department was questioned. The General Manager suggested that erroneous results might be caused by contamination of the sample by sulphates from sea spray.

In reply to that letter, the accuracy of the results was defended. However, the General Manager was advised that the Public Health Department had on order an automatic sulphur dioxide monitor which, because of its facility to give immediate results of concentrations over a short period of time, was very useful for identifying sources. The offer by the General Manager of co-operation to mount a joint study of pollutant levels and meteorological conditions has been accepted. It is expected that the automatic monitor will be available for installation in the Port Stanvac area in about four weeks.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether work has recommenced on the festival hall site following a walk-out yesterday by members of a certain wellknown union? If work has not recommenced, can he say when it will recommence?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: A stop-work meeting was held yesterday afternoon by members of the builders labourers' union working on the festival hall site, but I understand they recommenced work this morning.

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Premier say whether, despite the delays that have occurred in work on the Adelaide Festival Centre, he still expects it to open on the previously announced opening date of March 3, 1973? In view of the controversy that is raging about the suggested opening ceremony for the Sydney Opera House, can he say what type of opening ceremony is likely to be held at the Adelaide Festival Centre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Indications are that the architects will be able to hand over the building on the most lately agreed date of January 17. This will give time for the tuning of the building and the necessary rehearsals for the opening ceremony on March 3. Even though there was a slight hold-up by one section of workers yesterday, other workers were not involved in any stoppage. The concrete work was not delayed, because another concrete pour was not due until this morning and that pour has been made. It is not

expected that this delay will alter the schedule markedly, and we expect to be able to open on that date. I think that, before I make an announcement about the opening ceremony, I should get a full statement from the Chairman of the Festival Theatre Trust. It is the trust's responsibility to arrange for the opening and to make an announcement, but I will inquire of the Chairman.

Mr. Hall: When is the election date?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I really do not think that date will be a matter of great moment next time.

Mr. Millhouse: We're looking forward to it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, the member for Mitcham is forever a masochist.

TRANSPORT POLICY

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport seen the press reports in which the Transport Ministers of New South Wales and Victoria were reported as saying that Mr. Whitlam's proposal for free off-peak travel on State public transport systems would result in fare rises in those States? Does the Minister consider that that would also be the case in South Australia? In an article in the Melbourne *Age* Mr. Wilcox (Victorian Minister of Transport) is reported as saying that the Victorian railways earn \$8,000,000 a year from metropolitan off-peak services and that the Victorian share of the subsidy would result in a deficit that would necessitate increases in fares.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Having seen the articles to which the honourable member has referred, I am rather surprised at and disappointed with the views expressed, particularly because both Mr. Wilcox and Mr. Morris are two Ministers who have played a prominent role, with me, in trying to force the Commonwealth Government to acknowledge the need for assistance in respect of urban public transport. I have always given full credit to those two gentlemen for the co-operation they have given me. Our efforts have obviously had the desired result, as shown in the policy speech of the Prime Minister last Tuesday evening, when at long last he indicated that he would recognize the advice of his own experts. I think that the important point that both Mr. Wilcox and Mr. Morris have overlooked is that, in his policy speech, Mr. Whitlam said that a Commonwealth Labor Government would give a subsidy of \$3 a head, provided that the States introduced off-peak free travel. As I read Mr. Whitlam's policy speech, I interpret it to mean that, if a State Government does

not desire to avail itself of this \$3 a head, it does not have to do so. This was merely an offer on which a condition was placed. Therefore, if New South Wales and Victoria do not wish to avail themselves of what is the first offer ever made to provide reduced fares for public transport, the responsibility for rejecting it must be theirs. I have not had an opportunity to do the homework on this, but I should be most surprised if an adverse situation developed as a result of it. I will certainly not be making any snap decision or taking any half-baked information to Cabinet for it to make a decision on. I would welcome, as I am sure the Premier would welcome, the financial relief that a Commonwealth Labor Government would give in respect of the transport problem.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why does the Premier except the metropolitan railway system from his willingness to hand over the South Australian railways system to the Commonwealth Government? A few days ago the Commonwealth Leader of the Party—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Prime Minister elect!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I prefer to call him the over-hopeful candidate. Mr. Whitlam said a few days ago that he would be prepared, when in office, to take over the State railways. Our Premier, the gentleman opposite, when commenting on the following day said he would be delighted to accept the offer except for the metropolitan railway system. I understand that the metropolitan system is a money loser.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not compared to the country system.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It seems that, if the railways are to be taken over, they should be taken over holus-bolus rather than be divided into two parts. I realize that my question is hypothetical, but in view of the circumstances I ask the Premier to answer it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Whitlam made an offer to accept the railway systems in accordance with the offers that had been made by Sir Robert Askin and Sir Henry Bolte, both of whom excepted the metropolitan systems from their offer. The reason for this is that the metropolitan system of transport has to be integrated with other undertakings of the State to provide a total transport situation within the metropolis, and this is rather different from dealing with what are the long hauls in the rest of the State which could be adequately dealt with by the Commonwealth Railways. In fact, the

Commonwealth Railways now operates a substantial part of the total railway undertaking in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Would it be possible to cut the system into two parts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it would. In addition, Mr. Whitlam's offer does not except the metropolitan system from assistance; in fact, his offer specifically provides that, in relation to the metropolitan system, additional assistance would be given to the State to improve rolling stock, to provide for research, to provide for the laying of additional tracks, and to upgrade the total system in the metropolitan situation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: In accordance with the advice from the Bureau of Transport Economics.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The bureau has prepared proposals of this kind and Mr. Whitlam specified in Adelaide today the amounts available—

Mr. Millhouse: I wonder where he—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member wants to hear the reply to his question.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes he does, but you're getting too many interruptions from Ministers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that the honourable member should read what the Bureau of Transport Economics has had to say. Although the Commonwealth Government has not been willing to release the report, it has in fact released the report in part. The *Financial Review* has a copy of it, and today Mr. Whitlam outlined the specifications for the proposals which the Bureau of Transport Economics has submitted to the Commonwealth Government and which he will adopt as Leader of the Labor Government in order to help the Labor Government of this State.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government has any plans to review Adelaide's public transport system by importing another visiting expert from overseas immediately before the forthcoming State election? As we all know, the last election brought us temporarily a Labor Government; it also brought us the great benefit of Dr. Breuning. As the present Government will not be able to import any visiting expert after the election, I ask whether it has any plans for importing anyone before the election.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am a little confused by the honourable member's comment.

He said that the Labor Government would not be able to import anyone after the election, so apparently he assumes that the Labor Government will still be in office after the election, and is asking whether we may take this action before the election, instead. I think the honourable member is conceding that there will be a Labor Government after the election. If he is honest, he will admit that. I do not appreciate the snide comments of the honourable member about Dr. Breuning. I do not think the honourable member would like people to be snide about his professional ability. I do not think that sort of personality attack does the honourable member any good at all.

Dr. Tonkin: Oh, come on!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member can laugh this off if he likes, but he and some of his colleagues (to their credit, not all of them) have on many occasions attacked the integrity of Dr. Breuning—

Mr. Gunn: That's nonsense.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and it is somewhat tiring to listen to the gutter-type tactics they have employed.

Mr. Millhouse: We're waiting for some constructive proposals for action.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not very concerned about what the member for Mitcham is waiting for: I am more concerned with trying to reply to the member for Bragg, who asked the question. If the member for Mitcham would be courteous just for once and keep quiet, that might help his colleague. As the member for Bragg knows, the Government brought Dr. Breuning to South Australia, and he produced an extremely valuable report.

Mr. Mathwin: A costly one!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He produced an extremely valuable report which, with the exception of one part, was adopted by this Government. Since then, the Government has—

Mr. Gunn: Done nothing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Well, the Government may do something to the honourable member if he is not careful. If he does not keep quiet, I think the Speaker may do something, and this House would support him if he did. Since the Government adopted the Breuning report we have tried to give effect to the recommendations therein. The first of those recommendations to be given effect to was the appointment of a Director-General of Transport. Secondly, we took the necessary action to provide that Director-General with support staff. If the member for Bragg has such a poor respect, first for Dr. Breuning and

now for Dr. Scafton and his support staff, I am sure those persons will be delighted (as they were with his previous comments) to read it in *Hansard*! They know exactly what the member for Bragg thinks of them.

Dr. Tonkin: But you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That does not deter them from wearing their socks out in the interests of this State.

Dr. Tonkin: You have just made it quite obvious that you didn't read my speech. You weren't here.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have given information on the work that Dr. Scafton and his staff are doing. I am proud of that work, even if the member for Bragg is not or if he cannot understand it. The important point is that it is absolutely useless—

Mr. Mathwin: To have a dial-a-bus system.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is absolutely useless for the member for Bragg, his puppet from Glenelg, or others to go on with this snide sort of talk. The plain facts are that, immediately the Commonwealth Government acknowledges the need to provide finance for urban public transport, we can go ahead at full steam. Since Mr. Whitlam delivered his policy speech on Monday evening, the officers in Dr. Scafton's area have been working flat out to produce an urgent action programme to which we can give effect, because at long last there is a recognition of the need for finance from Commonwealth sources for public transport.

Dr. TONKIN: On what precise proposals, additional to those already listed by the Minister last week, are Dr. Scafton and members of his department now working as a result of Mr. Whitlam's policy speech? Further, does the Minister suggest that the reason why there has been no positive or tangible improvement in Adelaide's public transport system since he came into office is that he has been waiting for this policy speech in order to make political capital out of Adelaide's public transport difficulties at the expense of this State? This is a shabby confidence trick.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Apparently, the member for Bragg—

Dr. Tonkin: I bet I don't get a straight answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked a question, and the Minister is about to reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member is apparently trying (and making a very bad job of it) to entrench himself as the shadow Minister of Roads and Transport, as he described himself the other day. However, I think he will be in the shadow for a long time to come. If he cares to read today's newspapers, he will find that the Leader of the Commonwealth Labor Party (the Prime Minister elect of this nation) today confirmed the recommendations that this State had submitted, at the instance of the Commonwealth Government, to the Bureau of Transport Economics. Evaluations of some of the projects were undertaken by the bureau to the extent of, from memory, \$300,900,000. The bureau stated that obviously the remaining projects submitted, to the extent of \$500,000,000, would show a comparable cost-benefit evaluation, and this indicates that those projects are worth implementing.

Dr. Tonkin: Will you answer my question?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am rather surprised that the member for Bragg has not asked why the report has not been released. Opposition members are always anxious to have reports released but they do not ask for that in this case.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I point out that I did not ask whether there was any report.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We know why you didn't.

Dr. TONKIN: I asked on what precise proposals, additional to those already listed by the Minister last week, are Dr. Scrafton and members of his department now working as a result of Mr. Whitlam's policy speech. I have not heard any reference at all to this question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My reason for referring to the report is that the proposals on which the honourable member is seeking information are contained in that report. The Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport and the Prime Minister have declined to provide copies of this report for publication. I, as a member of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, have a copy of the report, but it is marked "Confidential: Not for Publication". However, at least one newspaper in Australia was able to get a copy and, in fact, gave a fairly comprehensive report of it. If the honourable member can contain himself just a little longer, I think he will be able to read just exactly what the Government can positively indicate on how

the public transport system of South Australia will be upgraded now that finance will be made available. Surely even the honourable member does not suggest that we should come out and talk about various proposals if it is not possible, financially, to implement them.

Mr. Mathwin: You promised dial-a-bus last Christmas.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The interjection from the member for Glenelg is not only out of order: it is completely untrue.

Mr. Mathwin: It's in *Hansard*!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I challenge the member for Glenelg to show where I promised it by last Christmas.

Mr. Mathwin: You said for Christmas—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg must await the call before he can start debating and interjecting across the Chamber. He is becoming too ambitious in interjecting, and he must conduct himself the same as any other member must do.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether Dr. Scrafton and his officers are giving equal time to evaluating the programme outlined by the Prime Minister in his policy speech last Tuesday evening?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Dr. Scrafton and his staff have glanced at the newspaper reports of the Prime Minister's speech. As yet I have been unable to get an official copy, and I should be delighted if the Leader could get one for me.

Mr. Millhouse: I suppose you got one of Whitlam's?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have a copy of it now, and I should be delighted to make it available for the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: Right! I'll have it now!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should be delighted, in return, to have a copy of the Prime Minister's policy speech. Until now, we have had to rely entirely on newspaper reports, which I think are accurate. However, the press report of the Prime Minister's speech suggests that the Commonwealth Government is now acknowledging, in part only, the recommendations of its own Bureau of Transport Economics. Mr. Whitlam, in his policy speech, has said that he will adopt the whole of the report of the bureau.

Mr. Becker: When? In the next three years?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suggest that, if the member for Hanson started reading the newspaper even in this House, he might be better informed.

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Minister of Roads and Transport now admit that he has been taking no action or any positive steps to improve Adelaide's public transport system simply because he has been awaiting the release of a Commonwealth report?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know where the member for Bragg got such a stupid notion; he obviously did not listen to what I said. The report of the Bureau of Transport Economics on urban public transport was presented to the July meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council.

Dr. Tonkin: You've had it all that time?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In all of that time, we have been trying to twist the Commonwealth Government's arm, and State Liberal Ministers and State Labor Ministers have been united—

Mr. Venning: Where are you preaching next Sunday?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I might be in the parish of Rocky River, and the honourable member would not appreciate that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think honourable members in this House have an obligation to conduct themselves as members of Parliament. There are far too many frivolous interjections, questions and conversations, and honourable members can do themselves, as well as this institution, a loyal service if they conduct themselves properly. The honourable Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Director-General and his staff contributed significantly to the material that went into the study of the Bureau of Transport Economics, and if the member for Bragg has so poor a regard for the work which they did then, and which they have subsequently done—

Dr. Tonkin: Who said so?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Bragg said so when he claimed that they had done nothing. That statement is an absolute disgrace from a member of this House.

RAIL TOURS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider implementing railway tours to the South-East as a means of adding to the State's tourist activities? Some train-lovers in my district have suggested to me that

places such as Bordertown, Naracoorte, Penola and Mount Gambier could be stopovers on such a trip and that the tourists could be accommodated in motels or hotels in these places. Each place offers attractions, such as caves, golfing, and so on. I have been told that there is immense interest in having this scheme put into operation. These people do not expect cheap fares, as they are willing to pay well for such a trip to the South-East.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to look at it. Perhaps the honourable member will write to me about any further suggestions he has on the matter, and I shall be only too happy to look at them.

MORPHETT ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question whether work on widening Morphett Road will be undertaken this financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No work is to be undertaken on Morphett Road during the present financial year. The Highways Department advance programme for Morphett Road provides for work between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road to commence early in 1974. This is subject to completion of preconstruction activities and availability of finance at that time.

MALATHION

Mr. VENNING: In the absence of the Minister of Works, has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the price the Government pays for malathion and the price paid by councils and landholders?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My colleague states that the Government pays a special Government contract price of \$6.50 a gallon for malathion. Landholders pay half of this cost.

STRIP RESTAURANT

Mr. BECKER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the strip restaurant?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The entertainment is no different from that being offered in a number of licensed cabarets in the city, in respect of which no complaint has been received by the police. As presented at present, this type of entertainment is not considered to be of such a nature as could be successfully prosecuted.

Mr. BECKER: The Attorney has said that the entertainment in this restaurant is no different from that being offered in some

licensed cabarets in the city. In view of this statement, can he say whether striptease is legal?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The question of legality depends on whether the performance is an indecent performance. The courts judge what is an indecent performance in accordance with the current community standards, as best they can interpret them. Certain forms of striptease entertainment are common not only in Adelaide but also in every city (and I suspect sometimes outside the cities) in every State of the Commonwealth. I believe that, in those circumstances, it would be difficult for a court to hold that a striptease performance of itself was an indecent performance in accordance with current community standards. That may or may not be a good thing (I express no opinion about that), but the courts have to apply the test of the current community standards. I should think at present that it is certain that a court would not convict on a charge of indecent performance simply because there had been a strip by a performer in one of these shows. The situation might be otherwise if the strip were accompanied by obscene postures or acts of some other kind. That is as far as I can go in answering the honourable member. It is impossible to give a categorical "Yes" or "No" answer to this type of question. This is a matter on which the courts must apply community standards, and I think it is unlikely that a striptease performance, on current standards, would result in a conviction in the courts.

PORT LINCOLN MEATWORKS

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Premier say whether it is intended that the recently formed South Australian Meat Corporation will eventually take over the operations of the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That matter is being considered.

Mr. CARNIE: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Minister of Agriculture whether, in the upgrading of the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln (which was recently announced by the Minister), it is intended to install cattle scales for live weight selling?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Minister of Agriculture whether, in the project to upgrade the Gov-

ernment Produce Department works at Port Lincoln, the Minister has considered installing more boning room facilities for lease to private operators and also whether the Minister has considered the possibility of the Government Produce Department's becoming an exporter of boneless meat? One of the major reasons why the large number of stock is shipped from Eyre Peninsula to Adelaide is the lack of buyer support at Port Lincoln, and one reason for the lack of buyer support is the lack of facilities, such as boning rooms, as I have mentioned. An increase in these facilities could attract more buyers to Port Lincoln, to the benefit of the producers and the Government Produce Department. Regarding the second part of my question, the only time when the Government Produce Department has exported boneless meat on its own account has been when normal operators drop out at certain times of the year because it is not economic to continue. Doubtless, this adds to the heavy losses incurred by the Government Produce Department. If it is uneconomic for these operators to operate at certain times, why cannot the Government Produce Department enter the field at economic times also, and so help to reduce the losses mentioned?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will take the matter up with my colleague.

VENUS BAY ROAD

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of November 2 about the sealing of the road from Flinders Highway to Venus Bay?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Consideration is currently being given to the construction of a sealed access road from Flinders Highway to Venus Bay, to be commenced immediately following the completion of Flinders Highway between Talia and Streaky Bay in 1974-75. The Venus Bay access road is tentatively estimated to cost \$160,000, and whether it is possible to commence work in 1974-75 will depend on the availability of funds and priority of other rural road projects at that time.

MEAT HALL

Mr. VENNING: In the absence of the Minister of Works, has the Minister of Roads and Transport received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the possibility of a new meat hall being provided at the Gepps Cross abattoir?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Minister of Agriculture states that he has no knowledge of any work on a new meat hall at the Gepps Cross works. His announcement referred to additional beef-slaughtering facilities, including a new beef chain, for which funds of \$200,000 by way of a loan were approved in principle by Cabinet in March of this year. Subsequently, revised estimates submitted by the board of management based on known requirements of the European Economic Community indicated that the cost of the project would be more than double the original estimate, and the matter was accordingly deferred pending a detailed examination of costs and a revision of the plans. It is expected that one of the first tasks of the newly appointed South Australian Meat Corporation will be an investigation in depth of the proposed new facilities for beef slaughtering.

SOUTH TERRACE BUILDING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to take any action to answer the prayer in the two petitions that were presented earlier today? As I heard the first petition read (and the second was in the same form), the prayer was that a public inquiry should be instituted and conducted immediately into the matter raised, with a view to correcting, by amending the law if necessary, the injustices that have occurred. I know that this matter is personally embarrassing to the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —as much the other day in this House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As yet the Government has not considered the petitions that have been presented today. I can only say that they will be considered. Perhaps it is unfortunate that the recital of alleged facts in the petitions is wildly wrong.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, now, come on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You had better justify that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well. I certainly can justify it, and I will do so.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that it is a long series of alleged facts.

Mr. Millhouse: They make some fairly serious allegations, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is entirely out of order. The Premier may reply to the first question, but, by taking notice of the honourable member's interjections, which are entirely out of order, he is only encouraging the honourable member to disobey Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member is making the allegations himself, he has remedies but, if he is taking that position, I suggest that he check his facts correctly.

RATE ACCOUNTS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Local Government consider having the Local Government Act amended to provide for the payment of council rates either quarterly, or annually as at present? The Local Government Act provides that a council may, for the purpose of raising revenue, value all ratable properties within an area. Alternatively, a council may adopt the Government assessment as to annual value or unimproved value. This valuation then forms the basis for the council's raising its revenue. The declaring of a rate in the dollar is a discretionary power vested in the council. At present, rate notices are issued annually and, under the Act, council rates are required to be paid by a certain date. Otherwise, the ratepayer is liable to a fine. When a large rate account is received annually, especially if an unexpected increase in rates has taken place, some ratepayers may not have budgeted for the increase and, because of the large amount of the account, they face financial difficulty and hardship in paying it. We know that, in certain circumstances, ratepayers may pay the account in small instalments but, again, this is at the discretion of the council concerned. From conversations I have had with ratepayers in the council area within my district, I am convinced that quarterly accounts would be beneficial to ratepayers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter has been considered but no finality has been reached. I think that the suggestion has much to commend it. However, if it were adopted, problems would arise.

Mr. Gunn: Such as cost.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Some problems would arise from an operational point of view. I consider that the benefits that quarterly rating would provide would far outweigh the minor increase in cost and I think it has been shown adequately that the quarterly accounts for water rates confer a benefit greatly enjoyed by those who find the going tough, namely, the

workers of this State. I will certainly keep the matter under consideration to find out whether it is practicable to give effect to the honourable member's suggestion.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply from the Minister of Lands to the question I asked about employment under the metropolitan unemployment relief scheme?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have received a reply from my colleague, who administers this scheme. Unemployment figures released by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service are normally based on those statistics available as at the last Friday in the month. Assuming this to be the case for October, the figures released would be those current as at October 27, 1972. On that day 575 people were employed under the Government's metropolitan unemployment relief scheme and up to that time 700 people had received employment under the scheme. It can readily be seen, therefore, that the Government scheme has been responsible for about 47 per cent of the reduction in unemployment for the metropolitan area in the October figures. One week later, as at November 3, 1972, a further 120 people had been employed under the scheme and other increases of this nature can be expected for some weeks to come.

HAPPY VALLEY SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Minister of Education, will the Premier ask his colleague to make a further investigation of conditions at Happy Valley Primary School, particularly so that the school may have another portable classroom at the beginning of the next school year? The Minister of Education has said that a classroom will be available later than the beginning of the next school year. I visited the school this morning, and the school has new enrolments totalling 21 for next year. Only two students in grade 7 are leaving the school. The school will have two classrooms for 85 students in seven grades. In fact, 18 students in the junior school are using the school library. Although the chairs and tables are too large for those students, the chairs and tables have to remain there when the senior students use the room. Further, there is no staff toilet at the school and members of the staff are required to use the students' toilet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report.

T.A.B. DIVIDENDS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of October 31 about T.A.B. dividends?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the calculation of daily double dividends is made in accordance with the board's rule 10 "Provisions relating to double investments". As such, the dividend is dependent on the amount available for dividend distribution by way of the size of the investment pool, and the number of units invested on the successful winning combination(s). Reference was made to the South Australian daily double dividends for the Moonee Valley race meeting conducted on Saturday, September 16. On this occasion the gross South Australian investment pool was \$33,181, with a net pool for dividend distribution of \$28,203.85 after statutory deductions. A daily double dual dividend was applicable to the meeting, and therefore \$19,742.70 being 70 per cent of the net pool was available for first and first combination dividend calculation, and \$8,461.15 being 30 per cent of the net pool was available for the first and second combination dividend calculation. There were 236 investment units coupling the combination of first and first in the legs of the double resulting in a dividend of \$83.65 and 1,314 investment units coupling the combination of first and second for a consolation dividend of \$6.40. By way of a comparison, the Victorian Totalizator Agency Board's gross daily double investment pool was \$450,776 with 1,623 units invested on the first and first combination for a dividend of \$236.05. There is no hard and fast rule that can be applied when comparing South Australian dividends with those interstate, for it is the investors' selections and amount of investment separately in each State that govern the dividend to be paid. The availability of market and form guide information however undoubtedly influence the investor to some degree.

MAIN NORTH ROAD

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on the construction programme for the new Main North Road at the Freeling-Kapunda road junction? A decision has been taken to resite this junction about half a mile north of the present junction. Detailed planning has been undertaken and several pegs indicating the line of the intended roadway have been in place for at least 18 months. However, several accidents have occurred at the present junction and accidents

continue to occur almost weekly. The junction is a cause of concern to people living nearby.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report.

PUMPING

Mrs. STEELE: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Premier obtain a report on the hours of pumping at a tank in Leabrook, between Rochester Street and Knightsbridge Road? This tank was completed about three years ago and since then other land belonging to the man from whom the Government purchased the site on which to build the tank has been subdivided and homes have been built. However, it is only in the last 12 months that these homes have been occupied. Since the beginning of October, pumping at this tank has been continuous for 24 hours a day. I understand from my constituents that the pumping will continue from October until April next year. The noise resulting from the pumping is a great nuisance to these residents, because it is going on all the time. One resident, who previously lived on Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, has pointed out that the North Adelaide pump runs for only a certain number of hours a day. These residents were apparently not aware that, before they took up residence, this pumping would take place. Will the Premier obtain a report and will the Government see whether the hours of pumping can be staggered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report.

WHEAT

Mr. GUNN: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Minister of Agriculture when a new Chairman of the Wheat Quota Review Committee is to be appointed to replace Mr. Travers, who resigned a few months ago? Many people have again appealed against their wheat quotas, but these appeals cannot be heard because the Minister has not appointed a Chairman.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the question to the Minister of Agriculture.

BREAD

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry been able to obtain further information on the position concerning the weekend baking of bread? Has he been successful or otherwise in his discussions with members of the bread-making industry and

allied interests, including shopkeepers and distributors of bread throughout the suburbs and country areas?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I told the House some time ago, I think in reply to a question asked by the member for Kavel, that an inquiry was being conducted within the industry, and I understand that that inquiry is still proceeding. Although I have received no further information, I know that submissions have been received from country bakers.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Community Welfare considered the report submitted to him and to other members by the Headmaster of the Ceduna Area School (Mr. Webber)? This report makes some far-reaching suggestions and, in view of the Minister's interest in the welfare of Aborigines, I should like to know whether he has seriously considered these suggestions.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I read the gentleman's letter with considerable interest, and perhaps some of the suggestions he makes deserve further consideration. The suggestions will be taken into account, together with the views of many other bodies interested in this matter, most important of all the Aborigines themselves. The views of Aborigines must be of paramount importance when we consider how their affairs should be handled. However, I think that, regarding many of the suggestions made by Mr. Webber, the Aborigines in the area with which he is concerned would be unlikely to agree with him. A constant process of consultation takes place between the department and the Aborigines, and the suggestions made will certainly be the subject of consultation with the Aborigines in the area.

BURNS UNIT

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General please ask the Chief Secretary whether the burns treatment unit is yet operating at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, if it is, how long it has been operating? The burns unit area was specifically set aside in what was then the new north wing and was unoccupied for a considerable time. The matter had escaped my memory, or I would have asked a question on the subject earlier in the session. However, I now make up for my apparent lack of interest or for my forgetfulness.

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

INSECTICIDES

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he has had or is having discussions regarding the control of the use of insecticides? A press report earlier this week stated that Dr. Rose, a botanist from Sydney University, had expressed strong views to the effect that there should be control of and investigation into the use of D.D.T. and that funds should be allocated in future for this purpose. This matter has exercised the minds of many people, both in the city and in the country. It is possible to buy lethal compounds, distributed under a trade name, for ordinary garden use, and many leading authorities think that some of the illnesses being suffered by people are caused, for example, by overdoses of these compounds, which can be easily procured and used to destroy insects and eradicate weeds. I ask whether the Minister, together with his counterparts in other States, has investigated this problem.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The matter of insecticides being harmful or likely to cause harm is constantly being considered by the Ministers of Health and by a subcommittee representing the various States, and I am continually being informed of any decision that has been taken concerning whether or not harmful substances are being used as insecticides. From reports that I have read, it seems to me that there is no cause for alarm and no problem arising in this regard. Insecticides are controlled in such a way that they cannot cause any great harm. However, it seems that the views expressed in the report to which the honourable member has referred need to be carefully considered in order to determine whether or not there is any likelihood of danger to the community as a result of using D.D.T. and other insecticides in home gardens. Although I understand that the Ministers of Health are satisfied that there is no real problem in this regard, I will nevertheless refer the honourable member's question to the Public Health Department, so that I can provide him with a detailed report on what is currently the thinking of officers in that department.

LOXTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the absence of the Minister of Education, I ask whether the Premier will obtain from his colleague a report on when it is expected to call tenders to erect a new primary school at Loxton. I believe that this is an approved project and that tenders were to have been called in October, but at

this stage, as far as I know, they have not been called.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

AFRICAN DAISY

Mr. McANANEY: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Minister of Agriculture what area of African daisy in the Hills area has been sprayed by the Government? Will he obtain a report on the risk of damage to vineyards and gardens nearby? Two or three people have asked me this because they are worried about the spray being blown long distances by gully winds.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture for a report.

ABSCONDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what is the present position regarding absconding from McNally Training Centre? Much publicity was given to conditions at the home and the fact that juvenile offenders were absconding freely. The Minister said previously that he was worried about the situation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As the new methods of treating juvenile offenders are taking effect and as the staff of the institutions are becoming accustomed to the challenge and problems associated with those new methods, there is a steady decline in the absconding rate, which, over the last four weeks, has been at least as low as it was in 1968-69, and the trend is steadily downwards. The present situation is very satisfactory from the point of view of the trend that is manifesting itself and the success that is attending the efforts of the superintendents and staffs of the institutions. The matter having been raised, I will get some figures for the honourable member next week, but I can say that the trend is excellent.

Mr. McAnaney: You're not worried?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. I am heartened by the emerging pattern which shows clearly that the methods adopted are proving successful and that the superintendents and staffs of the institutions, as they are becoming accustomed to the new methods, are finding the situation much easier to handle. There is now certainly no greater absconding problem than there has been in years past, and by that I mean over a long period of years. That is not to say, however, that the problem is completely solved. While there is any degree of absconding, we ought to be trying to improve the situation further.

Some degree of absconding is inseparable from the successful treatment of juvenile offenders, because there must come a stage in the treatment where a juvenile is put on his own responsibility, which means that there must be occasions when the system breaks down because he cannot respond to the responsibility put on him. The trend indicates that, as more skills are developed in the institutions in judging the degree to which a juvenile offender may be given responsibility, the absconding rate will decline even further.

UCOLTA RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when flashing lights are to be installed at the Ucolta railway crossing on the Broken Hill road, between Peterborough and Oodla Wirra? As the installation of the lights is included in the list of works for the current financial year, the local residents are asking when the work will be done.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I am not aware of the day-to-day programme, I will obtain the information and let the honourable member know.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary what is the current waiting time for elective operations in the various surgical departments of the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals?

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

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Attorney-General give me a reply, before we get up next week, to the question I asked on September 14 about under-age drinking?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matter and see whether there is a reply outstanding for the honourable member.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister of Community Welfare satisfied with the methods being used in the training of the Aboriginal people under the jurisdiction of his department? Being in the District of Eyre last week, I visited Koonibba Aboriginal Reserve and, among other things, I saw a house which, built in April this year at a cost of about \$11,500 and occupied by Aborigines, had been extensively damaged. Without saying that I know the solution to the problem, I invite the Minister to comment on the success or otherwise of the scheme to educate Aborigines

by giving them first-class facilities. Far from wanting to sit in judgment, I ask whether the Minister has any future plans in regard to housing for Aborigines.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This is a problem area. Inhabitants of that area are for the most part in the course of transition from one style of life to another, and this presents great problems. Attempts have been made in some areas to deal with the matter of housing for Aborigines, at this stage of transition, by means of transitional houses. At Koonibba the problem is intensified because members of the staff live close to Aboriginal residents who are conscious of the standard of housing of the staff and naturally ask why they should not be housed in a similar fashion. Further, the residents of Koonibba, who are in close contact with the towns, know how the rest of the population is housed. In those circumstances it is difficult to propose for the people types of housing that differ materially from the general standard of housing in the community, even though a different type of housing may be more suitable for their immediate needs. It is, however, not only a question of immediate needs and capacity to handle the situation: psychological and moral factors are involved and it is necessary to consider the wishes and aspirations of the people and to avoid the frustration, bitterness and resentment that can come from telling them that they should be housed in houses that differ from those of the community generally. This is a great problem. Certainly, the department does its best to train and educate the people to manage the type of housing provided for them. That training is more or less successful according to the individual. It is successful with some, less successful with others, and wholly unsuccessful with some, too. No doubt on his visit to Koonibba the honourable member observed a situation that occurred when some Aboriginal residents were, or an Aboriginal resident was, unable to cope with the type of housing provided. The honourable member has asked me whether I am satisfied with the training provided. I believe that in this field of Aboriginal affairs we just cannot afford to be satisfied with what we are doing. The department is conscious of the fact that it must continually improve and intensify its efforts to train Aborigines, who wish to make the transition from the old way of life to an integrated life in the community, to accept the responsibility that goes with that. This is a constant process of endeavouring to improve the training that is imparted, and to assist the Aborigines to make the necessary adjustments.

There will certainly be failures. This is a difficult process that has to be tackled largely by the system of trial and error. I do not think that, in this area, we can afford to allow ourselves to be discouraged by the obvious failures that have occurred and are undoubtedly occurring at Koonibba, and, indeed, elsewhere.

MINISTER OF WORKS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say when the Minister of Works will be available to give information to any member or constituent who seeks it from him? I had an inquiry to make of the Minister yesterday, but he was not here, and he is away again today. I am not concerned about where he is. However, I should like to know when he will be available, so that I can talk to him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that the Minister of Works will be in the House on Tuesday. In the meantime, he has unfortunately contracted one of the dreaded influenza diseases that seem to have afflicted several members of the House.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: I have heard a report that the ponding of Bool Lagoon and the gulleys cut in its floor have not had the desired effect of spreading water throughout the lagoon. Bool Lagoon, which is centrally situated in the South-East and which holds run-off water, is of major importance to the general ecology of the area. The success of the project will depend on experimentation. This drainage system channels water into the sea via Drain M, and this must also have an effect on the Coorong. Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether any detailed study has been made of the overall effect of the ponding of this water in Bool Lagoon? I should like to know whether the gulleys, which were cut in the lagoon to make it an effective storage basin in which water could be held or from which it could be released into the drain to serve other areas in the vicinity, have been successful. What is the total effect of this scheme on the South-East generally, and on the Coorong in particular?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have been informed that the work undertaken has not been as successful as was hoped. However, I am not sure whether additional work has been decided on to try to solve the problems associated with this scheme. I will obtain a report for the honourable member and give it to him next week.

ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier discuss with the Minister of Education the desirability of giving an assurance that there will be no reduction in the adult education classes in the Adelaide Hills because of the lack of departmental support? The Adelaide Hills area has been noted in recent years for the art and craft that it has produced. In fact, it may be considered to be the centre of art and craft work. A recent Education Department decision, if given effect to, will mean that there will be a reduction in the number of adult education classes in the Hills, affecting ballet classes, painting classes, craft classes, and many others. As we in the past have been encouraging cottage industry to prevail strongly in the Hills area (and I hope we do so in future), I hope that the Premier will discuss this matter with his colleague, with a view to giving an assurance that people who have been committed to learning these crafts will not be stopped because of the lack of finance and support. One other point is that there is no opportunity for people in this area to come to the city for tutoring, because no notable public transport is readily available for that purpose in the evening.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

SAFETY HELMETS

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the wearing of safety helmets and whether certain helmets comply with the safety standards in this State?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For a number of years it has been mandatory in South Australia for motor cycle riders to wear safety helmets, meeting standards specified by the Road Traffic Board. The current standards, incidentally, were published in the *Government Gazette* of December 3, 1971, and are in fact those recommended by the Standards Association of Australia and the British Standards Institute. It is indeed disconcerting if helmets not meeting these standards, but purporting to do so, are available for sale to the general public. To identify this problem in greater depth, I have arranged for the Road Traffic Board to undertake an investigation with a view of removing any doubt or confusion that may exist at the present time about whether those helmets on sale meet the technical and legal requirements for motor cycle riders. Although the honourable member may consider that it may be prudent to remove from sale

all helmets not meeting statutory requirements for motor cycle riders, it may not be practicable to do so, bearing in mind that safety helmets may also be used for other purposes; for instance, there is a continuing demand for such helmets by go-kart riders and skid kids. However, as I mentioned earlier, the Road Traffic Board will closely look at all aspects of the matter and inform me whether there is justification to implement some form of action to solve the problem.

PARLIAMENTARY ACCOMMODATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say for what purpose the room in this building, previously occupied by the Clerk Assistant and made available to the Premier since as a waiting room, is being used? Some months ago, Mr. Speaker, you insisted on my leaving the room I had occupied for a considerable time, the reason given being that it had to be upgraded so that it could be used by the Clerk Assistant in order that his room, adjacent to the Premier's room, could be used as a waiting room because it was considered by the Premier and others that it was undignified that the Premier's callers should have to sit in the passage outside his door and that there should be some private place for them to wait. As a result of my being moved, the Clerk Assistant did go into the space I had previously occupied, which was greatly improved, and a new room was made available for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in a back passage downstairs. I notice on the door of the room that was to be used as the Premier's waiting room the sign "Premier — Inquiries". As far as I can see from observations I have made casually in passing, there are three desks and chairs in the room and it looks very much as though the room is used by the Premier's staff as an office. I notice also that his visitors are still sitting outside in the passage. My question has much point because I well remember hearing a retiring Clerk of the Commonwealth House of Representatives say that the greatest mistake ever made by the Commonwealth Parliament was to allow Ministers and members of their staffs to occupy space in Parliament House, Canberra. It seems that this is precisely what is beginning to happen here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not explaining his question: he is commenting on the position relating to the allocation of rooms, and he must not. Does the Premier desire to reply to the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member seems to have been under some misapprehension as to the intended use of the room. When I was using the Premier's office in the House, it was normally occupied also by several members of my staff: the Secretary of my department, my private secretary, a press officer, and a typiste were frequently there simply so that ordinary work might be carried on, in the same way as people on the staff of the Leader of the Opposition are provided with somewhere to go. In fact, however, the Leader of the Opposition has somewhere for his people to go, whereas, when I was using my room here and a deputation came to see me, or when I was visited by people who had to see me at Parliament House, all my staff had to go out and sit in the corridor. Telephone calls would come directly to me instead of to members of my staff, so that the deputations or other visitors were interfered with and it was a hopeless, unworkable procedure.

Mr. Millhouse: It worked for a long time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It just depends on the kind of work that one does. I point out to the honourable member that rather more than previous Premiers I have a wide range of portfolios. The position is that the room previously occupied by the Clerk Assistant is now occupied by members of my staff who sometimes work here while I am at Parliament House. There is a typiste and one press officer, and often the Secretary of my department or my private secretary. In addition, the permanent head of the department or senior officers occasionally use that room. Further, it is used to accommodate people who are waiting to see me but, if the number of people waiting to see me grows too large so that they cannot be accommodated in the room, they may have to wait in the corridor. We try to accommodate them as best we can and to show them as much courtesy as possible.

BIRD SALES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say how a person or a firm whose permit to buy, sell or keep protected birds has been cancelled can still advertise the sale of protected birds? I refer to page 3 of the *Sunday Mail* of November 5, 1972, and a report under the heading "Police hold 100. Swoop on 'house of cages'." I refer also to an advertisement on page 58 of the *Advertiser* of November 11, 1972, offering

for sale a large range of budgies, finches, parrots and other birds. However, many of these Australian birds are protected.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A business cannot continue to trade if its licence has been cancelled. However, there is no offence committed by a person lodging an advertisement. The matter having been drawn to my attention, I have asked the department to place a notice in the press, appearing either tomorrow or over the weekend, advising the community generally, especially persons who might respond to these advertisements to which the honourable member refers, that, if they deal in such transactions, they will probably be committing an offence because the dealer has no permit. I hope this overcomes the difficulties that have been created in this area.

OVERLAND EXPRESS

Mr. MATHWIN: My question is directed to the Minister of Roads and Transport, but he is not here. I was going to ask the Minister about a question which, on November 2, I directed through the Minister of Environment and Conservation about the Overland express, how many times it had arrived late in Adelaide in the last three months, and whether it would not be better if more time were allowed for the journey.

The SPEAKER: Is the member repeating his question; is he moving a motion regarding another question he has asked; or does he seek a reply?

Mr. MATHWIN: When I asked the question, the Minister of Environment and Conservation said he thought the question had been answered a few weeks previously, whereas it had not been.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I apologize for my temporary absence from the Chamber: I was taking a Ministerial call from another State, and I heard only part of the question. Under those conditions, I cannot give the honourable member a reply, but I will look at the question in *Hansard* and bring down a reply for him.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

With one exception all the amendments made by this Bill are consequential on the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Bill which was introduced recently. With the repeal of Parts II to XI of the Industrial Code effected by the Bill for an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the replacement of the safety, health and welfare provisions of the Industrial Code by the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Bill there will be only three matters dealt with in the Industrial Code. They are sections 168 and 169, which require outside workers to be registered and factory occupiers to keep records of work done by out-workers, section 194, regulating the hours of baking of bread in the metropolitan area, and sections 220 to 227, concerning shop trading hours.

Although the Bill appears to be complicated, its purpose is simply to repeal all of the redundant definitions and sections in the Industrial Code and, where necessary, to either amend the remaining provisions or include new provisions in existing sections in respect of the subject matters with which they now deal. The one amendment that is not consequential on the other two Bills to which I have already referred is the amendment of the definition of "shop" to ensure that used-car yards come within that definition. This matter has already been the subject of questions and discussion in this House and the amendment is needed to remedy a possible defect in the present definition.

I now turn to the detail of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be proclaimed, which will be the same day as the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act is proclaimed to come into operation. Clauses 3 and 4 are formal. With one exception, clause 5 contains formal amendments by striking out 40 definitions from the Act. The exception is the amendment to the definition of "shop" to which I have already referred. Clauses 6 and 7 are formal.

Clause 8, as well as repealing redundant provisions regarding registrations, includes a new section which repeats that part of the present section 165a that is needed to determine whether a shop is an exempt shop or not within the meaning of the Act. Clauses 9 to 18 are all formal. Clause 19 makes consequential amendments to section 197. Clause 20 is formal. Clause 21 enacts in an amended form a new section 202 regarding the recovery of fines. Clauses 22 to 25 are consequential. Clause 26 enacts in an amended form two sections regarding the powers and

obligations of inspectors. They are proposed to be similar to clauses contained in the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Bill. Clauses 27 and 28 are both formal.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIFTS AND CRANES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lifts and Cranes Act, 1960-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is entirely consequential upon the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Bill, which was introduced last week. When that Bill becomes law there will be for the first time one comprehensive Act dealing with the safety of employed persons in the State. This will concern the safe working of employees, whereas the Lifts and Cranes Act is primarily concerned with the safety of the equipment to which that Act applies. The Lifts and Cranes Act provides that the designs of all cranes and lifts must be approved before they are manufactured or installed, that they must be registered with the Department of Labour and Industry and subject to inspection. However, because in the past the Industrial Code and the Construction Safety Act have also contained provisions regarding the safety of cranes, the Lifts and Cranes Act has not applied in respect of cranes in factories or on building sites.

As there is now no reason to have different Acts applying to the safety of cranes, depending upon the situation where they are installed or used, this Bill is introduced to ensure that all provisions of the Lifts and Cranes Act, except those concerned with the registration of a crane, will apply to all cranes used in industrial premises and on construction work to which the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Bill applies. As industrial premises and construction works will be registered under that Act there is no need for separate registration of cranes in or on those places. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the legislation to come into operation on a day to be proclaimed, which will be the same day as the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act is proclaimed to come into operation.

Clause 3 removes from the Act the exemptions in respect of cranes or hoists currently subject to the Industrial Code and the Construction Safety Act but provides that the legislation

will not apply to a lift or crane in any mine. Clause 4 is a consequential amendment on the change of title of the Chief Inspector, made by the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Bill. Clause 5 also effects some consequential amendments and simplifies the system of giving approvals so that both an approval and a permit are not necessary. Clause 6 will exempt from registration any crane other than a mobile crane which is installed in or on industrial premises or on construction works or on mines. Clauses 7 and 8 make further consequential amendments.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINING)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 3112.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is consequential on other legislation that has been introduced to cover the situation that has developed in the mining of precious stones. However, despite the legislation, people will still have to be caught in the act of stealing, and this will lead to some problems for the police. It will not be as simple as it looks to prosecute effectively people who are causing difficulty on the opal fields. However, with these reservations, I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the Bill. I hope that this Bill and the other relevant legislation that has been introduced will go a long way towards stopping the undesirable activities that are taking place at Coober Pedy.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Precious stones."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Why is the word "severs", rather than words such as "mines" or "picks", used in new section 152a?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): This word is used because it is only possible to steal a chattel; a part of a freehold, or land, cannot be stolen. Consequently, it is only possible to steal after the precious stone has been severed from the earth. Therefore, for that purpose we have had to prohibit not only stealing but also severing. This is the most general word that could be used. If we had referred to picking, as the Leader suggests, a precious stone could be removed by some means other than a pick. As

"severs" is the word likely to catch any removal of precious stones from the earth, it is the appropriate word to use.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and tide passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (LOITERING)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 3112.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): They tell me that things are fairly bad at Coober Pedy and that that is why it is necessary to have this frenzy of legislation and the creation of several offences there. I must accept that the situation is so bad that it needs a remedy. However, I am not pleased about the spate of Bills that create offences for which harsh penalties are provided. This Bill is a case in point. New section 18a (1) creates the offence of a person loitering on any land comprised in a precious stones claim. Apparently, in future a person will not be able to loiter on his own claim, because there is no exception if the claim is on a person's own land. One can be in trouble if one is on one's own claim between sunset and sunrise! I am sorry there is not a Parliamentary Counsel present, because I have asked for an amendment to be drafted on this. I hope that the Attorney-General will note that.

In new section 18a the penalty is \$500 or imprisonment for six months for loitering on a precious stones claim. In section 18 of the principal Act, the general loitering provision, the penalty is \$50 or imprisonment for three months. Apparently, the offence with which we are dealing is regarded as being so dreadful and so much worse than the general offence of loitering that we must increase the maximum fine 10 times and double the term of imprisonment.

Mr. Gunn: So we should.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why is it necessary to do this? It is completely inconsistent with the provisions of the principal Act and I cannot believe that this offence should be regarded as being of so much greater seriousness than the general offence of loitering. There is really only one operative clause in the Bill, namely, clause 3. I make two points. First, as the Bill is drafted, one can be guilty of loitering on one's own claim, and I think that should be put right by amendment. I think it should be made clear that

the offence is committed only if a person is on someone else's claim. Otherwise, as I have said, anyone who is on his own claim between sunset and sunrise will be in danger of being charged with the offence.

Secondly, I consider that the penalties are out of proportion to the penalties laid down for loitering at present. I do not quarrel with new section 18a (2), which sets out the prohibited hour; as being the hours of darkness. Given the situation there, as described by the member for Eyre and the Minister to me, this may be justifiable. I do not quarrel with, although I do not like, subsection (3), which switches the onus, but in the circumstances we can perhaps turn a blind eye to that.

As the Bill stands, I do not like the provisions regarding those two points that I have made, and I should be much more pleased if the offence being created were like an offence under the Mining Act and if the legislation were to operate for only 12 months, being subject to review by Parliament during the next session and subject to renewal or, if the emergency up there has passed, allowed to lapse. I intend to move such an amendment in Committee. I hope that, when whichever Minister is in charge of the Bill replies to the debate, he will reply to the matters I have raised, including the two points and the period of operation of the Act. I also hope that we will have time, when Parliamentary Counsel is available, to have amendments drafted.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I rise to support this measure strongly, particularly the penalties in clause 3. It is absolutely essential (and I make no apology for saying this) that severe penalties be imposed on people who are illegally on another person's precious stones claim. At present, in Coober Pedy particularly, a small group of people operate during the hours of darkness. Well organized and equipped with walkie-talkie radios, they watch the operations of legal miners all day and do not intend to carry out legal operations.

All they have to do is watch until a miner is successful. That miner may have worked for two or three years on a claim and may have just struck a reasonable class of opal. Overnight these criminals enter his mine shaft and in some cases steal opal worth \$600 or more, and it takes them only a few minutes to do this.

Many miners blast the shaft before they leave in the evening. As they cannot enter the mine for several hours after, because of the fumes, they go home to spend the evening with

their wives and families, and these criminals enter the shaft in the early hours of the morning and take what is available. In many cases, if they do not take opal, they damage the mine and the equipment. Because of the terrain of the country at Coober Pedy, mining operations are scattered over a large area and an army of police would be required to patrol the areas during the night if severe penalties were not provided.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think the penalty deters them already?

Mr. GUNN: If we are going to treat this element with kid gloves and say, "You are naughty boys; do not do it again," they will laugh at the police, as they are doing now. We are dealing not with ordinary people who break the law but with specialists. They are gangsters who have threatened lives, houses and properties. They have threatened to blow up houses with dynamite and they have shot at people. Probably, they are the most despicable people in this State, and I commend the Government for the action it has taken.

I make no apology for saying that, and on this occasion the member for Mitcham has been rather unrealistic. If he does not believe that, I suggest that he go and talk to the people at Coober Pedy and see how they feel about the situation. I ask the member for Mitcham what he would think if someone entered his law office and stole something.

Mr. Millhouse: Alas, there's nothing there to steal!

Mr. GUNN: If the member for Mitcham were to apprehend such a person and that person said, "If you do anything about this, we will blow your house up," how would he feel? This is the sort of behaviour the people of Coober Pedy are faced with, and I commend the Government for taking the strong action that it has taken. I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill. I realize that we may be breaking new ground, but we have a set of circumstances which we have not had in South Australia previously and which I hope we never have again.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): Following the eloquent remarks of the member for Eyre, there is little I need to say in reply to the member for Mitcham. I thought that the member for Eyre made an excellent speech and made his points very well. Although this Government, at any rate, is never anxious to resort to Draconian and repressive measures if other measures are available, I have no doubt, as a result of what the member for Eyre has said and what his constituents have put

to the Minister Assisting the Premier, that the situation is serious and calls for strong measures to protect the law-abiding people of the area from the lawless element.

Dealing with the two points made by the member for Mitcham, as to the question of loitering on one's own land, I do not consider that there can be such a situation. To loiter is to idle without apparent lawful reason. A person on his own land obviously has lawful reason to be there. He is a person on his own land but he is not loitering there, and it seems to me that there is no substance in that point.

As to the penalty, the first thing to observe is that the penalty in the Police Offences Act is, I suppose, considerably out of date, but there is a deliberate policy of imposing, in this new section, heavier penalties for loitering on a precious stones claim than are applicable to loitering in other circumstances. However, there is good reason for that: people may loiter in the streets of the city for many unlawful reasons, but reasons that are associated with relatively venial things such as unlawful betting and the like, whereas a person who is loitering on a precious stones claim has something to explain. He has to explain his reason for being there. Would he be there for other than a sinister purpose? If he can explain to the court that he was not there for a sinister purpose, the court need not impose a heavy penalty. I believe there is good reason for a heavy maximum penalty, because this provision deals with a matter involving more than normal loitering.

I do not think it is appropriate to place a time limit on the legislation. The situation at Coober Pedy has illustrated what could happen in other areas where the same situation arises, and there should be a permanent provision on the Statute Book to deal with the matter. This Bill is not in the nature of emergency legislation. A new offence is created with severe penalties, but those penalties are appropriate to the offence committed, and I believe this provision should be made a permanent law of the State. It differs from the Mining Act provision that confers power on the Minister to remove people from the area, but that is a different matter and is legislation of a different kind. This legislation creates a law to deal with a criminal offence of a kind that I believe to be a proper part of the permanent law of the State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Loitering on opal claims."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Regarding the Attorney's comment about my first point in regard to section 18 of the Police Offences Act, that is not loitering *simpliciter*: it is loitering in any public place. The obvious construction to be placed on new section 18a calls for an exclusion regarding a landholder's land. It could do no harm, even on the Attorney-General's own argument, to include that exclusion in the Bill. It would then have a qualification somewhat similar to the qualification in section 18. I ask that progress be reported to enable me to have my amendment drafted.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 18a (1), after "who", to insert "during the period expiring on the last day of the year that next succeeds the day of commencement of the Police Offences Act Amendment Act (No. 3), 1972".

I am most appreciative of the indulgence that the Committee gave me to have amendments prepared. This amendment is designed to allow the clause to operate until the end of 1973. For the reason I gave earlier, I believe (and I now adopt the word used by the Attorney-General when he replied to the debate) that a provision that is so Draconian should not operate indefinitely. I understand from all concerned that this is an emergency situation which should be over within that period. If all these people have been brought before the court, there would not be any need for the provision, but if they have not we have only to look at it again and accept whatever assurance is given by the member for Eyre and the Minister that the provision is still required, and the provision can be extended. We are perpetuating a provision to deal with a situation which now exists and which we hope will have been resolved within 12 months, but, if it has not, no irreparable harm will have been done, because it will be possible for Parliament to extend the operation of this clause either indefinitely or for another 12 months. Parliament has been doing this in the Prices Act for the last 24 years without apparently interfering with the effectiveness of the legislation but allowing Parliament always the opportunity to look at something which is out of the ordinary and which could work injustices.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I oppose the amendment, for the reasons I gave during the second reading debate. I did not refer to this provision as Draconian: the reference was a general reference. This is a proper measure for permanent inclusion on the Statute Book. It deals with loitering

on a precious stones claim, and I do not see any justification for limiting it. If it is found later that the measure is not needed, it can be modified. At that time, in the light of the facts available, Parliament could make any necessary amendments.

Mr. GUNN: I oppose the amendment and support what the Attorney-General said. It is completely unrealistic to make this Bill operate for only 12 months. The member for Mitcham said the situation might not exist in 12 months time, but he is unrealistic. We are dealing with professional criminals who would be happy to go on an overseas tour for 12 months. Some of these people have made a fortune and they have no regard for opal miners. I believe the opal miners are entitled to be protected, and the Bill, as it stands, gives them the protection they deserve.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed at the attitude of the two allies, the Attorney-General and the member for Eyre, on this amendment. What the member for Eyre has said is entirely beside the point. This amendment would not necessarily mean that the provision would come to an end in 12 months time; it would simply mean that Parliament had an opportunity—

Mr. Gunn: Anyone can move that the Bill be repealed at any time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When the member for Eyre has been here a little longer he will find out it is a little more difficult to do this than to put it the other way and provide that automatically the matter must come before Parliament. I am not depriving the residents of Coober Pedy of the protection indefinitely if it is needed. All I am doing is providing that Parliament must look at it again. Even if the Attorney-General did not use the word Draconian in reference to this provision, he used it when speaking to this Bill, and I believe it is an apt description of the offences which we are creating. I hope that, despite what has been said, the Committee will support my amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 18a(1), after "hours", to insert "and who upon request by a member of the Police Force does not give a satisfactory reason for so loitering".

Under the present provision, I believe there could be a danger of a person, who was on his own property in the evening, being charged with this offence. My amendment does not cover that directly. However, by including a similar provision to that which is now in section 18 of the principal Act, I am providing

that, if a person gives a reasonable excuse (and it would be a reasonable excuse for a person to say that he was on his own land), he is not guilty of loitering.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 18a(1) to strike out "Five" and insert "Two".

The penalty in section 18 is \$50 or three months imprisonment. I am willing to accept that at Coober Pedy there are wealthy crooks, and that therefore a pecuniary penalty of \$50 would not have much effect. Therefore, I accept that a significant period of imprisonment should be provided and that the penalty in section 18 should be doubled and made six months. However, I think we should be fairly consistent and, having doubled the penalty of imprisonment, we should not do more than increase the pecuniary penalty to \$200.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I oppose the amendment, for the reasons I gave in replying to the second reading debate.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 3114.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill, but I do so with mixed feelings. Section 14a is the result of an amendment I moved in a previous session. The strict adherence to the letter of the law in matters such as this does not always produce the desired result. The court in dealing with matters under this legislation must assume that fundamentally it is always in the interests of the rehabilitation of a convicted person that any sentence of imprisonment be suspended on condition that the convicted person undergo treatment appropriate to the alleviation or control of his problem, whatever that may be. In this case it is an addictional propensity towards the use of drugs of dependence. When this legislation was last considered by the House, in 1970, I said:

It is obvious to anyone who has had anything at all to do with people dependent on hard drugs that they are not acting on their own volition in many cases. They have to depend for their supply of drugs on the suppliers, who may threaten to withhold supplies unless they do what is requested.

Consequently, many people who are drug suppliers and peddlers are acting because of their dependence on drugs. I strongly support giving these people the opportunity of receiving treatment and having a sentence passed on them that can be suspended provided they undertake to remain under treatment. The new clause will make that possible.

It has proved to be impracticable to leave section 14a in the Act. I regret this, but my regret is tempered by the fact that, under the terms of the Offenders Probation Act, the court has the discretion to exercise its common sense and to do whatever it feels will be in the best interests of the convicted person, having regard to all the circumstances.

I am most concerned at the deterioration in the general state of affairs relating to the use of drugs of dependence in this State that has occurred during the two years since this legislation was last before the House. The incidence of drug dependence throughout the world, throughout Australia, and throughout South Australia has increased markedly. The number of young people, in particular, who are being exposed to, and succumbing to, drugs is increasing daily. I commend the Commonwealth Government for its action in relation to drug education. I commend every State Government and their Public Health Departments for the part they are playing as partners with the Commonwealth in drug education programmes, but I make the plea that more money be spent and more help be given towards solving the problems of drug dependence. It seems that the only way that we can satisfactorily solve the problem is by immunizing young people against drug dependence. I have used this term many times previously: it simply means making every young person's present life so exciting, so challenging and so full of meaning that that person will not want to exchange it for the dream-time world of drugs. I support the Bill.

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

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill extends the application of the Barley Marketing Act, 1947, as amended, to barley grown in every season up to and including the season 1977-78. As at present section 22 of the principal Act provides that it will apply only to barley grown in every

season up to and including the season 1972-73, the effect of this Bill is to extend the life of the Act for a further five years. Members will be aware that the Barley Marketing Board constituted by the principal Act operates under an Act of this State and an Act of the State of Victoria and, in effect, the members of the board are drawn from both States. It is clear, therefore, that any extension of the period of application of the Act will have to be agreed to by the responsible authorities of both States. Negotiations in this area are proceeding.

This Bill, then, is introduced as a precautionary measure to ensure that the results of any agreement can be given effect to in this State, since the Parliament of this State may not be sitting when agreement between the States is arrived at. Accordingly, it is provided by clause 2 that it will not come into operation until a day to be fixed by proclamation. This will ensure that there is no hiatus in the operations of the Barley Marketing Board.

Mr. FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment and that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments to clause 12, reinstated by the House of Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Land and Business Agents Bill to be held during the adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

At 4.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 21, at 2 p.m.