HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 28, 1974

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

MINISTERS

The SPEAKER: In the absence of the honourable Minister of Education and the honourable Attorney-General, who are away on Ministerial duties, members who have questions that they may wish to direct to those Ministers may direct them to the honourable Minister of Works.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

WHEAT

In reply to Mr. VENNING (February 21).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture points out that the negotiations between the Australian Minister for Primary Industry and the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation are not the province of State Ministers. My colleague was not involved in those discussions, and no advice has yet been received from the Commonwealth Minister about the results of his consultations with the federation last week. Until further information is available from Canberra, my colleague is not able to take the matter further.

COOPER CROSSING

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (February 20).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No approach has been made to the Army to obtain a pontoon for the Cooper crossing on the Birdsville track, as it is not known at this stage whether it is feasible to use such equipment on this site. The matter is being examined by the Highways Department.

BIRDSVILLE TRACK

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (February 21).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An application was made to the Australian Government for additional funds to enable the completion of the upgrading of the Birdsville track as a beef road, but the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, in its report to the Australian Government on giant assistance to the States for roads for the period 1974-75 to 1978-79, has recommended that allocations for special roads such as beef roads be discontinued, and that any such allocations be included in one Australian Road Grants Act. This report is still being considered by the Australian Government, and finality has not yet been reached. In regard to damage caused to the Birdsville track and other roads in the Far North on account of recent flooding, an application is being prepared seeking special financial assistance from the Australian Government to enable the roads to be reinstated. It is not possible to give any indication of the likely response of the Australian Government to this application.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when was the last occasion on which he had contact with the members of the Redcliff consortium concerning the establishment of the project at Red Cliff Point, and does he have the slightest doubt that this present consortium will proceed with the construction schedule that has already been outlined on several occasions, or whether it will in fact proceed with the project? Before this resumed session of Parliament commenced, the Premier indicated on several occasions that one of the prime purposes of this six-week sitting was to ratify the indenture to build the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. However, on Thursday of last week the Premier, in reply to a question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, told this House that the indenture Bill would not now be presented to Parliament during this session but would be introduced for ratification later in the year. The Premier also assured the House that this would not affect the completion date of the project, the consortium having indicated that, although it could not be on the site by April this year as originally intended, the completion date would be unaffected by the delay. In recent months there have been numerous reports of difficulties in tying up the detail involved in the Redcliff project, difficulties which, I point out, have not been helped by some of the statements and actions of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor). However, the Premier has maintained in this House and in press statements that there has been no diminution of capital involvement in the project by members of the consortium and that the project will go ahead as planned. Nevertheless, I am concerned by two statements in today's press, reported locally through the *Advertiser* and nationally—

The SPEAKER: Order! In starting to quote from press statements, the honourable Leader is getting close to making a comment whilst asking his question.

Dr. EASTICK: I appreciate that, Sir, but I believe that, as these are direct quotations and are particularly pertinent to the question I am asking the Premier, you will accept them. These statements, which appear in this morning's *Advertiser* and also in the *Financial Review,* relate to comments emanating from the annual reports issued at meetings held yesterday by two major companies involved in the consortium. The Chairman of Ampol Petroleum Limited (Mr. W. M. Leonard) has cast doubt whether his company will in fact participate in the project. This report states:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable Leader going to read the comment in a newspaper report?

Dr. EASTICK: I desire briefly to read paragraphs from two press reports that are pertinent to the question. The first report is as follows:

> Mr. Leonard said Ampol expected to be in a position to make a final decision on its participation in the Redcliff petro-chemical complex before the end of this year. He pointed out that the company had been invited by the Australian Government (together with C.S.R. Ltd.) to join the consortium planning to develop the South Australian project. Discussions had been in progress for three months and were still continuing with the original members of the consortium (I.C.I., Alcoa and Mitsubishi) to determine the economic viability of the project and, if this was satisfactory, the financial commitment of Ampol.

The second statement was made by the Chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries Australia Limited (Mr. D. R. Zeidler) in a reference to the world-wide shortages of petro-chemical products. The report states:

> He—

that is, Mr. Zeidler—

> forecast that world-wide shortages of basic petro-chemical products would continue due to construction delays and uncertainty of energy supplies. Because of this I.C.I, Alcoa, and Mitsubishi were evaluating the pieviously announced Redcliff petro-chemical complex.

It is because of the inference to be drawn from those two statements by people of substance in two of the five companies nominated in connection with the consortium that I ask my question. On behalf of the Opposition and, indeed, of every member of the public in South Australia, I want to know whether there are any doubts in the Premier's mind regarding the finality of this project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the Leader's two questions is that I saw all the members of the existing and proposed consortium the week before last.

Dr. Eastick: Proposed?

The Hon. D A. DUNSTAN: Well, at present the new consortium has not been finalized. As I have already explained, the Government was not willing to put before the House an indenture referring to the original consortium and leave the addition of other members to make up the 51 per cent of Australian equity until after the passing of the indenture. That has been indicated to all members involved. Indeed, it was clearly stated at the meeting at which all persons involved were present.

Dr. Eastick: When?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have said, the week before last. Negotiations are proceeding, as is the work on the details of the indenture and of the installation. Also, the necessary evaluation projects concerned with the exact shape of the work to be undertaken on the site are being conducted. I have not the slightest doubt that the project will proceed. We have what the members of the original consortium have described as a turn proposal and an intention to proceed.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say whether, in his negotiations and discussions with the six members of the proposed consortium, any of them have indicated difficulty that they may face about meeting the commitments required before, say, the end of this year or by the time of the signing of the indenture (which I should hope would be long before then)? In the extracts from today's national newspapers that the Leader has quoted, one company (Ampol) has indicated (and I am paraphrasing here) that it was not sure that it could have all this work done and evaluated by the end of this calendar year. That immediately casts doubt on at least one company's being able to meet this time table, and this leads to the concern being expressed by members on this side. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether at any time the companies involved expressed doubts that they could meet their commitments or satisfy the demands of the Slate Government by the time required.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, neither Ampol nor Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited did that. In fact, the remarks of Mr. Leonard, made in his capacity as Chairman of Ampol, were prepared before his meeting with me and other members of the proposed consortium. C.S.R. and Ampol expressed difficulty about getting sufficient information from the studies I.C.I. had already done. That has been a subject of discussion and was so at the meeting, and I indicated that the Government's requirement was that members of the consortium should be provided, on the payment of their share of the cost, with the information already prepared and obtained at considerable cost by the consortium. Studies have been done by this consortium apart from studies done by Dow Chemical Company, at a cost of more than $1 500 000. The only difficulty I.C.I. and Ampol expressed was about getting ready access to information already available in order to do their studies, to make, within the time table set by the Government, a complete proposal as to their specific element in the proposed development. The only other expression of question as to time table has been made by I.C.I., which has said that it will probably take until about September to complete its full evaluation of how the feed stock should be treated most economically, and how the whole parcel will fit together most economically, as the Government has said it wants that clearly stated in the indenture so that we know just what we are getting in plant and employment, and that is clearly expressed. Then there has been a question of time table in that matter: the Government has indicated that it requires these matters to be settled as early as possible, and that has also been indicated by the producers on the field. But those are the only matters that were raised within the consortium. I imagine that the remarks of Mr. Leonard derived from the fact that, prior to the meeting I have outlined, Ampol had expressed difficulty about getting sufficient material to evaluate its own position in the short term.

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Premier know of any obstacle being placed in the way of the proposed Redcliff complex in favour of the North-West Shelf petro-chemical project advocated by the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor)? Earlier this session all members were informed more than once of the urgency of the decision on the Redcliff project. Obviously from recent events, the time table regarding finality has been greatly slowed down. Mr. Connor has previously come out openly in favour of the North-West Shelf project compared to the Redcliff project, and South Australia has virtually been left to go it alone. Does the Premier consider that the planning for the North-West Shelf project is adversely affecting the Redcliff project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The preamble to the question is a whole series of mis-statements on the basis of no evidence whatever. In fact, however, the facts are completely to the contrary. The Minister of Development and Mines and I had a conference with Mr. Connor only last Saturday on the development of the Redcliff project. Mr. Connor has assured the producers and the consortium: he has publicly stated his support and that of the Commonwealth Government for the Redcliff project. In fact he has pointed out to the producers and to the consortium the need to make provision in the liquids line from Moomba to Red Cliff Point for back-up supplies from Mereenie-Palm Valley, which he has said will be committed by the Commonwealth Government in the pipeline grid to supply the Redcliff project. He has also made perfectly clear that the major refinery for the conversion of gas to petroleum in Australia, which he says is a factor of national importance in conserving fuel supplies, will be at Red Cliff Point, with the support of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Millhouse: You have had some trouble—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will run into trouble in a minute.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say what effect it will have if any of the organizations that are supposed to take part in the Redcliff project find that they cannot meet the financial commitment necessary to carry on with the project? There appear to be doubts (they may only be minor doubts at this stage) that perhaps one or two of the organizations concerned may not be able to go on with the project, either through lack of finance or because they decide they do not want to be involved further in the proposal. Other people and I would like to know whether it would place the project in jeopardy if one or more of the companies involved pulled out at this stage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that the honourable member is not apprised of the nature of the basis of the remarks that have been made by members of the consortium. There has been no question of a lack of funds on their part; the question involved is an evaluation of their part in the total project. The original consortium (I.C.I., Alcoa, and Mitsubishi) is prepared to proceed with the project. The requirement of the Commonwealth Government is that the companies achieve, at the minimum, 51

per cent Australian equity. With the addition of the Australian Industries Development Corporation, Ampol Petroleum Limited, and Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited, it is expected that the companies would reach about 70 per cent Australian equity in the project. However, I cannot forecast exactly what the relationship would be if any one of the new partners of the consortium should say, "We do not think we will be in it." I cannot say how that would affect that total equity scene and what the readjustment would be. The original consortium has made clear that it is willing to meet the requirement of 51 per cent equity in any event.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether there is a possibility of any member of the consortium not being able to fulfil its obligations in connection with the Redcliff project?

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Kavel repeat his question?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask the Premier whether there is a possibility that any member of the consortium will not be able to fulfil its obligations in connection with the Redcliff project?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will have to rule that question out of order because, as I understand it, a question similar in substance has already been asked by the member for Fisher. A question does not have to be identical to one previously asked before the Speaker rules it out of order; if a question is similar in substance to one previously asked, it is inadmissible.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will rephrase the question then, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule the question out of order.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Surely the substance of the honourable member's question was different from that of the one asked previously, which related to the financial aspects of the project.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you disagreeing to the Speaker's ruling?

Dr. EASTICK: I will do so if necessary. I rose on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has risen on a point of order. He has that right, and I will rule on his point of order.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. I point out to the Minister of Transport, who wants to intrude his presence into this situation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has risen on a point of order, and a point of order is not debatable. An honourable member may explain his point of order, and a ruling will be given on it.

Dr. EASTICK: The question asked by the member for Kavel related to a subject matter different from that raised by the member for Fisher, who referred specifically to the financial aspects of the project. The question asked by the member for Kavel related to the possibility of any member of the consortium being unable to fulfil its obligations. Financial obligations are only a small part of the total obligations that could be involved in this project. On that basis I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule that the question asked by the member for Kavel can be answered by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: I will not uphold the point of order, because this afternoon the Leader himself asked a question similar in substance to the one asked by the honourable member for Fisher and similar in substance, to some degree, to the one asked by the honourable member for Torrens. Standing Orders provide that, where a question is similar in substance to (not necessarily identical with) a question previously asked, it is inadmissible. It does not have to be asked by an individual member. As questions similar in substance were asked by the honourable Leader and by the honourable members for Torrens and Fisher, I do not uphold the point of order.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable Leader bring up his reasons in writing for so doing?

Dr. EASTICK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Leader has moved to disagree to the Speaker's ruling because the interpretation is over-restrictive of the rights of members to question the Executive. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Dr EASTICK: As I pointed out in my reasons for moving my motion, which you, Mr. Speaker, have just read, the opportunity has been denied to some Opposition members to ask questions relating to a major subject that is of considerable importance to the people of this State. If one were to accept the ruling that you, Sir, have just given, it would mean that, if I asked any Minister or member a question regarding the Redcliff project or, say, the finances of this Slate, I would immediately prevent any other Opposition member from asking a similar question on the same day. Although this may appear to be taking to the extreme the interpretation that you, Mr. Speaker, have given, I point out that on this occasion the Premier has been asked questions on a number of facets of this important subject. The question asked by my colleague the member for Kavel related to the total obligations that might be involved in the Redcliff project. The specific question asked by my colleague the member for Fisher related to financial responsibility and the ability of a member dr members of the consortium to raise sufficient capital.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's what the member for Kavel just asked me about.

Dr. EASTICK: If the Premier would cast his mind a little further and if he looked at all the horizons of this subject, he would well know that the obligations he had stated several times in respect of the Redcliff project were a degree of expertise and contacts in several areas. In the replies we have received from the Premier until now, and certainly in relation to the question asked by the member for Fisher, there has been a distinct implication that the only involvement of the members of the consortium was that relating to finance. I suggest that the member for Kavel correctly required from the Premier, or whoever else would have replied to the question, every detail about total obligations on the membership of the consortium.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, he asked about finance.

Dr. EASTICK: He did not mention the word "finance". The question was, "Is there a possibility that any member of the consortium will not be able to fulfil its obligations in the Redcliff project?" The honourable member would have sought the opportunity, with your concurrence and that of the House, to explain the question beyond finance to indicate that we need an assurance that the expertise and industrial contacts, or whatever involvement there may be from one member of the consortium, would not seriously affect the undertaking of this project. For the reasons I have given, I ask members to support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I refer to what I consider to be the Standing Order under which you have given your ruling, Mr. Speaker. That is Standing Order 202, which provides:

No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

The SPEAKER: That is not the Standing Order on which my ruling was made.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have not turned up the Standing Orders, but the whole gravamen of the ruling hinges on the point that the question is not the same in substance. I think you stated that several times in giving your ruling. It would be difficult to understand what the substance of the question was unless an explanation was allowed. If I had been able to explain the question, it would have been clear that I was not necessarily interested in the financial implications, and I thought there was no mention of financial implications in the question.

The question followed (and it was meant to) from a question asked of the Premier by the member for Fisher. I submit that it was a logical question to follow up with, as the Premier's reply was concerned only with the capacity of the Redcliff consortium to make finance available. That is certainly not implicit in the substance of the question I asked the Premier. I did not ask him about the ability of the people involved in the Redcliff project to provide finance. I think that the word I used was "obligations", which is wider in implication than the question asked by the member for Fisher. In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I consider that your interpretation has been too narrow and I must disagree to your ruling.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Evans, Nankivell, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Hudson. King, and McRae.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

GILLES PLAINS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Works have urgent attention paid to the necessity for repairs to be carried out to the infants yard at Gilles Plains Primary School? This morning I visited the school and met its Headmaster and the members of its council and staff. Although those people are pleased with and proud of the new building that the Government has provided for them they, and particularly the Headmistress of the infants school, are concerned about the condition of the infants play yard. I inspected this yard which has many depressions in it, some being about 4in. (10 cm) deep I was told that the boys played boats in these lakes or ponds during the rainy season. Schoolchildren's shoes are being ruined and teachers have complained that their shoes also are being ruined because of the deep pools of water that lie around the area. Although I know that an extensive programme of work is still to be carried out, I ask the Minister whether he will have this part of the project expedited.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take the matter up with the Public Buildings Department for the honourable member and find out what can be done.

ALICE SPRINGS RAILWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say what progress he has been able to make with the Australian Government in regard to reaching an agreement on the legislation necessary to authorize a start on the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway? As members are well aware, the Commonwealth Railways Department is mainly based at Port Augusta and, as the decision to start work on this railway is of the greatest importance to the work force there, I should appreciate any information the Minister can give.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At the Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting last Friday, arrangements were made for the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) to come to Adelaide tomorrow, earlier than previously planned, to enable him to spend some time with me discussing not only the Tarcoola proposal but also several other outstanding proposals.

Mr. Venning: Such as what?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Such as the standardization of the rail service, such as the transfer of the South Australian Railways to the Commonwealth, such as the operation of Trans-Australia Airlines in South Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is replying to a question asked by the member for Stuart.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, Sir. I am confident—

Mr. Gunn: You've been talking about it for four years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am confident that tomorrow, with the negotiations that have proceeded, we will satisfactorily conclude the matter of constructing the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway, and I believe that all that will then be necessary will be the formalities of the final printing of the agreement and its signing by the Premier and the Prime Minister. I expect the work to proceed soon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has been in this House long enough to know what are the requirements of all members during Question Time, and if he does not abide by the requirements of the House I shall have no hesitation in warning him on future occasions.

MONARTO

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say whether the views on Monarto, expressed by Professor Scott and published yesterday (that Monarto is potentially misplaced), will have bearing on the amount of Commonwealth funds that will be made available to build Monarto, and will members of the public employed by the Agriculture Department who arc asked to live in Monarto, be given the choice of continuing on in the Public Service if they do not desire to live in Monarto? Professor Scott is reported as saying that other areas could have been considered more seriously than Monarto and that a very big question mark hangs over Monarto He is also quoted as saying that there is a strong case for developing land near the coast rather than the hinterland. Professor Scott is described as a member of the Cities Commission and a Commonwealth Government adviser on urban and regional development. He seems to hold a dominant position in relation to Commonwealth policy and the disbursement of funds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The remarks of Professor Scott, like those of some other academic gentlemen who have not done their studies on the subject very well, have no bearing on the issue. The decision to site the new submetropolitan regional city at Monarto was properly studied and properly taken. It must be noted that Professor Scott talks about "a site on the coast" but carefully does not say where it is. This kind of vague statement from an academic who blows into South Australia for a short time really cannot count for very much.

Mr. Hall: What about his position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know about his position. I do not know what authority he has to speak on behalf of the Cities Commission. I know the commission has committed money to Monarto, has accepted Monarto as a site for submetropolitan regional development, and—

Mr. Hall: What about—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will not listen to answers, why in the world does he bother to ask questions in this House?

The SPEAKER: Older! The honourable member is out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Government has accepted Monarto as a submetropolitan regional development site, and funds would be voted after the Commonwealth Government had obtained a feasibility study prepared by the Pak-Poy organization and had accepted that feasibility study. The money has been committed.

Mr. Hall: Have you spent any money yet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are spending the money at present With the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, we have acquired more than 70 per cent of the site of Monarto.

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier give me figures relating to the expenditure at the site of the city of Monarto, showing the total sum spent since work on the project commenced and the sum spent so far in purchasing land?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get those figures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say how much money the Cities Commission has already committed to Monarto and how much is promised for the future? The question of the member for Goyder concerned the qualifications of Professor Scott, upon whom the Premier, in reply, proceeded to pour ridicule—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —by describing him as an academic who did not do his homework well, who had blown into South Australia for a short time, and so on. Having criticized a member of the Cities Commission who was appointed by the Commonwealth Government (perhaps that Government bungled in this case the same as the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs says it bungled in that case), the Premier then went on to canvass wider matters concerning the sum committed. I admit that the member for Goyder should not have interjected, and I suppose that the Premier was entitled to ignore the question the honourable member asked by interjection. He certainly did ignore it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier would have been out of order in replying to an interjection.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: By interjection the member for Goyder asked how much the Premier had committed. Perhaps the Premier would care to answer now the second part of the original question of the member for Goyder, as he ignored it entirely previously. That question was as follows: would those officers of the Agriculture Department who did not want to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —live in Monarto—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —be able to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked a question, and that will be the question to which the honourable Premier replies; the latter part of the honourable member's question will be ignored.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Government has so far committed itself to assistance with the land acquisition programme, having promised assistance to us in this regard to the extent of about $4 000 000. Of course, the remainder of the development programme will be a matter for further submission after the strategic concept plans for the city have been properly developed. It is impossible at this stage to ask the Commonwealth Government for money unless we can point to the specific things on which it is to be spent

Mr. Hall: Has the Cities Commission said anything on that?

The Hon D A. DUNSTAN: The commission will obviously be required to examine the concepts of the development It would therefore be extraordinary if, having committed the Government to spend $4 000 000 on the land, the commission left the land sitting there.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think you will be able to get Professor Scott on side?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon D A. DUNSTAN: I am not concerned about getting Professor Scott on side. We have a commitment from the Commonwealth Government and from the commission.

LIGHT SHADES

Mr LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Australian Standards Association, or whichever is the relevant body, to ensure that shade rings on all types of lamp holder arc improved so that they do not come into contact with electric light globes? Several years ago. a safety skirt was designed to ensure safety in locations in which a person's touching the metal part of an electric light globe could be dangerous. Recently, a holder of a new design, with a much narrower and longer shade, has become standard. With holders of this new type, contact is often made with the globe, causing an odour suggesting the smell of dead fish. However, few people suspect the lamp holder of causing the smell. Often people have looked everywhere over many hours for the source of the smell. In fact, only recently this very thing occurred in Parliament House.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that. I know of the incident to which the honourable member has referred; in fact, it occurred in the office of the Minister of Transport who, for some weeks, has been searching for a dead rat or a dead fish, thinking that it may have been placed there by some Opposition member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I say that facetiously; I am sure members opposite would not do that to the Minister of Transport. Seriously, there was a most unpleasant odour. Only last evening the cause was discovered to be the burning plastic to which the member for Unley has referred. This is the second occasion on which I have come into contact with this smell. In a hotel at which I was staying the plastic in the shade of the light came in contact with the hot globe, producing this odour. I shall be happy to take up the matter to see whether the problem can be solved. I understand that, in his home, the Minister of Environment and Conservation had a similar experience of this smell. The source of the smell could not be located, but it finally turned out to be this burnt plastic. In fact, it was the Minister of Environment and Conservation who wisely suggested last evening that this could be the cause of the smell in the office of the Minister of Transport, and he was dead right.

DERNANCOURT LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Local Government ascertain whether there have been any further developments with regard to the acquisition for public use of an area of land at Dernancourt that is bounded on the east by Reids

Road, on the north by Mahogony Avenue, on the west by a small council reserve, and on the south by the Torrens River? I have raised this matter before with the Minister of Environment and Conservation, by questions in this place on August 26, 1971, and November 2, 1972, and also by correspondence. On February 14 this year, the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully wrote direct to the Minister of Local Government urging that action on this matter be expedited, as the owners of the land had lodged an application to erect a dwelling. The council is powerless to refuse approval. A letter was also written to me, seeking my assistance. I draw the contents of this correspondence to the Minister's attention, asking that the matter be favourably considered.

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: I will look into it immediately.

HIRE CARS

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Transport have inquiries made as to the practice of some owners of reception houses or hotels of providing privately owned vehicles, which are not licensed by the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board, for the purpose of conveying wedding patties to their receptions, to the detriment of regular operators in the hire care and taxi industry who must finance a considerable outlay on these expensive cars? Indeed, they must pay licence fees and additional third party insurance premiums, as well as submit their vehicles to regular inspections for the protection of the public. I have been informed by a constituent that one reception house operator, whom I could name, has already been prosecuted twice for this offence and now appears to be evading prosecution by quoting an all-inclusive price, and that at least one hotel owner is also engaging in this practice. As this represents unfair competition in the industry, a loss of revenue to the State, and a loss of protection to the public, will the Minister ensure that additional efforts are made to prevent this practice from continuing?

The Hon. G T. VIRGO: I will have further discussions with the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board, which I know has already examined this matter carefully. Indeed, the board was responsible for the two prosecutions that have already been successfully launched. It now appears that the operator to whom the honourable member has referred is including in the cost of hiring his premises a charge for the taxis. I think he is trying to put a bit of cream on the fruit by providing Rolls Royce cars, and apparently he has been able to dupe some people into believing they are getting these cars free. This service is being provided to the detriment of *bona fide* operators, for whom the Government certainly intends to provide every possible protection. If there is any way the Government can deal with this matter through the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board, it will certainly do so.

CALLAGHAN REPORT

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier say when the Callaghan report on the Agriculture Department will be made public and, if it is not to be made public, when the Government will indicate what is to be its future policy regarding this department? I understand that only a few people in the department have seen this report, and there is a feeling of frustration and uncertainty in the department. I believe that an early announcement of the Government's intentions toward this department (which has been allowed to decline in recent years) should be made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Callaghan report is being evaluated, and there will be an announcement before long.

LITTER BINS

Mr. BECKER: Will you, Mr. Speaker, use your good offices with the Adelaide City Council to have several litter bins installed on the footpath on the western side of King William Road adjacent to Parliament House? I refer to the alarming quantity of litter present between the boundary line and the eastern wall of Parliament House facing King William Road, and the fact that no litter bins are placed at the bus stops in this area between North Terrace and the Festival Theatre. Because of the many people catching buses in this area, and as a result of the intense campaign against litter in this State, more litter bins are required urgently. Also, more seating is required for waiting bus passengers. I understand that this area was once covered by lawn, but is now bare as a result of the use put to it by people waiting for buses. In the interests of the anti-litter campaign in this State, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to use your good offices with the Adelaide City Council to have the situation improved.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether the reason for the litter being on the eastern side of Parliament House is that that section of the building comes under the jurisdiction of the Legislative Council, but this matter has not been brought to my attention previously. However, the honourable member having now raised it, I will confer with my co-administrator of Parliament House (the honourable President of the Legislative Council) and we will make a joint approach to ascertain whether we have good offices with the Adelaide City Council in the hope that the situation may be rectified.

COOPER CROSSING

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Transport arrange for a skeleton staff to remain at the Cooper crossing on the Birdsville track to assist people at this crossing? I understand from information that I have received this morning that the barge used previously at this crossing is now ready for use but a patrol grader is stuck in Paradise Creek, thus preventing any vehicle from approaching the barge. It is expected that the old crossing could be used with the help of the Highways Department staff, but I understand that the staff is due to commence leave today. In this area the staff of the Highways Department works for about three weeks and then has two weeks leave, and therefore they will not commence work again until about March 15. By that time the main flood will have reached the crossing. If a skeleton staff could remain and assist people over the old crossing that would help until the grader was cleared from Paradise Creek and the barge could then be used.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will discuss this matter with members of my department but, unfortunately, at this late stage I am not sure that I can comply with the honourable member's request. I wish the honourable member had made this request earlier today, as I could have spoken to the Commissioner of Highways when he was in my office. However, I will do the best I can to help.

MOBILE LIBRARIES

Mr. MATHWIN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Education, I ask the Minister of Works whether he has a reply to a request I made last year about the possibility of introducing mobile libraries. On August 8, 1973, in a reply to my question the Minister of Education said that he would have the matter thoroughly examined. In a reply on August 30, 1973, to a similar question, the Minister of Education said that he would refer the matter to the State Librarian and he would then be happy to give me a reply. I am aware that since then there has been a

take-over of private bus services, and this action has probably reduced the number of surplus buses that could be used as mobile libraries. This take-over was made in the name of compulsory unionism.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting during his explanation.

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my previous questions?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, Sir.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation (as Minister in charge of the Planning and Development Act) consider introducing amendments to section 41 of the Act in order to bring its exemptions in line with the exemptions contained in the Building Act? The exemptions contained in the Building Act allow a district council to exempt a part of its area from control under the Building Act. It has been suggested to me that similar exemptions should be provided in the Planning and Development Act. At present, the question of structures that are erected in any area in which a council has sought interim development control regulations is causing concern and confusion in the community.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will consider this matter and let the honourable member know the result.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Legislative Council intimated that it had divided the Bill into two parts and that it returned the No. 2 Bill with amendments.

WAREHOUSEMEN'S LIENS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Warehousemen's Liens Act, 1941. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Section 7 of the principal Act, the Warehousemen's Liens Act, 1941, sets out the circumstances in which a warehouseman. that is, a person lawfully engaged in the business of storing goods as a bailee for hire or reward, may sell those goods to satisfy unpaid charges due on them. At present the rights set out under this section are only available to the warehouseman if the charges or any part of them have been outstanding for more than 12 months. It has been suggested to the Government by the South Australian Road Transport Association that this period is somewhat unrealistic commercially, and that a period of six months would be reasonable and appropriate. With this contention the Government agrees and, accordingly, this short Bill reduces the period from 12 months to six months.

I point out to honourable members that the actions that must be followed by the warehouseman before he sells goods pursuant to section 7 of the principal Act and the protection afforded to persons having an interest in the goods, remain unchanged by this amendment. In addition, certain formal amendments have been made to amounts expressed in "old" currency to change these expressions to amounts in decimal currency.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a State Transport Authority, to set out its powers and functions, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

In July, 1973, the Government appointed a committee to advise the Minister of Transport and of Local Government on the means of establishing a single transport authority to control the activities of certain existing bodies operating in this State. The Government has had an opportunity of considering the report of the committee, and this Bill goes some way towaids giving effect to its recommendations. The term "goes some way" is used quite advisedly, since the ultimate intention of having a single authority actually operating all major forms of public transport in the State is just not capable of being realized at this stage However, it should be clear that this is the ultimate aim.

For present purposes there are three bodies concerned in the operation of major forms of the public transport in this Slate. They are the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board, and it is visualized that the proposed State Transport Authority will in the fust instance be given the right to give directions to these bodies and to exercise a degree of control over their activities. At the same time the authority will be required to provide the Minister to whom it is responsible with a detailed recommendation as to how the operational function of each body in relation to its public transport activity may be assumed directly or indirectly by the authority. It is clear that the assumption by the authority of the operational responsibility for, say, railways will require enabling legislation, the terms of which will depend on the recommendation of the authority, and necessarily the enactment of this legislation must await the recommendation. The present Bill is then no more than the first step in providing for the people of this State a co-ordinated system of public transport.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions used in the Bill. I draw members' attention to the definition of "prescribed body": while it specifies by name the bodies that I have mentioned, it does provide for other bodies to be included by the enactment of regulations under this measure. It goes without saying that such regulations are subject to the scrutiny of this House. Clause 5 formally establishes the State Transport Authority. Clause 6 provides that the authority shall consist of six members and a Chairman, and clause 7 sets out the terms and conditions of appointment of the Chairman and members. In this regard, it is indicated that the Chairman will be employed in a full-time capacity, and the other members will be part-time.

Clause 8 provides for the salary and allowances of the Chairman and members. Clause 9 provides for meetings of the authority. Clause 10 is a validating provision in the usual form and also provides the usual protection for members of the authority in their personal capacity. Clause 11 provides for disclosure by a member of the authority of his interest in any contract with the authority and also prevents such a member from taking part in any decision in relation to that contract. Clause 12 sets out the proposed powers

and functions of the authority, and this clause is commended to members' close attention particularly in the light of the introductory remarks on this measure.

Clause 13 makes clear that the authority is subject to the general control and direction of the Minister administering the measure. Clause 14 provides a power of delegation in the usual form. Clause 15 provides for staffing of the authority, and members will note that it is likely that most officers will be employed under the Public Service Act, although at subclause (4) provision is made for the employment of persons otherwise than under that Act. Clause 16 provides for the moneys required for the purposes of this Act. Clause 17 provides for the audit of the accounts of the authority. Clause 18 provides for an annual report of the authority, and clause 19 is a general regulation-making power.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SPEED)

In Committee.

(Continued from February 27. Page 2227.)

Clause 6—"Speed limits."

Mr. BECKER: As I intended to move an amendment that is consequential on an amendment that was defeated last evening, I will not proceed with it, but I point out that we on this side will closely watch the situation and, if any accidents occur at school crossings involving speeds in excess of 20 miles an hour (32 km/h), this Chamber will hear about it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Tyres."

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport explain what he has in mind under this clause and whether the prescribed tyre pressure will be equivalent to what has hitherto applied under the Act?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I cannot say precisely what will be contained in the regulations, but, as the honourable member knows, any regulations made must be laid on the table of this place and on the table of another place. Within certain limits, we intend to make the regulations as simple as possible so that everyone can understand them. Although sometimes that is not practicable, I assure the honourable member that that is always our objective. We will certainly bear the honourable member's comments in mind and ensure that this provision is so worded that he and members of the public can understand it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 19 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Length of vehicles."

Mr. BLACKER: I move:

To strike out "20" and insert "20.117".

As I made clear in my second reading speech, my amendment effects the exact metric equivalent of 66ft. (20.117 m) and is in line with the length prescribed in the original Act The existing provision in the Bill of 20 metres reduces the maximum length by a measurement of about 4in. to 4½in. (10.16 cm to 11.43 cm) and, although members may say that that is not much, it is important.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Important to whom?

Mr. BLACKER: It is important to most truck owners. When the Act was originally implemented, no doubt the Minister will recall that many trucks, which were measured with a tape measure, had their front bumper bars removed and, although I think this involves an illegal action, I know of two drivers who removed the bumper bars in order to comply with the legislation. Since then, trucks have been built to specifications. All truck or body manufacturers know the specifications, involving a maximum length of 66ft. (20.117 m) and have designed their units accordingly, the units in most cases being within an inch or so of the prescribed length. Under the existing provision in the Bill, some trucks and trailers will be in an illegal category. One possible way out of this is to issue a permit for each of the trucks concerned, but I believe that in such a case a permit will have to be obtained for each individual trip, and this can apply only if the unit involved is indivisible. Therefore, a truck driver who has a unit that has been built to exact specifications (to within one inch of 66ft.) will in future have to apply for a permit each time he wants to use the vehicle on the road. I believe this is an important amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: So little is involved in this that I do not want to waste the time of the Committee on it. Accordingly, I am willing to accept the amendment, if it will help the honourable member.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (27 to 39) and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, but I register my concern about and disapproval of the Minister's rigidity in connection with clause 6 (c), which relates to the speed of vehicles travelling over school crossings. The Committee has seen fit to say that any car passing a tram must reduce its speed to 10 kilometres an hour, yet in the case of school crossings it is quite satisfied with a speed of 30 km/h. It was stated during Committee that the speedometer needle would flicker considerably when the car was driven at less than 30 km/h. How much more would it flicker at the speed of 10 km/h, which is only about 6 m.p.h ? In that case I agree with the Minister that the needle would not be stable, but I believe the needle would be stable at about 30 km/h.

Clause 24 relates to the dipping of headlights I point out that 200 metres is much less than 300 yards. I suggest that most people driving in the country dip their lights at a much farther distance than 300 yards. I can see the need for uniformity throughout Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that in the third reading of a Bill he may discuss the Bill as it came out of Committee and not as it was during or before the Committee stage.

Mr. MATHWIN: I stress again my concern about this matter. I refer the Minister to clause 6 as it came out of Committee. Uniformity does not apply to that clause, because South Australia is the only State that has a speed limit for school crossings I am proud that we have such speed limits, and because of them we have a good record regarding the lack of accidents at school crossings.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDGES' SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading

(Continued from February 26. Page 2171.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This Bill is similar to those we have received regularly during recent years. The previous increase for judges of the Supreme Court was gazetted only 22 months ago. This Bill provides for the increases to be made retrospective to January 1 this year. We have always supported the principle of establishing a remuneration for the judiciary that will attract the best brains and ability available to the bench from persons in practice, because of the independence and impartiality required of judicial officers. I believe we should maintain that independence in our British system of justice because

we do not wish to be saddled with some of the worst features of some oversea countries, particularly the United States of America, for example, where in many jurisdictions the judges can be swayed because they have to face periodic elections

On many occasions in the past, this type of Bill has passed through this House with little comment, but I consider that on this occasion several significantly different features need to be considered. We are asked to approve an average increase of 29 per cent over the whole range of judicial officers. The increase in the number of Local and District Criminal Court judges is staggering. That matter is most pertinent to this Bill. As at January, 1974, there were 14 judges in the Local and District Criminal Courts jurisdiction. These appointments have been made since the legislation was introduced in 1969 by a former Liberal Government. With this number of judges, whose salaries will increase under the Bill to about $26 000 a year, members can see the impact that this Bill will have on the expenditure provided for law and order.

In addition, we must consider the salaries of other judicial officers and supportive staff who are involved in carrying out the administration of law and justice in this State. We all have a high regard for the personal integrity and ability of the judges who operate in our various jurisdictions. However, I believe that it is important that we look into the proliferation of appointments by the present Government in the Local and District Criminal Courts, as we are now considering remuneration for these judges. When the previous Liberal and Country League Government introduced this second tier of the judiciary, it broke new ground. This was regarded as a good and useful legal reform. At that time, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) bitterly opposed the Bill, and is reported in *Hansard* as follows:

I am satisfied that there are no advantages: a three-tier court system will be less efficient than a two-tier court system; it will be very much more expensive.

When the former Attorney-General of that L.C.L. Government (Mr. Millhouse) introduced the measure, there was no intention that the second tier of the judiciary would expand to the extent it has expanded We believed that it would be of moderate size and would carry out a useful function. The present Government has seen fit to expand rapidly this type of court, despite what the present Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, said when the measure was introduced. The increase in the number of judges in this jurisdiction has had a marked effect on the total cost of the courts in South Australia, not only with regard to judges' salaries but also with regard to the cost of the supportive staff that is necessary to carry out the functions of the courts so established.

Another serious effect of enlarging this area of jurisdiction has been the depredation it has caused to the middle ranks of the legal profession of this State. At present, the profession suffers from a grave shortage of experienced practitioners in the middle range. I refer to these matters because the effect of this Bill will be significantly greater than the effect of similar Bills we have considered in the past, for the increases proposed in this Bill are most significant, ranging, according to my calculations (which have been checked), from 31.2 per cent to 27.7 per cent, an average of about 29 per cent. I admit that these increases will bring the salaries of the judges in their various jurisdictions into line with the salaries received by their counterparts in Victoria, but I am not sure at all that that is necessarily the correct and absolute yardstick to use in determining judges' salaries. I admit this is a ticklish problem.

Mr. Millhouse: What would you suggest in its stead?

Mr. COUMBE: I might have something to say about this later. I do not necessarily accept the view that what an officer receives in another State is the correct yardstick to adopt in our own State. Under the Bill, the Chief Justice's salary will increase from $28 200 to $37 000, an increase of $8 800 or 31.2 per cent. The salary of puisne judges will increase from $25 750 to $33 000, an increase of $7 250 or 28.2 per cent in each case. The salary of the President of the Industrial Court is on the same range as that of a puisne judge of the Supreme Court, as provided by earlier legislation. The salary of Deputy Presidents will increase from $20 200 to $26 000, an increase of $5 800 or 28.7 per cent. The salary of the Senior Judge of the Local and District Criminal Courts increases from $22 000 to $28 500, an increase of $6 500 or 29.5 per cent. The judges in this jurisdiction are on the same classification as Deputy Presidents of the Industrial Court, so their increase will be $5 800 or 28.7 per cent. The salary of the Chairman of the Licensing Court is on the same basis as that of the Senior Judge of the Local and District Criminal Courts. The salary of the Deputy Chairman of the Licensing Court will increase from $18 400 to $23 500, an increase of $5 100 or 27.7 per cent. These figures increase rates assented to in April, 1972, about 22 months ago, and we must realize that the rates we are being asked to approve will be back-dated to January 1 this year.

When I first looked at these scales, they seemed to me to be fairly steep; I would have preferred something slightly less. After doing a few sums, I thought that a rate of about 90 per cent of the rates proposed would have been around the mark, especially with regard to the higher salary ranges that we are considering. In any case, a fair portion of Their Honours' income will go straight to the tax man, so that the Commonwealth Government will be the main beneficiary. Their Honours go immediately into the higher tax bracket. This Bill does not deal with the magistracy, so I would be out of order in canvassing that matter. However, we must consider the total expenditure for law and order. At present, the State has 27 magistrates who comprise a hard-working body that has the approbation and commendation of all members of the House. I have been trying to draw the attention of members to the fact that, because of the proliferation of members of the second tier of the Judiciary, this Bill is somewhat different from similar Bills that we have considered in the past. My remarks must not be construed as criticism of the bench, the members of which I hold in high regard. However, the contents and effect of this Bill should be explained to the House in greater detail than the sparse way in which the Attorney-General presented it. Indeed, there was a marked paucity of information in his second reading explanation. Therefore, it is the Opposition's duty to explain what the effect of these increases will be so that this Bill will not just slide through automatically as has happened in the past. The figures that I have presented to the House enable a much better understanding to be had of the present position. I should have preferred to see slightly smaller increases being given than those that we are being asked to consider.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support what my Deputy Leader has said regarding the bench. The Opposition does not want in any way to criticize the members of the bench or the active and important part that they play in society. However, the increases that are being granted are fairly steep. If these increases are granted, the Chief Justice will be receiving nearly double the salary that he was paid in 1969. Although he is to receive an increase of $8 800, he will receive an effective increase of less than $3 000

after he pays income tax. Although one might say that that is not much, I firmly believe that the wage rates in this country have got out of all proportion, as has happened in other countries. When persons receiving lower salaries hear of increases of this magnitude they must become dissatisfied with what they are receiving, and this must have a serious effect on their morale.

I do not agree with the principle that salaries in this State must be in line with those paid in other States, because some of those States have much larger populations than has South Australia. Although South Australia's average income level was previously much lower than that in the Eastern States, it is fast catching up. Also, statistical information shows that, despite our having price control in South Australia, the living standard of workers in this State has not improved. This must be to the detriment of the State, as we will be unable to compete on markets in other States like we have been able to do in the past. This is emphasized by the fact that, instead of this State's growth rate being the second highest in Australia as it was for many years, we now only just manage to be ahead of Tasmania.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen must link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr McANANEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. However, if wages are not an integral part of our growth rate or our cost of living, I do not know what is. Some people believe that a decline in a country's growth rate is good, but in an undeveloped country like Australia, in which there are great open spaces, our growth must continue for many years to come. In saying that salary increases must be stopped somewhere, I am not attacking the living standards of our workers. However, I think there should be an overall investigation of the various wage classifications in this country so that all sections of the community get a fair go. If my salary as a politician were reduced, I would be willing to accept the reduction if an adjustment were made at the top levels. The wage scale must be readjusted. However, these increases will place that scale even further out of adjustment, and will, as well, bring discontentment among the average people of the community. The increases should not therefore be of this magnitude.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill. Having listened carefully to the speeches made by the member for Torrens and the member for Heysen, I tried to get a clue about the altitude of the Liberal and Country League on the matter. However, I still do not know whether those two members will support or vote against the Bill. The member for Torrens did not say whether he supported it. The member for Heysen commenced his speech by using the words "I support", and I thought he was going to say he supported the Bill. However he said he supported his Deputy Leader.

Mr. McAnaney: He is a good person to support

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the member for Heysen tell me now, before I continue, whether he will support the Bill?

Mr. McAnaney: You'll see.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Even after he has spoken, the member for Heysen will not say whether or not he supports the Bill. Good heavens, no wonder the people outside of this Chamber wonder what on earth happens in here.

Mr. Gunn: Judging by your conduct, I can understand why they are amazed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps we will hear what the member for Eyre's view is on this matter. He may give a clue whether he will jump to the right or to the left on this matter when the second reading debate has concluded. The only thing I got from the member for Heysen (and I got two glimmers from him) was that he was trying to save the Chief Justice some income tax. He thinks that if His Honour is given a lesser increase he will not have to pay as much taxation. Apparently the honourable member thinks he would be doing the Chief Justice a favour in this respect.

The other point (and it is significant that the member for Heysen has announced his retirement from this place) is that he said he would be willing to accept a reduction in his Parliamentary salary. Those are the only two points I got from the member for Heysen. I interjected once while the member for Torrens was speaking, and asked how he would calculate the increases. He promised me (a promise which, I regret to say, he did not keep) that he would provide me with the calculations that led him to suggest the lesser increases. However, those calculations were not forthcoming, and I still do not know what the score is. I suspect that the L.C.L. would like to oppose this Bill but it does not know quite how to do so. We will see which of those two considerations prevails when the second reading is put to the vote.

I agree that this is always a difficult matter. I can remember, when I was Attorney-General, in 1969, introducing a Bill to increase the salaries of the judges. I thought then that the amount by which the salaries were to be increased was proper and appropriate. The Bill went through the House, and I do not think any difficulties were experienced with it. The member for Torrens, who was then one of my Cabinet colleagues, so far as I recall supported that Bill from start to finish, both in Cabinet and elsewhere. However, I remember going to a meeting in the country and being roundly attacked and criticized for the increases that I was proposing that Their Honours be paid. No matter how much the increase was. someone would always criticize it. I cannot (and I should like to hear a little more from the Premier in explanation of lhe way in which the calculations were made) either support or criticize the precise amounts by which it is intended that these salaries should now be increased, any more than T could with the Bill that I introduced in 1969. It is a matter of judgment and, obviously, the higher the salary under review the greater the increase must be; therefore, the more the resentment and jealousy that is likely to be engendered in the community. That is unavoidable. We cannot get away from that and, when we are dealing with the salaries of His Honour the Chief Justice, the other puisne judges, and Local and District Criminal Court judges, we are dealing with some of the highest salaries in the Stale.

If the Liberal and Country League is really dinkum in its criticism of these amounts, let it say what increase it thinks should be made and how it has arrived at that figure. I cannot find any amendment on the file, and I do not know whether we are to get any figure later. As the Attorney has said in explaining the Bill, the arguments in support of fixing appropriate salaries for persons holding judicial office have been canvassed many limes. That is done every time a relevant Bill is introduced, and we regret that such Bills are introduced so frequently. However, that is a fact of life, and we can blame the Commonwealth Government, ourselves, or anyone else, and depending on points of view we do so. These salaries may be justified. It would be interesting to compare the attitude adopted by the L.C.L. to this Bill with the attitude it has displayed in his House when our salaries are being increased, but maybe that is by-the-by.

The only point I add is that I am, of course, in practice in the profession for part of the time and I have an idea of the earnings of some of the most senior members of the profession. Indeed, I have an idea of the earnings of the profession as a whole, and that is perhaps as good an example of a private enterprise profession as there is left. I know that salaries are increasing and that the remuneration of the profession is increasing because the value of money is dropping. The people are willing to pay the fees that are asked. They know them in advance, certainly as far as the barristers' part of the profession is concerned.

We cannot have the income of members of the profession creeping up to and perhaps in one or two cases in this State passing the income of the judges. That is getting the system out of gear and, therefore, if for no other reason it is necessary to keep the salaries of judicial officers ahead of the salaries of the profession. Thus, it is necessary to increase judicial salaries from time to time, and that is what we are doing in this Bill.

I admit that judges have security that members of the profession have not. The judges have pension rights, security of tenure, and so on, and widows are looked after when judges die. They are big advantages and must be considered when fixing the salaries. Nevertheless, the salary paid while they are exercising their office is the salary to which they look, and a comparison is made between (hat and the earnings of members of the bar and the legal profession generally. I consider that an increase is justified and, certainly, I could not argue against the increases proposed in the Bill, large though they may appear to be at first sight.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We have had an interesting speech from the member for Mitcham. He has stated that he is looking for further argument from the Premier to justify these increases. He says that he cannot say whether the amount of the increases is the correct amount, but he supports the Bill quite firmly. He has seen fit to criticize the official Opposition, the L.C.L. In fact, we would think he was not in good health if he did not seek to do that on every occasion, but his basic argument today was not dissimilar from the argument we have advanced, namely, that we do not know whether an increase is justified.

The honourable member said that he did not know whether the figure was correct, but he puts his faith implicitly in the Government, on undisclosed evidence, and he will go along with the Government. I think that was one of his most unconvincing efforts. In trying to attack the L.C.L., he bad to dig up something. We do not know whether the increases are justified.

It seems that only two arguments have been advanced by the Government in the second reading explanation, and I think that those arguments have been canvassed already. The first is that we must make a comparison with other States. The member for Mitcham said by interjection that that was the only basis of comparison, so he answered his own question. When the member for Torrens was speaking, the member for Mitcham interjected, "How else can wc fix them if we do not fix them on a comparison with other States?"

I think the argument advanced by the member for Heysen has force. For some years this State has been considered to be a low-cost State, and this situation has involved many implications that overflow into the terms of this Bill. For many years this State has relied for prosperity on the fact that it has been a low-cost State, and I think the Premier has acknowledged that at times. Our markets in other States for consumer durables have depended on the fact that we can make goods here, tiansport them to other States, and sell them competitively.

All financial features, including wages and salaries, are tied up in this situation, and people do complain. When I was a schoolteacher, the teachers complained, and wage earners have complained that they do not receive as much as is paid in other States. However, for some time people have been able to purchase a house here for two-thirds of the cost of a house in another State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will link them up by indicating that, if we are dealing with a salary structure, inevitably we are tied with the cost structure.

The SPEAKER: Order! Any discussion of the cost structure in the debate on this Bill must be linked with the salaries to be paid under the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is what I am trying to do, and I shall round this argument off soon. In the past the advantages to South Australians of salaries paid in this State have been greater because the cost of living and the cost of purchasing a house in this State have been far less than the costs in other States. In this Slate in the past, a salary of $37 000, in real terms of the cost of living and the cost of acquiring a house and the necessities of life, has meant much more than has a similar salary in the larger Eastern States.

Mr. Venning: That's fast disappearing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. I think the member for Heysen made the point that I have referred to, but this difference is disappearing quickly. Salary tribunals and similar authorities have had referred to them the amounts paid in other States and the other benefits generally, and this seems to have been the most potent argument. However, I consider that some people who make these claims are cutting off their nose to spite their face, because they are steadily disadvantaging themselves in the competitive and living advantages that we have enjoyed, compared to the Eastern States.

I believe that considering salaries paid in other States is not enough: we must consider other cost factors as well. The average wage here is lower than the average wage in Eastern States, although the gap is narrowing fast under the activities of the pi esent Government I believe that the benefits to people will largely be illusory, because the increase in costs will not be to their advantage in our unique position in this State away from our Eastern States markets I believe that is enough to cause doubts in the minds of members about the validity of the first point made in the second reading explanation, that we must consider what is paid in New South Wales and Victoria and pay that.

This point of view, which is being carried into our thinking, is fast disadvantaging this State, as people will find out at some cost to themselves. The other point in justifying these increases is that we must attract the best men from the legal profession. No-one can contest this point, but I think one or two matters arise from it. The member for Mitcham did not go so far as to say that many members of the legal profession earned more than this amount, but he hinted that some of its members did earn this salary. It has been suggested to me that more than one or two members of the legal profession earn this salary. If members of the legal profession can earn significantly more than the salary being offered to the Chief Justice, I believe that their fees are too high.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do people pay them?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Why do people go to lawyers?

Mr. Millhouse: I did not say that: I said, "Why do they pay them?"

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer is that they have no choice.

Mr. Millhouse: Rubbish!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They may try to obtain free Legal aid, but many people are too proud to do that. If they do, they have to justify their application, anyway. They may decide not to pursue the matter, but if they are being charged with some offence they may have no other choice.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't know what you are talking about

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In my experience from people who have had dealings with the legal profession and the Jaw, the cost of justice to them has been fairly exorbitant, and I would need more than the occasional irate interjection from the member for Mitcham to be convinced otherwise. The member for Heysen made the point that the State Government was transferring a fair slice of State funds to the Commonwealth Government by way of taxation The Chief Justice will receive an increase of $8 800. Members of this House were granted an increase in salary of about 28 per cent, but that was an increase of salary from $9 000 to $12 000. That increase, and the increase for a wage-earner of 30 per cent on a salary of $3 000, is much less significant than an increase in salary of 30 per cent to a person who is earning $30 000.

The SPEAKER: Order! The payment of income tax on salaries is not part of the debate on this matter, and the matter of taxation can be referred to as only incidental to and not part of this Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not dealing with taxation, Mr. Speaker. An increase of 30 per cent is more significant on a salary of $30 000 than it is on a salary of $3 000, and many wage-earners in this State would be on the lower salary It does not cost the Chief Justice any more to buy food than it costs the wage-earner on a salary of $3 000, but a salary increase of $8 800 would be greater than the salary of most wage-earners in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: I wonder whether he is opposing or supporting the Bill?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am willing to tell the honourable member that I oppose the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: At last we have wheedled it out of the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems that all we have wheedled out of the member for Mitcham in the past few months is a sort of tirade of ill humour and petty abuse. I did not wheedle much out of the honourable member's speech except that he did not seem to know whether $8 800 was a proper increase or not but that he would agree with the Government. That did not seem to be any sort of earth-shattering contribution to the debate. The member for Mitcham is looking for evidence from the Treasurer as to how the figure was arrived at. If by enlightening the member for Mitcham the Treasurer can convince me that an $8 800 increase is justified, perhaps I may change my mind between now and when the measure is passed. If no further evidence is produced during the debate, I will oppose the very substantial increase in salaries for the Judiciary. I know that it is an impossible task to placate the two members who sit on the cross benches, but, from the attention I have received from Government members, I suspect that some of them are not unsympathetic to my sentiments. However, they will vote with the Government, because it seems to me that most times they have no other choice. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I am pleased to know that the member for Kavel is definite that he is indefinite and perhaps may oppose or support the Bill.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You never listen to further evidence that may change your mind.

Mr. HALL: I have been listening to the honourable member, who, at one stage, said he would vote against the Bill and later said he might change his mind. What we are seeing is not only an increase in salary but an increase in cost to taxpayers in the community, and that is most people. Taxation probably hits harder at the middle and lower wage-earner than it does at the higher salary earner in the sense of the standard of living that results from these earnings. Many people are affected by this sort of standard that is set not just for the Judiciary but also for others in the community. We are not just looking at the figures, which appear minor in relation to the State's expenses: we are looking at a new range of substantial increases. I will vote for the second reading of the Bill because it would be silly to say that no increases should occur; there would be no logic in denying any increases, because any member of this House could substantiate the need for increases.

I am interested in relativity. These increases sound high to most people in the community. I was criticized m the past for advocating increases when I was in Government and now I am looking askance at the size of these increases. I am sure some members of the Government are also concerned at their size: $8 800 is a substantial amount to people who get less than that for a whole year's work. It is important that we take a position in the scheme of things and in relation to the Australian standards of remuneration. Our position should be a little lower than that of those who wish to be at the top of the scale, and I think the Premier should tell the House where we stand in relation to the larger States of Australia and also give a Commonwealth example, although that may not be of much use to us.

I hope the Premier will be able to tell the House what are the current corresponding salaries, when rises were last given and whether more are contemplated soon. I believe that it would be senseless for us to try to be equal to or ahead of New South Wales and Victoria, that we should be content to sit a little way behind those two States, and that the other States should be willing to do likewise and not keep looking over each other's shoulders to see who should be the next one up. It is too obscure to base any increase on the salary of the Chief Justice of New South Wales, who has just been named our next Governor-General. He is stated as having a salary of $29 800 plus $1 150 expenses. I do not know when the last raise occurred in New South Wales or whether one is imminent now.

I think this needs to be explained to the House and I will move an amendment to the clause relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice and judges if those salaries are the same or almost the same as those in New South Wales. I believe the South Australian salaries should be less (but comfortably less) than those applying in the senior State of Australia.

The Hon. D. A DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The increases in judicial salaries have been based upon the general movement which has taken place in judicial salaries. The policy which has long been adopted in this State is that judicial salaries should be based on those paid in New South Wales and Victoria. Although judicial duties are essentially the same irrespective of location, the burden upon our judges and the requirement for expertise is no less than that required in New South Wales and Victoria.

Nevertheless, the practice has been followed of fixing South Australian salaries at a slightly lower level than in New South Wales and Victoria because of a greater purchasing power in this State. I am instructed that at the moment New South Wales judicial salaries are being increased but that the legislation has not been completed. New South Wales judges traditionally receive a marginally higher salary than Victorian judges receive, and I am instructed that that relativity will be maintained. The Victorian judges have already had their salaries increased. The Chief Justice of Victoria now receives a salary and allowances amounting to $39 125, compared to the proposal of $37 000 for our Chief Justice. The puisne Supreme Court judges in Victoria receive $35 125, compared to $33 000 for our puisne judges. The Senior County Court judge in Victoria receives $31 750, compared to $28 500 for our senior Local and District Criminal Court judge. The County Court judges are on $29 500, compared to $26 000 for the equivalent Local and District Criminal Court judges in South Australia.

Mr. Hall: Can you tell us what they are going to be in New South Wales?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the final figures for New South Wales. 1 am simply instructed that negotiations are proceeding currently for an increase in salaries, and it is expected that the relative margin above the Victorian figure will be maintained in New South Wales. The relativity previously existing between our judges and those in Victoria has been provided for in this Bill.

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

SUPERANNUATION (TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TRANSPLANTATION OF HUMAN TISSUE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 26. Page 2172.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: Hooray! At least we know that much.

Mr. Becker: Does it cover brains?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think any provision has yet been made in medical science to cover the position of transplanting brains. Although this might be of some advantage to some honourable members, I can assure them that it is almost beyond the powers of medical science. There is no doubt at all that modern medicine has advanced tremendously over the past three decades. I do not intend to go through the history of these advances. However, there have been some significant features, beginning with the discovery of insulin in the late 1920's. Then, in the early 1930's, followed the discovery of sulphonamides and, in the 1940's, of antibiotics. One of the most significant discoveries of all has been the discovery of steroids of the cortisone group and allied substances. With the discovery of the cortisone group particularly, and with the development of micro-surgery techniques using the operating microscope, it is now possible to perform techniques that previously would have been considered completely impossible.

Recently, I noticed that the original Frankenstein film starring Boris Karloff was to be shown on television. When that was first filmed, what it portrayed was sheer fantasy and, as I have said, it is still not possible to transplant brains, as there are some peculiar difficulties that make it unlikely that brains will ever be able to be transplanted. Nevertheless, it has proved possible to transplant other organs and parts of organs to an extent undreamed of only a few years ago. This is possibly because the problem of tissue rejection has been solved, basically by the development of cortisone and the other similar substances to which I have referred. Corneal grafting was one of the first transplant operations performed, having been performed now for many years. It has been possible to transplant the cornea because of the lack of blood supply; there are no blood vessels in the cornea, and for that reason the normal reaction of the body to foreign substances (even those of other people) has not applied. Occasionally, the cornea will still become opaque and the corneal graft will be unsuccessful, but that is the exception rather than the rule. Once again, cortisone is used in the after-care treatment of the corneal patient

Bone grafts have been used with rather more success in recent years. Kidney grafts are now being undertaken. 1 would point out that our own kidney renal unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has been well in the forefront of these developments. In recent years we have seen the introduction of cardiac transplants. It is almost unbelievable that the heart of one person can be transplanted into the body of another person and continue to beat. The advances in techniques that have made these transplants possible have also been reflected in the tremendous advances in keeping people alive. One of the difficulties we have had is in deciding the point of death. In days gone by, the patient did this himself; he simply stopped breathing or his heart stopped beating, and that was all there was to it. With the tremendous advance in resuscitative techniques, we find now that organs which fail, whether the heart or the kidney, can be taken over by an artificial organ, and the body may be kept alive. Now, with the further step of transplanting, an organ that works can be taken from the body and used.

With this tremendous advance in the ability to keep people alive, it is sometimes extremely difficult to decide when a person has passed the point where he could no longer live. Fortunately, the Bill does not try in any way to define the point of death. I think that to do so would be impossible for any committee, and it would certainly be impossible to do so in legislation. This is left to the judgment of the medical practitioner; I believe that is exactly where it should be left. Referring to this matter, the Thirteenth Report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia to the Attorney-General states:

> We feel that no useful purpose would be served by legally defining when death has occurred, or by providing a set of rules by which this may be determined and accordingly make no recommendation on this subject. We do however recommend that the person making the decision as to the occurrence of death should be one attending the putative donor as a medical adviser and should not be a member of or professionally connected with the transplant team.

I think that is probably good advice although, as the Bill reads, it does not exactly follow that report Clause 4 (3) sets out the duty of a medical practitioner, as follows.

> No part of a body shall be removed except by a legally qualified medical practitioner who must have satisfied himself by personal examination of the body that life is extinct.

There is a second safeguard because, in the overall picture, the medical practitioner who is charged with the treatment of a patient who dies and whose body or some part of whose body is used for a transplant is the one who pronounces that death has ensued; in other words, by common practice, it is still his responsibility to say that the patient is dead. It is then an added duty on the practitioner who will remove the organ to satisfy himself also that the person is dead and cannot be

resuscitated, and that there is no prospect of future life. I believe that is as it should be; that is the normally expected duty of any medical practitioner.

As I believe there are tremendous advantages in this legislation, I support it strongly. My own experience in the corneal grafting field, first as a house surgeon and registrar over many years and later in private practice over many years, supports the assertion that in the past great difficulties have been associated with obtaining material. It is absolutely essential that, if it is to be used successfully, material be obtained from the donor as soon as possible after death I can remember on many occasions having to interview the relatives of people one, two or three hours after those people had died. I have had to put to them the advantages of allowing a cornea to be used for a transplant operation. Such interviews are conducted in trying circumstances, often in the small hours of the morning, when the relatives are in no position really to make any reasonable judgment. At such a time one feels that one intrudes on their grief, yet it has been necessary to do this to obtain the material in good time. Then it did not matter whether the person who had died had intimated his willingness to have some part of his body used for a grafting operation; immediately he died the common law provision took over. The Attorney-General, in his second reading explanation, referred to a report in the *Northwestern University Law Review,* as follows:

> The present common law in England and the United States, except as modified by Statute, holds that the right of possession for purposes of burial generally belongs to the surviving spouse, children and next of kin in that order.

That is fair enough. However, it goes even further than that, because the report continued:

> Damages can be recovered from anyone who performs an unauthorized autopsy on the body, mutilates or dissects it, or removes or retains any portion without consent.

Therefore, any surgeon who contemplated using any part of a body without making certain of his legal position, by having the signed permission, was laying himself open for action. I return now to corneal grafting. Ideally, the material should be removed within six hours of death and used within 24 hours or 48 hours of death That does not give much time. These time limits are greatly reduced when it comes to renal and cardiac transfers. Fortunately, preservation techniques have been developed that make it possible to preserve corneae in eye banks Indeed, a scheme is being developed in which people who wish to leave their corneae for corneal grafting may do so, and the cornea may be preserved long enough to enable it to be sent by air to the Asian and Pacific countries where the incidence of blindness is caused by corneal opacity. It may be that, by doing so, Australians will help restore the sight of blind people in the Asian and Pacific area.

A bone bank exists at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and probably at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and bone can be preserved for a longer period. Because of the extreme urgency involved in removing an organ from a cadaver before it becomes totally unusable, the new system is essential. The potential donor will sign a form giving notice of intent, which must be witnessed by two persons, and, if he is wise, he will also notify his next of kin that this is his intention. This form will be sufficient provided there is some way in which the prescribed person (in this case the medical superintendent or an officer nominated by him) is aware of its existence. The surgeon may act on this authority, even though an authority given normally would be null and void once the person died.

The authority is specific and may specify one organ or any part of the body. The original situation may still apply in the absence of an authority. In other words, if the patient who died left no authority, it would still be possible for the surgeon to approach the relatives and, provided the prescribed authority had good reason to believe that the deceased person was not against that course of action or that the surviving spouse or other relative was not, go ahead and take the graft material. In these circumstances, it would still be necessary to interview the relatives and obtain their approval.

The safeguards in the Bill refer to the Coroner's jurisdiction. Naturally, in a case involving criminal activity, an accident or something out of which a charge may be laid, the Coroner has total and absolute jurisdiction. In practice, if there is any question that a patient's death may be the subject of a Coroner's inquiry, it is not common for certain donor material to be sought. However, potentially healthy kidneys and hearts are available from persons who have been killed in accidents and this is, unfortunately, one of the major sources of donor material. Nevertheless, the Coroner's authority must be preserved at all times and, indeed, is preserved in this Bill.

Clause 5 provides that the Governor may make such regulations as he considers necessary or expedient for the purposes of the Act. This will set up the machinery: the method of indicating one's desire to give material; the method of storing that information in a filing system of some sort; a method of checking out that authority when the person involved dies (this sometimes presents problems); and finally, the form in which the register will be kept. This is a sensible and eminently desirable Bill, which will make it easier for permission to be obtained to use grafting material. Indeed, I believe this Bill will advance tremendously the practice of these grafting techniques, and will still preserve the safeguards and rights of the individual.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5— "Regulations."

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister say whether it has been decided where the central registry will be kept; whether it is intended that it will be kept in one central position; whether it is expected that each major hospital will keep its own registry or whether it is intended that the registry will be divided into sections involving each organ; and what method of filing will be used?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I will obtain that information for the honourable member. To the best of my knowledge, no decision has been taken on the form that the registry will take, where it will be kept, or whether each major hospital will have its own.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND VALUERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 26. Page 2172.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): This is a sensible move and I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 5, at 2 p.m.