

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 20, 1974

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

**CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

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

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION BILL

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

QUESTIONS

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

GRAPE SPRAYS

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (March 5).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has stated that the disease downy mildew of grape vines has been more widespread and caused more crop losses this season than has been experienced before. While the disease is normally present to a minor degree, its widespread occurrence this season is directly related to adverse weather conditions. Following this season's outbreak there will be a high level of infection carried over the winter, and an increased hazard next season if weather conditions are again favourable for disease development. The Agriculture Department has been aware of the need for control measures and has campaigned throughout this season on the need for protective spraying. This campaign will be continued next season and it is expected that growers who were previously not familiar with the potential of the disease will be more ready to apply protective treatments next season.

The temporary shortage of one fungicide of German origin (Delan) was associated with the problem of expecting an abnormal seasonal demand in a particular country, and the time lag involved in freighting supplies to meet an unprecedented demand situation. The importers of spray chemicals attempt to carry adequate but not excessive stocks, and it is understood that supplies of Delan in 1973 were 14 per cent below the estimated Australian demand; but in the latter part of the 1973-74 season adequate supplies have been available. It is recognized that a world shortage of insecticides and fungicides is threatening, but it is expected that there will not be any major shortages of these materials for next season.

It is also recognized that prices of agricultural chemicals are rising, in line with other materials. In the case of copper oxy chloride, which is used as a fungicide against downy mildew, the price has risen 38 per cent between 1973 and 1974. In the same period the price of copper, which is the base material, has risen on the London metal exchange by 86 per cent. It seems that the price of copper-based fungicides is clearly related to the world demand for the metal.

MURRAY RIVER LEVELS

In reply to Mr. CUMBE (March 13).

The Hon. T. D. CORCORAN: The peak at lock 1 of the Murray flows occurred on Sunday, March 10, with a

flow of 53 460 m³ a day, and on Monday, March 18, the flow was 25 800 m³ a day. The flow at lock 9 is 25 200 m³ a day and is expected to rise because of the impending Darling outflow to about 50 000 m³ a day in the first week in April. It is expected that only locks 7 and 8 and perhaps lock 2 will have to be removed, and no flooding of river flats or of low-lying irrigated areas is expected. Further gates were closed yesterday at the barrages at the Murray mouth to maintain pool.

HAHNDORF SEWERAGE

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (March 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Preliminary designs for the sewerage scheme for Hahndorf have been prepared and estimates of cost and revenue are now being made. An environmental impact statement has been forwarded to the Director of Environment and Conservation for consideration. It is expected that a proposal will be submitted to Cabinet for reference to the Parliamentary Committee on Public Works within the next month.

STRATHMONT PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (March 7).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The uncertain supply of materials makes it difficult to provide a precise date for the commencement of modifications to the building at Strathmont Primary School. However, present planning provides for a starting date soon after Easter, with a likely working period of about 15 weeks. If these plans can be adhered to, the Strathmont pre-school centre may be available by the beginning of the third term of this year.

WINE AUCTIONS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (March 1).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Provision already exists for liquor to be sold by auction at other than licensed premises in certain circumstances. Section 72 of the Licensing Act, 1967-1973, authorizes the grant of a permit to a licensed auctioneer to sell liquor by auction for any of the following reasons:

1. On account of a licensed person on his licensed premises.
2. On account of the estate of a deceased or bankrupt person.
3. When offered for sale with any person's effects, provided that the value of the effects is substantially greater than the value of the liquor.
4. For such purposes or in such circumstances as justify, in the opinion of the Licensing Court, the grant of a permit.

Permits for auctioneers are frequently granted pursuant to this section, and auctions of liquor for reasons 2, 3, and 4 above are normally conducted on other than licensed premises.

PRIVACY BILL

Mr. HALL (Goyder) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion without notice.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: Later I shall move the following motion:

That this House censure the Premier for his attempt to couple with the Privacy Bill new methods to intensify Government propaganda which are, in addition to the existing methods used by the huge number of press secretaries, personal assistants, research officers, and other similar personnel who have been appointed under the Premier's over-staffed administration, designed to smother the news media with Government releases, slanted to favour the State Labor regime, thereby destroying objective reporting in South Australia and preventing the normal contact

between reporters of the news media and the Government, and request him immediately to cease his attack on the democratic process, to withdraw his proposal to establish land-lines and co-axial cable links with radio and television stations, and to give an undertaking that the Privacy Bill will not be proceeded with in the next Parliamentary session.

I have moved to suspend Standing Orders to have debated what is obviously a fundamental alteration in the Government's attitude to the media. One realizes that the media today plays an extremely important role in communicating to the public the attitudes of Government and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders, and under Standing Orders he has 10 minutes to explain why the suspension should be considered. He has not got the right, and he will not get it, to debate his subject matter of the motion. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I am debating the subject matter of the proposal by establishing why I want Standing Orders suspended. Standing Order 463 provides:

The mover shall in every case be limited to 10 minutes in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension, and one other member may be permitted to speak, subject to a like limit, but no further discussion shall be allowed.

The SPEAKER: That is the ruling I have given.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, these are my reasons—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is the ruling I have given.

Mr. HALL: —because of the importance of the media today in transmitting to the public the views of Parliamentarians, of Parliament and of Government. I have moved the motion because of the fundamental difference that the Premier proposes in his and his Government's approach to the media in this State. It is also allied with the move made in the Commonwealth sphere, which is showing a blatant disregard for the democratic rights of the community.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot continue in that strain. He is linking another Parliament, which has no direct connection with this Parliament, as a reason for the suspension of the Standing Orders of this House. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: We are part of the Australian community, but at this stage I will not proceed with reference to another place. I think that would be self-evident to members of the House who follow the news media. In recent years we have seen a very evident Ministerial arrogance develop in this House and in the community, and that arrogance has been typified by the—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member persists in disregarding the authority of the Chair, he will not have authority to continue. The honourable member, in accordance with Standing Orders, which he has quoted, has 10 minutes in which to speak to this House about why Standing Orders should be suspended, and on the merits of any notice of motion that he has submitted.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I submit that I must say why I want Standing Orders suspended. The reason why I want them suspended is to discuss the arrogance of this Government and its suppression of the democratic process. That is why this proposal has been put forward. We all know that last evening the Premier became most arrogant on the *This Day Tonight* programme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you like it? You are trying to smother free speech.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I take the point of order that the honourable member is entitled to explain the reasons for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders but is not entitled to indulge in personal abuse.

Mr. Gunn: You can't take it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member will find out in a moment whether we will take it. The member for Goyder, when he is arguing for the suspension of Standing Orders, is not entitled to debate the motion that he proposes to move.

Mr. Mathwin: Stop protecting the Premier.

The SPEAKER: As I have pointed out, the honourable member for Goyder is confined to Standing Orders, and I can interpret Standing Orders only as they are determined by this House. They provide that an honourable member has 10 minutes in which to explain the reasons why Standing Orders should be suspended to discuss this matter. I repeat that, in accordance with Standing Orders, the subject matter of the notice of motion cannot be debated in that period of 10 minutes.

Mr. HALL: The last facet of an extremely overloaded situation of examples as to why this motion should be moved was provided by the Premier's intemperate display last evening on *This Day Tonight*.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have just asked for a ruling on the matter of the honourable member's referring, in arguing whether Standing Orders should be suspended, to the kind of material that doubtless he will be using in his speech when the suspension of Standing Orders is granted. You have given a ruling on this matter but the member for Goyder is persisting in ignoring it, and I again raise the point of order that he is out of order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order, because on two previous occasions I have explained the circumstances applicable to a debate such as this. If the honourable member for Goyder is going to persist in ignoring the authority of the Chair in ruling in accordance with Standing Orders, he will not be given the permission, as required by Standing Orders, to further his argument for the suspension.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not interpret Standing Orders as preventing me from giving ray reasons for moving for the suspension.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Goyder that, if he considers Standing Orders further, he will see that the person who interprets them is the person in charge of the debate, and that happens to be the Speaker. The honourable member for Goyder does not interpret Standing Orders.

Mr. HALL: I have a copy of Standing Orders in ray possession, and it was given to me, I thought, so that I could place some personal interpretation on the Standing Orders. I know of no other reason why they were given to me. I take it that it is still a free enough House for me to have an interpretation of Standing Orders, or is it one where we are to have my views on that matter suppressed also?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can speak to the motion to suspend Standing Orders, and nothing else.

Mr. HALL: I return to the reason why I have moved my motion, and that is the Premier's intemperate remarks last evening on *This Day Tonight*. That is what has prompted this, and—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: —if you don't like it—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have no hesitation in warning the honourable member for Goyder. In seeking the suspension of Standing Orders, an honourable member may explain to the House why he seeks that suspension. He may not speak on the subject matter to which he wishes to refer later. Personal attacks on honourable members will not be tolerated while an honourable member is speaking to a motion to suspend Standing Orders.

Mr. HALL: This is the first time that the House has met since the television programme last evening, and I did not refer to that in moving to suspend Standing Orders. I cannot understand why you should rule as you have. The point is, as I have said, that the Premier has proposed a fundamental—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL: You are taking up my 10 minutes in this way, thus suppressing discussion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members persistently interject, I shall have no hesitation in applying the Standing Orders and warning honourable members, who will then have to suffer the consequences. The honourable Minister of Education.

Mr. Hall: You are shielding the Premier.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Hall: Keep it in the dark!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Goyder for the second time. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr Speaker—

Mr. Mathwin: Sit down! You're just taking up the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, the point of order I want to take is that, in taking previous points of order, I have indicated that, if and when the suspension of Standing Orders is granted and the member for Goyder is arguing his case, he can allude to the various matters that form the substance of his argument. He may not do so in giving the reasons that led him to move to suspend Standing Orders in the first place. The motion to suspend Standing Orders in order to move a censure motion or a motion of no confidence has to allude to the fact that such a motion should be the subject of urgent consideration by this House.

The SPEAKER: On two occasions, I have already informed the honourable member for Goyder of his rights under Standing Orders. I will make no further attempt to uphold the point of order, as I have already pointed out the position to the honourable member for Goyder. The honourable Premier.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. HALL: You have ruled while the Minister of Education was on his feet speaking to a point of order, and I disagree to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Bring up the reasons in writing.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't want to speak about this: you want to cause an argument.

Mr. Hall: You want to shield the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! I order the honourable member for Goyder to bring up in writing his reasons for disagreeing to my ruling.

Mr. Millhouse: You brought this on the House by repeatedly interrupting him.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Gouger has moved—

Mr. Hall: Goyder!

The SPEAKER: I said that the honourable member for Goyder had moved to disagree to the Speaker's ruling, because he was doing no more, in his opinion, than describing the reasons why he was moving for the suspension of Standing Orders. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, indeed it is.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: I read Standing Order 463 again, as follows:

The mover shall in every case be limited to 10 minutes— I have not disputed that I should be limited to 10 minutes in giving the original explanation—

in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension and one other member may be permitted to speak, subject to a like time limit but no further discussion shall be allowed.

It appears to me that your ruling purports to assume what my reasons should be, and that is why I cannot agree to it and why I have moved in this way. You, Mr. Speaker, are saying that my reasons may be of a certain nature but not of another, and I cannot agree to an artificial censorship of my reasons explaining why I wish to move to suspend Standing Orders so as to move a motion in this House. How on earth can I be subjected to that artificial control? I thought that this Government was promoting an open society of free thought. I thought any adult was supposed to be able to read, say and think what he liked, but that does not apply in this House: I am not allowed to give my reasons for moving to suspend Standing Orders.

I wonder what criteria you use, Mr. Speaker, in ruling, as you have ruled, that I cannot proceed to give legitimate reasons, which I have not been able to give before in this House because of the recent occurrence in question, linked as it is with a series of occurrences over a long period. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand your reasoning. You have ruled against my reasons without stating any basis for your ruling. You are therefore restricting the debate and removing my opportunity to give reasons that the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and others here should know about.

I do not believe that the Premier will be game enough to accept this challenge to have a frank and free discussion on this issue involving his motives and movements in this area. I believe the House will be shackled, because the Government will prevent debate by opposing the suspension, even though no doubt there will be time to raise the matter at the end of this session. So we find that the motion will go to a vote directly and it will be squashed by the Government; nothing more will come of this debate, and I shall not be allowed to say why I should proceed in this way. The reasons are self-evident. The Premier has been exposed to the public of South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They are self-evident: this is another Senate pre-election speech.

Mr. HALL: I do not mind how often the Minister of Transport talks about the Senate. If he wishes to be as stupid a tactician as that, that is his business.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has moved to disagree to the Speaker's ruling. That is the subject matter on which he will be entitled to speak and no extraneous matters will be discussed. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the Minister of Transport was out of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder was out of order.

Mr. HALL: You did not say so until then, Mr. Speaker. Your ruling that I was out of order in pursuing my reasons cuts across what we have always thought were the freedoms of this House, and one certainly has difficulty in maintaining those freedoms in the face of the deceptions the Premier puts over the public of South Australia. For instance, in this House yesterday he said that Opposition Parties have as much assistance as Ministers have.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: They do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not be permitted to speak in the vein in which he is talking. He has moved a motion of disagreement to the Speaker's ruling on the interpretation of the Standing Orders. Extraneous matters are not permitted in that discussion and, if the honourable member persists in that, I shall have to use the authority of the Speaker to prevent him from speaking outside the terms within which he is permitted in this House.

Mr. HALL: I do not believe you and I should have a row on that. What is pertinent is your refusal to let me speak freely. It is a restraint on the freedoms of this House that you ought not to impose and I believe you are wrong in so imposing that restriction. I can say little more than that except that you manifest an undue censorship on what we say and we are prevented from speaking our minds. No other opportunity to do so will be given under the present political situation. I therefore move to disagree to your ruling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I second the motion of disagreement to your ruling and I very much regret that it has been necessary for the member for Goyder to move such a motion. I believe he is justified in doing so. What the member for Goyder is trying to do relates to something which has happened since this time yesterday and which I understand happened some time after dinner last evening. This is literally the first opportunity the member for Goyder has had to raise this as a matter of urgency in the House and it was on that point he was speaking when the Minister of Education persistently, I believe, to rob him of most of his 10 minutes—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has seconded a motion of disagreement to the Speaker's ruling. There is nothing in the Speaker's ruling about interjections or points of order by some other member. It is a ruling the Speaker has made and the Speaker will stand up to it. The honourable member for Mitcham must confine his remarks to the motion under consideration.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out that you made the ruling on a point of order taken by the Minister. That was the relevance of my referring to it.

The SPEAKER: The Speaker makes a ruling in accordance with Standing Orders. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, you were prompted to do so. The Minister for Education rose to his feet not once but four times while the honourable member for Goyder was trying to explain the reason for his motion to suspend Standing Orders, and that will be seen clearly in *Hansard* tomorrow if any of us needs a reminder. That is the position. The quite scandalous behaviour of the Premier has occurred since the—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order!

The SPEAKER: Order! I keep reminding the honourable member for Mitcham and this is the last time I will warn him. He is speaking to a motion of disagreement to

the Speaker's ruling and, unless the honourable member confines his remarks to that motion, I will rule him out of order and not grant him permission to continue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me also remind you that we, on the Premier's say-so in answer to a question last week, are drawing to the end of a session: the last sitting of this House will be next week. It is urgent to get these things before the House.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham he is speaking in total disregard of the authority of the Chair. I have ruled on many occasions when there has been a motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling that such a motion has nothing to do with anyone else in this Chamber. It concerns a ruling I have given as the Speaker and it is a motion to disagree to that ruling. That is the only subject matter. If the honourable member for Mitcham transgresses on this occasion, I shall warn him and withdraw permission for him to speak further.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am only trying to get the point across that the member for Goyder was doing his best to explain the reasons why it was urgent for a suspension of Standing Orders to be granted today to discuss this thing in the first place. The incident that gave rise to his motion occurred since the last sitting of the House, or certainly since there was any opportunity in this House to do anything about it. The House is to rise next week, and it will then be four or five months before members have another opportunity to debate what is a matter of great importance to the community—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and that was—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the second time, after which I will implement Standing Orders. The honourable member has been in this Chamber long enough to know what that means. A motion has been moved to disagree to a ruling that I, as Speaker, have given, and that is the only subject matter on which the honourable member may speak. I warn the honourable member for Mitcham that, if he is going to disregard the authority of the Chair after two warnings, I shall implement Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can only assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have done my best to speak to the motion of disagreement to your ruling, by pointing out why the member for Goyder was speaking in the way he was speaking when you, Sir, stopped him. You, Mr. Speaker, ruled that he could not continue in that way. How one can be more on the point than that, I do not know. I hope, whether or not I am on the point in your view, Mr. Speaker, that I have illustrated to you that this debate should be proceeded with because of the urgency of the matter and because it is a great departure from the normal practice carried out in this State. I hope that at least on this side of the House there will be a solid front in support of the motion which has been moved by the member for Goyder and which I second.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Past rulings of the Speakers of this House on this matter have been consistent and plain. In explaining the reasons for the suspension of Standing Orders, debate must be confined to those matters alone, and the matters to be discussed in the subsequent debate on the suspension of Standing Orders cannot be canvassed in the initial debate. This practice has been strictly adhered to since this House first met and those members who have been here for as long as has the member for Goyder know perfectly well other Speakers in this House have enforced that ruling

as you, Sir, have properly done today. In the course of his remarks, it was obvious that the member for Goyder tried to put on a show in order to get public attention on what is apparently an entirely mistaken premise.

Mr. Millhouse: Balderdash!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been the Government's practice to allow any motion of no confidence in it to proceed, and it will do so now. If the honourable member wants to debate the matters about which he has tried to speak improperly against your ruling, Mr. Speaker, he will have an opportunity to do so, provided that he does not continue in his attempts to get himself suspended in the meantime.

Mr. Millhouse: Ha!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was obvious to every member in this Chamber that that was what the member was trying to do. Your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is entirely in accordance with the precedent set in this House in relation to these matters, and I assure the member for Goyder that, given that your ruling is upheld, his motion for the suspension of Standing Orders will be acceded to by the Government so that he will have an opportunity to say about me the things he wants to say. If he can substantiate them in the House, it will be up to him to do so.

Mr. HALL: In reply, I refer to a new factor introduced into the debate by the Premier when he said that I was trying to get suspended. However, this debate has been proceeding through its various forms for about 30 minutes in total, and I know enough about your rulings, Mr. Speaker, and the proceedings of this House, to realize that I could have been suspended as early as 2.10 p.m. had I so desired. You, Sir, will realize how carefully I had skirted the final cut of your sword by lasting through until 2.35 p.m. However, one of the objectives of the debate has been achieved by 2.35, the Premier having stated that he will permit the debate to proceed, whereas he would not have said it earlier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: It is only because it has gone on for this time—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's a lie.

Mr. HALL: —that the Speaker has been shamed into allowing this debate to proceed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's an utter lie.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In his initial comments the Premier explained certain matters regarding the original motion. Although I accepted that explanation, I will not now permit a long debate on the subject matter of the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr. Millhouse: The member for Goyder is in the middle of replying.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether you have at this stage granted the Premier that right. If you have, Sir, I take this point of order. I do not, however, want to transgress your ruling. I am in the midst of replying and, although I cannot put my finger on the exact Standing Order, I doubt that the Premier has the right to interrupt my reply simply because you, Sir, have risen to your feet to admonish me on a certain point. That should not be considered to be a reasonable interruption to my speech, as this matter has nothing to do with the Premier. I await your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this matter.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 137, I uphold the honourable member's point of order because at this stage the question before the Chair is "That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to". That is the only subject matter of the debate at this stage. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for upholding that point of order. I am sure, now that the Premier has decided to permit this debate to continue, that he will have every right and chance to reply to any unfair allegations that he thinks I may have made. I hope that I will be given a chance, before he replies, to state my case. I wish to add nothing more but that I persevere with my disagreement to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder has moved the following motion, which was seconded by the honourable member for Mitcham:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

For the question say "Aye"; against say "No". The Noes have it.

Mr. HALL: Divide.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously counted the House but, in accordance with Standing Orders, I again count the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that I have the right to speak on the suspension motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for suspension. Is it seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I support the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, and I do so in accordance with the constant tradition of Governments in this State, always observed by this Government, that if any motion of no confidence is proposed, an immediate way will be made for it to be moved and debated. That has always been the case, and immediately the honourable member came into this House this afternoon and moved his motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, I told members on this side that no-one was to call "No" and that the suspension was to be allowed. I believe members on the Opposition benches heard that.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a pity Hugh didn't hear that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member for Goyder then tried to debate the actual motion in respect of which he was moving for the suspension of Standing Orders, rather than the suspension motion, and to that, in accordance with Standing Orders, objection was taken, but there was no question on this side that the honourable member would not be able to put whatever case he had.

I bitterly resent the utterly untruthful and baseless statements by the honourable member that I had been shamed into doing this as a result of what he did in the House earlier this afternoon. There has never been a case

when a no-confidence motion in this Government has been proposed and immediate provision has not been made for that motion to be submitted and disposed of, and we proceed in accordance with that tradition. It is not a question of being shamed: the House will doubtless hear just how little the honourable member has to argue on this motion, but that will be for the debate on the motion itself. I am not worried about that, but I resent the kind of implication the honourable member has made. It is the kind of implication that was put on me by his friends on a television programme yesterday.

Motion carried.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): After three quarters of an hour, I thank the House for its courtesy in allowing me to proceed with this motion and, regardless of what the Premier has said, may I say that I am surprised at having been given this facility this afternoon.

Mr. Venning: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has, on many occasions, assumed the authority of Speaker of this House. I warn the honourable member that, if he wants to supersede the elected authority in this House, I shall have to deal with him in accordance with Standing Orders. I will not tolerate that any further.

Mr. HALL: I was about to explain the motion that I wish to move. Before I do so, however, may I say how wonderful it is that the Premier should bitterly resent the remark I made, when a few minutes before then he stated that my chief objective in speaking this afternoon was to be expelled from the House. He could say that, supported by the loud "haw-haws" of the Minister of Education, who has wasted about half an hour of the time of the House by his interference in the debate. The Premier can say that: yes, it is quite all right for him to say that I am bothering the House only to be sent out, for Senate publicity.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Yet the Premier bitterly resents anything I say that is no more severe in nature than what I have referred to. That gives us some clue about why he has lodged a complaint with the *This Day Tonight* people because of their severe questioning of him last evening. What a great advocate of free speech! With all the army of press personnel at his disposal, he needs to be protected by the management. Of course, that is what my motion is all about. I move:

That this House censure the Premier for his attempt to couple with the Privacy Bill new methods to intensify Government propaganda which are, in addition to the existing methods used by the huge number of press secretaries, personal assistants, research officers, and other similar personnel, who have been appointed under the Premier's over-staffed administration, designed to smother the news media with Government releases, slanted to favour the State Labor regime, thereby destroying objective reporting in South Australia and preventing the normal contact between reporters of the news media and the Government, and request him immediately to cease his attack on the democratic process, to withdraw his proposal to establish land-lines and co-axial cable links with radio and television stations, and to give an undertaking that the Privacy Bill will not be proceeded with in the next Parliamentary session.

We have now had the experience of a few years of office in this State of the Labor Government, which has now had tenure of office since 1970. We have seen an arrogance of government that I believe has not been seen before in this House in this century. This arrogance is typified by the attitude of the Minister of Education who continually interrupts debate and who uses Standing Orders to shield Government policy from dissection. He uses that

system instead of fronting up to criticism. We have seen the Minister of Labour and Industry simply shrug off intimidation in this community. We have seen the Minister of Transport (the hard face of Labor, as I call him) arrogantly override community rights in South Australia. All Opposition members, whatever their political persuasion have seen and experienced what I am talking about, and I think all of them are bitter about this attitude of the Government, an attitude which should not continue but which unfortunately does continue.

The Government has in its possession reports that have never seen the light of day. What about the Duncan report, which dealt with a subject that received great reportage all over South Australia by this media that is so beloved by the Government? The report on water rating has never seen the light of day. The Juvenile Court report that was not tabled would be of interest not only to members but also to the people of the State, especially at this time with the Principal of Vaughan House having been invalidated out of her job as a result of injuries received from an attack on her by inmates (or boarders, or whatever they are called) at that institution. She has been invalidated out of her job, yet we cannot see the Juvenile Court report. The Government views attempts to seek information with the gravest suspicion. The Premier bitterly resents criticism, as has been evidenced this afternoon, when his last words in replying to my motion to suspend Standing Orders again related to the television programme last evening.

That bitterness will grow if he continues to hide from inquiry. A wall of secrecy will be built around the front bench opposite. On the shelves of Government departments will be stacked report after report that the public wants to see. A computerized tape will be used to disseminate information. There will be no tabling of written reports. There will not be an objective scrutiny of community affairs, because reports will not be there to be seen. Members on this side do not have to make an assumption about this: we have seen Ministerial and Government arrogance. Few Ministers have not been guilty of this arrogance. Even last evening, the Minister of Marine, in relation to the Boating Bill, simply overrode the rights of individuals. There will be a great challenge for a future Government that some day gets control in South Australia in starting to try to solve problems rather than impose restrictions.

Earlier, I referred to the programme *This Day Tonight*. It is remarkable that earlier today the Premier refused to be interviewed by reporters from *This Day Tonight*, with instructions being issued that no other Minister was to be interviewed by reporters from that programme. Later in the day the Premier rescinded that instruction for reasons that I do not know, and was interviewed, although he bitterly resented being questioned. It is amazing that a politician who has been in this House for 20 years or 21 years (too long, at any rate) should take this attitude. His attitude last evening showed that he has been in this place too long, because the power he has arrogated to himself has produced the type of reaction we saw from him on that programme. The interviewer last evening was not speaking on behalf of that "X" person that had been interviewed: he was speaking on behalf of a large slice of the South Australian community. The Premier went over the channel and spoke back to the community in the way to which we have become accustomed. He is informed enough as a student of the media to know that this is the way it happened. He has been arrogant to a large slice of the community; he has shown that he wants to operate in secret and does not like the prying eyes of the media.

He has now come forward with new proposals, although I have no doubt he will shift his ground a little under criticism, as he has done so often before. I am sure he will shift ground from his general proposals, which are to establish a direct link between Ministers of his Government and the media. He has some scheme to do this with direct lines. He has already said that he does not believe the Government should give specific releases to individual radio and television stations. There should be one master tape with one master release for everyone. I wonder whether a man will walk down the streets in a few years time and listen to his master's voice coming from the boxes on the posts, as music is now played during a festival. This seems funny to members opposite, but I will deal with it further a little later.

What is the Government proposing? What did the Premier put forward without telling (as I understand it) Caucus or Cabinet? The members who sit behind the Premier can deny or confirm that. I am told that the Premier acted in this matter without the authority of his Parly. If that is so, it further aggravates his offence to the community. The Premier has proposed that Ministers generally shall speak once on an item; there will be one release for all ears. Therefore, when we turn to a commercial radio or television station (or, dare I say, to *This Day Tonight*), or listen to a news programme in another State, we will hear the same honeyed words, the same message, from a Minister or from the Premier. When a reporter from a news programme telephones, the computer will click on and the reporter will hear someone speaking, giving the message.

Mr. Rodda: "This is your captain speaking."

Mr. HALL: Yes. I hope we do not have to wear uniforms to listen to these tilings. Therefore, the Premier has made a formidable move in the direction of thought control in South Australia. He is trying to short-circuit the system and to remove the objective reporter, who stands between the Minister, or public spokesman, and the media as it presents its message to the public. He is trying to remove the objective reporter. During their careers, all members have been subject to the praise and criticism of the press. Not even one member has not been on the wrong side of the media. The Premier knows this, as he used the media well when we were in office to generate criticism against our Government. I do not say that what he did then was wrong. My view of democracy is that there must be a case and a challenge to it. The Premier is trying to remove or subjugate that challenge to the Government, thus destroying one of the basic elements of democracy, which is that there must be a challenge to what the Government does.

What aggravates his offence is the weakness at present of the Opposition in this State. In saying that, I do not wish to be offensive to any Opposition member. However, it is evident to members of this House that the Opposition is weak. At this time of travail in the Liberal and Country League camp, the Government has chosen to strike at objective reporting. At the time of Opposition weakness, there is a special responsibility on the media to take an objective look at the Government. I share with many other people in the community admiration for the reporting fraternity in South Australia. I believe reporters are free of fear or favour in their reporting, although they are unduly restricted by some of the libel laws of the State. Some matters cannot be uncovered or revealed by them, although they should be exposed. This restriction on reporters will be 100 times worse if the Privacy Bill ever passes this Parliament. Despite these restrictions, reporters do their best to do an objective job.

I believe they are to be commended and not suppressed. I hope I never subscribe to what the Premier is doing now in trying to short-circuit objective reporting, simply providing a mechanical means of transmission. He and I have been criticized in the past. All members have had their difficulties and differences with the media. The Minister of Works may have a peculiar expression on his face when I say this, but there is nothing to hide in this regard. We have all had our differences and, from the balances and checks involved in the system, normality comes in the end. But we will never reach the give-and-take situation if there is to be this short-circuiting process. I wonder what connection there is between the Premier's moving in this way and the Commonwealth Government's intended expenditure of \$1 250 000 to promote that Government's activities across Australia just a few weeks before a Senate election! No-one, including the Premier, will ever tell me that that is coincidental.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: We have other examples of what may be foisted on us in the future and of what some people think of freedom. In the last day or two there has been a statement by the Commonwealth Minister for Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Slewart) that would send a chill down the spine of every Australian. That Minister spoke of his plans for Australians' recreation in their spare time. He was asked: how do you make people use their leisure time creatively?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder has moved a long motion, which in the main deals with the activities of the State and the Government of South Australia. I will not allow a discussion on extraneous matters involving Governments or Parliaments over which we have no control. Even though this is a censure motion, and even though the honourable member has great latitude in debating such a motion, he may not introduce matters over which this House has no control.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, my alluding to this incident was only incidental, but South Australians are just as much subject to this Minister's decisions as is anyone else. What the State Government does can well complement what the Commonwealth Minister does and, as I say, I was referring to this matter only in a complementary way. The Commonwealth Minister's answer was, "Your word is 'make'; I hope we don't have to make it compulsory." If the Premier's Commonwealth colleagues have that attitude and if he wants to short-circuit information releases and to remove the objective reporters' work in connection with these releases to the public, what sort of conjunction will this be? What sort of losses will there be to the democratic process if these people are allowed to proceed in this way?

Yesterday the Premier said that Opposition Parties have a great deal of assistance in performing their Parliamentary duties. He referred to "Parlies" (in the plural) and of course there are three Opposition Parties: the Liberal and Country League, the Liberal Movement, and the Country Party, which are all represented in this House. One may say, I suppose, that I bitterly resent (as the Premier resents some of the things I have said) the information he gives to the public to the effect that we, the Liberal Movement, receive special assistance. We have asked for it, but we have received none. We receive no more assistance than a back-bencher receives. The Premier's statement in that regard, of course, was incorrect, and I leave it for the Premier to correct.

In justifying and hiding the true cost of his proposals, the Premier has always said that I entered into a scheme

(I heard this last evening on the programme) of monitoring radio programmes. Let me tell him, if he has not read the relevant documents, that I engaged a woman in the Premier's Department, at a salary of less than \$60 a week, to monitor certain radio programmes. That scheme failed, because the programmes were too diverse and the scheme was not economic. I did not believe that we should spend that sort of money on that scheme, and the woman concerned was given normal departmental work to perform. When for personal reasons she left that job after several months, she was not replaced. That is the truth of that matter, and the Premier completely and deliberately misinterprets it.

Mr. Millhouse: He knew that.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and his docketed would bear it out. The Premier completely misinterprets the position, and his reference to a cost of \$6 000 is deliberately misleading to the South Australian public. It may be the capital cost of setting up some electronic marbles that will give the South Australian public the same little "beeped" message of honeyed words, but this is only a fraction of the cost of the system that the Premier visualizes, because we all know that someone must interpret the recorded message, or is the electronic marble so wonderful that it will work without people touching it? That would be the ultimate horror. Obviously, members of the Premier's personal staff or of his Ministerial staff will ensure that the programmes are monitored, and some action will be taken, if it is to be effective, the cost being far beyond the \$6 000 that the public is hearing about at present.

But what is rather more amazing is that the Premier has been responsible for a tremendous increase in the size of the Premier's Department. We do not know just how many personnel are at present employed in his department. There have been a few moves sideways in the sense that certain duties have been absorbed, so to speak, but we know that many people now operate in that department as personal assistants. When I left the office of the Premier in 1970, three public relations people were performing duties on behalf of the whole Government; now, I understand that at least five are on the Premier's personal staff, and I should like to know (we will not know this afternoon) how many people would qualify as personal assistants, or as a departmental aide, in relation to conveying the Government's story to the media and the public, presenting the best possible face on Government activities.

I am sure that the Premier will not tell us this. These people's positions would not be recognizable in the Public Service lists. As a matter of fact, I have been told that the Public Service Board, I think recently, called for the position of an information officer, and one of the examining people was one of the Premier's weekly-paid staff. Just what is going on in the Premier's Department? How much more money is the public expected to pay out each year in order to tell a good story about the Premier and his Ministers? Maybe these people are necessary, but I sometimes come into contact with personal political supporters of the Premier and when I ask, "What has the Premier done that you approve of?" they usually come out and say that it is something we did when we were in office. The last one to whom I spoke said, "He reformed the abortion laws," and I said, "Wrong! What else?" That person had no idea.

This is frequently the case in South Australia: the Premier has built up for himself an extremely good public relations image that is not based on executive or legislative action. He has seen that this is successful so far and would now like to have more of it, so he desires to remove what is possibly the one remaining obstacle to having

political control over South Australia: he desires to remove the objective reporter. I resent that move because, as I have said earlier, I believe these reporters do a job according to their professional integrity, which is high in South Australia. I understand there is much disquiet among journalists concerning the ramifications of the Premier's move, and well there may be! I have heard that there is some disquiet even among those in positions in the Premier's Government, and these people include public relations and press information officers who consider that this move may be short-circuiting their role.

I do not know whether that is the case, but certainly there is a fear among people that, if the Government acts direct and cuts out the necessity for retaining these people, there will be a surplus of reporters in South Australia, and their services in connection with contacting the Government will not then be needed nearly as much as they have been needed in the past. The Premier may bitterly resent my statements and, working along with the Commonwealth Government, may try to hide his intentions, obviously to manage and guide public thought to a degree never before witnessed in this country. He may bitterly resent criticism of the scheme and show his resentment in the bitterest of terms. He may refer to it, as he did when he sat down a few minutes ago, and may allude to it again, and protest to management (as I understand a protest has been lodged on his behalf on this matter), to suppress this sort of questioning, but it will never work in the long run. I suppose it is little consolation to those in Opposition to know that he may have some success by hiding the fact that he does nothing or something obnoxious in this community and that he misleads rather than leads, as he obviously does. The one thing that suffers from the Premier's management of this State is freedom. That reminds me of another famous man (although I would not couple them together, because the Premier would not like it) in another place who is in great trouble and who uses the greatest of motives to try to get himself out of a bad position.

Recently, we have seen the Attorney-General, in the name of the United Nations and of freedom, introduce a Bill that will stifle community discussion of most items that should be discussed freely today. On the industrial front much has been ventilated in other debates in this House (to which I will not refer), but the Premier stands responsible for his lack of action and use of intimidation. I do not say that alone, but speak for others. Perhaps the Premier reads newspapers, although I doubt that he will do so now because he would not want to read his own words. I am not the only person protesting about the loss of freedom in the industrial community. The Government does not care, and this is in an area where we lose the effectiveness to protest about all the other injustices that this Government may perpetrate on the South Australian community. I hope that we can at least preserve one freedom, the freedom of this House. However, because of what the Government has done and what it allows in the community, I should not be surprised if it moved against that freedom. I view the Government's move with much seriousness, and ask the House to support my censure motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The honourable member has moved a personal censure motion on me for actions taken in accordance with Government policy in South Australia. I listened with care to what he said about this matter. I discount personally the remarks of the honourable member about me: I do not think they matter and I do not intend to reply to them at

all. Let me turn to what, as far as I can see, is the gravamen of any matter that he put in this motion.

First, he complained that the Government had provided press staff and that it now intended to use a monitoring system in relation to radio and television to assemble information that would enable the press staff to put out explanatory material about issues raised on radio and television and, secondly, that coaxial cables would be used to allow a voice tape to be played directly on radio or television rather than that the same material be rung through separately to each of the stations. He says this would cause interference with objective reporting and questioning.

He was somewhat uncertain about that part of his attack because sometime ago he had realized the need for Government to do this and he had appointed an officer to monitor radio and television stations in South Australia at Government expense in order to ensure that the Government had exactly the kind of information that would enable it to put out explanatory material to the public, as we now intend to do. He pointed out that his experiment failed; of course it did. He appointed an officer to audit manually about 1 200 radio and television sessions a week, and it is not possible to do that. However, it has been discovered that it is possible to do it electronically, simply and rather more cheaply than by employing an officer to do it. What is the difference in principle between these methods? Does the honourable member say that, because his manually operated system failed, the Government should not do the same thing by rather more modern and cheaper methods? One would assume that he does, because where is the difference in principle? The honourable member admitted that he had appointed an officer to monitor and gather the necessary information so that the Government could make its explanations, but his experiment failed. It failed because he did not do his job well and did not understand how it could be done. Yet he accuses us because we are doing what he set out to do, but we will do it effectively.

Mr. Mathwin: There's a difference in the cost, isn't there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The cost of our method will be less than the cost of employing one officer for a year, so it will cost less than what the member for Goyder intended to spend. The honourable member's second objection is that it will cut out objective reporting by having direct voice tapes and by using a coaxial cable, but that is not true. The honourable member knows perfectly well, the Leader of the Opposition knows, and I know that I started the system, and he saw the advantage of it and followed. We put voice tapes directly on to radio and television news sessions, it is easier, when one is in Opposition and does not have the administrative duties to perform, to telephone seven separate statements. However, if these are telephoned through (the honourable member does it, and the Leader does it), there is no objective reporter involved. By providing a coaxial cable circuit to carry the report simultaneously to the stations, how is an objective reporter cut out? It is no different from the present practice, except that it saves Ministerial time and money.

Mr. Payne: He doesn't understand what is involved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The system will not cut out press conferences, news interviews, and questioning by reporters. The honourable member accuses me of trying to avoid that sort of thing, but never in the history of Australia has there been a Government whose Ministers are more readily available to the media than the present South Australian Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The media will tell you that, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No journalist comes here from another State without marvelling at the access the press has here to all Ministers of this Government, including the Premier. If the honourable member reads any of the relevant material published in national and other State journals from time to time, he will realize that that comment crops up in every article.

Mr. Mathwin: It comes up regularly in the *Herald*!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, because it is correct, and the *Herald* always gives accurate information. What precisely then is the objection of the member for Goyder? He is only condemning the Government for doing efficiently what he has been trying to do and what we have been trying to do for some time.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He failed, and he is frightened you will be successful.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I turn to another matter to which the member for Goyder objected. He said that the Government had adopted an attitude of utter arrogance to the media, whereas it has done no such thing. Quite frankly, if one is to talk about arrogance towards the media I should have thought that the member for Goyder would perhaps be a little reticent in accusing others. The honourable member has cut a tantrum this afternoon about my remarks in relation to the way in which I was dealt with yesterday by an A.B.C. programme, *This Day Tonight*. I have very vivid memories of the rueful face of Mr. Rhys Clark as he walked out of the Premier's office when the honourable member was Premier, expelled from the office under interdict. Because of questioning? No; because Clive Hale had raised his eyebrow on *This Day Tonight*. I have not put *This Day Tonight* under any interdict, but I do say that I think I was not properly dealt with yesterday, and I will tell honourable members why. This Government has consistently been accessible to the media. We have had some trouble with the *This Day Tonight* programme in that people from that programme from time to time have peremptorily demanded that the Premier and Ministers go on live, at short notice, at times when they have other engagements, and they have then threatened that, if we do not go on, the Government will be dealt with by an announcement that the Government refuses to comment.

Mr. Rodda: Threatened?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, threatened. We have been threatened that that is what will happen if we do not go on. There has been a certain amount of feeling about that because, as members know, Ministers have very serious and heavy commitments and it is not always possible at short notice to go out live on a television programme at a time of night for which other commitments have already been made.

Mr. Mathwin: I bet that makes you raise your eyebrows, doesn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not need to do so. The honourable member can do so if he wants to.

Mr. Mathwin: I cannot do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member should take lessons from Clive Hale. Yesterday I had a very heavy programme with the State visit to South Australia of Dr. Lim Chong Eu. Yesterday morning a couple of columns appeared in the *Advertiser* written by Ian Steele, which were not released from the Government and which were his views of what the Government was doing, something about refurbishing the Government's image—I do not think it needs any refurbishing; I think it is shining at the moment.

Dr. Tonkin: Perhaps your trouble is that you don't believe that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I do believe it. I am very happy with the Government's image at the moment. I was asked by my press staff whether I wanted to have a press conference about the article. I said that I did not think there was any need to do so, because I did not make the press release and I had a very heavy programme. They were then asked by *This Day Tonight* whether I could go on at lunch time, and it was explained that I had a Cabinet luncheon for Dr. Lim Chong Eu and it was not possible for me to do that. A threat was made to my staff at that stage that it would be said that I was not willing to go on. I discounted that as one of those press relations things, and my staff came back and said that they seemed to be very keen to get me on the programme, asking me whether there was any way I could fit it in. I said that I did not know how it could be done but asked them whether it could be arranged. As a result, yesterday afternoon an appointment of some importance to the State that I had arranged at Parliament House was put off in order to accommodate *This Day Tonight*, at their request. Immediately I got on the programme I was asked why I had changed my mind to go on the programme, and the interview went on from there.

Members would have seen the programme. Every single question asked of me implied impropriety, malice, political bias or misuse of public funds by the Government. I do not think that was objective questioning, or objective reporting, either. It is not how I have been accustomed to being dealt with by fair and objective reporters, and I objected. I am quite certain from the honourable member's reactions previously how he would have reacted as head of the Government on much less than that, and so he should have. It was not arrogance: it was due regard for what is proper and fair treatment by any section of the media. If I had been treated like that by a commercial station, I would have complained. There have been one or two occasions when I have been so treated, and I have complained to one commercial station and it said, "Fair enough", because I do not complain unless I have grounds for doing so.

I refer now to the rest of this strange, complicated and misspelt draft of the motion. I do not know what "proper-ganda" and "personell" are. For the most part, the member for Goyder did not speak to it. There was practically no mention of the Privacy Bill or the other bit. It was just a plethora of personal spleen, and I do not think that should be the basis of a censure motion in this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I second the motion. I have listened with great interest and not a little amusement to the Premier's very "reasonable" explanation for his conduct last evening. All I can say is that it is a pity he was not as reasonable on camera as he has been in this House. As far as I know (from what he has said there is nothing to the contrary), there was no reason why he should not have given the explanation which he has given so "reasonably" to members here today, but he did not do that. He was rude and arrogant to a young woman who was interviewing him, and he was rude and arrogant to the many thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of South Australian viewers. That was the impression he conveyed and chose to convey last evening. He cannot now come along and give such a "reasonable" explanation, such a plausible explanation as he has tried to do today, and be believed. He did not want to go on the programme last evening, and he took it out on the interviewer when he did go on the session. If that is not arrogance, I do not

know what is, and he compounded the offence completely when he said earlier this afternoon, by referring to it himself, that he was completely unrepentant for what he did last evening. The member for Goyder has already dealt with that aspect of the matter, and I do not intend to say any more about it.

I should like to canvass one other matter the Premier raised. He has boasted that there has never been a Government so open to the media and to the public as is his Government. I cannot help thinking how often over the past four years I have heard complaints from people in all sections of the media about the difficulty which they have in contacting my successor, the Attorney-General. If I had heard this complaint from only one person I would not mention it. It is legendary that the Attorney-General hides behind his press secretary and is often absolutely *incommunicado*. Many times the media has come to me for a comment because they have not been able to get hold of the Attorney-General.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And you'll always give it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My word! I will always give a comment if I am asked to give it.

The Hon. L. J. King: You haven't much to do, of course. You have plenty of time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suppose the Attorney-General is now trying to make an excuse for himself by saying that he is too busy to talk to the media. I do not know whether that was the purport of the interjection or not, but it is the only thing I could get out of it. Let me say what I believe should be the position and what I have tried to practice both in office and in Opposition. I believe that a member of Parliament or a Minister is the same as any other person and should be equally as accessible to anyone who wants to speak to him as should a private citizen. If, under questioning either on a television programme or by, say, a newspaper reporter, one cannot maintain the position that one has taken on a certain subject, there must be something wrong with it, and it would be a good idea to re-examine it. If in that way one can be shown to be wrong, let one admit it and have another look at the matter. In other words, a Minister or a member of Parliament should be in a position to justify whatever he has said or done and to make that justification publicly. That is the principle on which I try to work, and I believe it is a principle on which every honourable member should try to work.

In reply to the Premier. I have referred to the Attorney-General, because in my experience that is the best rebuttal of the boasts that the Premier makes. Perhaps other Ministers are the same. However, it just happens that his and my portfolio largely coincided, and that I know about the difficulties that the press has had in getting in touch with the Attorney since he has been in office and, indeed, since he has had a full-time press secretary. This applies to him more than it does to other Ministers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is your portfolio?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education has done enough mischief this afternoon, wasting half an hour of the time of the House in trying to obstruct the member for Goyder, by raising (as he often does) points of order simply to waste time. I suggest that, if he wants to participate in this debate, the Minister should get up and try to defend what the Premier has done. I come now to what is the greatest objection to the Government's action as reported in yesterday's press. In the very nature of things in a Parliamentary democracy, the Government has a great advantage over the Opposition in relation to publicity. It is in office; it is doing things; and it is making news.

This applies to any Party that happens to be in Government. The Government therefore starts with an inbuilt advantage.

In my view, democracy is a process of discussion within the community, and it is undesirable that the Government should compound, or attempt to compound, its advantage by deliberately pushing its views on to the media through its Ministers and other supporters. If the media wants those views, it should be able to go and get them. However, it is wrong for the Government to do what it is now intending to do: to make it even easier to put across its point of view and not, of course, help the Opposition in any way at all. We are not alone in thinking this. Yesterday, the Leader was quick, or as quick as he can be on this matter (it was the first question that he asked yesterday), to ask what would happen in this respect and whether the Opposition would get the same advantage as was being given to the Government. In the course of his so-called explanation of his question, the Leader said:

Therefore, I should like to know how much the Government intends to spend on this new toy.

The Liberal and Country League therefore apparently thinks much the same as the Liberal Movement does on this matter, although it did not take any action on it. I turn now to a far more significant section of the public than are L.C.L. members in this place, and in this respect I refer to what has been said by both daily newspapers in their editorial columns. The *Advertiser* has an editorial on the matter this morning, and the *News* has one this afternoon. The *News* has summed up pretty well what I have been saying about the advantage that the Government has. Part of its editorial is as follows:

With Ministers giving news releases direct, what happens to press conferences, to opportunities to question news as it is released by Ministers? There is a danger that anything which by-passes the established newsgathering system will lead to a breakdown of the inquiring, questioning process which is essential to balanced reporting. This danger will be ever-present in the system the Government plans, regardless of how scrupulously fair the Government says it intends to be.

I can raise two objections: first, that this will compound the advantage of one side in politics (an advantage that the Government already has), and, secondly, it will further divorce Ministers from direct contact with the general community, and particularly from the news gatherers. These are the greatest objections that I have to what is being done. My suspicion, and that of the member for Goyder, is that this proposal has emanated from the eleventh floor of the State Administration Centre and that it was not known to other Ministers. It was quite noticeable that, when the member for Goyder said this, he did not get a flood of denials from Ministers, most of whom were present at the time, or from other Government members. One can draw one's conclusions from that studied silence.

I hope that the Government, led by the Premier, will have second thoughts about this matter. I do not believe the Government has gone too far yet (the report was given in yesterday's press by Mr. Steele). Whether or not the Premier blamed him for doing that, I could not tell from the explanation he tried to give today. However, I certainly would not blame him for it. If the matter has got no further than the planning stage (which I understand is the position), I hope the Government will draw back and not proceed with the proposal, because it is open to the objections embodied in the motion and to those elaborated by the member for Goyder as well as those to which I have referred. It is not too late for the Government, even though the Premier has spoken, to

draw back and not proceed with this proposal, which would so undesirably smother the news media, certainly in the sector of politics in this State. This will, I believe, react against the proper democratic processes in our community.

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

That the question be now put.

Dr. Eastick: Fair go!

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I take it that, if the Minister's motion is carried, I will retain my right of reply.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

Mr. Hall: So it's the gag!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye"; against say "No". The Ayes have it.

Mr. HALL: Divide.

The House divided on the motion:

While the division, bells were ringing:

Mr. Gunn: The gag!

The SPEAKER: I will gag someone else in a minute. The question before the House is "That the question be now put". I appoint the Deputy Premier teller for the Ayes and the honourable member for Mitcham teller for the Noes. I am sorry—

Mr. Millhouse: I called first.

Dr. Eastick: No, you didn't.

The SPEAKER: Regarding the calling of a teller, it rests with the Speaker to appoint a teller. I appoint the Leader of the Opposition teller for the Noes.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you appointed me.

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr. Russack.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 20 Noes, a majority of two for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Mr. Gunn: Shame! Dictators!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Eyre knows better than in any circumstance to interject when he is out of his place. The question before the House is the motion moved by the honourable member for Goyder, the motion of censure against the Government.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order. May I request you to read the motion before the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The motion moved by the member for Goyder for the consideration of the House of Assembly is as follows:

That this House censure the Premier for his attempt to couple with the Privacy Bill new methods to intensify Government propaganda which are, in addition to the existing methods used by the huge number of press secretaries, personal assistants, research officers, and other similar personnel, who have been appointed under the Premier's over-staffed administration, designed to smother the news media with Government releases, slanted to favour the State Labor regime, thereby destroying objective reporting in South Australia, and preventing the normal contact between reporters of the news media and the Government, and

request him immediately to cease his attack on the democratic process, to withdraw his proposal to establish land-lines and co-axial cable links with radio and television stations, and to give an undertaking that the Privacy Bill will not be proceeded with in the next Parliamentary session.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Russack. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Later:

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the House to the fact that I have corrected the list of Ayes in the recent division on the question "That the question be now put". An error occurred in that the names of the honourable member for Ross Smith and the honourable Minister of Works were left off the list of Ayes.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the payment of superannuation benefits to persons who have served as members of Parliament, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 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.

Dr. Eastick: No.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier seeks leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading it. Is leave granted?

Dr. Eastick: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This Bill effects a consolidation of several enactments relating to superannuation for members of Parliament in this State. It also reflects an examination of the situation in the Commonwealth Parliament and in the Parliaments of the other States in relation to superannuation for members of Parliament. In its preparation, regard has been had to the changes proposed by the recently enacted Superannuation Bill, 1974, which provided for substantial alterations to superannuation benefits for members of the Public Service and others.

Clauses 1 to 4 of the Bill are formal. Clause 5 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure, and they are commended to members' close attention. Clause 6 in subclauses (1) and (2) sets out the circumstances in which retirement as a member will be regarded as involuntary, and at subclause (3) deals with voluntary retirement. Clause 7 sets out certain rules that are to govern the calculation of "service" for the purposes of the measure. These rules, in substance, are those contained in the Acts proposed to be repealed.

Clause 8 merely continues in existence the fund established under the repealed Act. However, at subclauses (2), (3), and (4), the trustees are empowered to borrow for the purposes of the fund, and such borrowings are intended to be guaranteed by the Treasurer. A provision of this nature is intended to ensure that the fund will not

suffer any "cash flow" problems if it is obliged to make payments by way of commutation, as to which see clause 21 below.

Clauses 9 to 12 are self-explanatory. Clause 13 continues in existence the present trustees, namely, the Speaker of The House of Assembly, the President of the Legislative Council, and the Under-Treasurer. Clause 14 proposes an increase of contributions from 9 per cent of basic salary to 11½ per cent of basic salary. In addition, provision is made for members who receive "additional salary", as defined, to make contributions at the same rate on that additional salary. Clause 15 sets out the rate of contribution by the Government, and is similar to the corresponding provisions in the Acts proposed to be repealed.

Clause 16 sets out the grounds on which a member becomes entitled to a pension, and again this clause is commended to members' close attention. Clause 17 sets out the method of calculating the annual pension payable under the measure, and subclause (2) sets out the method of calculating the additional pension payable to those who, pursuant to subclause (3) of clause 14, have elected to make additional contributions. Clause 18 provides for a pension on retirement due to invalidity. Clause 19, with some modifications, repeats a provision in the Acts intended to be repealed, and deals with the situation where remuneration or pension is received by virtue of membership of another Parliament and, in addition, provides for the situation where a member pensioner becomes a judge within the meaning of the Judges' Pensions Act.

Clause 20 ceases a pension under this Act on the pensioner again becoming a member. Clause 21 sets out the basis on which portion of a pension may be commuted. With this clause must be read the second schedule to this Bill. Clause 22 provides for a refund of contributions plus interest where no other benefit is payable under the measure. Clause 23 deals with the situation where total contributions exceed total benefits paid, and provides for a refund of the difference between contributions and benefits. Clause 24 provides for pensions for spouses of deceased member pensioners, and the amount of pension payable is set out in this clause. A minimum pension of 40 per cent of the salary of the deceased member is provided for in this clause.

However, I draw members' attention to the fact that this minimum pension is subject to reduction if the member pensioner had commuted portion of his pension. Also, I draw members' close attention to one effect of commutation, and this is that service in respect of which a pension is commuted cannot be aggregated with future service if the member pensioner again becomes a member. Clause 25 makes a similar provision for spouses of deceased members, that is, those members who have not entered on pension. Clause 26 provides for spouse pensions to cease on remarriage, but to revive again if the spouse ceases to be married.

Division II of Part V, being clauses 27 to 31, sets out the method of calculating child benefit and generally follows the scheme set out in the Superannuation Bill, 1974, recently before this House. Clauses 32 and 33 continue in force pensions under the Acts intended to be repealed. Clause 34 makes payable forthwith certain pensions under the Act intended to be repealed that were, pursuant to that Act, suspended until the former member attained 50 years of age. This provision is consistent with removing that restriction on the payment of pensions under this Act.

Clause 35 provides for the future adjustment of pensions and substantially follows the provisions of the Superannuation Bill, 1974. However, unlike that measure the

amount of pension, as reduced by commutation, will be the amount subject to adjustment. Clause 36 substantially re-enacts a provision that existed in the Acts intended to be repealed and is, it is considered, self-explanatory. Clauses 37, 38, 39 and 40 are self-explanatory.

Dr EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Education Act, 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: 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.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister seeks leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading it. Is leave granted?

Dr. Eastick: No.

Mr. Becker: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The enactment of this short Bill is rendered necessary by the passage of the Superannuation Bill, 1974. Honourable members will recall that that measure provided for a pension on early retirement if the contributor had attained the age of 55 years, where that retirement was permitted by the terms of the contributor's employment. At present the principal Act, the Education Act, 1972, does not generally provide for such retirement, and the effect of clause 3 is to provide that a member of the teaching service may retire at the end of the school year, as defined, in which he attains the age of 55 years or at the end of any subsequent school year until he attains the age of 65 years when he must retire.

The right of female contributors to the fund who are at present contributing for retirement at age 55 years is not affected by this Bill. In their case retirement will be at the full pension for which they were (Contributing. Thus their pension will not be subject to reduction on the ground of their early retirement.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MISCELLANEOUS)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: 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.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General seeks leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it.

Dr. Eastick: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This Bill makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Licensing Act. It is essentially a Committee Bill and, accordingly, I shall explain it in terms of its various clauses. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 removes the definitions of "previously unlicensed premises" and "premises previously unlicensed". These definitions have raised technical problems as to exactly what is meant by the expression "previously unlicensed premises". Accordingly, the definitions are

removed and the intention is set out more clearly in those provisions in which these expressions were formerly used. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act. This section at present restricts the right of certain persons (for example, licensed auctioneers) to hold licences under the principal Act. In fact the principal Act provides for the granting of hotel brokers' licences, and it was never intended that this restriction should apply to licences of that nature. The provision is accordingly amended so that the restriction applies only to licences granted under Part HI or Part IV of the principal Act.

Clause 5 enacts new sections in the principal Act providing for the grant of special licences to certain organizations. These new sections are parallel to provisions at present existing in section 18 of the principal Act with the following exceptions. New section 16c provides that a fee determined by rules of court shall be payable for the licence granted in respect of the Adelaide Festival Centre. The present fee for this licence is \$50, and that fee is quite inappropriate in view of the quantities of liquor purchased by the licensee for sale in pursuance of the licence. New section 16d provides for the grant of a licence to the British Sailors' Society (at home and abroad) Incorporated authorizing it to supply liquor on its premises at Port Adelaide.

Clause 6 amends section 18 of the principal Act. This section previously provided for the granting of a special licence in respect of various specified festivals of historic, traditional, or cultural significance. It is now considered that these festivals can be dealt with under a general provision that was enacted by Parliament last year. Amendments are therefore made accordingly. An additional provision is inserted under which the court may extend the period of a special licence under section 18 from three days to 14 days.

Clause 7 amends section 27 of the principal Act. The amendment is designed to correct a technical defect in the provisions of the principal Act. It does so by providing that a person may lawfully take liquor purchased from a club that is entitled to sell liquor for consumption outside its premises within the licensed hours or 30 minutes thereafter. Clause 8 enables the Licensing Court to grant a special licence, pending the renewal of a licence, for such period as it considers fit. Clauses 9 and 10 seek to overcome technical difficulties in relation to the exhibition of notices prior to the grant of a licence in respect of certain premises. At present the Act provides that the notice must be exhibited on or near the main entrance to the premises and so as to be easily legible by members of the public passing on the nearest public footpath. It is sometimes physically impossible for a notice to be erected on or near the main entrance and at the same time to be easily legible by persons passing the site of the premises.

These clauses therefore provide that in such a case two notices must be erected, one at the main entrance and the other in some place where it is conspicuous to members of the public passing the site of the premises. Clause 11 deals with an application for the renewal of a licence. It provides in effect that the court may exempt an applicant for the renewal of a licence from the provisions relating to notice where there is proper reason to do so. Clauses 12 and 13 make amendments consequential upon the removal of the definition of "previously unlicensed premises". Clause 14 deals with the exhibition of notices where an application to transfer a licence is made. These amendments correspond to the previous amendments made in relation to the exhibition of notices.

Clause 15 deals with an application to transfer a licence on the sale of licensed premises. Certain information

which was previously required to accompany the application must now accompany the notice of application. Clause 16 deals with the exhibition of notices where there is an application to remove business to new premises. These amendments correspond to the previous amendments in relation to exhibition of notices. Clause 17 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 18 provides that where a licence is transferred the court may also transfer supper permits and entertainment permits that are annexed to that licence.

Clause 19 deals with the duties of the clerk. The clerk does not now normally attend all sittings of the court, and accordingly an amendment is made removing that requirement. A drafting amendment is made to paragraph (a) of subsection (3). Clause 20 enables the court to vary the hours pertaining to a licence granted over premises situated west of 133° of longitude. Thus where premises are situated west of Penong the court may provide that liquor may be sold within hours which it deems appropriate. This will enable a licensee of such premises to compete fairly with licensees in Western Australia where, especially during summer months, there is a wide divergence between South Australian time and Western Australian time. Clause 21 expands the present provision under which a police officer may require a person whom he finds on licensed premises to state his age, or to give satisfactory evidence of age where he has reasonable cause to suspect that the age stated may be false. The power may now be exercised by a licensee or his employee.

Clause 22 deals with permits for liquor tasting. At present application must be made seven clear days before the application is heard and determined by the court. This requirement is amended to provide that application must be made seven days before the day, or the first of the days, for which the permit is sought. Clause 23 makes it an offence for a person to carry away liquor purchased on licensed premises in a case where the licensee is not authorized to sell or supply liquor for consumption outside those premises.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONTRIBUTIONS)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fire Brigades Act, 1936-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: 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.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General seeks leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it.

Dr. Eastick: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This short Bill is intended to rationalize and bring into line with practice in other States the financing of the Fire Brigades Board. For several years the burden of contribution towards the estimated expenditure of the Fire Brigades Board has been distributed between the Government contributing 16 per cent, councils contributing about 23 per cent, and insurance companies contributing the balance. Several large councils in recent financial years have sought and been granted by the Government reductions in their level of contributions, the Government making up the reductions by way of *ex gratia* payments.

This measure adopts the distribution of costs in force in New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia and intended to be adopted by Victoria. Under this provision the level of contribution of the Government and councils is reduced to a fixed 12½ per cent of the estimated expenditure of the board, while the balance of 75 per cent is to be contributed by the insurance companies. It is intended that this provision will take effect from the commencement of the next financial year. To consider the Bill in some detail: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on July 1, 1974.

Clause 3 amends section 54 of the principal Act and provides that the Government's share of contributions to the expenditure of the board shall be one-eighth, councils' share shall be one-eighth, and the insurance companies' share shall be three-quarters. In addition, opportunity has been taken to remove from this section the provision that limited the Government's contribution to something over \$20 000. This limitation has, for other reasons, been in operation for several years, and its further retention seems undesirable.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2442.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This Bill purportedly seeks to improve the environment of South Australia and it has certainly been awaited a long time. It has been called a litter Bill, a bottle Bill, or a can Bill, but it can now be seen clearly that it is a deposit Bill. However, I believe we should be considering an anti-litter Bill. For many years we have had deposits on bottles and other receptacles but no deposit has been required in respect of certain other containers. We are not necessarily opposed to the present system of deposits but we believe that before implementing a new system involving deposits we should examine the proposals carefully. Let me make quite clear that my Party is extremely conscious of the need to improve and upgrade our environment, to solve the problems of pollution, and to encourage the recycling of our resources.

They are fundamental beliefs and we have stated them many times. We hold them so strongly that the former Liberal and Country League Government established the Committee on the Environment in February, 1970. This was the first time an in-depth study by experts had been made into the South Australian environment. This committee functioned under the distinguished chairmanship of Professor Jordan, and the present Director of the Environment and Conservation Department (Dr. Grant Inglis) was a member of it. The Jordan committee, as it became known, presented its report to the present Government in May, 1972, and I believe that that report has been widely accepted as being a major work in this field, many aspects of it having been widely acclaimed and some of them having been implemented. We support strongly the principles set out in the report which seek basically

to improve the life of people in the community and to preserve our resources. We oppose strongly the irresponsible littering that we see, for instance, along many of our roadsides.

I propose to speak on the broad principles of the Bill and its associated problems, and my colleagues will speak in more detail to the Bill. We will discuss solid waste disposal, the litter problem generally, the Jordan report, and alternative means of legislation, the various oversea reports on investigations carried out, and even the metal can industry, on which we have seen comments in the newspapers recently.

Mr. Duncan: You've seen the colour of their money.

Mr. COUMBE: I take great exception to that, Mr. Speaker. I have said nothing in this House this afternoon that would warrant the "two-bob snob" (members may recall that term that he used) making that assertion against me. I resent the remark and ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Torrens tell me to which statement he takes exception?

Mr. COUMBE: I take exception to the statement made by the member for Elizabeth that I had seen the colour of their money, alluding to members of the can industry.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Torrens has taken exception to a remark made by the member for Elizabeth, and has requested that it be withdrawn. I therefore ask the honourable member whether he will withdraw his remark.

Mr. DUNCAN: Sir, I withdraw the remark to which the honourable member has taken exception. My remark referred to the colour of the money that has been clearly seen to be spent by this industry on advertising, and to the amount of money spent on the campaign by the can manufacturers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth cannot debate the issue. He has withdrawn the remark to which the honourable member for Torrens has objected, but which I did not hear. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: I accept the honourable member's withdrawal of the remark so far as it concerned me. I have stated that the metal can industry must be examined, because the Minister intends to take certain action in relation to it. Also, depots, which will be an integral part of the measure, will be covered in this debate. The wine and fruit industry will be affected, and special problems will ensue in country areas. I refer, for instance, to the recycling of products and of resources generally. Although this is a most important subject, the Bill is only a short measure, indeed, even shorter than the Minister's second reading explanation.

Two important basic questions immediately spring to one's mind on reading the Bill, and members should ask themselves, first, why is the Bill being introduced now; and, secondly, whether this is the best way of solving the problem that exists. These two questions are vital to the whole Bill and should be examined to see whether the Bill will achieve what is intended. In saying that, I am aware of the Government's intention later to introduce other legislation dealing with waste disposal. Similar legislation is at present being examined by the Australian Environment Council. Why, therefore, is this Bill being introduced now? The Minister knows perfectly well that a House of Representatives Standing Committee has been sitting since last year to examine the problem of litter and containers, and its report should be available soon. The Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Conservation (Dr. Cass) set up that committee under the chairmanship of Dr.

Jenkins. In his second reading explanation of this Bill, the Minister said:

At present, we await a final report on litter control . . . The obvious inference that the House must draw from that remark is that the Government does not know the solution to the litter problem. In the meantime, regardless of what the Commonwealth committee reports, this Government will apparently push ahead with this legislation on its own. Members should be aware that much evidence has already been presented to the committee to which I have referred since it was established last October. That evidence has been given by representatives of consumers, retailers, drink manufacturers, the packaging industry, organizations involved in preserving the environment, and so on. Indeed, I have ascertained that 137 submissions have been made to the committee. I should think that those submissions would have covered a fairly wide spectrum of organizations in the community, including producers and consumers and those interested in the environment. With such a wealth of evidence before it, that committee should bring down a fairly comprehensive report. Incidentally, as members would no doubt realize, that committee, being a House of Representatives Standing Committee, comprises mostly members of the Australian Labor Party. If that committee brings down a finding contrary to the objects of this Bill, our present exercise will prove futile. Surely, in all common sense and logic (if not for fair play) we should await the final recommendations of that committee.

What research has the Government undertaken on the whole problem with which we are faced today? The Minister of Environment and Conservation was reported in the *Canberra Times* of February 18 as having admitted that no research or investigation had been carried out into the problems involved. That was a fairly straightforward statement by our Minister on this important subject. The Minister was also reported as having admitted that the South Australian Government had made no study of the container problem before deciding in principle to adopt a course of action similar to that adopted in Oregon. This Parliament is therefore being asked to consider an important piece of legislation on which the Government has undertaken no research.

The Minister was further reported as having said that the decision to adopt the Oregon approach (and all members know what that is) had been made before Dr. Inglis left for Oregon, and that Dr. Inglis was sent merely to study any practical or legal difficulties that might arise in implementing the system here; he was not sent to recommend whether it was the best system. I draw members' attention to that part of the Minister's statement concerning Dr. Inglis's duties: he was not asked to recommend whether it was the best system or, indeed, whether there was a better system. He was asked to examine the legal aspects only. They were the Minister's words, and they indicate bluntly that he or the Government had decided the issue, irrespective of what other schemes there may have been in Australia or overseas. Furthermore, I suggest to the Minister that his Government's action put Dr. Inglis in a most invidious position and one that I would find rather embarrassing if I were a professional officer.

I have said that the Government sent Dr. Inglis to Canada and the United States, more particularly to Oregon, to observe the results of legislation there. In addition, the Government had the benefit of the report by the Jordan committee, to which I have referred, and the Kesab reports, none of which recommended the action taken in this Bill. It is patently clear that the Government

has gone ahead with a Bill for a deposit-type scheme involving only one aspect of litter, without any research having been done (as the Minister has admitted), against the findings of several expert committees, and without waiting for the recommendations of the Commonwealth committee.

It has done this despite the views that have been expressed by the bodies to which I have referred. This action by the Minister and the Government should make any member of this House immediately suspicious of the Government's motives, and it casts grave doubts on the usefulness of the Bill. I am still dealing with the matter of why the Government is introducing the Bill now. Members will recall that on June 9, 1973, the State Australian Labor Party conference passed a resolution that, doubtless, members opposite would know by heart. That resolution states:

That the conference calls on the Parliamentary Labor Party to introduce legislation to ban the use of non-returnable drink containers.

I suggest that the Minister's hands and the Government's hands were tied. Because the State A.L.P. conference decided that the compulsory deposit system had to be introduced in this session, before the next annual conference, the Government had to go ahead with it. In other words, the Government is completely committed to this course of action and it has no discretion to consider other courses of action: it cannot consider any alternative.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Will you read that resolution again?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. It states:

That the conference calls on the Parliamentary Labor Party to introduce legislation to ban the use of non-returnable drink containers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you suggesting that that committed us?

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister is following this out, and his hands are tied. To put the matter bluntly, as the Minister by implication has asked me to do, even if the committee appointed by Dr. Cass has a better solution and recommends that the compulsory deposit system is not the best system for Australia or South Australia, this Government, by pushing ahead with the proposal in the Bill, is saying that the findings of the Standing committee will make no difference to the policy that the State Government will pursue here. The State Government has no choice or alternative, and is forced into this position. It is asking us to agree to that, and the citizens of the State will be guinea pigs. Apart from dealing with deposits and cans, the terms of reference of the Commonwealth committee include:

The responsibility of reporting on whether it considered any alternative or supplementary course of action might more effectively deal with the environmental problems presented by the disposal of containers.

That is an important term of reference and it shows that the attitude adopted by the A.L.P. in the Commonwealth Parliament differs from the attitude of the State A.L.P. Sometimes they are friendly, but on this occasion they have had a difference. It is completely unreasonable to introduce a compulsory deposit system before the Standing committee, with all its expertise and opportunity to gather information, has a chance to find out whether there are better alternatives.

The second question that I ask is whether this is the best method to solve the problem of litter in our community, and I have serious doubts about that. I have said that this Bill should be an anti-litter Bill, and I believe that the Minister and his supporters are genuinely

interested in the litter problem, as is this Opposition and almost everyone else in the community. In his second reading explanation the Minister referred first to deposits, not litter, and his explanation shows clearly that he was trying desperately to justify his position in this regard. He did not mention litter until about the middle of his explanation.

After all, surely this Bill is designed to solve some of the litter problems, and I have referred to the Minister's statement that he was awaiting a report by the Australian Conservation Council on litter control. He and his Government did not know the answer.

Dr. Eastick: He had to do something.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, he was told to do something, and he tried his best. In all fairness, I believe that he found himself in a most invidious and tenuous position. The major fault I see in the Bill is that it deals with only one aspect of the total environmental problem; it goes about solving the problem the wrong way around. I believe the Government is adopting the wrong method of dealing with this problem. What we should do is look at the whole matter of litter, whereas the Bill looks at the problem in a back-to-front manner. On the parameters to which I have referred, I oppose the Bill, as I do not consider its provisions capable of fulfilling the objectives that my Party, the people and I believe should be fulfilled. I do not believe that what the Bill can achieve is in the best interests of preserving the environment on behalf of the people of South Australia.

As I am not in the habit of making statements without supporting evidence, I will now support what I have said by examining recent findings of organizations that have examined the total litter problem in South Australia and in other States. The first organization to come to mind is Kesab, whose report will be dealt with more fully by one of my colleagues. The Minister will be fairly well acquainted with the November, 1973, report of this body. Incidentally, Kesab does a great job in this State, similar organizations do excellent work in other States. We all owe a great debt of gratitude for the splendid work Kesab has done. Although it receives a Government subsidy, similar organizations in other States certainly receive more. In its report, Kesab states that the majority of litter is produced by the irresponsible discarding of food and beverage containers, and I think we all agree with that. In its survey of the problem, Kesab reduced the various categories of litter to percentages. There has been discussion on whether litter should be looked at in terms of volume or in terms of certain objects being more easily seen than are other objects.

In dealing with the total litter problem, this report uses percentages. The largest category was found to be paper, including packages, containers, newspapers, wrappings, tickets, and anything of that type. Some articles were more discernible than others, but paper amounted to a high proportion of the total litter volume. Paper reported an amazingly high proportion of 61 per cent. Miscellaneous paper, including all sorts of items, was the biggest single item, amounting to 33 per cent. Amongst the single items listed is the newly-emerging nuisance of take-away food containers. I have several shops in my district that dispense these foods. These containers are composed of metal pieces, aluminium foil, and so on, and they represent 8.5 per cent of the total litter. Steel drink cans amounted to 7.1 per cent, and milk and fruit juice containers, 6.7 per cent. A problem associated with milk cartons is that they are waxed and non-biodegradable. Newspapers amount to 6.3 per cent, and plastics (which are an increasing nuisance), 5.2 per cent. These items include cigarette

packets, cellophane wrappings from cigarette packets (I do not know whether cigarette butts are included), foil, and lolly and meat wrappings.

It is interesting to see the various percentages, with paper representing 61 per cent, miscellaneous papers 33 per cent, and steel drink cans (with which this Bill deals) only 7.1 per cent. Therefore, as the Bill is dealing with 7.1 per cent of the total, one immediately asks what is being done about the other 93 per cent. I think that the Government has its priorities a little mixed up. Another investigation on a wider scale, which was conducted in another State and which included bottles and cans, produced a figure of 10 per cent, as the Minister will recall. The report of Kesab makes one ask what is being done about the other 90 per cent of litter, apart from cans, on our roadsides. I suggest that the Government has its priorities wrong.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're saying that we shouldn't worry about the cans.

Mr. COUMBE: No, I am saying that we should be dealing with the whole litter problem, rather than concentrating on 10 per cent or 7 per cent of it. I would guess that, when the Minister saw the Kesab report, he was embarrassed by the figures to which I have referred, because they certainly do not support what he has been saying.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It didn't prove to me that the cans weren't a problem.

Dr. Eastick: He couldn't show his embarrassment; he has to kowtow to his Party.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister shows his pig-headedness by not considering the whole problem. He is nibbling at it piece-meal. Another committee that has dealt with this matter is the Jordan committee, which looked at the question of the can container, the milk bottle, foils, and that sort of thing. That committee listed three solutions to the problem.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have they worked?

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister should wait until I finish what I am going to say.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We know what you'll say. The waste committee has been using this argument for months.

Mr. COUMBE: In presenting three solutions, the Jordan committee referred to education, penalties and deposits. The committee suggested that these three solutions should be adopted in the order recommended by it. This was an expert committee and Dr. Inglis, for whom I have a high personal regard, was a member of it and a signatory to the report. However, the Minister seems to have ignored the findings and facts presented by that committee and has reversed completely the order of the committee's recommendations. That is evident by comparing the contents of the report to the provisions of the Bill. The Kesab report made three suggestions and suggested that the problem should be considered in the order of education, equipment, and enforcement. This committee placed strong emphasis on the enforcement aspect, and suggested that if this were applied much of the litter in South Australia would be controlled.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How large a proportion?

Mr. COUMBE: I did not pose that question, and it seems that the Minister does not know much.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I know the answer.

Mr. COUMBE: Some of us have visited Singapore. When I was there some years ago I was amazed and impressed by the cleanliness of that city. The problem was tackled first by education, then by enforcement, and then by on-the-spot fines. I am sure that litter in a city with Singapore's climate, would be more injurious to the

health of its population than it would be to the population in South Australia. The result in that city has been startling. I am reciting to the Minister findings of expert committees, but the Minister has stated publicly that his Government has done no research on this problem.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you advocating on-the-spot fines?

Mr. Mathwin: What's wrong with that?

Mr. COUMBE: I believe that the Government should examine the question of on-the-spot fines. In the United Kingdom a Bill was introduced that made no recommendation on the question of non-returnable deposits. In the often quoted case of Oregon, it is supposed to be the paragon of all virtues and has been held out to be the panacea for all ills. The Minister has often referred to that State, but the cost of litter collection there seems to have risen steeply since the introduction of the commonly called bottle Bill. Oregon has a much cooler climate than has South Australia, so that it would be difficult to obtain a proper comparison, but it seems that our hotter climate would have a worse effect in this State. Other States of the North American continent apparently do not share completely the views of Oregonians, because some of these States have grave doubts about whether similar legislation could operate satisfactorily in their territories. I point out that the Government by its method of introducing this Bill is apparently flying in the face of a great wealth of informed opinion in this State, in other States of the Commonwealth, and in other countries. These are not the opinions of cranks, but of well established, authoritative, and highly respected committees.

Mr. Keneally: You told us that we shouldn't take any notice of them but should do our own research.

Mr. COUMBE: The Government should have done research and made use of the findings of these expert committees. The Minister has ignored the recommendations of the Jordan committee, and seems to have had no research done on this problem, yet he has the gall to introduce a Bill of this nature without having done any research or having conducted a feasibility study. Inevitably, we must consider the question of cost, and we would be failing in our duty if we did not examine this aspect.

Several beverages are involved, but let us consider beer, which seems to be popular with many people at this time of the year. It is apparent to me that the average man will have to pay more for his bottle of beer than he has been paying. He will have to pay 1c deposit on each bottle, but how many people will bother to return to the pub to obtain a 1c deposit on their empty bottle? These people will store the bottles at home. However, I remind members that, under the provisions of the Bill, any outlet that sells a bottle is obliged to take it back if it is clean. Any outlet that sells a bottle will be obliged to take it back, the only defence being that if it is dirty it need not be accepted. Hotels do not take back empty bottles at present. The licensed marine store collector and charitable organizations collect the bottles and return them to The Adelaide Bottle Co-operative, which uses one of the most efficient systems in Australia to recycle the bottles at no cost to the consumer. If he were here, a highly respected former member of this House (Mr. Fred Walsh) would agree with my statement about the efficiency of this system.

Mr. Keneally: What would he do now if the same collecting agency was operating?

Mr. COUMBE: There is a difference now. The Minister is asking us to prescribe that any outlet, such as a hotel, must take back an empty bottle if it sells bottles. Obviously

some people are going to take bottles back to the hotel. They do not have to, but under this Bill the hotelkeeper will be obliged to take them back.

Mr. Max Brown: How much do you get for a dozen empty bottles now?

Mr. COUMBE: I believe the L.M.S. collector receives about 10c a dozen and the ordinary consumer about 6c a dozen.

Mr. Max Brown: You are talking about only 4c.

Mr. COUMBE: I have not yet reached my point. If the member for Whyalla is agreeing with what I am saying (and it seems as if he is), he must get on to the Minister's back and have him alter the clause in the Bill that requires a hotelkeeper to take back bottles returned to him. Hitherto hotels have not been obliged to take back empty bottles but they will be obliged to do so under this Bill. To comply with the conditions of the Bill he will have to provide a place for the empties to be stacked, be it in the open or under cover, and he will have to provide staff to handle the empties. In remote country areas this could be difficult. I suggest that members compare the proposed system with the one operating today. I am obliged to the honourable member for Whyalla for reminding me—

Mr. Max Brown: You are arguing the point about 4c a dozen.

Mr. COUMBE: No. The Minister is making it obligatory for the hotelkeeper to take back a bottle as long as it is clean. He will have to provide additional staff to handle the empties and he will also have to find somewhere to put them. An extra cost will be involved.

The member for Stuart asked me to look at the matter of fruit juice cans. We do not necessarily object to the principle of deposits as it applies at present. Today, shopkeepers selling cool drinks refund the 5c a bottle deposit, and that will continue. Shopkeepers in the metropolitan area will have to display a notice in shop windows regarding deposits on cans. I am not cavilling about that. We should look at the Minister's proposals and, before we get carried away, we should examine them to see whether or not—

Mr. Keneally: If you are for deposits on bottles, I cannot see how you are against deposits on other containers.

Mr. COUMBE: I believe we should tackle the whole problem of litter and not do it piece-meal as the Minister is doing. The member for Whyalla, being an expert on the subject of beer cans, knows that most South Australian beer cans are made from aluminium. At present one receives 1c for an aluminium can at charity collection centres. It is intended to put a 5c deposit on aluminium and steel cans. If a consumer wanted his deposit back, he would have to take the cans to the nearest collection depot and he would receive 5c a can refund only if the cans are clean. How can a person tell whether or not a can is clean.

Between the purchase of the can and its return to the retailer, money will be tied up. Apart from anything else the purchaser will pay an extra 5c a can. Who will pose this question to the experts who have been so vocal on this matter and know so much more about it than I do? Who will pay for the cost of establishing the depots? We will all pay the cost. Who will set up the depots? Not the Government. The Government may set up the legal machinery for them, but the cost of establishing them must be borne by the producers of cool drinks and beer and by the makers of cans and bottles. They must buy the land, put a security fence around it, and erect buildings as well as provide the staff to operate the plant, so there will have to be a service charge. The producers or manufacturers of the products will have to bear the

additional cost, and they will pass it on to the public. Although one pays a 5c deposit initially, that deposit is returned thereafter. Someone must pay for this and, as sure as God made little apples, the producers, or anyone else who applies to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, will want prices increased. I therefore suggest that the person who buys a bottle or can of beer will pay more for it in the long run as well as the initial deposit. This will happen at a time when everyone is suffering from severe inflation.

What I have said regarding beer bottles applies also to soft drink containers of all descriptions. I have in the past couple of weeks taken the trouble to go to my local supermarket and examine the containers, be they cans, plastic receptacles or bottles, on sale therein, and it is amazing to see how many beverages are put in such containers. Undoubtedly, those who buy soft drinks in cans will be paying more in the long run. I have no doubt about that it is inevitable. This means that we are getting to the disgraceful and almost unprecedented situation in which the Government is setting out to tax children. No inference other than that can be drawn from the Bill or the Minister's second reading explanation.

I do not intend to refer to the manufacturing industry, unless Government members really want me to do so. Although arguments can be advanced for and against such a course of action, it seems that ring-pull containers will disappear. Although the use of a new button-type container is being examined, it is not yet available. It seems paradoxical to me that, on the one hand, the Government goes to so much trouble through the Industries Development Committee and other bodies to encourage industries to set up in this State and yet, on the other hand, it cuts them right down by legislative processes.

Mr. Keneally: Why are you concerned about the can industry and not the bottle industry? You don't mind having deposits on bottles but you don't want them on cans.

Mr. COUMBE: Perhaps the honourable member will understand what I have said if I say it again, for the third time. One must pay deposits on bottles at present. As the Government is introducing a new deposit system, we should examine it closely to see how it will operate and, if the Government wants to proceed with it, to ascertain whether the new scheme is the best available. The member for Port Augusta has invited me to refer to cans.

Mr. Millhouse Oh, no, don't accept.

Mr. COUMBE: With that encouragement. I will do so. It is an undeniable fact of life that many people in the community prefer cans as an alternative type of container. Whether or not they want to carry them in an Esky or in any other type of container is their own choice. The fact is that the public demand has created a need for this type of packaging. Indeed, that need has created an upsurge in the can industry. If the public prefers cans, what right has the Government to deny it that freedom of choice or, indeed, to make it harder, and more expensive, for the public to obtain these types of container? Although on the one hand the Government talks about consumer protection and the right of privacy, on the other hand it imposes conditions that limit the free choice of individuals in this State. The Government needs to do much research on this whole matter. Doubts have been raised not only by me but also by others regarding the whole matter of litter control.

From my observations I am certain that some sections of the packaging industry have a serious responsibility to examine their methods of packaging. I believe, for instance, that some types of carton are far too large for the product contained in them; in other words, they are

over-packaged. I believe that plastics, although they are useful in many respects, present packaging problems. In this respect, I refer particularly to poly-urethane containers, in which radio and electronic parts are packed. The industry manufacturing that type of product has a responsibility to examine this matter, which is such a major aspect of the litter problem.

I refer also to the problem of reclamation, the recycling and disposal of all these products, and the conservation of our natural resources, in which we so firmly believe. The Government should carry out research into all these subjects. However, it has admitted that it has not done so. Although the Government has failed to act in this respect, papers on the subject have been delivered by experts. The Opposition supports correct recycling programmes and the preservation of our natural resources. I ask what research the Government has carried out regarding a better type of receptacle, and in this respect I refer to litter bags, to which the member for Fisher referred last evening on another Bill and which can be placed in all sorts of positions, including cars and boats. The Government should be examining this aspect and, indeed, the Opposition would strongly support such an investigation.

Dr. Eastick: We'll give them a chance to.

Mr. CUMBE: We certainly will. The Opposition believes that the Government should undertake this research and, indeed, would support its being undertaken. The Government has introduced this Bill prematurely and, if it refuses to wait for the report of the committee appointed by Dr. Cass, it should seriously consider referring the matter to a Select Committee of this Parliament so that the views of all sections of the community can be heard. I hear groans from members opposite: they do not want the voice of the various sections heard: they want only their points of view expressed in this measure. They could not care less about the little man or the people in the world around them.

The appointment of a Select Committee could fulfil an extremely worthwhile purpose, but my main contention in opposing the Bill at this stage is that the Government is only toying with the whole major problem of litter control. It is dealing with only one facet of the whole subject and is going about it in a completely wrong way. The Government should introduce a Bill to deal with litter, which is a complete blot on our community, in a positive, realistic and forthright way. I make that serious plea not only on behalf of the Party of which I am privileged to be a member and, incidentally, which several times has shown its concern for the abatement of pollution, such as when it appointed the Jordan committee, but also on behalf of the whole community.

We see around us and from press reports that people daily are becoming more environment conscious. This is good, and these people will be disappointed at the narrow confines of this Bill. We need a widely-based education programme, supported by a strict enforcement system to overcome the pollution that irresponsible members of our community are causing to our neighbourhoods, countryside and roadsides. This work should be supported by a sound programme of recycling our waste products. I submit that the Government has introduced this Bill in a bad form. It should be referred to a Select Committee so that further information could be obtained. The measure should then be resubmitted to this House, after all sections of the South Australian community have been heard, in a more acceptable form.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This is a Bill without logic, and it has been introduced without the

factors involved having been considered logically from point to point. Obviously, it has not been introduced under the guise of a logical measure if we accept that the decision to introduce and enforce it has been made by a group of people who have not been able to consider the political sense of the measure. There is no denial from members opposite that it is a measure that they must introduce. The Minister has acknowledged this, because he has been directed by an outside body to introduce the measure, and introduce it in the session of Parliament that commenced last year.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I would have introduced it without being directed. Who is doing a complete about face?

Dr. EASTICK: I have no doubt that the Minister will tell me about his about face. We will come back to the record of what I have said about this measure, and the Minister will have no difficulty in putting his point of view. We have a suggestion to help the Minister along the way. The Minister was in a similar position on another occasion, when a secret meeting at Klemzig directed him to about face. Let him deny that. He was directed to completely about face on another measure, when he, the Premier, and his colleagues knew the folly of what they were letting themselves in for. They took illogical action then, and it is illogical action to introduce this Bill in this way.

The dictionary meaning of "logic" is the "science of reason", and I suggest that there is no science in the unilateral action regarding this measure that has been forced on the Minister by a group outside Parliament. Logic is proof, and what proof is there in the arguments that the Minister has put forward? What proof is there in the fact that he has not given the House the contents of the report made to him by his officer? What is the total purport of the report? On what basis does the Minister proceed in this matter, having regard to the facts that can be obtained if one studies overseas experience on this matter?

We must get down to the nitty gritty, and I ask what direction the Minister gave to the officer before the officer went overseas. What specifically was the officer told to examine and report on, and what were the parameters of his whole visit? Can the Minister say clearly that he was to study the pros and cons of legislation in operation overseas, the effect it was having, and whether it was of any benefit?

None of us needs to be reminded that there is such a thing as litter. It is recognized fully, and it has been the subject of many reports. It has been the subject of activities and statements by Kesab, and statements have been made from the Minister's department since he has been Minister of Environment and Conservation. Further, all kinds of industry have examined the matter, and activities other than industrial activities also must consider the impact of litter and the many ways in which it pollutes the environment. We know that the litter problem exists, and it is regularly brought to the attention of members of Parliament and people who serve the community on councils.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Councils keep bringing to our attention the need for deposits on cans, as you well know.

Dr. EASTICK: That is correct. A few years ago a council of which I was a member called for the introduction of a system of deposits on cans, more particularly on stubby beer bottles. We know of the need to act, but

some councils also know that there is more to the whole subject than just providing for a deposit on cans and hoping that the problem will be solved.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Then why did they carry a motion just recently on that one issue?

Dr. EASTICK: I will come to that in a moment. Members who have been involved in these matters over some time recognize the concern being expressed by those who have the responsibility of dealing with litter. Although I do not want to repeat what the member for Torrens has said so ably about this, I want to deal with the question of what is meant by the word "litter". This legislation deals with articles that would represent only about 10 per cent to 15 per cent of the total volume of litter. Therefore, the Government is tackling only 10 per cent or 15 per cent of what is a major social problem. Neither the Minister nor any of his friends can bring forward any document suggesting that the effectiveness of this Bill in dealing with this 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the total volume of litter will be greater than probably a 40 per cent overall benefit. It can be argued whether that 40 per cent should not be 35 per cent or 45 per cent. However, I know of no evidence that suggests, even in the wildest stretch of the imagination, that we can expect a benefit of more than 40 per cent from the provisions in the Bill that are directed towards this 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the total litter problem.

We must approach this whole problem of litter (of which cans and bottles are a part) with a master plan. We must acknowledge that, apart from bottles and cans, there is another 85 per cent of litter. The financial burden involved should not be attached to this 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the problem but must be spread over the whole problem. We have to make certain in approaching this problem that we do not let emotion get the better of us. We must accept that there is public concern about conservation, the environment, pollution, and other associated matters. We must recognize that we need a balanced approach to deal with these problems. In this approach, we must not discriminate against one area or, as my colleague said, take money out of the mouths of children and beer drinkers, and that would be the position if the Bill were passed. We must look at the whole problem. We must recognize that there is an urgent need to solve the total problem of litter, or garbage, or whatever one calls it.

Mr. Keneally: Garbage!

Dr. EASTICK: I am not talking about the amount of garbage that we hear from the honourable member when he speaks, as he does infrequently. In the interests of conservation, we must consider resource recovery. We must find a method to finance the measures that we want to implement so that the financial burden on the community is minimal. Many worthy organizations in this State have considered the problem of resource recovery. They have heeded evidence available in this country and overseas in connection with the overall problem of household garbage. Indeed, some years ago the Town Clerk of Brighton was a member of a group from this State that went overseas to study garbage treatment, disposal and handling.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He likes this Bill, though, doesn't he?

Dr. EASTICK: With other people, this man recognizes that, in dealing with pollution, we must go beyond the matter of the litter that is scattered on the ground, whether it be bottles, plastic, cardboard, paper, or cans. The problem of air pollution caused by the burning of refuse or other debris must also be considered. We expected from the Minister a clear statement on what the Govern-

ment intended to do about the total problem of litter and garbage and of resource recovery. What action is being taken to ensure that pollution problems in the air and on land are being effectively dealt with? The whole problem must be examined, before discriminatory action is taken in relation to a small facet of the problem, and this applies more particularly in relation to discriminatory financial action against a small proportion of the population, especially children

There is an emotional factor associated with this problem. I acknowledge that these problems must be recognized, and I have asked that there be a balanced approach to them. One view on this matter was expressed in a Letter to the Editor, which appears in today's *News*, from Mr. J. Sibly, of Netherby. This letter, under the banner headline "Deposit system is fairest", states:

What is the best way of convincing someone to do something? You can tell them or ask them, you can bully them, or help them. The proposed legislation for a deposit on cans and bottles is sensible and positive. It encourages people to prevent littering.

If they decide it is too much bother to return a can then some keen-eyed boy or a charitable body will pick it up and cash it in. The only one who has to pay anything is the one who decided that he could not be bothered collecting his deposit. No scheme could be saner or fairer.

That person has expressed his point of view. If we look at yesterday's *News* or at copies of the morning newspaper, we can see the views of other citizens, who have an equal right to believe that what they think is correct, and their views may be entirely different from the view contained in the letter that I have quoted. In the proposal foreshadowed by my colleague, the opportunity exists to allow people and organizations to state their point of view. Councils that have expertise in litter and garbage disposal will also be able to give information to such a Select Committee.

The committee can be told about processes used overseas to extract from garbage as much as is reusable so that it can be recycled. The rest can be burned in a kiln or compacted and used to produce modular masonry blocks for building. In some cases, a proportion of the material can be used as fertilizer or soil conditioner or, indeed, as a fuel to generate power. They are the things that should be considered in this project, and we should not be trying to destroy one sector of the industry by this discriminatory tax. If we accept the possibility that we can use a resource recovery method, we can also refer to many booklets and articles prepared not only by experts but also by those who have been charged with the responsibility by some authority to present a point of view to the community. One such booklet published by the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute in New York slates.

Solid waste—garbage in plain language—has been around as long as mankind. It always has been a problem, but in simpler societies one from which man could walk away. Only in this modern age has garbage become a crisis.

This Government would have us believe that cans and bottles are the only factors causing a crisis in the garbage or waste problem: this Government would take unilateral action against these two containers and suggest it was the answer to the total problem, this Government would walk away from the Jordan report and take an action contrary to the considered decision of that committee, and this Government would take an action that is contrary to the nature of evidence placed before the Cass committee of inquiry. This Government, like it did in relation to land tenures, seems to go against the tide of evidence, but it will find that it is in the same position as it was in, in relation to the land tenure measure, that, when an expert

committee produced a finding that was the reverse of the Government's point of view, the Government quickly accepted amendments to give effect to that different opinion.

As it has in the past, this Government will find itself in the same position when the Cass inquiry produces its report, if it continues as it is now. It will be like a shag on a rock as the only State in the Commonwealth that is discriminating against many in the community, and it will have to retract from its position. As I have asked previously, "How do you unscramble the egg once you have scrambled it?", or, as one person put it in a letter to the *Advertiser* in a simple but effective way, "How do you undo rape?" That is the situation that the Government wants to get into: it wants to go unilaterally against the tide, the weight of evidence, and the facts that were included in my recent quotation, and make its decision. I point out that another organization based in Michigan has published documents, but others are available from New Zealand, New South Wales, London, and many other places. I shall read an extract from the Michigan paper, and members can place their own interpretation on it, but the message is clear. The document states:

The problem: world-wide concern over the environment is essential to a healthy existence on this earth.

No member would deny that statement. We have said it publicly and we believe it. The document continues:

The problem of solid waste management as a factor in the concern is real, and the subject of much discussion in the environmental community. Packaging materials, all of them—

and I stress "all of them"—

make varying contributions to the problem. They also make real and convenient contributions to our health, welfare, and safety, which must be weighed in balance with other concerns.

The key words surely, and something that the Minister ignores, are "must be weighed in balance with other concerns". This Government refuses to accept the responsibility of weighing the total problem. The document continues:

The solutions: some of the technology which will ultimately solve the solid waste problems is already known. The so-called implementation to make it work will be along in time if we as citizens, industry, and Governments follow through with enough commitment to make it happen.

What commitment is there in relation to the Government's action of isolating one small segment, thus impeding progress, when we should be considering a balanced approach to the whole problem? The document continues:

This implementation will take several forms, experts tell us.

Truly modern landfill operations today and in the future will accommodate huge volumes of "homogenized" waste in a completely sanitary, non-polluting slate and, at the same time, reclaim undesirable land for public uses such as parks and campsites.

Members familiar with the activities of the Marion council will realize that it used the landfill method and, recognizing the need to act on the total problem, it has been able to put into effect several of those schemes. The document continues:

Open-dumping operations, still the predominant method of waste disposal, must be ended and converted to sanitary landfills.

Where in the total of pollution control has this Government undertaken action of that kind? The document continues:

Sophisticated new incinerators will generate much-needed energy from solid waste while reducing its volume and adding very little to the atmosphere in the form of pollutants. Modern incinerators of the future will convert solid waste to energy to meet increased needs.

Automated "classifying" equipment will separate salvageable materials such as paper, metals, and glass for recycling before the remainder is otherwise disposed of. New markets must be created for this recycled material.

I ask the Minister whether the officer who was commissioned to go overseas was asked to look at a total operation or whether he was asked to look only at the deposit system as it applied in Oregon? Was this officer given the chance to bring back to the Minister information that could be put to this Parliament so that we could consider the overall problem of pollution control and a better approach to conservation, or did his report refer to one minor problem? I believe that it is necessary that we should consider these aspects when discussing our approach and attitude to a measure that has been introduced in isolation. I suggest that there is a need for a much wider vision than is being shown by the Government. I acknowledge the authorship of statements made previously, with the limitation of information available, that suggested without reservation that this type of measure should be accepted. I point out, so there will be no misunderstanding or misquoting by the Minister, that an item in the *News* of June 9, 1973 (and I accept it as being factual), states:

The Opposition Leader (Dr. Eastick) said the scheme need not cost the public more if they "cashed in" the materials in their hand. We welcome the general effect this will have on safety, particularly in recreational areas.

I do not walk for a moment from the last statement. We recognize that in the total safety of the community there is a need for an improvement in the environment of recreational areas, whether they be for swimming, sport, hiking, or a game on the village green. However, this Bill will not achieve that result. Other members will no doubt supply greater detail than I have supplied on the means by which this problem may be tackled. I accept the responsibility, and I expect the Government to accept its responsibility, of obtaining the maximum information available from the public, industry, and research centres. The Government should study the matter in total, not in a foolish, illogical and isolated manner.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading of the Bill, and in doing so I do not think any member need go further than the Jordan report for the information he or she should seek. I suppose I am biased in a way, because I was a member of the Government that commissioned the Jordan committee early in 1970. I still do not know whether the L.C.L. supports or opposes the second reading, because neither L.C.L. member who has spoken thus far (that is, the Leader or the Deputy Leader) has made it clear. I point out to the Leader that on page 162 of the Jordan report, in paragraph 6.44, appears the following:

The main problem, which is one of litter, is concerned mainly with the bottle used for soft drinks and beer and to a lesser extent those used for wines (including flagons) and spirits.

So, there is a good reason for starting at this point, and it is bad luck for manufacturers of these items that there is this good reason for it. Whether or not it is bad luck, however, it is one of the facts of life, and we must accept it. I suppose no member would say that he did not support conservation; I know that I would not say it. Having said that, I believe that we must do something about it. Reference has been made to the three solutions, suggested by the Government, in the Jordan report for this problem. Paragraph 6.49 of the report states:

(1) An extensive education and advertising programme designed to inform the public in the need to stop producing litter and in the need to recycle all resources; (2) the imposition of penalties on those found discarding bottles

and cans except in an acceptable way; and (3) the making of all glass and metal cans returnable with the imposition of a deposit.

I do not believe that an education programme would work, and I do not think others believe it would, but there it is in the Jordan report. I believe that can manufacturers, representatives of whom spoke to me today, have been remiss in not trying this in their own interests. I believe (and I am putting my own view in saying this) that they should be given one last chance to demonstrate that an education programme would do something to alleviate the problem. This morning I saw a presentation around the slogan "Drop something, sport". I personally doubt that it will work, but I am willing to give it a chance between now and the next session of Parliament. I really cannot believe that the Government intends to push this Bill through both Houses.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Hear! Hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised that the Minister wants to get the Bill through both Houses within the next week. I should like to see the manufacturers say that they are willing to embark on an education programme. I would prefer to give them one last chance to do it. If the programme fails (and I am afraid that it will, although I would like to see it succeed), we could go ahead with the Bill early in the coming session. I know that there is weighty opinion in favour of the Bill's being passed immediately. The Leader referred to a letter in this morning's *Advertiser* I was impressed by Mr Warren Bonython's letter in yesterday's *Advertiser*. Mr Bonython, who is President of the Conservation Council of South Australia, has come out unequivocally for himself and for conservationists in favour of the Bill. It is significant, I suggest to the Leader and members of the L.C.L., that Mr Bonython was a member of the Jordan committee and apparently concurred in this part of the report, yet that is his view now. In his letter, he said, in part

The Conservation Council of South Australia, representing the great majority of conservationists in this State, unequivocally supports the Bill. The principle of recycling materials, instead of throwing them away after a limited use, is one fundamental to conservation and which through sheer necessity is fast broadening its acceptance in world thinking. The philosophy of easy throw-away leads first to a waste of dwindling natural resources. Secondly, if it is persisted with it calls for an unnecessarily high rate of resource exploitation which in turn poses an increased threat to the environment

Those are the views of a man whom I greatly respect. Nevertheless, I am willing to give the can manufacturers one last chance to inaugurate an education programme and to see whether it works. They have been talking about it for long enough.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Would you say that 60 per cent collection would be the maximum result following further education programmes?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not commit myself on that: I would like to see what the result is first of all I point out (and perhaps I am being entirely critical of the can manufacturers) that I have a submission, dated July 11, 1973, they made to the Minister in which they said much the same thing about an education programme; yet they have done nothing about it. To be fair, I think they should be given one last chance. I do not wish to repeat the performance we witnessed yesterday on another Bill, the debate on which dragged on for about eight hours, and the same points were put over and over again

I have stated my position on this matter, I think sensibly. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill. I then intend, following my lead on another Bill, to support the motion that the member for Torrens will move to refer

this Bill to a Select Committee. I acknowledge this long-standing problem, and, if there is any way in which we can avoid a compulsory deposit or what I think will also be necessary, namely, on-the-spot fines, I think we should take it. I do not think it would matter too much if we were to wait for another three or four months to see whether anything can really be done regarding this problem, now that can manufacturers know that this is the crunch and get an education programme started. I therefore support the second reading because we must tackle the problem. However, I should like to see the Bill delayed by being referred to a Select Committee, which might bring forward something worth while to give the people who are so bitterly opposed to the legislation a last chance to justify their opposition.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria). This session of Parliament has been a historic one.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p m.*]

Dr. TONKIN: Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. RODDA: In his second leading explanation the Minister gave us an exhibition of "hot-bricking" or "feather-footing", if I may borrow some phraseology, and this suggests that he is not as unaware of the great interest shown in the Bill by the community as one may think. Early in his remarks, the Minister said:

I am not unaware of the interest our prior notice of intention in introducing such legislation has generated.

That must have been the Ministerial understatement of the year, as an enormous amount of interest has been shown in this Bill. In his blow-softening remarks, the Minister referred to the imposition of mandatory returnable deposits on beverage containers, and related the experience of this type of legislation, which was introduced in Oregon in 1972. He also referred to Alberta and Saskatchewan in Canada, Vermont in America, and to various other States. He said that he did not intend to ban the can but that the pull-top opener would disappear within two years. This is, therefore, yet another instalment of the new-bride policy that we have come to expect from the Government, which makes promises of things to come and keeps them under wraps all the time. I always had a better impression of the Minister than this. However, he, too, is apparently not above applying the new-bride policy. It appears, therefore, that a longer term in Cabinet does not necessarily do one much good: perhaps I was lucky that I had only three months as a member of Cabinet. This Bill deals specifically with beverage containers. However, it only skirts the problem of pollution at present facing this State

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the litter on the sides of the roads in the South-East?

Mr. RODDA: I will refer to that later, when I will tell the Minister what he is not doing about it. This sort of thing is evident throughout the community. Unfortunately, however, the Bill hardly touches upon this great scourge that scatters itself over our lovely countryside. It appears from this short and simple Bill that it will be necessary to establish a fund of about \$5 000 000 for this purpose, and indeed that is not a small sum. I do not minimize the Minister's problem in this regard. The Opposition is not insensible to finding a solution to the great problem of environmental control. However, looking at the Bill, one cannot but be amazed that the Government has decided to move into this field in such a piecemeal fashion.

Littering has been a problem throughout the States, and the mobility of people in motor cars has given rise to this form of pollution on a wide scale. Littering occurs in many ways throughout the community. Litter is anything that people throw away in the wrong place, that is, in a place other than a normal solid waste collection receptacle. Litter is the trash of which we dispose improperly, and it covers the widest range of things imaginable. It is a serious problem for many reasons. First, it is an eyesore defacing the natural and scenic beauty of the environment. Secondly, it threatens public health and safety in our recreation spots, on our roads, and in our waters. Thirdly, it interferes with agricultural operations, and may jeopardize public access to private lands. Fourthly, if allowed to accumulate, litter reduces property values, accelerates urban blight, and is psychologically depressing to people living in the area. Fifthly, discarded materials that clutter up our public places are increasing at an alarming rate each year.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: So you support the Bill?

Mr. RODDA: I support the principle of the entire control of litter, and that is more than the Minister is doing: he is touching only the tip of the iceberg. Littering is caused by people, and it will have to be corrected by people. A great and encompassing responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Minister and his Government in this respect. Parliament also is responsible to devise ways and means of rectifying this ugly situation and maintaining control in such a way that there is a legislative obligation on Mr. and Mrs. South Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member reading his speech, or merely referring to copious notes?

Mr. RODDA: If I were to throw my notes on the floor of the Chamber, I could carry on in the same manner, Mr. Speaker. A legislative obligation is being placed on Mr. and Mrs. South Australia to play their part in keeping this country a good place in which to live. A quick look at the statistics shows how insular is the Minister's Bill in tackling this problem. Paper and similar products comprise about 60 per cent of the litter pollutant, while beverage containers comprise about 16 per cent or 20 per cent, plastics about 6 per cent and other items in all shapes and sizes about 14 per cent. These other items include old cars, caravans, dead animal carcasses, and old discarded household goods. That is the spectacle that adorns our countryside!

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. RODDA: It is easy to do that, Mr. Speaker, because in my district bottles and cans are a major pollutant: Some of my colleagues have dealt with the specific effects of cans. The House cannot consider this matter in isolation, and I am sure that your generosity, Mr. Speaker, will give us the necessary latitude.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not reflect on the generosity of the Chair.

Mr. RODDA: The Bill contains many deficiencies, and I am sure the Minister does not object to our pointing these out to him, although he has taken a hard line regarding cans. There is a most noticeable ingredient in the littering that occurs in beautiful parts of the State. We see the enemy at work in our environment, and, as an American philosopher once said, the enemy we are looking for is really ourselves. We have a "Blow you, Jack" attitude and we could not care less. We keep our houses, gardens and streets in order but when we get about 100 yds (91 m) away from our house we throw things out of the car window and do not care a hoot about what is put on to the roadways or into the waterways. When I look at the simple and good-hearted people on both sides of the

House, I have difficulty in realizing why we have such a problem.

In January last year the Naracoorte Apex Club, in my district (and I understand other Apex Clubs throughout the State acted similarly) engaged in a pick-up programme and in the 10 miles (16 km) from Naracoorte to Struan the club picked up about 132 bags of litter and several hundred dozen bottles. Within a month, the area was just as dirty again, and I say that without reflecting on the good people in the area. This highlights for the Minister what will happen regarding the 10 per cent of litter with which the Bill deals.

We have extremely scenic areas in my part of the State, and I am sure the Minister is not insensible to that. On one occasion a group of visitors from Victoria, travelling in about six cars, set up their picnic under a big gum tree. At the time I was going from one of my properties back to the homestead, when my dogs got off the leash and walked on to the picnic area. The group comprised nice people, but when we went back next day we found 24 beer bottles, a heap of cans, and many plastic plates left to "adorn" the roadside. That is the type of thing with which the Minister must deal. I have heard him ask members on this side whether we favoured on-the-spot fines.

Mr. Keneally: Do you?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, if the need arises, and I am sure that the Government, if it faces up to this issue will, through proper education, sign-posting and the imposition of these fines, solve the problem. Statistics show that the tourist is not the main litter offender, and I am sure that the member for Fisher will tell us about what he saw on his trip overseas. The honourable member has initiative and he made up-to-date findings. He did not go for a jaunt as some other people have done: he went to have a close look. I saw litter bags being used in motor cars in some countries overseas, and Lee Kuan Yew is not frightened to take action to keep his country clean. The Minister has a responsibility to solve the litter problem in South Australia.

When I was serving on a council, I was called out one day to look at some rubbish on a highway. It comprised a big heap of bottles, an old carpet, and a tarpaulin. When we uncovered the heap, we found the carcass of a pig that had been dead for a long time and the effluvium was there in a decomposed state. This shows the type of people we are. I do not excuse myself, and everyone has a responsibility to do something about the litter problem. We do not like the piecemeal start that the Minister is making and the matter should be referred to a Select Committee.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why?

Dr. Tonkin: Mostly because of your ineptitude.

Mr. RODDA: A Select Committee comprising members from both Houses should be appointed.

Mr. Crimes: That's only delaying the start.

Mr. RODDA: We are not delaying the start at all. At present, members do not have sufficient information about this matter. I do not think Opposition members should be kept in the dark. The member for Fisher has displayed great initiative in going overseas to look into this matter.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why wasn't he the leading spokesman for the Opposition?

Mr. RODDA: It always pays to keep the best to last.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You've disowned him.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Fisher may tell the Minister later why he was not the leading speaker for the Opposition. I believe a Select Committee should inquire

into this matter. We must have a programme to educate the people about the need to prevent litter pollution. Unfortunately, we suffer from the old Australian "couldn't care less" attitude. One day, when I was waiting opposite Parliament House to catch a bus, I saw some people, who had been to a football match, throw into the gutter a paper bag out of which rolled a can, some banana peel and an apple core.

Mr. Crimes: Banana peel disintegrates, but a can does not.

Mr. RODDA: Cans make an awful noise when they hit the gutter. I am not trying to minimize the problem of disposing of cans and bottles.

Mr. Payne: You should—

Mr. RODDA: If any member opposite deserves a bouquet, it must be the member for Mitchell, who is always in the Chamber, although he was late this evening. Members of the public will respond to responsible legislation. I do not think that the Minister need be frightened about tackling this problem with strong measures. If the Minister were willing to use strong measures, he would have the support of all members. I should like to see a Select Committee look into this matter. In the Committee stage of this Bill, we will have more to say about this legislation, which deals with the tip of the iceberg in connection with this problem.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you support the Bill?

Mr. RODDA: I give conditional support to the Bill. The people of the State are not insensible to the need for practical and strong measures to deal with this problem.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome). At the outset, I want to make perfectly clear that I am all for cleaning up litter in this State. This has been an increasing problem over the years. It is high time all people made an effort to help clean up litter. I am most disappointed about the way in which the Government is tackling this problem in this Bill. It appears to me that the Government is using a sledgehammer to hit a tack, although I realize that the litter problem is not small. After all the work undertaken by the Committee on Environment in this State, I should have thought the Minister would heed its report and act on its recommendations. As all members know, in its recommendations, at page 4 of what is commonly known as the Jordan report, the committee gave its first priority to education and advertising.

This afternoon, I heard the Minister say that this programme had been a failure, but I cannot agree with him. The member for Mitcham said that such a programme would not work. Nevertheless, I am convinced that it would work. The second priority of the Jordan committee was that penalties should be imposed on those who discarded bottles and cans in an unacceptable way. The third priority was that there should be a deposit on all glass and metal containers. The Government has seen fit to put the cart before the horse by incorporating in this Bill as its first priority what the Jordan committee recommended as the third priority. Often in this House we bear the Government give as an excuse for introducing certain provisions that they have been recommended in committee reports. Yet, in this case the Government has chosen to use as its first priority what a committee made its third priority.

For the amount of effort that has so far been made in this direction, I believe that the education programme in relation to litter has been a success. In the schools, children have been educated about the problem, and already we can see the results of this campaign. Children can now often be seen picking up aluminium cans for the Red Cross. Receptacles are located around the city into

which these cans can be placed. When I am with my two grandchildren, whose ages are seven years and nine years, I am frightened to throw a lolly paper out of the motor car window because of the reprimand they will give me. For two years, the motor car of their parents has had in it a litter bag that has been used continually. I believe that these litter bags should be used, because it is not hard to work out what will happen if an empty can rolls around the floor of a car and gets under the brake pedal. That could easily cause an accident.

The Minister will recall that last October in the House I asked him a question about camping areas in the Flinders Range. I said that over that October holiday weekend about 10 000 people had visited the Flinders Range. However, as I drove in the area at that time I saw little evidence of any litter. This was the result of people being educated about the litter problem and taking a responsible attitude to the matter. If we place more emphasis on the education campaign, it will have an effect and there will not be a need for legislation of the type now before us. Groups such as the Boy Scouts are conducting "litterthons" and doing an excellent job. Children's organizations clean up litter at the sides of roads. If we educate children while they are at school they will remember what they have been taught all their lives. In years to come we will see the result of such a programme.

The second priority stated by the Jordan committee was for penalties to be imposed when bottles and cans were discarded in an unacceptable way. I believe that fines would be a deterrent; I cannot imagine anyone committing a second offence. I am sure that if a person were fined \$10 on the spot for an offence of this type, he would certainly have second thoughts before throwing away litter again. Until an education programme and penalties have been tried fully, I can see no reason at all for introducing deposits on cans and bottles. A means of solving the problem without introducing deposits is to provide for the use of aluminium cans and not steel cans. I know the steel can industry would possibly not agree with what I have said. However, at present one can observe that there are far fewer aluminium cans than steel cans to be seen lying about.

I have been told that steel cans used for beverages represent a small percentage of the total number of steel cans manufactured. It is necessary to use steel cans for preserved food and citrus juices, as these commodities cannot be canned in aluminium. For most beverages the use of the aluminium can would solve the problem and, if the scrap value of this can could be increased to 1c, this would assist the problem. Aluminium is a non-ferrous metal with a recycling value, because it can be recycled many times, which is an advantage. Since this legislation was mooted I have visited many rubbish dumps throughout my district and have noticed the absence of aluminium cans and large beer bottles.

Obviously, schoolchildren, pensioners, or collectors pick up these cans or bottles, although there are thousands of steel cans and stubbies left at the dumps. Normally, aluminium represents about one-third of 1 per cent of solid waste and, at present, it is worth \$220 a ton, which is 10 times higher than the value of any other solid waste. As there are 10 cans to the pound (45 kg) each one is worth 1c. If the scrap value could be increased to 1c there would be no need for this legislation providing for a deposit of 5c a can. The reason for not considering the value of the steel can is that we have adequate supplies of steel in Australia, and scrap steel is not of much value compared to non-ferrous metals. Collectors try to collect the non-ferrous metals.

A publication, *Waste not Aluminium* produced, I think, by Comalco, has interesting information on this subject. I assure the Minister that I do not own any shares in that company (although he thinks I do), neither do I own shares in Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, so that I am not defending the steel industry. However, as I have shares in gas, I hope the Minister will get the Redcliffs project moving! I see that in Queensland .2 per cent of the total number of cans returned are steel cans, with 17 per cent being aluminium. In the Brisbane area up to 28 per cent of the cans returned are aluminium, and that shows the value of this can. Two years ago I visited South Africa and was impressed by the absence of litter on the main highways. On those highways are situated rest stops, with shady trees and concrete chairs and tables, and a concrete receptacle for rubbish. These receptacles were full most of the time, and there was a noticeable absence of cans on roadsides.

When I returned I referred to this matter in my Address in Reply speech and I was pleased to see (and I do not take credit for it) that the Highways Department has now installed rubbish bins at roadside rest stops. If these areas contained tables and chairs, I am sure that many people would use them and that litter would be placed in receptacles. Perhaps Highways Department employees could assist in cleaning up litter, particularly on our main roads. When Iain has prevented work from being done, I have seen this department's employees picking up litter dumped on the roadsides, and I congratulate them on their efforts. Gangs of men paint the guide posts on our roads, and it would be no problem for these men to pick up cans and litter on the roadsides.

It could be argued that motorists should pay the cost of this work: motorists litter our roadsides and, if Highways Department employees tidy up this litter, the motorists should pay, and not the individual. This legislation would probably operate satisfactorily in the metropolitan area, particularly at our seaside suburbs, but what about country districts and particularly the Far North? This is an area I represent, and this legislation will cause real problems. Before cans were introduced bottles were the only drink containers in the Far North. The carriages used on our railway services had open windows and it was not uncommon to see a continuous row of bottles alongside the railway line. Today, with closed carriage windows it is impossible to throw bottles from the carriage, and few bottles can be seen along the railway line. The can proved popular because it was light and durable, cooled quickly in a refrigerator, and was easier to dispose of than was a bottle.

Does the Minister intend to set up collecting depots in country areas? According to this legislation depots will be set up in the metropolitan area, but what about country areas? It has been suggested to me that delicatessens in the Far North will refuse to handle cans, and I have been told that they would rather sell cold water than handle drink cans. With no depot in the town the proprietor would be compelled by this legislation to accept any can returned, provided it is clean. If he lives 700 miles (1 127 km) from Adelaide, he is responsible to get these cans back to the city in order to obtain his deposit, and it seems that such a person will refuse to handle cans. Also, hotels will be compelled to accept a bottle with a 1c deposit.

Would Government members, after entering a hotel in the Far North, purchase two cans of beer and pay 10c deposit, or would they buy a bottle of beer and pay 1c? I know that they would buy the bottle. Obviously, cans will not be used and the use of bottles will be more

prominent. A bottle for which 1c deposit is paid will be thrown in the street or on to the side of the road. If a person took 25 bottles back to the hotel, he would receive the price of a schooner of beer, but imagine what 25 bottles would weigh! At Oodnadatta, which is 670 miles (1 078 km) from Adelaide, it would be impossible for a publican to get bottles back to Adelaide with the roads in their present condition. He will take the bottles out to the dump. Aboriginal children take a great delight in smashing bottles, and most of the bottles in the dumps in the North have been smashed. This solid waste, which is of value to the State, will be in the rubbish dumps forever, because the freight is too high to bring it back to Adelaide. Freight to Marree costs \$20 a ton by road, and even more by rail. Oodnadatta is 270 miles (434.6 km) north of Marree, and it would cost \$28 a ton to bring empty bottles back to Adelaide. They will be taken to the dump and be there forever.

At present the dump is full of aluminium cans and, in future, it will be full of bottles. It costs \$600 for a transport to travel from Oodnadatta to Adelaide. The transport owner must receive \$600 before making a profit, and he must pay \$75 road tax. With those costs it is impossible for anyone there to send bottles back to Adelaide, whereas the can has some recycling value. It may well be that some aluminium cans can be brought back to Adelaide eventually. It is interesting to read the Jordan committee report. The committee flew to the North of the State, over Marree to Oodnadatta and return, but there is nothing in the report to show that it touched down at Marree or Oodnadatta. The committee was appointed in 1970 and produced its report in May, 1972, and, had it touched down at Marree, it might have seen the accumulation of rubbish at Marree that was there when I first became member for the district.

On my first trip to Marree, in January, 1971, I was approached by the local people, who said, "Is it possible for you to clean up the rubbish around the town?" The rubbish had to be seen to be believed: there was an accumulation of 80 years rubbish around the town. Marree is situated on a plain, with hundreds of square miles of flat country around the town. People for 80 years had gone out to the open spaces and dropped their rubbish there. The rubbish encircled the town. I approached the Minister and asked him to do something about the rubbish, but he replied that the Government was not willing to do anything to help clean up the rubbish. I took up the matter with the Commonwealth member for the district. He approached the Commonwealth Government, which sent a grader and bulldozer to clean up the rubbish around the town.

Mr. Evans: Who was that?

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Kelly, M.H.R. They dug trenches, bulldozed the rubbish into the trenches and covered it over. There was a dust hazard for some time but, as a result of recent rains, the whole of the country has regenerated and natural bush is growing on it. One would never know that much of the country had been a rubbish dump. I took up with the Minister the matter of the rubbish at Oodnadatta but, again, he refused to act. The rubbish there was confined to one area, but over the years people had driven through the dump, and it was about three-quarters of a mile long. The Commonwealth Government refused to act, because Oodnadatta is not a railway town. The rubbish is there as a monument to the Minister of Environment and Conservation!

The problem arises of how to deal with motorists from other States. Cans and bottles will come in from other States, and these will certainly be a problem in terms of the

Bill. If the Government were to wait until the Commonwealth Government produced its report each State might introduce uniform legislation to solve that problem Litter is created by the thoughtless, careless and irresponsible actions of people. If it were possible to make everyone conscious of the litter problem and determined to eliminate it, there would no longer be a problem and this legislation would not be necessary. People, not products, are responsible for litter. I only wish that the Government had waited for the House of Representatives Standing Committee report to be released shortly. I am disappointed in the Bill, not in the Government's action in attempting to control litter in the State, but in the way it has attempted to do it.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): At the outset, I am disappointed with the legislation and sadly disillusioned by the attitude of the Minister in introducing such legislation. He sits there on the front bench looking smug, surrounded by his admiring colleagues, when he has taken the worst possible course he could take to bring the issue of conservation before the House and the people of the State. There is no excuse for this. The Minister has had the benefit of the very best advice it has been possible to obtain for him. However, there is one thing to be said in his favour: the legislation opens up the topic for discussion so that we can get it hopefully to a Select Committee and decide what must be done. One would think that there should be no need for a Select Committee on this subject.

Mr. Keneally: One would think that!

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, but it becomes obvious from the Minister's action in introducing this legislation that a Select Committee is necessary. He has not taken the slightest notice of the Jordan report or of other responsible organizations which have produced reports. He has not taken a scrap of notice of these considerations.

Mr. Duncan: You're not lecturing resident medical officers now.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Thoughtless people!

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister may try to talk his way out of this. He has been sitting there, hoping he has got away with it, but he has not. Many things could be done under existing legislation, but the Minister has completely obscured the issue by introducing a Bill that deals with bottles and cans. That is what we are debating: bottles and cans, whereas we should be dealing with the far broader aspects of conservation and anti-pollution measures. The Minister is obscuring the whole issue of conservation and is showing by his actions a closed mind to this whole problem. There is no excuse for him. I am as much in favour of conservation measures and of the attitudes and actions that promote conservation as any other member is. It is a matter of great concern to all of us and, indeed, it must be of great concern to us because, unless our environment remains fit to live in, we will not survive as a race.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What would your children think about that?

Dr. TONKIN: My children could see through the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about the Minister's being transparent.

Dr. TONKIN: There is an interesting paradox, because on the one hand the Minister is patently transparent, yet on the other he is so dense that he cannot see the value of accepting the recommendations of the Jordan report.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And he doesn't believe in education.

Dr. TONKIN: That is so. We have been threatened by a startling increase in population over recent years, a growth that is causing more and more pollution. As a

result, people are finally becoming aware of the dangers of pollution. In this respect, I pay a tribute to the officers of the Education Department and other educational institutions in this State and, indeed, throughout the world, because they are teaching young people what conservation really is. They are warning our young people of the dangers of pollution and, therefore, of littering.

We are returning to the days that I can remember when I was at school, when it was not the done thing to drop litter, paper, or anything else anywhere but in a bin. That was something that we just did not do, and it was a reflection on the educational standards of that time. However, the standards today are different, as one realizes when one sees today's older young people throwing cigarette butts, newspapers or any other sort of litter out of car windows.

Mr. Keneally: You haven't mentioned cans and bottles. Why not?

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Stuart seems to want badly to get back to the subject of cans and bottles. However, I am dealing with the relative place of cans and bottles in the overall matter of pollution, and this is something the Minister does not want us to consider. It was because of the increasing awareness of the rapidly expanding problem of pollution that the Jordan committee was first set up in 1970. The Opposition can take considerable credit because it was in office when the Jordan committee was set up. I make no apology for reading the terms of reference of that committee.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You know that it has been in the papers in the last few weeks.

Dr. TONKIN: I wish that the Minister would try to control himself and not be too embarrassed. One of the committee's terms of reference was as follows:

To inquire into and report upon all aspects of pollution in South Australia, including pollution of land, sea, air and water, and on all matters and things associated therewith, and to submit recommendations to the Government of South Australia as to any action considered necessary to retain, restore or change the environment in the State so that the life of the community is improved and not impaired.

What excellent terms of reference they were, and what a suitable preamble that is to an excellent report. The committee included Professor Jordan as Chairman, and Mr. Warren Bonython, who has taken such a tremendous interest in conservation, as one of its members. Indeed, Mr. Bonython wrote a letter to the press—

Mr. Duncan: Where do you stand in all this?

Dr. TONKIN: I will come to that shortly. Another member of the committee was Dr. Inglis.

Mr. Keneally: Who's he?

Dr. TONKIN: I should have thought the member for Stuart would know that, as I understood that he took an interest in this matter.

Mr. Keneally: I know, but do you?

Dr. TONKIN: The committee also included Mr. Bruce Mason, Dr. F. D. Morgan, and Mr. E. R. Schroder, a man well versed in industrial matters in this State and a great conservationist, and Dr. P. S. Woodruff. It can be seen, therefore, that the committee comprised experts from many fields.

Mr. Duncan: The majority of them were in favour of this Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: This was a committee—

Mr. Duncan: I am pleased you used the past tense, because the committee reported in 1972.

Dr. TONKIN: I wonder whether the member for Elizabeth intends to get up and make a speech. I should be interested to hear him if he does. If he does so I

will pay him the courtesy of keeping quiet, a courtesy that he has not seen fit to extend to me. The Jordan committee comprised men of the highest standing, all experts in their own fields. In May, 1972, it came out with an advanced and forward-thinking report and, despite what the member for Elizabeth thinks, that report is still relevant. One has only to look at the appendices of that report to see exactly how wide-ranging were the committee's inquiries. Indeed, as the member for Frome said, the committee travelled widely throughout the State, from the Far North-West to the South-East, and across to the West Coast. It examined 120 written submissions presented by more than 150 organizations and 50 individuals. More than 300 people, representing over 100 organizations (for example Government departments, and private and voluntary concerns) in the community, gave evidence to the committee. No-one can say that the people of this State or the authorities responsible for these matters in South Australia did not have a chance to advance their points of view. There is no doubt that, in relation to the disposal of solid and liquid wastes, the committee has produced a well worthwhile report and has made some good recommendations, despite what the member for Elizabeth or the Minister now say.

Mr. Duncan: You'd better speak up, because they're up in the gallery now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I should have thought that the member for Elizabeth, not only being rude but also having reflected on another member in this House earlier in the debate, would have learnt his lesson by now. The Government's tactics throughout the whole of this exercise have been to deflect attention from the fact that it has done nothing to solve this problem when it has had every avenue open to it to do so. That is the point, and that is why this legislation has been introduced, especially after a little prodding from an A.L.P. convention. Part of paragraph 6.49 of the Jordan report is as follows:

There are at least three solutions to the problems produced by bottles and cans as drink containers. Those considered possible are: (1) an extensive education and advertising programme designed to inform the public in the need to stop producing litter and in the need to recycle all resources.

That is good, worthwhile stuff, and I defy the Minister to disagree with it. There is only one snag. He has not got off the ground and given us an extensive educational campaign. Where this has been adopted (and in this respect I pay a tribute to those service clubs and organizations that have conducted anti-litter campaigns), it has been extremely successful. One has only to the Royal Show to realize what can happen when people co-operate.

Mr. Keneally: Why should this be the Minister's responsibility?

Dr. TONKIN: What on earth is the Minister there for?

It is interesting to note that the member for Stuart thinks the Minister ought not to be responsible in this regard or, indeed, that he is not responsible. The report also refers to the imposition of penalties on those found discarding bottles and cans in an unacceptable way. Here again, there is already legislation on the Statute Book. However, if that legislation is not sufficiently far reaching or severe, it should be amended. I do not oppose on-the-spot fines, if they will help solve the problem. Finally, solution (3) states:

The making of all glass and metal cans returnable with the imposition of a deposit.

The comment was made that the recommendations should be introduced in the order stated: first, education; secondly,

the strict imposition of penalties for littering; and finally, a deposit system. The members of that committee consider the first two items so important that in paragraph 7 of the summary and conclusions they state:

A vigorous educational programme should be implemented to discourage the scattering of litter; if this is not successful significant "on-the-spot" fines should be introduced.

It is no good my referring further to the report, because that is where the matter stops. It is necessary to look at the over-all considerations. The member for Torrens has gone into much detail about what litter comprises, and cans and bottles comprise only a small proportion of all litter. Another factor is durability, which I freely admit is important. Because of that, consideration must be given to cans and bottles: we do not back away from that. However, the most common form of litter that one sees on the road comprises sheets of newspaper, cartons, wax paper, and cigarette cartons.

The later survey which was conducted by Kesab and to which the member for Torrens has referred shows clearly that the litter problem ranges far wider than only bottles and cans. The Minister has introduced this legislation either because he has nothing else to introduce or because he has not the courage to enforce existing anti-litter laws. He could have arranged more intensive advertising campaigns and more intensive education campaigns in schools and elsewhere, and he is at fault for not having undertaken those campaigns previously. Because he has not done this and because he is not willing to enforce all present laws, he has chosen to take the other way out by introducing legislation that deals with only a small proportion of litter.

It is a shame that he should try to impose this sort of thing on the people of South Australia, certainly on those in industry. It will not make the position easy for anyone, and he is obscuring the whole issue of conservation. How many extra litter bins has he, in conjunction with the Minister of Transport, had installed on highways in South Australia? Is it possible that a litter bag should be required to be carried in all motor cars? I do not know, but these suggestions have been made and I ask why we are not investigating them. We are fiddling with cans and bottles when we should be considering the whole matter. I think the Minister has nothing else up his sleeve and is only trying to cover up.

The Government has not the courage to enforce anti-litter laws, whereas in Singapore, the United Kingdom and West Germany, where these laws have been enforced, the results have been startlingly good, and the environment in each community has been freed of much litter. I think the member for Frome has referred to the work done by highway repair gangs in picking up litter. How many special litter gangs are operating in South Australia at present? If the Minister is concerned about the state of our highways, why does he not spend money and get a litter gang out, cleaning up the roads? This could be done in conjunction with an education campaign, and the fact that these men were on the side of the road, in a clearly marked vehicle, would help in the education campaign. We have not heard from the Minister about these matters.

Mr. Keneally: Would you say—

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously, this hurts the member for Stuart, because he knows that the Government should have been doing something about these matters since the Jordan report was released. The members who comprised that committee are pleased that action is being taken and they will support it, because it is all that has been done to implement their recommendations. However, they will

support any other measure that is introduced to advance conservation, and I hope that soon they will have that opportunity.

Mr. Duncan: That's a lie, and you know it I suppose you have never heard of the Environment Protection Council, which has been established⁹

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order, and the honourable member for Bragg is out of order in replying to them.

Dr. TONKIN: With great respect. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not reply to that one. Consideration must be given to garbage and refuse disposal and we must change our way of life in this respect. Probably, we will need to have more than one rubbish bin and will have to do some sorting of refuse (and that will not hurt us). Probably we will have to sort bottles and cans for separate collection, and it will be necessary to have separate and organized disposal centres. The position in Vienna is a model and I recommend that the Minister see it when he is overseas. The system is extremely efficient, and we could well adopt it here.

There are major obstacles in the way of introducing a deposit system on cans and bottles, and my colleagues will deal with these. There are significant difficulties that will considerably outweigh any advantage that accrues. Does the Minister really think that he can establish collection centres which conveniently will serve everyone in the metropolitan area and the country areas and which will reduce the amount of pollution caused by bottles and cans? I accept that he believes that, but he is being too optimistic, and I do not understand how it will work. By his own admission, the Minister has made no effort at all to research this problem. Obviously, he has not taken any notice of the Jordan report, and he will not listen to Kesab. I believe that he is putting the cart before the horse. Perhaps this was the first piece of legislation, out of several pieces of legislation, that was ready. Perhaps he will tell members if that statement is correct.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The second reading explanation may help you.

Dr. TONKIN: We do not know what is intended. I believe that the Minister had made a political commitment, and I think that he was probably pushed into taking this action. My reading of the Jordan report and other authorities does not lead me to think that a deposit system will solve the South Australian litter problem. I do not know the solution to the problem, and I strongly suspect that the Minister does not know it, either. Therefore, I will support the Bill at the second reading stage, as I believe the matter should be considered by a Select Committee, whether a joint committee of both Houses or a committee from this House.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: "Stall" is the word you are looking for.

Dr. TONKIN: I should like to see this committee set up and sitting during the recess, and there is nothing to stop that from happening. Then, during the next session of Parliament we should all be ready to take the appropriate, well informed and researched steps—something that the Minister cannot do at present. It is easy for Government members to talk about the industrial lobby.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you deny it?

Dr. TONKIN: I know that much money has been spent on this.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Were you lobbied?

Dr. TONKIN: I was not lobbied, and in fact some of the advertisements in the daily press have irritated

me because I think that, to some extent, these people have destroyed their own case. However, that is no reason why that point of view should be set aside. All aspects of the matter must be considered in a fair and Parliamentary way, and that can be done only by a Select Committee. If the Minister is honest about this matter, he will support the proposal to have the matter investigated by such a committee. If his present attitude is right, he need have no worries, for his judgment will be vindicated. If he is wrong, he should be, the first person to be grateful to the Select Committee. He should want to see the best solution possible achieved for the people of South Australia. In any case, I believe that the Minister, who is usually responsible, will agree to our proposal to have the Bill referred to a Select Committee.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Not likely.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sorry to hear the Minister say that. It is a shame, because I think he could earn himself the respect of all members and of the community if he took that course. I am most disappointed that he will not do so.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I want to deal with only two aspects of the Bill. First, I wish to refer to the effect of the legislation on the wine and spirit industry. I know that the Minister has made some public statements about this matter but, as the Bill stands, these beverages are within its compass. Therefore, I believe it is appropriate that I should point out some of the disadvantages to the industry if the Bill is passed as it stands. However, we are confident that the Minister will keep his word, given publicly, and exempt these commodities. Some peculiar features are associated with the wine and spirit industry. South Australia produces 70 per cent of the wine produced in this country, and of that quantity 70 per cent is exported to other States. That illustrates how ludicrous it would be for this legislation to apply to this industry, as the bulk of its production goes to other States.

This also highlights the importance of having some sort of unanimity among the States on this matter. A previous speaker has suggested that it would be desirable to delay action in this State until the investigations of the relevant Commonwealth committee are concluded. There will be complete and utter confusion in the wine industry if two sets of bottles have to be used, one set designed to meet the requirements of this Bill, and the other set designed to be sent to the other States, which take 70 per cent of our production and in which no provision similar to that in this Bill would operate.

It is impossible when bottling wine to stop at a certain point. For example, if a 5 000gall. (22 730 l) vat were being bottled, it would be impossible to stop the bottling process after 2 000gall. (9 092 l) had been bottled for the local market and then bottle the remainder for export. Wine cannot be banded in that way. It must be a continuous process, otherwise there is ullage, evaporation and oxidation. Once bottling of a large vat commences, it must be continued until all the wine is bottled. Therefore, the placing of wine in different types of bottle and container would be impossible.

Moreover, I do not believe that wine bottles present a great problem at present. As has been said, the provisions of the Bill strike at only about 10 per cent of the litter problem. As I drove down from the Adelaide Hills this morning, I paid special attention to litter along the roadside. I saw some waste paper and material from waxed cardboard milk containers. I saw no bottles and only one or two cans. Therefore, even if the provisions of this Bill are totally effective, we will not make great inroads into the overall litter problem.

Mr. Keneally: You should look at the roadsides up north.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As the legislation does not deal with cardboard containers or waste paper, I do not see the honourable member's point. People do not habitually drink wine and throw the bottles out of car windows, and so on. Since the Second World War table wine consumption has greatly increased, but this has happened in a fairly civilized way. A problem associated with wine drinking has arisen in isolated areas of the State, but that is a different matter. Most wine is consumed with meals at a person's home or in a restaurant. Bottles do not become litter, because they are collected from restaurants. At present the wine and spirit industry has an effective recycling programme, and this glass, the only medium used for containers, does not contribute to the litter problem to any significant degree.

If we are to take what the Minister said at face value (and we have no reason to doubt the honesty of his public statement), I hope that he will consider seriously the position of these industries. I believe that flagons are now being reintroduced from other States, and this industry has need for a high proportion of re-usable containers. About 70 per cent of the production of this industry goes to other States, and it is desirable that there should be some uniformity in these circumstances.

I now refer to the question of educating the public. The member for Frome made a valid point when he spoke about his visit to South Africa, because I have visited the same country. Picnic areas have non-movable tables, seats and rubbish receptacles I am pleased to note that in parking bays on major country roads in this State action has been taken in this regard. However, I do not know what arrangements have been made to clear these rubbish bins, but I am sure that people would use these areas frequently and, with a receptacle available, the quantity of roadside litter would be reduced.

The member for Bragg referred to European cities. When I was privileged to visit some of these countries last year on my study tour, one of the first impressions one has is of the cleanliness or otherwise of a city or countryside. I do not believe that these places are kept clean by the use of this sort of legislation, but the Minister has said that education will not operate satisfactorily. I believe that on one television programme he said education was silly. I think they were his words.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No, not mine.

Mr. Coumbe: What did you say?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that several people who viewed the programme have said that the Minister used those words.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps we could obtain a transcript of the programme, but at least the Minister said this afternoon that education was a failure.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In this instance.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot agree. Obviously, in some European cities people are proud that they keep the place clean. When one comes out of an underground station in Stockholm one finds a receptacle for used tickets at every turnstile but, when leaving the underground in London with no receptacles available, one finds the steps strewn with tickets.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have you ever dropped a train or tram ticket?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have in the past, but as a result of my experiences I make a conscious effort now not to drop litter. If the public were educated by a

genuine effort and took a pride in their city and countryside, we would be far more successful in our campaign against litter than we have been. Travelling by train into Saltzburg one sees no paper or litter, but travelling on the Indian-Pacific one may see little heaps of half-burned sleepers and heaps of ironmongery. The Government should give a lead in any education programme concerning litter, because, until the public is educated to be proud of the cleanliness of the city and countryside, we will always have a problem. We may have to impose fines, but until we make the public aware of the litter problem we will make no progress. No genuine Government effort has been made in this State in this regard.

From reading overseas publications one realizes that a genuine effort has been made by starting in the schools to make youngsters conscious and proud of their environment, and to have a civic pride in their district. In America, this is highly successful in some areas. In conclusion, I will quote from one of these publications, because I do not wish to speak at length. I see no point in canvassing again the points that other members have raised. I have publications from America and other places where a genuine effort has been made to educate the public in keeping their environment and surroundings clean. The introduction to one publication states:

Litter-prevention is more than simply "cleaning up" . . . it involves a change in habits and attitudes. Mere removal of litter is relatively simple, but prevention of litter is a continuing educational task. Many communities are so used to drab surroundings and dirt that they have grown to accept them as incurable. Once you prove this isn't the case—as others have—things begin to happen. You *can* have a clean and beautiful city. All you need is optimism, patience and the will to put your plan across. To live and work in an attractive, well-kept area pleases the eye and enriches the soul. Property values improve . . . and it is good business. This guide is designed to help volunteer citizens create a year-round educational programme in any size community.

This is the kind of long-term approach we should adopt over a period in order to develop in our citizens a pride in their communities, cities and country. If all people are not made aware of the problem we could introduce any amount of legislation, but it would not be worth much in the long term. The Government is very keen on prohibitions, hitting the public with its grandiose schemes, and pushing people here and there, whereas it would be better if the Government gave the community a lead by educating it, possibly starting in the schools, and we might get somewhere. I have dealt with only two aspects of the legislation, namely, the effect it will have on the wine and spirit industry, which is of some significance in my district, and the education aspect, which the Minister is reported as having described as silly.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: By whom?

Mr. Evans: He said that in his last sentence on his television interview with me.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You'll hear more about that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I elaborate on my point that the Government could give a lead by saying that it has given a lead in educating the public on wasting water. This legislation would probably work if the public were made well aware of all the problems involved in litter. I do not think the Minister has really made an effort in his relatively new department on this educational aspect. I support the Bill at the second reading stage, so that it may be referred to a Select Committee, and so that members may be educated in all aspects of litter. I do not think we have many expert members on this legislation. If ever the value of a Select Committee was brought home to me it was on the psychological practices legislation. That Select

Committee was an education to all of us. I believe that this Bill is a similar measure on which the House needs educating. With those reservations, I support the second reading.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra). Before I make my contribution to the debate, may I say at the outset that I support the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee that can investigate the litter problem and carefully prepare a report on this topic. This Bill is another weak piecemeal attempt to combat the litter problem and another clear example of the hasty catch-cry type of legislation to which I have become used in the relatively short time I have been a member.

When the Government introduces legislation on whatever subject, I try to observe the motive behind it. Generally speaking, the motive is to earn revenue, increase taxes, burden the public generally, replenish the coffers or enlarge the Public Service. However, that is not the case with this legislation. What the Government has done is to introduce a Bill on a most important matter that is of concern to all members, and I wonder whether the Minister, in particular, has thought what could be the effect of implementing this legislation.

The member for Torrens, at great length and in great detail, demonstrated the effects there could be on the public generally if the legislation were passed. He even brought to members' attention the effects there would be on the children of our community. I shall spend a short time referring to the effects on another section of the community, namely, the manufacturing section, which has set itself up to provide a service for the public generally, particularly the consumers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I've heard it all before.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister may say that, but I will refer to him later. When I look at my desk and see the accumulation of material from which I had hoped to draw my comments, I am reinforced in my view that a Select Committee should be appointed to investigate this problem. During the last few days there has been an influx into this House of people concerned about this legislation and members have received a very wide range of material that could best be dealt with by a committee specifically set up to examine this problem. Can manufacturers have spent much money to set themselves up in industry, but they have been grossly misguided in doing so if we expect them to accept the Bill now before us. On Proclamation Day, December 28, 1973, the Premier said.

The job facing us is to minimize the effect on South Australia by getting into this State a diversified and stable industrial and employment base, as quickly as possible.

The Premier led industry out on a limb, and now his Government is trying to cut that limb from under the organizations concerned. The Premier stressed to the people of South Australia on that occasion the importance of promoting industry here. We in South Australia have an industry which is set up for the purpose of producing drink containers of various types and which plays a vitally important role in its field. The Bill, if it passes, will destroy that section of industry. I have no qualms about referring to one of these industries for the purpose of putting before the House a clear and genuine example. For example, J. Gadsden Proprietary Limited, acting on the Premier's statements of confidence, extended its factory within the last few months to enable it to cope with the can manufacturing trade. In October, 1973, that company spent \$1 000 000 on this project, and a further \$500 000 has been spent on additional equipment by another firm that fills cans with its product. If this Bill passes, that type of industry will be put out of business. I understand that

the circumstances of these can manufacturers have already been brought to the Minister's notice. When the Minister was questioned recently about the loss that this industry would suffer, he replied, "This could very well be." When the loss of employment was brought to his notice, the Minister said, "It is unfortunate, and I am very sorry for them." I should like to relate that to a deputation that recently waited on the Minister regarding this matter, an occasion which I am sure the Minister will recall.

Like many other manufacturing industries, J. Gadsden Proprietary Limited has played an important role in this State, having acquired funds to invest here and having also set itself up in such a way that many members of the public are dependent on it, not only for the service but also for the employment that the company provides. This company employs 30 specialists, including trained operators, chemists, quality control staff, and so on, and these people cannot just find employment elsewhere if that section of the business closes down.

Mr. Keneally: So you're a champion of the workers, are you? Isn't it incredible?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The member for Stuart can make rude comments across the Chamber.

Mr. Gunn: Let him get on his feet and make a contribution to the debate, rather than making snide interjections.

Mr. CHAPMAN: He will have time to do so.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Government isn't very interested in the debate, is it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel has already made his speech. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am opposed to the deposit system, as I do not believe it will achieve the desired results in dealing with the litter problem; nor do I believe that the Government fully understands the litter problem, because drink containers comprise only about 10 per cent of this State's litter. Why, then, is there this desperate concentration on these containers? Why does the Government not examine the other 90 per cent and do something positive about that? The Minister has said that receptacles have been placed along our highways for other forms of litter. Surely, he does not expect motorists travelling on the highways to stop at those litter bins to unload their litter. What point is there in setting up litter bins on country highways? Surely the Minister realizes that the only way to cope with the problem is to place the litter bins at strategic points.

Mr. Payne: Aren't they, on highways?

Mr. Keneally: Have a go on your own and stop reading.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Every effort is being made to distract me from the point. Do some Government members think that, if they keep interjecting, they will succeed? I admit that I have that much information in front of me that I am finding some difficulty in collating it for the purpose of this exercise. That is all the more reason why more time should be made available to enable a Select Committee, the appointment of which has been advanced so often by Government members at other times, to concentrate on and collate this material.

I refer again to the importance of retaining this manufacturing industry. It has made a significant investment in this field because of the encouragement it has been given by the Premier, and has provided employment for many people. I remind members that the Bill is nothing but destructive towards this section of the community, as no regard is being given to the industry or the public in this exercise. A weak attempt is being made to combat the litter problem, but the desired result will not be achieved. No-one is willing to be involved in the collection of reusable

deposit containers. I am informed that the Retail Traders Association and the South Australian Mixed Business Association, organizations which represent 99 per cent of the stores handling this type of container, are not willing to act as recovery centres for deposit containers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How do you know that?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have been informed of it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: By whom?

Mr. CHAPMAN: By reliable sources. I have no reason to doubt this information, which reinforces my point that a Select Committee should be set up to deal with the allegations made. Whether or not storekeepers can be encouraged to co-operate with the Government in this exercise or centres can be established for this purpose, the result will still not be desirable. Several members have already pointed out that a health hazard will arise as a result of the accumulation of non-reusable containers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Isn't there a health hazard all over the State at present?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The thing to do is to dispose of containers through household garbage disposal. This is the quickest and most positive method of solving the problem. If we are to produce a system that will be desired by the people of South Australia, let us introduce the type of education programme suggested by the member for Kavel. I would not support an education programme alone, as this would not be sufficient. Accompanying such a programme must be effective penalties. In addition, there must be litter bags, strategically placed bins, and encouragement at every level.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't think the Minister has encouraged anyone?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister has in no way convinced me that the Bill is a positive contribution towards solving the litter problem. Neither the Government nor the Minister has been positive in attempting to solve the problem. These attempts have certainly not been genuine. Let us consider the Government's allocation to Kesab in 1973-74 of only \$10 000. What a miserable sum, when the Government is supposed to be attempting to solve this problem. During 1973-74, Tom the Cheap also gave Kesab \$10 000. If a representative of industry can contribute in this way, surely it can be accepted that industry is sincere in its attempt to overcome these difficulties. In Western Australia, where there are considerably fewer people in a much smaller populated area, \$20 000 was allocated for this purpose in 1973-74, the allocation in 1972-73 being the same.

The Government cannot convince me that it is making a genuine attempt to solve our litter problem. Although I do not necessarily take up the case of the manufacturer, I believe that, as all sections of the community have been referred to in this debate, it is important to support those who have acted responsibly, invested their money and made a genuine attempt to establish themselves in this State. Manufacturers of drink containers are entitled to protection when such hastily drawn legislation is brought before the House.

Mr. Payne: They're engaged in selling a one-way product, and they're determined to go on doing so.

Mr. CHAPMAN: These companies have made a contribution towards solving our litter problems. Recently, they have offered financial and other assistance in an effort to solve the problem.

Mr. Payne: How many advertisements have you seen asking people not to litter? They've just advertised about not having deposits.

Mr. Keneally: Cigarette manufacturers support athletics.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have concentrated my remarks particularly on the can manufacturing industry. I have no doubt on the evidence I have received that this industry in South Australia will be destroyed if the legislation is passed. As an example, I cite what has happened in the State of Oregon in the U.S.A. I have no reason to doubt evidence conveyed to me in the last few days that the introduction of a deposit system in Oregon has had a disastrous effect on can manufacturing industries. It has had a disastrous effect on the marketing generally of metal soft drink containers. When the legislation was introduced in that State in September, 1972, 40 per cent of soft drinks was marketed in canned containers. At this stage, less than two years after the legislation was introduced, the percentage of soft drinks marketed in a metal can has been reduced to 5 per cent. Surely that is a clear illustration of the effect of such legislation. I do not find it embarrassing or difficult to support the organizations to which I have referred. I think it is important to encourage people to establish industries in this State. However, we should not encourage people to spend large sums on establishing industries and on providing services and then, immediately they are established, cut them down.

Mr. Keneally: What about people manufacturing—

Mr. CHAPMAN: The continual interjections of the members for Stuart and Mitchell have made my task of conveying my message on behalf of this important group rather painful. I have attempted to put forward the importance of this industry. It is an important role that it plays in this State and I hope every consideration will be given by the Government to this matter before it proceeds with this legislation.

If the Minister persists with this Bill and uses the numbers he has on his side to bulldoze it through, as we have become used to recently in respect of other legislation, I would like him to consider this point. There is not much doubt that the can manufacturing industry will, if it does not go out of business, be seriously eroded.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why?

Mr. CHAPMAN: But what happens to the public requirements? What sort of containers do we put drinks in as a result of this industry going out of business? We understand that the glass manufacturers could not cope with the volume of trade if called upon to do so, and that they would be seriously embarrassed as a result of the can manufacturing industry being forced out of business. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that that is what would happen. I have spent a few hours recently with people from only a portion of that industry, but they are there and are ready to provide this Government with the facts surrounding their industry. Is it not fair to suggest that, if the Minister deals with them as he has done so far, a Select Committee might at least give them a fair go?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I have seen them.

Mr. CHAPMAN: For the reasons put forward by other members of the Liberal and Country League this evening and by me in these few brief remarks, I will not support the introduction of a deposit system as proposed by this Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I strongly support this Bill. I do so with increased conviction after hearing the speech just made by the member for Alexandra, who said in the middle of his speech that he was representing "this important group", referring to the can manufacturers. It was an interesting admission and a statement that certainly

clarifies the position as to whom he was representing—not the people of South Australia but the can manufacturer, which is not a South Australian company but one that set up here to grab a share of the market in this industry. That shows where the honourable member's interests lie—not with the people of Alexandra.

I have just been to Kangaroo Island and I should be surprised if anyone there supports the honourable member in the attitude that he expressed this evening. The people of Kangaroo Island are particularly aware of and concerned about the tourist industry and would be most interested to hear the sort of thing he has been spewing forth this evening. It is the sort of thing the average person in South Australia would view with grave concern, because it does not represent the interests of the people of this State and it does not concern a decent environment: it concerns profit. That is what the honourable member is concerned about, and has always been concerned about. It is what the Government is concerned about when members opposite get up and spew forth that sort of stuff. It is just ridiculous.

Mr. Mathwin: Your record is shocking.

Mr DUNCAN: I will get to the honourable member in a moment. He has a poor record in this matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to speak to the Chair. I also ask the member for Glenelg to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was referring to the member for Glenelg and I will, in a few moments, deal with his particularly shoddy record in this matter. This evening, we have heard several members opposite get up in their typical style and attack the Government on this measure with all sorts of paltry and piffling excuses and reasons. Many of them have changed their attitudes over the last few months, and one cannot help but wonder why. I have a good idea of the reasons why they have changed their attitudes in this matter. For the last two weeks we have seen in the precincts of this House people from the packaging industry trotting to and fro lobbying members, and they are still here now. We have seen examples of members running to and from them to get instructions on certain points; it is a particularly shabby approach to a matter that involves everyone in South Australia. This is not a sectional matter—the whole community of South Australia is involved. It is the sort of matter where members of the Opposition could well have taken a community attitude instead of the sickeningly partisan attitude they have taken this evening.

I refer now to the attitude they have taken because it is illuminating. I will refer first to the member for Glenelg, because he is a member who has chosen to be outspoken. On October 18, 1972, in the *Guardian*, which I understand is a weekly local newspaper in Glenelg, connected with the Messenger Press, a report referring to the member for Glenelg states:

Wants ban on bottles. Glenelg MP, Mr. John Mathwin, this week said the sale of non-returnable bottles should be banned. Mr. Mathwin said many children were injured, even maimed, by broken glass from non-returnable bottles.

Mr. Venning: What did the Minister of Environment and Conservation say?

Mr. DUNCAN: I will get to that in a minute. If that is not an indication of a twister, someone who has turned, I do not know what is. The member for Glenelg has turned in this way and so he opposes the passing of this Bill this evening.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I say that the member for Elizabeth is completely misrepresenting me. He has said I am a twister and I have gone against the policy which I mentioned some time

ago in a paper. I have not even spoken in this debate, so I ask the honourable member to withdraw his remark that I am a twister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Sir. It is clear—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, only one of us can be on his feet at a time. The member for Elizabeth has cast aspersions on several members on this side of the Chamber during this debate by way of interjection, and now he is doing so in debate. The member for Elizabeth accused the member for Glenelg of being a twister in relation to this debate, but the honourable member has not spoken. Obviously his views cannot be twisted if he has not spoken, therefore, the statement should be withdrawn in order to protect the personality and character of the member for Glenelg.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member making the speech is responsible for the accuracy of what he says. I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The member for Elizabeth has called me a twister and that is an absolute lie. I object to the word "twister", and it is a lie because I have not given any indication of where I stand on this matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I previously have ruled that there is no point of order raised by the honourable member. The honourable member for Elizabeth

Mr. DUNCAN: I withdraw my statement, particularly in view of the intimation made by the member for Glenelg (when he denies being a twister) that he now intends to support the Bill.

Mr. Mathwin: You are a liar!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Glenelg to withdraw that remark, because it is unparliamentary.

Mr. MATHWIN: Well, Sir, it is obvious that the member for Elizabeth has not spoken the truth this evening when he called me a twister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw his previous remark.

Mr. MATHWIN: I withdraw the word "liar" and say that the member for Elizabeth is stretching the truth. He was not telling the truth when he called me a twister, because I have given no indication as to where I stand on this matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth

Mr DUNCAN: No doubt the matters to which I referred have been painful to the Liberal and Country League, and clearly the Opposition does not want me to continue in this vein. However, I shall proceed, because the matters that I have documented against the L.C.L. are damaging, and I think that they will prove what motives that Party has used in its approach to this Bill. The member for Rocky River wanted to know what the Minister's attitude was to the statements of the member for Glenelg strongly supporting the ban on non-returnable bottles. The Minister said that the environment committee was investigating the matter and that we would take action in due course. That is what we have done. We have introduced a Bill so that the people of South Australia can be protected from the situation arising from non-returnable types of soft drink and other beverage containers, and so that they can have an environment free from this litter. I now refer to other Opposition members, some of whom have spoken in this debate and who have taken a strong stand in the past in

favour of this sort of legislation. It will be interesting to see their response when they are exposed in a few moments. Initially, I refer to the member for Frome, who is referred to in a report in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "M.P. wants steel cans to be banned", as follows:

An M.P. wants the State Government to prohibit steel food and soft drink cans being used in South Australia. Mr. Allen (L.C.P. Frome) said in the Assembly yesterday that aluminium cans used exclusively would help the pollution problem. In country towns there was an absence of aluminium cans. However, there were steel cans lying around in their hundreds. He said this proved that people collected the aluminium cans and sold them for recycling.

Mr. Jennings: He meant Steele Hall.

Mr. DUNCAN: This is an indication of the attitude of the member for Frome.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He didn't have it this evening!

Mr. DUNCAN: I refer to the member for Hanson, who is on record as having supported a deposit on beverage containers. An *Advertiser* report states:

Mr. Becker also advocates a 5c deposit on all cans. "I realize the deposits would mean more problems for storekeepers and manufacturers, but I can see no other way to combat pollution," he said.

Can one be fairer than that? Surely we can depend on his vote, because this statement seems to be completely in line with the Government's policy of introducing this Bill. Before turning from the past altitude of the L.C.L., I turn to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I think these will probably cap the whole turncoat approach of the L.C.L., because the Leader has spoken in this debate and has indicated that in Committee he will vote against the Bill. A report in the *Advertiser* states:

The Opposition Leader, Dr. Bruce Eastick, said the scheme need not cost the public more if they "cashed in the materials in their hand". "This is a positive approach to an increasing problem, and one which has been requested by many members from both sides of the House, following representation from people, particularly local government authorities," he said.

"We welcome the general effect this will have on safety, particularly in recreational areas." He warned the deposit would have the desired effect only if it was meaningful.

I think the Leader has clearly stated to the House his position in relation to this Bill and his attitude to this matter, yet in this article he is reported to have suggested that the deposit would be effective only if it were meaningful. What does he mean? He means that the deposit should be a deterrent to buying these containers and therefore sufficient to induce people to pick up and return containers. That is the attitude of this Government.

The Hon G. R. Broomhill: Why has he changed his mind?

Mr. DUNCAN: I do not know why he has twisted and turned.

Mr. Crimes. We have seen the adverts in the paper.

Mr. DUNCAN: Whilst I refer to the Leader of the Opposition, I say something about an article that appeared in the *Gawler Bunyip*, a newspaper appearing weekly in the district of the Leader of the Opposition. Under the heading "Can the can say students!" the article states:

Grade 5 and 6 students at Gawler Primary School have been combating the litter problem in the district in no uncertain manner. In the past two weeks they've collected more than 5 000 soft drink and beer cans on their way to and from school and even at weekends.

The article continues:

In a letter to the Leader of the Opposition and member for Light (Dr. B. C. Eastick), they said the can deposit legislation was "not too hard to swallow, contrary to what

the S A. Beverage Packaging and Distribution Liaison Committee believed". The letter also said the children felt the legislation would lead to a reduction in can sales and a reduction in the litter problem. Dr. Eastick replied that the children's thoughts would be taken into consideration when the legislation was debated.

It is clear that the children's views have not been taken into account. In fact, the Leader has betrayed his constituents: he has supported the attitude of the South Australian Beverage Packaging and Distributing Liaison Committee. These people have been haunting this place for the past fortnight. They have been feeding biased information and giving directions to members opposite. They are still here tonight trying to get the Opposition to oppose the Bill.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite are getting upset because the matters I am putting before the House concern them. They support industry but they do not support the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for restoring the House to order. I have referred to the approach of the L.C.L. to this matter. There is no doubt where its sympathies lie, and it is very much open to doubt where its motives lie. Why has the L.C.L. taken this approach? I want to refer to the approach that has been taken in one of Adelaide's daily newspapers. It is illuminating that the *News* initially supported the legislation, but has now turned completely against it. Like others, including the Leader of the Opposition, the *News* has had a sudden change of heart in this matter. There may well be something in common between the attitude of the *News* and the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What do you mean by that crack?

Mr. DUNCAN: The honourable member will find out. When the Government first announced that it intended to use the economic incentive of a deposit to cope with the increasing flood of cans, the *News* of June 12, 1973, stated in its editorial:

The State Government is moving boldly against pollution with its plan to make deposits on drink bottles and cans compulsory.

"Hear, hear!" said the *News* for the Government's approach. The editorial offered one or two minor reservations as to how storekeepers would cope, but it described the deposit plan as an "admirable" idea. We have overcome the minor problems that might have been faced by storekeepers; members opposite would know that, if they had studied the Bill. By January of this year someone had persuaded the *News* to think again on the question. It may have been that curious alliance known as the South Australian Beverage Packaging and Distributing Liaison Committee; it may have been a Director of the *News* who is also a Director of the South Australian Brewing Company. Whoever it was, the Editor of the *News* plainly had taken fright over the matter. On January 3 of this year the deposit plan, according to the *News*, had become "fraught with potential difficulties". The *News* was careful to repeat the misleading claim of the industry being circulated that "it is important to remember that drink cans are only a very small part of the pollution problem"; that is a misleading claim, and it is completely wrong and without justification, but it has been made again this evening by the Opposition.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But what about the connection you said there was between the Opposition and the *News*?

Mr. DUNCAN: I will come to that. The *News* quoted a recent survey that stated that cans represented only 7 per cent of litter. Tonight we have heard admissions from the other side that, even on the calculations of members opposite, cans represent at least 10 per cent of the litter problem; someone said 10 per cent to 15 per cent. By last Thursday the *News* had decided that deposits just would not work; in saying that, it showed a further deterioration of its attitude from that of June last year. As an index of that newspaper's confusion, it is important to note that the editorial on that day suffered a strange "sea change" between its first and second editions. The first edition offered the misinformation that the Bill before the House included a provision for 20 depots for used cans in the metropolitan area. As members can see, there is no such provision. The Minister's second reading explanation says:

On the basis of experience in the Province of Alberta, it is expected that the minimum number of such depots that will be required in the metropolitan area is about 20.

Mr. Coumbe: What will happen in the country?

Mr. DUNCAN: That is not the point I am making: I am making the point that the *News* was dishonest. The *News* twisted and turned, as has the Opposition and its Leader. I am sorry to have to refer to the Leader of the Opposition in these terms, because I believe he was in a very difficult position. The reason why the Opposition has taken this attitude is that it wanted to try to get him out of the difficulty he was in because of his statements. The Opposition has said that it will accept the Bill, provided it goes to a Select Committee and provided it is tabled and shelved. That is what the Opposition is really saying tonight.

Mr. McAnaney: That's not correct.

Mr. Coumbe: A Select Committee has to report to the House.

Mr. DUNCAN: But it would not have to report until next session. The *News* had the decency to amend its statement in its editorial. However, it persisted with the somewhat ridiculous line of argument that depots would be so inconvenient that not only would some people stop buying cans but "plenty" would still chuck them out of car windows.

The *News* did not follow through its strange logic by saying that, with the incentive of 5c a can, if there were piles of cans on the roadside, they would be quickly collected by other people. The *News* increased its earlier estimate of 7 per cent for can litter to between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. It then made the curious observation that the Government "is forgetting how can-orientated our society has become". This is the very core of the problem. Are we to become the sort of society that exists in Florida, where there are no returnable containers at all? I hope not! That is the reason why we must proceed now with this Bill, so that the industry can tune up to the legislation and so that we can get it into operation as soon as possible. Every day that we delay there are fewer and fewer returnable containers and more and more non-returnable containers.

The State of Oregon in America decided that it had had enough of the wasteful society when can usage reached 40 per cent. It could see what was ahead of it; if it did not act, it would become like Florida. That was why the industry in Oregon acted as it did. Many members opposite have referred to the claim that the legislation will increase the cost to the consumer. I totally reject that claim: it is a lie.

Mr. McAnaney: Prove it.

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite are so attuned to the South Australian Beverage Packaging and Distributing Liaison Committee that they cannot hear anything from the rest of the community. A Schweppes 13oz. (370 ml) returnable bottle costs 14c plus a 5c deposit, whereas a Schweppes 13oz. can costs 22c with no deposit. That proves that Opposition members who have made the ridiculous claim that the legislation will increase costs are utterly wrong. This point, if no other, proves how the Opposition is trying to find anything that can support the case of its principals, the South Australian Beverage Packaging and Distributing Liaison Committee; that committee is giving the Opposition instructions. I have collected all the advertisements that have been inserted in the daily press by the committee and it is clear from them that, even if one takes the most conservative price charged by the daily press for advertising on that level, the sum being spent in the campaign against the Government's Bill is vast; it is probably more than \$30 000 on advertising in the press. That indicates to me one reason why the *News* has changed its attitude, and I can only think from the way the Opposition has changed its attitude that the Liberal and Country League Party may well be receiving financial support from the committee.

Mr. BECKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I ask that the last remark be withdrawn. The member for Elizabeth made the remark to raise the ire of the Opposition: it is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order! No point of order is involved.

Mr. Becker: Yes, it is. He reflected on the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): At the outset, I say that I have made some statements in the past similar to those in the letter that every member received this evening from a person in the Netherby area, and I will refer to the letter later. I had intended to speak only about the litter situation as I saw it in another country when I was paid by industry and given the opportunity to go overseas; I will also refer to that matter later. However, as the member for Elizabeth stooped to the depth to which he did this evening, I wish to have incorporated in *Hansard* that what he has accused the L.C.L. of doing is untrue, and we deny it. The only benefit to any Opposition member (if it is a benefit) has been made public, namely, the sum of money paid to me to go overseas to enlighten myself and hope that I could enlighten others, including the public. The Government and the press had the same opportunity, and I will also refer to that matter later. The Party that sits in Government wrote letters to the wine industry giving a guarantee that, if money was paid to its Party, it would guarantee that there would be no Commonwealth impositions by way of taxation. That was obtaining money under false pretences.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a certain Bill, and extraneous remarks should not be made when discussing it.

Mr. EVANS: It was implied that my Party received a bribe behind the scenes to support a certain industry attitude, and there was no complaint at that stage. I could draw five other comparisons if members wish me to do so.

Mr. Gunn: Go ahead and do it.

Mr. EVANS: No, because the Speaker would rule me out of order.

The SPEAKER: Older!

Mr. EVANS: I could cite cases where people have paid money for protection. One, for instance, concerned a gambling Bill. I set out in the first instance to support the legislation publicly in literature I circulated in my district

two elections ago, saying that I supported having deposits on beverage and beer containers; in other words, carbonated drink and beer containers. The person who sent the letter to us asked me to support the Bill but said that we should make the deposit uniform, and not let just the beer or wine industry out. The reason why the Government will not attempt to make the deposit uniform is that it knows that its own union members would object to a 5c deposit on beer bottles; there is no other reason for it. The Government knows at the bottom of its heart that the wine industry until three weeks ago was to have an imposition placed on it.

The wine industry knew it, and through representation to the Minister, no doubt the Premier through the Industrial Development Branch, it said. "You will ruin the wine industry." What happened? The Minister pulled his head in. The Minister said on television that it would ruin the industry and place it in jeopardy. Regarding another television programme on channel 10, the Minister said that "education is silly". The Minister, with others, watched a run-through of the programme at channel 10, and the last words he said were "Education is silly".

Mr. Coumbe: What about that!

Mr. EVANS: There is no doubt in my mind about that point or that the Minister knows that the industry could be ruined. The Premier is going overseas to search for new industry, spending State money for eight weeks (he will look at other aspects. I admit), yet the Government is not willing to try another programme that has proved successful in other areas of the world in curing a problem and not creating others. I refer to the situation in Oregon, which is pertinent to the point, as we are attempting to adopt that State's legislation. Admittedly, Oregon has a deposit system on soft drink containers and a small deposit on beer containers. As the brewing industry there has so much power, it applied pressure on the Oregon Government and came up with a smart move for a 2c instead of a 5c deposit scheme. The Minister knows that as well as any other member does.

Mr. Mathwin: The member for Elizabeth knows it, too

Mr. EVANS: Let us look at how Oregon has achieved to a major degree a litter-free State, its sister State of Washington has also achieved this, but by different methods. Oregon, which has a population of about 2 100 000, enforces its laws more strictly than does any other State of the United States of America, even more strictly than Singapore, which has a population of about 2 000 000. Last year Oregon authorities prosecuted about 950 people for litter offences. The State of Washington has a population of about 3 500 000. The people in Oregon who were convicted of litter offences faced gaol terms of up to 233 days and fines of \$16 500. They also faced the problem of losing their driver's licence, fishing licence, boating licence, or hunting licence, which costs up to \$50 a season. The Oregon police authorities appointed 110 special police officers to police its national parks and reserves for litter offences and other offences against its conservation laws. During the school holidays cadets are employed by the Police Force to work on the beaches and in the parks, not to make charges but to advise people against littering and tell them what the law provides.

I should like now to refer to some statistics, because so often people rig certain matters in order to create a false impression so that they can gain some advantage after. The Highways Department in Oregon spent \$505 211 on litter collection in 1966-67; in 1967-68 it spent only \$239 306; and in 1968-69 expenditure in this direction

decreased to \$158 845. When it was intended to introduce legislation dealing with containers, the authorities said, "Have a look at our highways. They are an unsightly mess, full of litter." In 1969-70, expenditure on litter collecting amounted to \$332 523; in 1971-72 it was \$501 311; and in the 1972-73 fiscal year it amounted to \$560 339. For that calendar year, the expenditure amounted to about \$650 000, and this year it will be more than \$800 000. Despite that, the Minister said that in Oregon litter was cleaned up as a result of the bottle legislation. But what about the increase in expenditure on litter collection from about \$332 000 in 1969-70 to \$800 000 just four years later? Why did much more money have to be spent on picking up litter if the degree of litter was decreased by the bottle legislation? That statement is automatically proven false. If one needs further proof of this, one need, only refer to the statement made by Oregon's Director of Transportation (Mr. G. M. Baldwin), as follows:

In the fiscal year 1968-69, we spent \$158 845 picking up highway litter, and the public clamoured for more attention to highway litter, writing letters by the hundreds. So the legislature authorized more highway funds for litter pick-ups. During the next fiscal year, the cost of litter clean-up rose to \$332 523. The cost climbed to \$589 076 the following year, the highest in the State's history.

Later, he said:

Last year, the fiscal year 1972-73, we spent more than \$600 000 picking up other people's litter along Oregon's beautiful highways.

That statement was made only 15 months after the legislation had been in operation. On top of that, others have expressed real concern about the real effect of the bottle Bill. There is no doubt that the State's popular Governor, Mr. Tom McCall, who is a former radio commentator, gains much publicity and is able to get the message across. I make that point, because in South Australia in 1967 the Premier was able to save much water in this State by undertaking a publicity and education campaign. However, we have not heard one word from him or the Minister of Environment and Conservation regarding the control of litter. Both those gentlemen make attacks on and blame industry or someone else. No real attempt has been made to educate the people by, say, a single television programme or a series of programmes, as happened in 1967.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Kesab has been running them for several years.

Mr. EVANS: That is so, and the Government gives it only \$5 000 a year. However it has seen fit to spend \$600 000 on restaurants this year. Where, therefore, do the Government's priorities lie? Indeed, the Government has spent over \$800 000 on restaurants, as the expenditure of \$166 000 was announced recently. That is where the Government's priorities lie: it would sooner spend that sort of money on eating houses instead of trying to combat litter. Of course, one does not know what sort of revenue these eating houses produce for the Government (we are not told), but it is the public's money that is being spent in this way.

In Oregon, youth is employed on this work in three programmes. I refer to the work of the Oregon Youth Patrol, the Oregon Litter Youth Patrol, and the Federal Neighbourhood Youth Corps. The first organization is financed by the sale in that State of special environment plates for motor cars at a cost of \$25. One can use any letters one likes on the plate, such as one's own name, and those letters become the vehicle's registration number. The sum of \$90 000 was received in this respect from environment-conscious people, and the money was spent by

employing youths, at \$1.75 an hour, during their school vacations. A total of 140 persons was employed on that programme in two five-week sessions during the year. On top of that, two other groups of people were employed, one federal and one State. Although I could not ascertain the details, I understand that between 600 and 800 youths out of a population of only 2 100 000 people were employed on those programmes. If a person was found guilty of littering, he could be sent out on the roads to pick up litter, and such a person had to wear on his arm a band bearing the letters "L.P." (meaning litter pick-up). There is nothing wrong with that approach.

Oregon has achieved an environmentally satisfactory situation by many means, although I believe the end result could have been achieved without the introduction of the bottle Bill. I make that point, because I originally believed in deposits on all containers. However, when one looks at the problem created by the other litter (be it 40 per cent, 60 per cent or 80 per cent of all litter) one realizes that we must try to cure the attitude of people in this respect. After all, there are other types of litter, so why should we not try and deal with the whole lot in one approach? I say that so that people know where I stand on the matter of litter and solid waste disposal, both of which are interwoven. We must have an education programme and be willing to contribute to it more than the meagre \$5 000 a year that is given to Kesab. I do not wish to reflect on the Adelaide City Council, but one can go through the city on a Saturday or Sunday night, particularly the latter, and see that nearly all the litter bins close to Hindley Street, North Terrace or King William Street are overflowing. They are not cleaned out and there are not enough of them. Also, last Saturday evening litter could be found around the one litter bin on the Mount Barker Road between the Toll Gate and the Old Mountain Hut. In this respect we have shirked our responsibility in not providing sufficient facilities. A member just said as he was leaving the Chamber that my Party had also shirked its responsibilities. I believe it did shirk its responsibilities in the past, just as the A.L.P. did. I do not think that anyone was really worried about the litter problem until recently. In fact, that is the problem. The Government has encouraged industry to come here, the Premier being one of the greatest offenders, if it can be called an offence to encourage industries to come here. We have not worried about the end result of this policy. However, now industry has started to worry about the end result. Perhaps it is frightened that legislation will be introduced, but only industry at this time has worried about the problem. The Government has not worried about it; it has not accepted its responsibility. The Government has tried to put the blame on someone else, when the problem is with the individual and not with the article. People can litter and people can stop littering; that is how this problem must be dealt with.

I now wish to deal with the matter of solid waste. I have handed around the submission that I will make on this matter to the Commonwealth inquiry. I believe we should have a full investigation into the way this matter should be bandied; we should investigate which system uses up the most resources. I know that the first reaction is that the non-refillable container uses the most resources. However, I should like that proved by a study, and an independent investigation has not been carried out anywhere in the world. When I say "independent", I mean it. I know that industry may have attempted to make such an investigation, but people will not accept that as being unbiased. Environmentalists have tried to make a study, but people will not accept the results, either, because

they believe they will be biased. We need to have an investigation made that will be accepted by both groups. The extra weight factor is involved, an aluminium can being 22 times lighter than a refillable bottle of the same capacity. Therefore, if 10 tons (10.1 t) of aluminium cans were taken to Ceduna, refillable bottles of similar capacity would weigh 220 tons (223.5 t), the energy used being considerably more.

Reference has been made to depots. Fuel is used in this way when a person obtains containers from a shop and then has to go to the depot as well as back to the shop. The extra fuel involved may not be considerable, and in the end the refillable bottle system may prove to produce the greatest savings of resources, compared to the non-refillable container system. No-one has yet carried out a study into this matter, and I find that annoying. I now wish to refer to the State of Washington. That was the only State in which at the one meeting I met representatives of industry and of the environment department. There was no animosity or ill-feeling between them. In that State, industry pays \$150 on every \$1 000 000 turnover of an article at three points: first, at the manufacturer level; secondly, at the wholesale or distributor level; and thirdly, at the retail level. That money is used successfully for the educational programme in that State.

In addition, the use of litter bags in motor vehicles is enforced. I have stated before publicly that I support that practice, and I still support it. Fines may be imposed in Washington State, but there is no power to gaoil people, and no gaoil sentences have been imposed. Business enterprises are obligated to have within close proximity of their establishment suitable trash cans (we call them garbage cans) to accommodate the amount of litter likely to be created by that business enterprise. I believe that it is a fair law that a shopkeeper or other business proprietor should have a garbage can of suitable size alongside his store to hold the litter that is likely to be disposed of in that area. Reference has been made to depots at which containers can be returned, and in this connection I refer to the State of Alberta. I do not believe that anyone would like a depot next to his house or close to it. The only depots that I saw were dirty, untidy and a disgrace to the environment. At the time I was in that State it was snowing, so I cannot tell what the general litter position was, and I will not attempt to praise or condemn that State with regard to the environment. However, I believe that litter depots would be unacceptable in many parts of this State. We have flies and cockroaches, and Alberta does not have them to nearly the same extent. We have much hotter weather on average, so that depots would present a real problem here. In addition, the average man would find it inconvenient to have to line up and wait at a depot, and it actually happens in Alberta that many people have to wait.

I should like to know why the Minister sent people, at the expense of the taxpayers, to the State of Oregon. Did he send them to report back on all aspects of the problem and to try to find an alternative to the system in Oregon, or did they go there simply to report on how to put into action here the Oregon legislation? We believe that they were sent there merely to see how the Oregon legislation was operating, and that they did not look at any other legislation operating throughout the world. I travelled through these States of Oregon and Washington by bus and car, and I could see no difference environmentally between them. I do not criticize Dr. Inglis for his comments to the Commonwealth inquiry that there is a vast difference. If one went to one State

on the day that its litter was cleaned up, that State would be clean. If one went to the other State when the litter had not been picked up, it would not be clean, and that position applies in reverse.

We must consider that Washington State has industries such as the Boeing company, whereas the Oregon State has mainly fishing, hunting, and similar enterprises, but there is no doubt that, on the smaller roads and in the country generally, both States are environmentally clean. I believe that throughout America the country is reasonably clean—cleaner than this country. Overall the people are more environmentally conscious than are the people of this State, particularly in regard to litter. In South Australia we are apathetic and have tended to blame someone else. In at least 20 States in America a person can be gaoled for littering, and this policy is enforced in a few States. Oregon is the strictest State of all. I understand that in three other States people have been gaoled, but for the more serious offences.

I wish to refer briefly to the United Kingdom, whose population is about 54 000 000. In that country, I saw Mr. Harry Pryce, of the environment department, who is in charge of the section dealing with solid waste and litter. He has carried out a complete survey. I have given his name to the member for Peake, who is going overseas. Any member who goes there should have a yarn with him. In the United Kingdom, all aspects of the matter have been considered, and at the time they had decided not to have deposit provisions. There has now been a change of Government, and I do not know whether there has been a change of heart, but when I was there the relevant Bill was before the House of Commons and the second reading explanation had been given. I concede that the names I have given to the member for Peake are largely people on the industrial side. I make no apology for this. If one goes to environment departments, one usually meets only one person. When I went to industry, naturally I was put in touch with as many industry people as possible.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You had your mind made up before you went.

Mr. EVANS: I did not. I gave no guarantee that I would support industry. The people who sent me know where I stand now, and I will explain that to the Minister. I intended not to give industry a report on my findings. However, at the end of the first week of my trip, I sent back one report. After that, I changed my mind and sent back no more reports. One copy of the report I sent back went to a person at the *Advertiser*. Afterwards I checked what was in the report and found that some of the material was not correct. I have not used that material, and no-one else has used it. That is the only report I made to industry on the trip. In addition, I told industry that, if education, the supply of equipment, and the enforcement of the law did not eliminate the problem in relation to litter (whether cans, bottles, plastic containers, or cardboard containers), I would support legislation to provide for deposits or banning some containers. I say that clearly and without doubt.

Although a Commonwealth inquiry is being held at present, no member of the Government is willing to wait and see what it has to report. That inquiry has on it four members representing the Australian Labor Party, two representing the Liberal Party, and one representing the Country Party, so that Labor has the balance in its favour. The Dunstan Government is not prepared even to wait and see what the Commonwealth inquiry has to

say through Dr. Jenkins, for whom most people have respect, certainly more respect than they have for the Minister on this issue.

I myself have said in the past that we need to tackle the problem of the container. I am not saying I will not support deposits in the long term but we have not taken any notice of the Jordan report, which has been available for two years; the Government has not accepted even one proposal to spend money on education. It will spend money on other things; it has upgraded grants to other people in the State. It has spent money to enable people to go overseas to encourage industry to come here, but on education and research on this matter it has spent nothing it is just an emotional thing for Government members as a Party. This Bill is a public relations exercise, because the Government Party resolved at its annual conference to introduce deposits on all containers.

Let the wine, dairying, and plastic industries all be assured that, if the Australian Labor Party stays in power, they will be next. The member for Elizabeth is fighting for it, and he is the greatest believer in it. That is the intention. I refer to John Waggoner, in Oregon, who is on the environmental council there. He made the point that that is the intention of his organization in Oregon. He is the architect of the Bill there, he wants deposits on containers of all shapes and sizes—and that is the opinion of the member for Elizabeth. Even if he thinks we can accept that, I do not believe it is possible to accept it. We must tackle the problem from the beginning.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support some of the aspects of the Bill. I thank the member for Elizabeth for saying in his speech that I had committed myself to one side or the other. It is obvious, from the time he has spent in the Chamber, that he does not know who has spoken and who has not. He attacked me, even though I had not opened my mouth at that stage. However, he changed my mind on one aspect; he enlightened me on one point. I refer in particular to the scourge of South Australia—non-returnable bottles. I have attacked them consistently over many years, ever since they were introduced into this State. They were attacked by a previous State Governor (Sir Edric Bastyan) who called the beer bottle the “brown Australian daisy”, and he made some great speeches on this matter some years ago.

Local government, as the Minister well knows, is concerned about this aspect of pollution, and particularly does it concern the seaside councils, in areas where young children on the beaches are often maimed by broken bottles, etc. Some councils, when they lease kiosks on the sea-front, stipulate in the lease that the lessee, if he purchases non-returnable bottled drinks, shall not have his lease renewed when it expires. It is obvious that several councils, particularly the seaside councils, have had to face up to this problem for many years.

More recently, we have been confronted with another type of container—the tin or the can. I am amazed that, after so many months and so many announcements by the Government, the Premier, and the Minister over the years, this Bill does not attack the problem of litter, danger, and pollution. We should expect a better Bill than this one, which merely provides, in clause 1:

This Act may be cited as the “Beverage Container Act, 1974”.

That is all we get. We have had announcements over the years by the Government. One such announcement stated:

Ecology “think tank” for South Australia.

Is this Bill the work of the think tank, the brilliant brainwave that the think tank has produced for this State?

The announcement continued:

The Government is working on the establishment of an environmental research institute to provide information that could be sold interstate and overseas.

Is this the best the think tank can do after all this time? Let us go back a few years to 1970 and see what announcements were made by the Government through press statements. In the *News* of November 16, 1970, we read:

The Government to act on litter. The Government was examining the possible introduction of on-the-spot fines for litterbugs, the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today. "We may have to for people who constantly disregard the law," he said. Mr. Dunstan said the Government's study was not taking as a guide any existing system of on-the-spot litter fines. But a method used in some American States was among those being looked at. The Premier said he was not generally happy with any form of on-the-spot fines. Mr. Dunstan was commenting on a one-day conference on litter prevention held in Melbourne at the week-end. The conference, attended by delegates from all States, decided to ask Federal and State Governments to spend more money on litter prevention. Mr. Dunstan said today the South Australian Government was most concerned and aware of the litter problem and was taking part in its prevention. An anti-litter campaign had been held earlier this year in conjunction with National Tourist Week.

As I said earlier, tourism in this State is a sick word, because the Government's record in tourism is the lowest in Australia; in fact, it is an absolute disgrace. A further press announcement states:

South Australia is to help in the setting up of a national body to campaign against litter.

The Commonwealth Government was also taking a hand in it in 1970 when, in the *Advertiser* of November 17, we read:

On-the-spot fines possible. The State Government is examining whether litterbugs should be made to pay on-the-spot fines. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday that, generally, he was not happy with any form of on-the-spot penalty, but this action might be necessary for people who constantly disregard the law.

So there are on-the-spot fines, and the Government knows all about this. We read in the *Advertiser* of June 15, 1971:

On-the-spot fines for litter supported. The State Government will consider legislation for on-the-spot fines for depositing litter.

So in 1971 the Labor Party Government was talking about on-the-spot fines. What happened? Nothing at all. When the Government comes up with a Bill, it gets cold feet. The member for Elizabeth was kind enough to read a statement I made some time ago. I would have read this statement myself, because I am not ashamed of it, and it states:

Glenelg MP Mr. John Mathwin this week said the sale of non-returnable bottles should be banned.

I believe they should be banned, because of the trouble, hardship, and injury they cause particularly to young people. My association with councils and my position as President of the Surf Life Saving Association for two years have given me an insight into this problem on our beaches. The report quoted by the member for Elizabeth also states:

Mr. Broomhill said the environment council was investigating the matter. "No decision is likely to be reached before the recommendation of that committee is received," he added.

Apparently, this is another committee report that we have not received in Parliament. We do not know the contents of the report and how it suggested to the Government that it should tackle this problem, because it is another secret report held by this supposedly open Government. A further report in the *Advertiser* states:

Men littered nearly twice as much as women, a Commonwealth inquiry was told yesterday.

The report continues:

The executive director of the council (Mr. J. D. Honeysett) said he had visited the United States late last year to examine the effects of legislation to reduce litter. He did not think any of the schemes should be introduced in Australia. Mr. Honeysett said the council believed a national organization of Governments, industry, consumers and retailers should be established to examine the whole problem of solid waste management and conservation of resources.

Apparently, this is not a secret committee, because it suggests that we should consider the whole problem and not only one aspect of it. After many press announcements, the Minister, when introducing this Bill, did not provide for members his second reading explanation. He asked that it be incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading it, so that we did not have the privilege of hearing what he had to say. Apparently, the Minister thought that it was not important enough for members but that it should be placed in *Hansard* for people to read if they wished. I believe that this Minister and the Government get cold feet when they have to face an environmental problem such as this. From what I have read, on-the-spot fines are successful in countries in which they operate. If we have to control litter bugs, why not fine people on the spot if they throw rubbish about?

Mr. Payne: What about Queensland, where they have this legislation?

Mr. MATHWIN: In Singapore on-the-spot fines of \$40 or \$100 are imposed, and this system has been most successful. The Minister knows of this: even if he has not travelled overseas, many of his colleagues have had that pleasure. As I do not have much confidence in an educational programme, I agree with the Minister on that aspect. We spend much money trying to educate people to stop killing each other on our roads, but that educational programme is not really effective. However, I understand that industry is willing to support a programme of educating society and to spend \$X on this operation. I am willing to let that system be tried for a time, as it may prove that the Minister is wrong and that people can be educated. We should take this chance to allow manufacturers to show what they have in mind, provided that they get on with the job.

I do not disagree to the suggestion made by the member for Torrens that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. First, it is a shame that the Government has taken little notice of the Jordan report. Secondly, I believe the offer by manufacturers to help should be accepted and, thirdly, I believe this Bill is inadequate to control the problem, especially following the Government's indications of what we should expect in relation to this matter.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the Bill because of what it will do for the environment of South Australia. I would not have spoken in this debate had it not been for some of the remarks made by Opposition members. Little has been left for them to say after the excellent contribution of the member for Elizabeth, who hit hard on the raw and went to the meat of the matter. I can understand why Opposition members took some umbrage at what he said, because it is embarrassing to be unmasked, and that is what happened this evening.

Opposition members have not had the courage during this debate to state clearly where they stand in this matter: we have had the old 20c each way throughout. Many times during the debate Government members, by interjection, have asked Opposition members to state clearly where they stand on several issues, but each time the challenge has not been accepted. Members

opposite do not want to be seen coming out and opposing the deposit system, yet they do not want to be seen promoting the deposit system, for obvious reasons.

During the debate Government members have been able to glean one or two facts about the philosophy of members opposite. First, Opposition members agree with the Government and people generally in South Australia that we have a litter problem and a problem with non-returnable containers. Secondly, they are all enthusiastic conservationists: they are all against pollution. Thirdly, they are all supporters of recycling our resources; they believe that this is in the best interests of the State. The one point that has struck members on this side is that, despite supporting the three principles I have referred to, the fourth proposition from the Opposition is that the Opposition will not be a party to doing anything about litter. The member for Elizabeth has clearly pointed out the change of opinion that has taken place in the minds of some members opposite. We do not know why they have changed their minds: we can only suspect. I would like the members concerned to point out what has motivated their change of mind.

I now want to point out the inconsistencies in the arguments of the Opposition. When I refer to the Opposition, I do not include the member for Mitcham, who does not always say things with which I agree. However, on this occasion he said something very sensible. He said that members of the Liberal and Country League have no idea where they stand; or, if they have such an idea, they do not have the courage to state where they stand. At no time have Opposition members stated their philosophy on what is proposed in regard to non-returnables.

Mr. Coumbe: The member for Mitcham also supported a Select Committee.

Mr. KENEALLY: I did not agree with everything he said. I said that much of what he said made sense, but that does not mean that all he said made good sense. One of the points laboured by Opposition members is that, to use the words of the member for Torrens, this Bill is a panacea for all the problems, from the Government's viewpoint. Actually, it is not that. In his second reading explanation, which members opposite did not read, the Minister said:

We may not be said to be tackling the problem piecemeal, as this legislation is only the first stage.

That is fairly simple language and fairly easy to understand, but it is obviously way above the heads of Opposition members. The Minister's explanation continues:

We intend to introduce further legislation specifically to cover the problems of litter throughout the State and waste disposal of all kinds, particularly within the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Is that very difficult to understand? What is so complex about that Members opposite denied that that was the Government's policy and they denied that the Government had any intention of doing that. They suggested that the Government believed that introducing legislation for deposits on non-returnable containers was the only action that should be taken, but their suggestion is rot. This is the first action we will take, but there will be many other actions to follow. It would be far better if the Opposition supported what we are doing, because the Opposition has already been informed that this is only the first step. Opposition members should support the Government's initiative instead of stating that this is all the Government is going to do and instead of trying to hang their cloak on that nail, when they know it is untrue.

Mr. Nankivell: What else are you going to do?

Mr. KENEALLY: I should imagine that, even in the honourable member's precarious position, he may be a member of this House long enough to see a number of items that the Government will introduce. However, I do not say that all of his colleagues will have such a tenure in this House. The honourable member will be present when the Government continues to introduce environmental legislation for the good of the State over the next 12 years, based on the prediction of the member for Goyder.

The Opposition is opposed to deposits on cans, but it supports the present deposit system on soft drink bottles. I have heard members say that to put a deposit on cans is taxing the kids. Shocking! The Government should be ashamed of itself! Yet those same members are happy to see cool drink bottles with a 5c deposit! They do not believe that that is taxing the kids! They do not believe that the Government should be ashamed of that. Indeed, they support it. What is so remarkable about cans that there should not be a deposit on them? Why should members opposite promote the interests of the can industry to the disadvantage of the glass industry? Clearly, the Opposition has its priorities all wrong. It is confused and inconsistent.

Because deposits are applied to bottles without affecting the sales of bottles, I can see no reason why the same thing should not apply to cans. Members opposite say that we have no real knowledge whether this legislation will succeed and that we do not accept the recommendations of the Jordan committee. However, in saying that, they are forgetting, of course, that two members of the Jordan committee have recently supported the legislation that the Government sponsors. Opposition members cannot point to even one committee member who says that the present legislation is not sound, yet they continue to refer to the Jordan committee as an authority. It is possible that committee members, in the 12 months since they issued their report, have accepted that what the Government is doing is for the benefit of South Australia.

Mr. Nankivell: What did members of the committee say?

Mr. KENEALLY: The committee's recommendations were made to the Government 12 months ago. A decision about cans needs to be made right now. The honourable member well knows that 100 000 000 non-returnable cans are sold in South Australia annually, and the figure for the whole of Australia is about 1 500 000 000. Yet Opposition members try to tell us that this is not a problem of great proportions! Actually, the figures are increasing each year, because non-returnable containers are grabbing a higher percentage of the market, all the time. The Opposition knows that about 100 000 000 cans a year are not being returned in South Australia. In 10 years time, about 1 000 000 000 cans will be spread over the length and breadth of the State. If any member believes that this is not a problem of great proportion, I challenge him to go to Port Augusta, observe the rubbish along the side of the road, and see how much of this rubbish comprises cans and non-returnable beer bottles. The member for Frome said, by way of interjection earlier this evening, that all the other refuse, such as cardboard, papers, etc., blows away, and that is correct. Undoubtedly there is a problem with other litter, but the Government, which has already expressed its concern about this matter, will be doing something about it in the future.

Opposition members say they believe that all litter problems must be lumped together, but they do not believe that that is its only argument to delay the introduction of the legislation. The Opposition does not

have the courage to say that it opposes the introduction of a deposit system, or that it supports the littering of South Australia with cans, or that the manufacturers of these non-returnable containers have a responsibility to the community to help solve this problem. The Opposition wants the Government to finance the implementation of this legislation, but it is not interested in the people who make enormous profits out of cans at the expense of the community and those children the Opposition says we would be taxing. The member for Elizabeth has already pointed this out, but I will repeat some information that clearly indicates the morality of can manufacturers and what they are doing to the people of the State.

A 13oz bottle of cool drink costs 14c. plus a 5c deposit, making 19c. The deposit is recoverable on returning the bottle to where it was purchased. A 13oz. bottle would cost 14c if the bottle was returned but, if the bottle was not returned, a child around the corner would collect the 5c deposit. A 13oz. can of the same drink costs 22c, that is, 8c more than the 13oz bottle. Who is robbing whom? Who is protecting whom? Who is taxing the children in the community? Who are the honourable people in this matter of 22c for a 13oz. drink in a can, compared to 14c for a 13oz. drink in a bottle? How can the Opposition defend that? It can put forward no argument.

Dr. Eastick: Aren't soft drinks under price control?

Mr. Venning: What would it cost the Government to market the stuff?

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: For the first time since I have been a member of the House I find myself agreeing with the member for Rocky River: he is confused by what I am saying, and I am equally confused by what he is saying. With canned drinks one pays more and gets less.

Dr. Eastick: Who fixes cool drink prices?

Mr. KENEALLY: One other argument the Opposition is keen to promote—

Mr. Dean Brown: You accuse us of not answering interjections, but you don't, either.

Mr KENEALLY: If the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs agrees with that principle, that does not make it any better: that what the Opposition is supporting is taking advantage of the children it was so keen to protect earlier in the debate. Another argument promoted this evening is that cans make up only about 10 per cent of the litter problem; estimates range between 6 8 per cent and 15 per cent, but it is 10 per cent on average. I have consistently asked members who promote that theory to say what is their unit of measurement: whether the 10 per cent is in single items such as empty cans, lolly wrappers, cigarette boxes or sheets of newspaper; or whether it is total weight or total volume. However, I did not receive even one reply. I asked that question of every member who spoke prior to the member for Glenelg speaking. As I was not sure what the member for Glenelg was saying, I could not ask him the same question. It would not have been fair. No member was willing to give me a reply, even though the Opposition is trying to give the impression this evening that it is the fount of all wisdom where litter is concerned. The Opposition knows the statistics, yet when it is asked to clarify them its members ignore the request. They do not know

Mr. Coumbe: Do you have the answer?

Mr. KENEALLY: It is indicated in the Minister's second reading explanation. I am speaking this evening to answer some of the inconsistent arguments the Opposition has put forward. It was interesting to see the difference

in attitude in the speeches made before the member for Elizabeth spoke and those made subsequently. This leads me to comment on the contribution to the debate of the member for Fisher. One would have thought that, as a man well versed in the whole subject of non-returnables, he would have been given the opportunity to lead the debate for the Opposition. That would have given him ample opportunity to expand on his wide range of experience and knowledge of the systems overseas, and he would not have had to condense his wide knowledge into the 30 minutes allowed I wondered why he was not given this opportunity but, having heard him speak, I know that wiser counsel than mine prevailed: the Opposition knew that it was in its best interests that he not lead the debate. A period of 30 minutes was enough for him to be allowed.

Mr. Payne: The skids were put under him.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. Accusations have been made that the Government is unwilling to research this subject. I ask the House what research is needed to be done when we already know that 100 000 000 cans are let loose throughout the State each year, that this number will increase each year, and that within 10 years the number will grow to 1 000 000 000 with the natural increase to be expected. If non-returnable containers are allowed to expand at the current rate, up to 200 000 000 cans will be let loose each year. What sort of research is needed to prove that? The statistics are available and the answer is there if the Opposition is willing to view the legislation honestly. However, the Opposition is not willing to accept the legislation I wonder why, because it has not been clearly indicated yet Other speakers are yet to come and it might be like good wine—the best lot will be left until last. If the best contribution has been made, however, it was a sorry lot indeed.

Comment has been made on the value of on-the-spot fines. Earlier in the debate no member was willing to be tied down to supporting such a principle. However, as the debate progressed, some members were willing to say that they supported on-the-spot fines, and the member for Glenelg was enthusiastic about this whole matter. Because the honourable member likes to think of himself as an innovator who introduces private members' Bills that he believes are for the good of the State, I challenge him to introduce a Bill providing for the imposition of on-the-spot fines. He said that this had proved effective in oversea countries; undoubtedly, his knowledge of those countries is greater than mine. The *News* of October 10, 1973, contained a report on the evidence given to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation by a representative of the Queensland Government, Mr. Robert Hoare, part of which report was as follows:

The Queensland Government believed that, if the proposal for a minimum deposit were introduced, it should be given a fair trial. Mr. Robert Hoare, a planning officer in the Queensland Co-ordinator-General's Department, told the committee that on-the-spot fines for littering had not worked well in Queensland. The local authorities had found that the cost out-weighed the returns they got from fines

It is indeed surprising to see a member of the Opposition out of step with Mr. Bjelke-Petersen. I suspect that that is a position in which Opposition members would often like to find themselves, but that does not happen much. It has also been suggested that, in introducing this legislation, the Government has not considered the average man in the street. Members opposite like to think they are speaking

for the man in the sheet. The member for Fisher says that he speaks for the num in the street. Indeed, I think he has the only man in the street in his district!

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: So does the member for Alexandra!

Mr. KENEALLY: That is so. On March 19, a petition was circulated in one of this State's colleges of advanced education

Mr. Coumbe: That was yesterday.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is interesting. Although the petition was not taken or promoted right around the college. 402 people signed it in the first six hours. I do not know whether one could say that that is an indicator of the feeling in the community. Although arguments on both sides of this matter have been advanced to me. This would seem to be a fair indication of where the community stands on the matter. The non-returnable bottle or can, particularly the latter, is a new phenomenon and is not traditional in this State or, indeed, in Australia generally. When it was first introduced, everyone thought it was convenient; no-one denies that. However, when we have to balance convenience against the environment (and, therefore, against what we must do regarding the State in which we live), are we to plump for convenience. or for the good of the State? As members represent the whole State, I do not think they have a choice; they cannot come down on the side of convenience, as Opposition members would have us do. They want us to come down on the side of vested interests

Mr. McAnaney: Keep off that.

Mr. KENEALLY: This seems to be a sore point. The member for Alexandra said this evening that interjections from Government members would not stop him from speaking up for those he represents, and, of course, that is the can industry. That is the industry for which he spoke tonight. I have not heard one Opposition member condemn him for saying that, and one may infer from that absence of condemnation that Opposition members support what he said. If they do not, Opposition members can then say that, although the member for Alexandra spoke for the canning industry and advanced facts presented to him by that industry, which also perhaps wrote his speech for him, that does not apply to them. Opposition members will have that opportunity, and I challenge them to say this in clear, unequivocal terms.

Dr. Eastick: Even those who have already spoken?

Mr. KENEALLY: It may be difficult for them to do so. However, the Leader can ask the member for Davenport, when he speaks, to do him a favour and say, "The Leader rejects totally the attitude and sentiments expressed by the member for Alexandra." Of course, the Leader has changed his mind many times on this matter, and perhaps he has done so again tonight since he spoke.

Mr. McAnaney: Have you changed your mind?

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member can if he so desires, read *Hansard* later to see what I have said. In that respect, I must thank *Hansard* for the work that it does on my speeches; it certainly makes them read better than I imagine they sound. I have been informed that one manufacturer has on its bottles the words "Not to be refilled. Dispose of properly." That is an educational approach. What the whole argument is about, as the member for Elizabeth and, by interjection, the member for Mitchell said, is that we are talking about an industry that thrives on non-returnable containers, and it can achieve its cheapest unit cost by pushing through its product in great volumes, but what is the ultimate result?

Mr Payne: Don't bring it back!

Mr. KENEALLY: Don't bring it back; pollute the countryside! I ask Opposition members seriously to consider this matter, and I hope that in future they will take a more responsible attitude and reject the sentiments expressed by their colleagues who have already spoken.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): The member for Stuart said he hoped that the speeches, like wine, would get sweeter, but I hope that we get all the pips out of the wine; we certainly got the pip from his contribution! This evening's debate has involved more politics than one would have imagined possible before the debate began. It seems that it is a question not of what is the sensible thing to do but of what is the emotional thing to do and how much mileage can be gamed for the Government. In the electorate, the Government could be seen to be interested in cleaning up bottles and cans on the sides of our loads. However, this is obviously only the tip of the iceberg. The Opposition believes that, if the Jordan report is not considered to be sufficient, it would be much more sensible if a report was received from experts throughout the country. We could, for instance, rely on the report of the Commonwealth Parliament Standing Committee. We should then take a deep look at the whole matter of pollution.

However, this evening's debate has been an emotional one, charged with a tremendous amount of politics, especially as the Government believes that this legislation will give it a tremendous boost in the electorate. Whether this is the correct step that will achieve the greatest good at this time is another matter entirely. The member for Elizabeth reminds me of a fighter who is willing to jab a number of times under the belt and then skip through the ropes. He has been in and out of the House, he has sat in his seat and almost every other seat, he has been in the gallery, he has been at the door, he has been outside, he has been silent and he has spoken, he has walked about and been still. I do not think I have ever seen anyone so unsettled and agitated after making a speech. If a member makes what he believes to be sound contribution to a debate, he is able to sit back in his seat and relax.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should come back to the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE: With due respect, Sir, I do not think I have strayed from the provisions any further than the member for Elizabeth strayed from them. The member for Elizabeth quoted what various people had said, but I am sure that they would not agree with the interpretation he put on their remarks. In looking at pollution, we should consider the advice of experts and the experience in dealing with this problem in other parts of the world. We should work out precisely where we are going; we should not pick out one part of the problem. When we have considered the matter thoroughly, it will be time to start taking action. We should not commence by taking piecemeal action to attack the tip of the iceberg.

Because of the emotion and politics involved, it has been hard this evening to take a clear look at the total problem. It is no compliment to the Government that it has introduced legislation that relates to only a small part of the problem. In view of the small sums spent on educating the public about the litter problem, there has been a good response by the public. Recently, as I have travelled along the Princes Highway, I have been encouraged to see that the receptacles recently provided by the Highways Department have been continually full and overflowing. I am pleased that people are pulling up at these strategic places along the road and depositing litter from their cars into these roadside containers. If the public has responded in this way to the small programme proceeded with so far, how will

people respond to a larger programme, with much more extravagant advertising and with many more receptacles provided, signs displayed, and so on?

I understand that in Singapore 7 000 bins have been scattered around the city. I do not think that a programme of anything like that size has been embarked on in this State. We would be surprised to see how people would react if these facilities were provided. Although environmentalists and conservationists have injected much emotion into discussions on this matter and although they are doing much work in this field, I believe we should take a wider view, dealing with the whole problem and not just one part of it. In Singapore in the last five years pollution generally has been tackled. The report readily available to members shows that since 1968 incredible progress has been made. In 1968, the "Keep Singapore Clean" programme was launched. Each year special emphasis has been placed on certain aspects, such as "Keep Singapore Clean and Mosquito Free" and "Keep Singapore Clean and Pollution Free". Various programmes lasting from a fortnight to a month have been launched.

The people of this city have become conscious of the tremendous pollution problem they face. As their climate is humid, they face a greater problem than we face in this country. In Singapore, a large programme has been embarked on to educate people to keep their city clean. Surely this is something that we can emulate in this country. We must look at the pollution problem in its entirety and not attack one aspect. We have plenty of information available, and we can learn from the experience of other countries. The success of various policies in those countries should encourage us to introduce wide-ranging programmes here. There is no need to go about this in a piecemeal way, creating a hardship for one section of the community.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I listened with interest this evening to the speeches made by the two Government members who have spoken. I was trying to find out why the Government had decided to put the cart before the horse in this matter. Although those members spoke briefly about the Jordan report, they did not really say why it was decided to reverse the order of priorities set out in that report and proceed with container deposits, rather than first implement a system of education followed by on-the-spot fines. An education programme to be followed by on-the-spot fines would attack the whole problem. The Government accepts that the proposal in the Bill for container deposits will have an effect on only about 10 per cent of the total litter volume. There will not be much appreciable difference in the situation if we cater for only 10 per cent of the problem. Clause 4 of the Bill provides:

"beverage" means—

- (a) brandy, gin, rum, whisky, cordials containing spirits, wine, cider, perry, mead, ale, porter, beer, or any other spirituous, malt, vinous or fermented liquors;
- (b) any carbonated soft drinks or waters;
- or
- (c) any liquid intended for human consumption by drinking, declared by regulation to be a beverage for the purposes of this Act

That leaves the Bill very wide indeed and at this stage the Minister has not indicated publicly whether this includes fruit juices. The member for Kavel canvassed the situation of the wine industry and the fact that the Government has already made a statement to the effect that it will grant the wine industry an exemption from the provisions of this Bill. However, paragraph (c) of that

definition of "beverage" is virtually all-embracing and, to the best of my knowledge, the Minister has made no statement on canned fruit juices.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We're not doing anything in relation to the present system applying to canned juices.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am grateful for that comment from the Minister, but the Bill as presented to us enables the Government at any time it desires by regulation to include any liquid intended for human consumption. So, while the Minister does not intend to include fruit juices at this stage, the Government has the power to do so at any time it likes.

I will now refer to a few comments that Berri Fruit Juices has made. Undoubtedly, the member for Elizabeth considers I am representing vested interests once again if he regards the 2 000 fruitgrowers that constitute Berri Fruit Juices as being another big set-up with vested interests; if he thinks that, well and good, but I assure him that those 2 000 fruitgrowers are not making a fortune out of canned products.

I point to some of the matters raised by the management of Berri Fruit Juices when presenting the situation to the Minister on behalf of the 2 000 growers. It was pointed out to the Minister that 50 per cent of the citrus produced in South Australia has to be processed to be marketed, and the other 50 per cent is marketed fresh. This leaves about 30 000 tons (30 480 t) of fruit that is processed annually into fruit juice and canned; it represents 30 000 000 cans that are produced annually by Berri Fruit Juices. At a deposit rate of 5c a can, that works out at a total deposit of \$1 500 000 annually on the cans produced by that one organization. Having to find an additional \$1 500 000 to purchase that firm's products must, if the Minister includes their products in this Bill, have a bearing on consumption by the public.

The company goes into much detail to point out to the Minister that the only practical way to handle canned fruit juices is to put them into steel cans. They cannot be put into aluminium cans. As the member for Frome said, there is very little problem with the aluminium can because there is a recovery value of ½c a can, for that reason, they are especially sought after by youngsters who collect them in their spare time, which undoubtedly reduces the problem. Experiments have been done by the canned fruit juice industry and, if tomato juice, for example, was put into an aluminium can, within 24 hours that can could be affected by the acid action on it. So this is an industry that is virtually dependent on the steel can and, while fruit juices are now exempt, there is nothing to say that in the future the Government will not see fit to impose a deposit system on fruit juices.

Another point of view put forward is that some people, once they have paid a 5c deposit on a can, believe that gives them the right to do what they like—to throw that can away if they want to. However, some success in education can be achieved with a little work and effort, but so far no effort has been put into the education side of the problem. We can see this even with our own children. In the last two or three years, in my own case, I have made a rule that my children are to keep any papers, cans, or whatever they have in the car until we reach home. It has now become part and parcel of normal travelling and I find that the children no longer even think of throwing cans out of the car window. This is education, and I am sure it can be achieved.

If the can-making industry is ready to assist with this promotion of education, it can be successful. While a deposit system will cover only 10 per cent of the problem facing us, we must pursue the overall approach to litter

generally, educating people not to throw anything away and providing additional rubbish outlets, including more bins or suitable containers in the street, no matter where they may be (parking bays on the main highways have at least one or two litter bins). If that sort of thing is promoted to a greater extent, and especially in the city, we shall obtain some success.

If we look around Adelaide, we see it is not cans and bottles that lie around the streets: it is scraps of paper, tickets, sundry pieces of newspaper, and other bits of rubbish. It is not cans. So this legislation will in no way enhance the appearance of Adelaide. It is the general education of the public and the provision of more rubbish bins that will eventually improve the city's appearance. I support the move of the Opposition to have this Bill referred to a Select Committee. That can be done and the committee's report can be available by the beginning of the next session. I cannot understand why the Government cannot wait until then before proceeding with this matter. If it does, it will obtain a much wider opinion from the public, and this would be a much better result than drawing its own conclusions and racing into this matter in the way it has.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I have been listening to the debate this evening, but I find that not much has been said by either side that would enable one to make up one's mind or alter it. I do not suppose that I will add much to that situation.

Mr. Venning: That's right.

Mr. HALL: I agree with the honourable member for once. However, several points have been missed. Obviously, people do not litter their backyards, but tend to litter somewhere else. It is when they are on the beach, on the road, or somewhere away from their home, that people litter. We must consider incentives or impositions that must be applied to prevent litter. I am sure that members would adopt the attitude that litter must be prevented and action taken, but a rather extreme attitude is being adopted by members on both sides. The members for Stuart and Elizabeth damn anyone who listens to the dan manufacturing industry. Their attitude does not surprise me but I am disappointed: Government members have always shown a disinclination to listen to anyone in business. They dislike business and want it to fail or be taken over by Government action, and that attitude is evident this evening.

I have always maintained an attitude independent of sources outside Parliament, but I have not been too proud to talk to members of this industry. Why should I feel ashamed if I take that action, as I should be according to the members for Stuart and Elizabeth? Theirs is a ridiculous, parochial, and stupid attitude, because it seems that this industry is not allowed to have an opinion. Whether one agrees with it or not, it is a valuable opinion because that industry meets a tremendous public demand of about 100 000 000 cans a year, but the Government would have us believe that such an industry cannot add anything to this debate, and that is a stupid attitude. On the other hand, contributions from L.C.L. members appear to offer no long-term solution. They seem to believe that everything should be put off without assessing what will happen in future.

The Hon G. R. Broomhill: That is different from what your Deputy was saying.

Mr. HALL: The Minister cannot adopt his back-bench tactics when he sits on the front bench. To me, not enough regard has been paid to the future by either side. Government members want us to be fair, and the

member for Stuart said we should be consistent. The honourable member did not explain why the deposit on a beer bottle is 1c but is 5c on a can. He did not explain that the brewing industry is very powerful and that the Government listens to it. Can this Government say it would not have consulted the brewing industry when it altered the Licensing Act? Why should it not be an equal deposit, even though there is an interest that states that it should not be equal? The Government has not asked for the opinion of the can industry, but has made a decision that brings glaring inconsistencies into the Bill. I have spoken to members of this industry, and I wish the Government would speak to them in order to obtain their views.

We are dealing with a complex situation in that there is a potential of more than 1 000 000 customers in South Australia, and cans from this industry can be divided into a million points of distribution, but they all have to be returned to a rather centralized collection centre. There will be several ways in which these centres can operate, but the Government considers that relatively few are needed, a decision that may cause many problems because of the concentration involved. The ideal way of collection is through every person's garbage bin, and the many garbage bins in the metropolitan area would be the most frequently used method of collecting cans. If 100 000 000 cans went into the community each year and all became litter, we would have been knee deep in them long ago. Only a small proportion of cans put out by the industry becomes litter; many are returned, some to be recycled but most going to the dump. That is the best place for them because of what will have to be done in future in relation to the treatment of waste. When we have a proper system of treating waste, the proper method of recycling will be introduced. The Government suggests that all bottles with a deposit placed on them will be returned but, if it had listened to the industry, it would realize that about 20 per cent to 25 per cent of all large cool drink bottles sold are never returned.

Mr. Payne: How many cans get back?

Mr. HALL: Many are not returned, but they will have a 5c deposit. That deposit will not be fully effective in removing cans from the litter problem. I do not believe that the Government is correct in unilaterally being the first State, as I understand it, to attack this problem. As the representative of a country area, I do not like to see cans littering our roads, but I believe that the problem should be tackled on a national basis. If education or some other method does not operate satisfactorily, we will have to try using deposits. Anyone who suggests that deposits will never be applied is not looking at what may occur. It seems that the introduction of a deposit of 5c is aimed not at cans being returned but at penalizing can manufacturers so that cans will be taken off the market, and the Minister knows it. The system he proposes is unworkable in the first instance. He cannot concentrate 100 000 000 cans in a few collection centres and expect the public to submit meekly to the inconvenience that that will cause.

Why does the Minister not wait? There are several reasons why he should wait. We are approaching a season when the sales of canned drinks will be lower than they are in the summer season. I do not know what the figures are; I had hoped that someone opposite might have asked about this. At any rate, the problem of can litter will be much less in the coming months than it was in the past few months. This presents an opportunity for the Government to stay its hand and wait and see what the other

Stales want to do It would enable the Government to support the Jordan committee's report in the meantime. I am not asking the Government to put off deposits forever. If nothing else works, I will support deposits, although I will not be in this House to do so. The member for Heysen says, "Hear, hear!"

Mr. McAnaney: I did not say that.

Mr. HALL: Perhaps it was someone else. In the last few days of representation that I have in this House I am not going to say that deposits are out for all time. However, to try deposits first, without knowing what the other States will do and without adopting a national programme, is administratively foolish. The trade in cans does not stop at the border. Whilst there is nothing much occurring on the western and northern borders, we have considerable trade across the south-eastern border. Of course, the trade across the south-eastern border is smaller than the metropolitan trade. Really, litter is a bigger problem in the country than in the metropolitan area, as it is much easier to clean up a limited area than to clean up thousands of miles of country roads

Mr. Venning: Metropolitan people take bags of rubbish to the country and throw them out of their cars.

Mr. HALL: They obviously do not understand the country viewpoint, because the honourable member has never explained it to them. There is a proper progression in the attack on litter. I am not trying to hide the can problem under the general problem of litter.

Mr Payne: Let us remember that 100 000 000 cans are sold annually.

Mr. HALL: But there are not 100 000 000 litter cans every year. A surprisingly small proportion of cans become litter. The vast majority of cans go through garbage bins. The can litter problem is created by the hard-core litterer who, unlike the householder, does not take advantage of collections. The type of person who causes the trouble is the person who travels in a car and throws cans out of the window. Of course, some cool drink bottles are disposed of in the same way, too, although some are picked up because of the deposit.

A fine has only one impact: it has an impact only on the person who litters. A fine has an inhibiting effect only once, whereas a deposit provides many opportunities for many people who want 5c; for example, sporting clubs and children. So, there are many pressures leading to the return of cans if there is a 5c deposit. Nevertheless, 5c is a penalty in connection with non-reusable containers' there is no economic use except the fractional one of recycling. So, the Government is using a sledge hammer to tackle the problem. Every Government tries to do (or I hope it does) good things in the community. Of course, the Government does not always do so, but let us assume it is trying to do so in this case. However, it is being heavy-handed in introducing this penalizing legislation at this stage, against advice. The Government has only to wait during the cooler season to see what the other States do. If all States adopt deposits, we will not escape having deposits here.

Mr. Payne: What about Queensland?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member need not be too worried about Queensland. Even that State may fall into line with a national policy. If the rest of Australia does not adopt deposits and an education programme and if this Bill is passed. South Australia will be out of step. Labor Party members have always said that they are keen on uniformity in Government. I do not always agree with that view, but in this case it has much merit. The Jordan committee has advocated an education programme,

but that may not be the answer. This Government has advocated a penalty deposit, and that may not be the answer. Which should be tried first? Should we ruin an industry first, or should we give it a chance? Or, should we wait to see what the rest of Australia does? If it is decided to ruin an industry, it is better for all the Stales to act together. These serious questions are not being answered by the Government. I will vote to have this matter referred to a Select Committee, and I do not want to be misunderstood.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You will be.

Mr. HALL: I will meet the Minister on a platform anywhere to discuss the issue. However, if I am not here when he raises it, I hope he will be fair. I believe we should wait until the cooler months, when we can see what the other States do. Why has the Government been inconsistent in relation to beer bottles? There is no disagreement in connection with ring pulls, which are obnoxious things. I have seen them ingrained into footpaths; they have killed fish in the sea; and they can be swallowed. I do not think any member would oppose discontinuing the ring-pull can on a certain predetermined date but, regarding the general attitude to the problem of litter, I do not think the Government has fully considered its position. I think the Government has been hasty in preparing penalty legislation before the rest of Australia has decided what it will do. On that basis, I support the second reading and I will support the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee. I trust that amendments will be moved in Committee if the reference to a Select Committee cannot be achieved.

[Midnight]

Mr VENNING (Rocky River): Although I have listened with much interest to the debate this evening, I cannot say that it has been a good one, because of the subject we are debating The Bill is the outcome of an Australian Labor Party conference held some months ago at which a resolution was passed that this legislation would form part of the Party's policy. As a consequence this Bill has been introduced. I realize that it is difficult to put forward an argument on a Bill such as the one we are debating. I will support the move to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, because I believe that the committee's report would be invaluable.

This evening we heard one or two Government speakers, and I was disappointed in their contributions to the debate. I deplore the attitude of the member for Elizabeth in his attack on my Opposition colleagues' attitude to private enterprise thinking, and I deplore his condemning Opposition members because of their attitude and interest in private enterprise, such as those in the can manufacturers. He abused us for our attitude. The member for Stuart condemned the price of soft drinks in cans, but I should like to see the Government go into business I have said this time and time again in debates here and in other places: I should like to see what the cost would be then.

Mr. Evans: On an equal basis.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. I should like to see what it would cost consumers to buy these commodities in those circumstances I think that every Australian would go along with the catch cry of "Keep South Australia beautiful", but that only tickles the surface of the situation by about 10 per cent. What do we find when we traverse the countryside? We see motor vehicle wrecks and chunks of rubber from old tyres. I have seen a motor vehicle stationary on the side of the road because it had tyre trouble. I have returned along the same road the same or the following day and have noticed that a worn tyre has been left on

on the side of the road. There is also the problem of the weekend driver who drives into the country with a bag of tins and tosses them under a bush on a back load. So there is considerable room for something to be done regarding Kesab.

The Hon. L. J. King: But not anything effective.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, and I will come to that later. How should we go about the problem? The Bill deals with only about 10 per cent of the problem, whereas we should be examining the whole problem and see what can be done. At some schools one finds that many of the children, through education, take an interest in their school and do not drop papers in the yard. The children are trained by their teachers to collect their rubbish and place it in receptacles. As a consequence of this, many schoolgrounds are a credit to the schools. However, in country areas one finds rubbish and litter practically everywhere. Education could do much to improve this situation.

I also believe, strange though it may seem, that this is political legislation, because people must have the incentive to improve their way of life. However, under a Socialist Government (and I do not want to be political) the incentive for people to take great pride in their way of life and in their State is less apparent than it is with the private enterprise way of thinking. One sees this not only in the keep South Australia beautiful aspect but in all aspects of State welfare and competition.

I cannot help but reiterate that education should be undertaken, as recommended in the Jordan report. We educate children in our schools, but what happens to them after they leave school? Their education is neglected. It has been said this evening that the Highways Department provides receptacles along main highways, at distant intervals, in areas where truck and vehicle owners are likely to camp at night so that they can place their rubbish in them. Many motor vehicles contain litter bags.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you find cans along the railway lines?

Mr. VENNING: This has been a problem right up through the North along the railway lines. Bottles were thrown from carriage windows back in the days when the carriages were not air-conditioned. However, that situation has corrected itself, because with air-conditioned trains things cannot be thrown out of windows. I intend not to enter into the details of the Bill regarding recycling but merely to deal with the matter of litter, which has been covered time and time again by my colleagues. It has been stated (and this is an aspect that I want to watch closely) that the Minister says the wine industry is to be exempted from the legislation. Is that correct?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have a look at the second reading explanation.

Mr. VENNING: I checked through that but could not see where it was stated that this would happen. All members know how concerned the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments have been in the past about the wine industry. I therefore hope they will be consistent and help the industry, and that the industry will be exempted from the legislation.

It has also been stated that 70 per cent of the business of the wine industry is conducted outside the State. If the industry is not to be exempted from the legislation, grave difficulties will be experienced. It appears that we have the Minister's assurance that the Government intends to exempt the industry. Because of the importance of this industry, particularly in the Clare district which I represent and which is one of the leading wine-producing areas in the State, I am pleased that its activities will not be hampered

by the legislation. One wonders why the Government could not wait for the report of the Commonwealth Parliament's Standing Committee. However, the Government has seen fit not to do so. For that reason, I believe this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee so that evidence can be taken from a wide range of people, and we can later examine that committee's report.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I should like to make a brief contribution to this debate because this is such a complex matter. Initially, I was inclined to support the Bill. However, its practical application poses some real problems. The Government's approach to this complex matter is only a superficial one that will not offer a satisfactory solution to the problems facing us. One must ask why the Government has introduced the Bill. It is only fair for one to think that this Bill has resulted from suggestions that have come up through the Labor Party machine, as this would probably have sounded a good idea to the rank and file members. The theory behind the legislation would have come through any Party machine, without any real consideration, other than one or two speeches being made at a Party meeting, being given to it. The implications of the matter would not have been realized until the Bill was drafted.

This Bill has repeatedly been referred to as an aspect of the anti-litter programme. It is intended to play an initial part in the anti-litter campaign throughout the State. However, I do not think it will be really effective. It has been stated that these sorts of containers represent only about 10 per cent of this State's litter problem. Therefore, if that programme is only half successful (which is highly unlikely), only 5 per cent of this State's litter problem will have been solved. It is therefore unlikely that this Bill will result in sweeping improvements in our anti-litter programme. However, the objections that have been outlined previously by members are basically sound. It must be stated, however, that no evidence has been presented to show that the proposed programme will work; on the contrary, there has been more evidence to suggest that it will not work. This is the problem that concerns me. Three speeches (including the Minister's second reading explanation) have been made by Government members, none of which contained statistical evidence to show that this legislation would work or, indeed, to illustrate where it has worked in other situations. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that grave doubts exist regarding its effectiveness.

The member for Elizabeth made a colourful speech, in which he rubbished the Opposition and one of the newspapers. However, did he offer any worthwhile support for the Bill? He did not make a significant point about how the Bill would work or how it could be implemented to the benefit of the community. He merely said that, the sooner it was passed, the sooner it would be implemented. The member for Stuart referred to the philosophy behind the whole project. If the Bill is right in its objects but wrong in its application, should it be supported? I do not believe it is correct to support anything that I do not think will work. Although members may agree that the Bill's object is correct, they should question the whole project unless it can be proved that it can be implemented satisfactorily.

The Opposition has suggested that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, and I agree. The member for Stuart gave an illustration regarding deposits on soft drink containers compared to the use of cans. However, every district has its own problems. For example, my district has in it two soft drink manufacturers. This

means that a bottle is returned quickly to the factory after it has been used. We do not experience the freight problems that are experienced with, say, beer bottles and other types of container. To return all beer bottles would involve hundreds of tons of dead freight. At \$30 a ton, this will run into thousands of dollars. Freight is involved both ways, and the cost of this alone will outweigh any return from deposits, resulting in an additional cost to be borne by someone, although I do not say who that will be. The cost may be spread over a wide section of the community, but the freight cost must be absorbed somewhere. Consequently, the consumer will suffer. The member for Stuart said that Opposition members knew all the statistics. I believe it is correct that Opposition members did present some statistics and facts. Has the Government put forward any facts and figures to suggest a satisfactory solution to the problem? In the debate, the question of litter as a whole has been dealt with, although this Bill deals only with containers. Containers represent only about 10 per cent of the total litter volume, so that is all we are concerned with in this debate. However, we must consider other litter programmes.

With regard to glass containers, clause 7 provides that the onus for refunds and deposits is placed on stores and reselling premises. Those businesses will have to accept the responsibility of setting up these depots. A \$200 penalty is faced by resellers, who must accept another responsibility outside their normal duties. Their only outlet is that they are not obliged to accept containers in an unclean condition. Someone has to say whether or not a container is clean. It cannot be said that all containers received will be hygienically clean and able to be used. Therefore, there is a loophole whereby any depot can refuse to take a bottle, unless it can be immediately placed in a sterilization plant.

Clause 10 relates to the limitation on the sale of certain containers. Containers must be sold from authorized premises in order that they will be used in a delineated area. Apart from causing inconvenience to the end user, this also places some retailers at an advantage and others at a disadvantage. Immediately, sections of the community have to reject or accept certain responsibilities. Clause 11 relates to the exhibition of signs. This is rather amusing, as this clause provides that signs shall be exhibited, whereas recently we dealt with legislation prohibiting signs. The effect of this Bill will be a greater use of glass containers, with the gradual elimination of metal containers. Thus the freight problem will be increased considerably. I understand that it has been said that the weight of bottles is 22 times greater than the weight of cans of the same capacity. Therefore, whenever beverages have to be carted over long distances and the containers returned to be refilled, someone will be involved in extra cost, and normally the end consumer has to pay.

I am also concerned about who will be responsible when a container is broken. The Bill does not provide for this form of litter. Immediately a bottle becomes unusable by having perhaps only a chip at the top, it is a litter hazard. As the provisions of the Bill will create a greater use of bottles, the problem will increase. The Bill deals with only a small part of the problem. We have a general litter problem; no-one disputes that. However, I do not think the Bill will solve that problem. If the provisions of the Bill are 50 per cent effective, at most we will have improved the overall litter problem by only 5 per cent.

If we are to deal with the total litter programme in this piecemeal way, will we have to have separate cigarette legislation, newspaper legislation, blown-out tyre legislation,

broken glass legislation, plastic legislation, and so on? A whole series of Bills will be necessary to solve the problem. I do not think anyone would suggest that so many Bills should be introduced. Even if the provisions of this Bill are totally effective, only 10 per cent of the problem will be solved. As I believe that we must try to solve the total litter problem, I think that it is necessary to set up a Select Committee to look into this matter, and I will support that proposal.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the second reading, realizing that in Committee there will be an opportunity to discuss the legislation further. No-one is more conscious of the litter problem in the metropolitan area than I am, as the western boundary of my district includes the popular beaches of Glenelg and West Beach, part of Sturt River, and the Patawalonga reserve and lake area, in which, from time to time, there has been a great collection of litter of all varieties. Rubbish is left in gutters, it washes into the drains and, when there is a rain storm, it is washed to the Patawalonga basin from which it flows into the sea. Something must be done about the litter problem. On occasions I have called for Government action. I have called for deposits to be imposed to try to clean up litter in some areas.

Since I last called for Government action, there has been a concerted effort in this respect by councils and voluntary organizations in my district. No matter what attempt is made to tackle this problem, we still come back to the fact that we have not yet had a definite education programme, or a programme implemented by councils or other bodies to enforce on-the-spot litter fines. Perhaps we have missed out in this area. Now we have this legislation before us, and the Minister has not made it easy. In his explanation he states:

We do not intend this legislation to "ban-the-can", as has been done in Saskatchewan, but we serve notice in this measure that the pull-top opener must disappear within two years.

He goes on in another place to say:

We may not be said to be tackling the problem piecemeal as this legislation is only the first stage.

So, if we look at the whole problem, we should do it altogether. This may be the best system. Recently KESAB with the assistance of the service club of which I am a member, the Glenelg Kiwanis, did a check of Gordon Street and Partridge Street in Glenelg and, of the 650 items collected, 310 represented paper; bottles and jars totalled 16; there were 95 cans, three plastic items, and 20 miscellaneous items. There were 206 other items, of which 200 were metal items.

The ratio of cans in that litter pick-up was 14 per cent in October, 1973. Let us look at other countries of the world and see what is being done there. Let us look at the litter composition in the Sandy Beach area of Washington State, with 100 miles (160 km) of Pacific Ocean frontage. On July 28, 1973, of the 150 169 items collected in that area, paper comprised 20 486 items, or 13.6 per cent; plastics comprised 67 399 items, or 44.9 per cent; "tin" cans, aluminium cans, and other metal items numbered 15 664, or 10.4 per cent; glass returnable beverage bottles, non-returnable beverage bottles, other bottles, jars, etc., numbered 41 132, or 27.4 per cent; and miscellaneous numbered 5 488, or 3.7 per cent. So the litter problem has spread over a large area.

Many of the States in America are conscious, as the Minister said in his second reading explanation, of the fact that the problem must be tackled. It must be tackled in many other ways. We have heard all sorts of suggestions this evening that most cans are collected by the garbage

bins, that there should be separate bins and a separate recycling plant, and so on.

Of the three councils in my electoral district, the Henley and Grange council estimates that household garbage amounts to about 3 200 tons (3 250 t) a year. The foreshore refuse amounts to about 2 000 tons (2 032 t) a year; street litter is about 200 tons (203 t) a year; and 6 000 tons (6 096 t) of refuse is collected by the refuse trailer system each year.

In Glenelg, household garbage is estimated at about 2 100 tons (2 133 t) a year; each weekend about 60 cub.yds. (45.9 m³) is deposited at the council depot, and another 60 cub.yds. is collected each week from the foreshore and the reserves in that area. The council depot is also used as a recycling depot for cans. The council considers that the response to this programme is excellent, and it is expected that about two wool sacks will be filled each weekend.

In the West Torrens council area, the municipal garbage amounts to 29 110 cub.yds. (22 220 m³) and residential garbage is 15 100 cub.yds. (11 500 m³). The total cost to the West Torrens council is \$86 594. The effort is being made by the residents now and, since the announcement of the intention to do something in this area, already there has been a general awareness that people are being more careful with their litter.

In the past four or five weeks, the Glenelg beaches have been looking much better than they looked last year, but at the same time many voluntary organizations are continually picking up litter. Even under the present system, they are now receiving a deposit for their efforts. It is easy, of course, to say there should be a set deposit on bottles when we aren't intending to do something about wine bottles. Having lived and been brought up in a hotel, I know the Minister appreciates that in hotels some years ago beer bottles were worth ½d a bottle, and they were a tremendous problem in the country. Just after the Second World War, it was impossible to obtain beer bottles from the brewing company unless one had an equal number of empty bottles. There was always a \$1 deposit on the crates.

So there has been some effort in this regard. Although the Bill is concerned with the marking of containers, it does not state how we shall solve the problems of the cool drink manufacturers in this State who export their products to the Northern Territory and to Broken Hill. There is the same problem with the South Australian Brewing Company: two runs will be necessary with drinks if they are to be forwarded to those places. It will probably mean that some other State will capture the market. While a Commonwealth committee is inquiring into this problem, we would have thought that the State Government would wait to obtain the full details of its report, but at the same time we must be grateful for the campaign being undertaken by our schoolteachers, as a result of which the children of today are more litter-conscious than children were in the past. That is because of the personal interest of the teachers, and because of the projects and the opportunities available in various sections of industry which award prizes. Some of the projects done by schoolchildren have awakened the community to the real problem facing it. So, as a result of education in this area, schoolchildren today have the opportunity of receiving this benefit, but the real benefits will not be felt for some years to come.

I also consider we have never really tackled the litter problem, and I have always called for on-the-spot litter fines; I still call for them. They should be enforced. It is

interesting to note in other countries, according to the information given by the member for Fisher, how the problem is being tackled. For example, in Alabama, penalties for park violations are fines of up to \$500 or gaol for up to six months, for highway violations, fines of not less than \$10 or more than \$100, or gaol for not less than five days or more than 30 days, or both. In Alaska there is a fine of up to \$500 or gaol for up to one year, or both. The litterer can be required to pick up trash along the "nearest" highway for "not more than four hours on each of two days". In Arkansas, there is a fine of not less than \$10 or more than \$100, and the vehicle can be attached to cover the fine. A person must carry a litter bag in his vehicle. In Colorado, the litterer can be required to pick up trash, and this can be enforced by State and local police, State patrol, commissioned officers of State divisions of wild life, parks, and outdoor recreation. For some violations, the fine is up to \$15. In Connecticut the fine is up to \$200 or prison for 30 days, or both. In Idaho the fine is up to \$50 or gaol for up to 10 days. In Indiana fines up to \$100 for a first offence; not less than \$50 or more than \$200 for a second offence; not more than \$500 and possible gaol up to 30 days; plus costs of \$40. In each of these States severe litter laws are provided, but it seems that this Government has not inquired about litter penalties in other States of Australia. We should tackle the overall problem on an Australia-wide basis, and the Minister could call other Ministers together and, with the assistance of the Commonwealth Minister and the report that is to be available to him, some conclusions could be reached. At present the area of Glenelg needs more litter bins, but there is a three-month wait for them. Like everything else, no matter what is wanted one has to wait. No doubt there are problems associated with this legislation. Depots are to be established in the metropolitan area but nothing has been said about depots in country areas. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated:

As was referred to above, while the retailer, as such, is not required to handle empty containers as defined in clause 8, there is nothing in this Part that prevents a retailer, if he considers that it is in his economic interests to do so, from establishing a collection centre at or near his premises. It is entirely up to him.

Storekeepers and retailers have opposed this provision because they do not wish to have a collecting depot at their establishment: most of them do not have the facilities or space to collect cans. A situation could arise in a shopping centre in which several stores sell drinks. However, one business is not going well and the proprietor decides to accept cans as returns. It will start there, but no doubt it will snow-ball. This legislation should be referred to a joint Select Committee, the hearings of which should be open to the public and the media so that the whole issue might be investigated thoroughly. I support the second reading.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): At this late hour I do not intend to make a lengthy contribution, but I wish to canvass one or two matters. Again we have witnessed Government members, with two exceptions, sitting in their seats and playing their usual role of "Yes" men to the front bench. The members for Elizabeth and Stuart engaged in personal abuse of Opposition members; they made wild and untruthful accusations about members on this side and particularly about people in industry in this State. I believe that those speeches were a disgrace to the Parliamentary system. A few weeks ago Government members complained that a member on this side had used the privileges of this House

to denigrate people but, in this debate, they have acted in the same disgraceful way, particularly the member for Elizabeth.

This attack followed closely on an article in a newspaper produced, I understand, by the member for Spence. In the *Herald* of March 4, on page 3, the honourable member, in a cunning fashion (because he was obviously making sure he would not leave himself open to a libel action), cast aspersions on the character of the member for Fisher. I do not think it did the member for Spence any good and, if members opposite have to engage in smear tactics to convince people that what they are doing is correct, their actions say little for them and for this legislation. When this legislation was first mooted (and it has received much coverage in the press and has been the subject of much comment in the community), I wrote to the Minister of Environment and Conservation on December 20. On January 17, I received the following reply:

I refer to your letter of December 20, 1973, raising a number of queries in connection with the Government's proposal to place a minimum deposit on all drink containers. At this particular time I am unable to provide any specific answers to the particular questions asked, as final decisions have not yet been made on the exact form of the legislation. However, I can assure you that all of the points raised are ones that are being considered and, based on oversea experience, will not present any great problems when the system comes into operation. I will endeavour to provide you with a more detailed reply as soon as possible. To this day I have not received a further reply from the Minister.

Mr. Keneally: Have you seen a copy of the Bill?

Mr. GUNN: No. I made that representation on behalf of several storekeepers in my district who were concerned because of the effects this legislation would have on them. I believe the Minister should have given me replies to my questions, and I am still hoping to receive them. The Minister has not properly answered my questions either in the Bill or in his second reading explanation I do not know how long I shall have to wait before I can inform my constituents properly. It is not good enough that Opposition members should receive such shabby treatment.

Mr. Coumbe: But you are still hopeful?

Mr. GUNN: I am hoping, but I think the matter has been put in the "too hard" box. I support the second reading because I am concerned about the problem of litter. When I was a councillor, I made several recommendations on this matter. I represent a large area in which are situated some small centres, and, on behalf of small shopkeepers who wish to continue to sell cans, I want to know how the collection centres will be set up in those areas. The Minister has indicated that areas will be prescribed in the metropolitan area, so that there will be about 20 specific collection depots. I cannot understand how 20 or 30 collection centres will be able to serve the metropolitan area, and we are waiting for words of wisdom from the Minister to indicate how this system will operate. How will the system operate in country areas? Evidently the Minister is content to say to the industry, "You run the system. This is your problem." What will happen if a country shopkeeper refuses to receive empty cans? One shopkeeper in my district does not like receiving empty bottles.

Mr. Keneally: But you would not advise him to break the law, would you?

Mr. GUNN: I am not like the Premier: I do not advocate breaking the law. One shopkeeper marks the bottles that he sells and he accepts back only those bottles. If it is inconvenient for the small shopkeeper to handle cans, people in the country may not retain the

benefit of using cans. Clause 10 places limitations on the sale of certain containers. As I understand this clause, if a shopkeeper refuses to receive used cans he will be prevented from selling cans to his customers. In a small country town with only one shop it will obviously be inconvenient for the shopkeeper to adopt the proposed system. He will need to establish a storage area for empty cans. Who will load the empty cans on to a truck? Who will do the book work involved? Who will finance the scheme?

Mr. Keneally: Doesn't the shopkeeper need to have somewhere to store the full cans? As they are used, there will be a place for the empty cans.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member ought to do his homework. Obviously, if empty cans are stored with full cans, the shopkeeper will be in trouble with the Public Health Department. The shopkeeper's only defence if he refuses to accept empty cans is that they are unclean. An employee may have to get a torch to look into the cans.

The Hon D H. McKee: That would be a good job for you.

Mr. GUNN: It would be a good job for the Minister when he retires. We all know about jobs for the boys and the golden handshake. Obviously, country people are penalized as a result of higher freight costs. If the containers have to be transported back to a central point, the consumer will be forced to pay. I am thinking particularly of people in outlying areas.

If the Minister is sincere in his endeavours to control the litter problem he should adopt the recommendations of the Jordan committee. The Liberal and Country League Government proved its sincerity when it set up the Jordan committee, which approached the subject logically. Why has the Minister not introduced on-the-spot fines? I and my colleagues would support him if he introduced such fines, which have worked in other parts of the world. The Jordan committee's recommendations are in the best interests of the community as a whole.

Mr Keneally: The small shopkeepers—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Stuart is out of order in interjecting and the honourable member for Eyre is out of order in trying to answer interjections.

Mr. GUNN: Even with the deposit system, people will still discard litter. So, it is obvious that there must be an educational programme and on-the-spot fines. Many people will not worry about the 5c deposit: they will still throw cans out of the car window. It will therefore still be necessary to have penalties. Although I am willing to support the second reading of this Bill, I believe the proper course of action is to refer it to a Select Committee so that all sections of the community can present their viewpoints. The committee can then impartially examine the evidence and make recommendations to the House. Other members have referred to the Commonwealth committee that is looking into this matter; its recommendations should be considered, too. I support the second reading.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Many times I have seen resolutions passed by councils and primary producer organizations seeking a system of deposits on bottles. Indeed until I sat down and studied all the evidence, I thought that it would be an easy way of achieving its aim. However, the more I analyse this legislation the more I realize that it is typical of much of the legislation this Government has introduced. Certain people litter the countryside, yet we expect those who do not litter it to pay for this

legislation. That is unjust Heavy fines, even imprisonment, should be imposed on people who commit litter offences; that should be the first step towards solving the problem.

Although it may not be a serious matter for a person to throw a bottle on the front lawn of a suburban house, picnickers in the country often leave all their litter behind in a heap. It would take only a few heavy fines to stop this practice. I have known of instances where a teacher would not allow her pupils to put any surplus paper in the wastepaper basket but said, "Throw it on the floor. It's the cleaner's job to pick it up." Admittedly, that does not happen often. By educating children, the litter problem could be solved to a certain extent. We sometimes look down on Asians as being beneath us in certain respects, because we are smug and think we are superior to them; yet when we go to their countries and see how they respect their environment and do not litter, we should feel ashamed of ourselves.

I have seen motions moved in favour of a 5c deposit on all types of bottle. I will not support the second reading of this Bill because of its unjust discrimination between the various types of container. I realize the difficulties the wine industry would experience if a levy was imposed on its non-returnable bottles. It might well be a heavier burden on some industries than on others, but it would be an even heavier burden if placed on cans. We should appoint a Select Committee to investigate this problem and we should not move ahead of the other States. We should have effective uniform legislation throughout Australia. As people travel more and more, we should have fair and just legislation throughout Australia.

The Government in its public announcements hitherto has not come up with any proof to demonstrate that this is fair and just legislation. Ultimately we might have to have a uniform deposit on all kinds of container, and there are many different kinds of container. I take Reslon pills which, until yesterday, always came in a little bottle that caused pollution, but they now come in packets. In many cases bottles could be replaced by easily disposed of litter. By education and studying these problems we could come up with a better solution than this discriminatory unjust legislation now before us.

I support the second reading and the move that a Select Committee further investigate the claims various people make. I refute entirely the statement of the little amateur politician (the member for Elizabeth) that any Opposition member has been influenced by what the can makers have said.

Mr. Rodda: He talked much rubbish.

Mr. McANANEY: As we have listened to all viewpoints, including that of the can manufacturers and consumers, we should try to assess the situation and come up with legislation that would be non-discriminatory and fair to everyone in the community. This legislation does not fit that description; it needs further investigation, and that is what I support.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): It is my task this evening to sum up the debate for the Opposition and, in doing so, I make clear at the outset what the Opposition's attitude is, although it was made clear from the moment the member for Torrens began speaking, and the Leader and other Opposition members made it clear. The Opposition is fully in favour of cleaning up the litter problem in the State in a rational and logical manner. We want it cleaned up effectively and it is for this reason that we will insist that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee before we support the third reading. I have thought about the Bill and have looked at the Minister

opposite. It reminds me of Caesar's assassination in the Capitol in Rome many years ago. As I stand here and look at the pillars of this Chamber and I see Brutus Broomhill sitting opposite, I am reminded of the man who successfully stabbed Caesar in the back, because the Minister has this evening successfully knifed the cause of conservation in the back, has knifed the consumer in the back, and has stabbed the beverage industry in the back. So I stand here and say, "Et tu, Brute!"

It is into the following areas that I wish to delve in summing up the Opposition's case, namely, the effects the legislation will have on the consideration of the environment of South Australia and the effects it will have on conservation, consumers and industries, particularly the beverage industry. Before summing up our case, however, I wish to comment on the whole basis of the Government's case. The Government has introduced this legislation on two basic assumptions, namely, that the deposit on non-returnable containers will encourage people to return them, and that once the containers have been returned they will be recycled in the community. If these basic assumptions do not stand up, the legislation must fall. Regarding the 5c deposit on non-returnable containers forcing people to return them, the Minister has tried to hoodwink the public; that is obvious from his second reading explanation.

The Hon. L. J. King: But Brutus was an honourable man: he would not hoodwink anyone.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, but like the Minister he finished up dishonourable, and that is the conclusion we will come to in this place tonight. A 5c deposit on a container will not force people to return that container. If a person is in a boat and has opened a can, he will throw it overboard rather than worry about getting back his 5c deposit. I remind the Government that we are living in an affluent society.

Evidence has already been presented which suggests that bottles on which there is a 5c deposit are not returned and, indeed, that the rate of non-return is significant. Therefore, the first basic assumption certainly does not stand up. The second basic assumption was that, if the container was returned, it would be recycled. The Minister had only to consult the industry to ascertain that it would be uneconomic to recycle tin containers. There is no hope of their being recycled economically. Therefore, the second basic assumption does not stand up, either. What good case, then, has the Government advanced?

Having destroyed the Minister's case, I come now to the meagre and thin case advanced by Government backbenchers. The first was the token effort of support made by the member for Elizabeth, who based his whole 30-minute speech on nothing more than personal, trite attacks on the Opposition. In his speech he said, "They have been gol at," and "They are only concerned with profit." He also claimed that the Opposition was running to the gallery to seek information from its lobbyists.

The SPEAKER: I ruled that remark out of order previously, and I do so again. The honourable member cannot refer to the gallery in any debate in this House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The member for Elizabeth said that the Opposition was running to seek information from its lobbyists. These statements are typical of the level of attack and the sort of effort made by the member for Elizabeth, and it is not even worth my attempting to rebut them further. I refer now to the member for Stuart, who said that the Opposition had made three clear points, on which we had all agreed this evening. The first was that we wanted to clear up litter (and I agree with that); the second was that the Opposition wanted to support

the protection of the environment (I support that fully, too, as my colleagues have done); and the third was that the Opposition favoured recycling. The honourable member agreed with those three assumptions and then advanced a fourth assumption: that the Opposition had done nothing about the matter. I suggest, however, that there is a breakdown in the honourable member's logic, as the Opposition has already shown that this Bill will not encourage recycling. Indeed, it will not be economic to recycle tin containers.

Before returning to the Opposition's case, I refer to that advanced by the members for Mitcham and Goyder. I found it to be an interesting case, as they had a bob each way. First, they said they would not support a deposit on non-returnable containers until an educational programme had been instituted, and then they said they would support the second reading. I find those two stands inconsistent. However, I will not attack those members further, because I think they took a correct stand on this matter. They had at least thought about the problems involved and had tried to deal with the issues that really mattered.

I turn now to the Opposition's case and refer to some of the problems that the Bill will cause. It is unfortunate that the Minister has failed to go to the people who know the facts and ascertain what problems will arise as a result of this legislation. As the Minister claims to be responsible and, indeed, to be concerned about conservation, one would have thought he would try to ascertain the possible effects of any legislation that he introduced. The first point that the Opposition made (and made rather forcibly) was that the House is examining only a small proportion of this State's total litter problem. In this respect, estimates ranged from 7.1 per cent to 10.5 per cent or, as the member for Hanson said, up to about 15 per cent.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think that education is still the answer?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If this Parliament is to tackle the litter problem (and I certainly hope that it will), it should tackle the entire problem rather than just the minute portion that is being tackled now by the Government in this half-baked attempt, which will have further consequences. People will soon be irritated by this legislation if it passes and, having become irritated, this volatile group will modify its attitude towards the total litter problem in case they should end up with yet another abortive piece of legislation. I therefore believe that through this legislation the Minister will start to break down public support for solving the litter problem.

The Opposition forcibly made the second point that the Government is trying to solve this litter problem in the wrong way. If one examines the final recommendation in the Jordan report, one finds no reference to a deposit on non-returnable containers. It is suggested in recommendation 27 that a vigorous educational programme should be conducted and that on-the-spot fines should be imposed. However, paragraph 6.49 of this excellent report discusses deposits on non-returnable containers. The committee recommended, first, an educational programme; secondly, on-the-spot fines; and, finally, if the other two did not work, a deposit on containers. It has been suggested that a sort of packaging tax, which has worked so well in Washington State, U.S.A., could be imposed. The industry has apparently offered to agree to this here. Why, therefore, has the Minister, apparently being a reasonable man concerned about conservation, not examined this proposal? Also where are all the litter containers that the Government has installed in metropolitan and country areas? Of course, people will

throw their litter and containers from cars if sufficient receptacles are not available for them. It was also suggested (a suggestion with which I agree) that it should be compulsory for litter bags to be placed in motor cars.

I was delighted to hear that that principle had been introduced in the Boating Bill. Why not adopt the same cheap and effective system in motor cars? The Minister has failed to appreciate that, when a person in a motor car finishes with any sort of drink container, if there is no litter bag in the motor car he will throw the container out of the window. Another suggestion by members on this side is that we should have litter cadets, similar to those used in America, to inform members of the public of the implications of their littering the community.

Opposition members have shown that the Minister has successfully stabbed the consumer in the back. The can has become an acceptable container for drinks, yet in this legislation the Minister will ban the can. Statistics from America show that, where a deposit system was introduced, the percentage of cans used as drink containers was reduced from 40 per cent of the total number of containers to about 5 per cent. The consumer will be further inconvenienced by the introduction of these deposits. Of course, the cost of drinks will be increased. I point out that an increase in the price of a bottle of drink of 1c will add about \$3 000 000 to the annual cost of drinks in this State. Yet the Minister is willing to place this \$3 000 000 burden on the South Australian public.

The Jordan report dealt fully with the general packaging problem, and the Opposition supports its proposal. If we wish to reduce the litter problem, we should try to eliminate excessive packaging, rather than ban certain forms of convenient packaging. The members for Fisher and Murray presented excellent evidence showing that overseas experience should be followed here and that a deposit on non-returnable containers would not be effective. Amongst the many nations that have cleaned up their litter problem, the United States, the United Kingdom and Singapore introduced as a first measure an educational programme. Secondly, as the member for Hanson suggested, some sort of fine should be imposed on litter offenders. Instead of imposing fines of \$10 or \$20, or even \$100, the Minister intends to impose what is, in effect, a fine of 5c. which is the deposit people will lose if they throw a can out of the window. Yet the Minister claims to be responsible and indeed concerned about solving the litter problem.

The litter problem in Oregon State in America has been reduced not necessarily by implementing a deposit system but rather by an extensive campaign to clean up litter from the roadside. The litter problem has been solved just as adequately in Washington State. A litter tax imposed there has been of benefit. In Singapore, fines have been imposed and an educational programme has been implemented. In Chicago, an educational programme by itself has been largely successful, but children in schools there as well as the general public are educated. Overseas experience certainly suggests that the Minister has again made a mistake in introducing this legislation before trying out other forms of control.

The Minister has failed to appreciate the effects of this measure on industry in South Australia. A Minister who would abuse the Opposition for seeking to know the effect of this measure on an industry would obviously be irresponsible. By this legislation, the Minister is stabbing the beverage industry in the back. The members for Chaffey and Kavel have clearly shown that in the case of the wine industry and the fruit industry this legislation

will not work, because the containers used cannot be recycled. Why introduce this legislation? Again, we see evidence of the fact that the whole basis of this legislation has fallen down.

Another effect on industry will be the cost of running depots. In introducing the legislation and including a depot system, the Minister has failed to appreciate the cost involved and the fact that the general public will have to cover that cost. The Minister claims to support the protection of the environment in South Australia, but the evidence suggests that he has not really thought about the matter. Instead of imposing a reasonable fine on those who throw away litter, he has imposed a 5c fine in the form of a deposit, and this will affect less than 10 per cent of the total litter volume. The Liberal and Country League wants to solve the litter problem in South Australia. However, we do not support this Bill. We will support the second reading simply to enable us to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I hope that the Minister, who claims to be a reasonable man, will allow the Bill to go to a Select Committee. This legislation lacks thought on the part of the Minister, as well as a hard line in relation to the litter problem.

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) I can be brief, because I have to reply to virtually only one speech, as all Opposition members repeated, parrot fashion, what the first Opposition speaker said. The funny thing is that the Liberal Movement members, who commenced their speeches by being tremendously critical of what had been said by L.C.L. members, then adopted exactly the same attitude as those members. I have great sympathy for members opposite, who have obviously been instructed how to speak in this debate. If members opposite think that they can convince people in their districts that, by supporting the second reading of this legislation, they are trying to look after the interests of those people, they have another think coming. They are not likely to fool the community in that way. One of my colleagues who spoke earlier outlined what has been obvious to many members. The embarrassment that must have been obvious to many members was borne out by his remarks. He referred first to the Leader of the Opposition who, when the Governments intentions to introduce legislation of this nature were announced, rushed immediately, the same day, to the press indicating that the scheme was a good one and need not cost the community more money, it was a positive approach to solving the problem.

Dr Eastick: I said it need not cost more money. What have you done since?

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: We have done exactly what we indicated we would do. I can understand the Leader's embarrassment, and I feel for him.

Dr. Eastick: No 5c was mentioned initially.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know what the Leader thought would be the deposit but he went on to warn that a deposit would have an effect only if it were meaningful. I should have thought he was talking of more than 5c. However, I will not canvass that any more because I am sorry for the Leader, who belongs to a Party that has instructed him on this issue, and he is not acting according to his own conscience. That applies not only to the Leader but also to the member for Hanson, the member for Frome, and the member for Glenelg, who have all been most outspoken in the past. I am sorry they had to be subjected to being required to speak in opposition to a measure that they could really accept.

I shall refer now to one or two other matters touched on in the debate. I congratulate the members behind me who answered the nonsense put up from the other side. Broadly speaking, two major questions have been raised by members of the Opposition. First, why does the State Government not wait until the Commonwealth inquiry has been conducted so that it can operate uniformly? I can tell honourable members why. A conference of State environmental Ministers some 12 months to 18 months ago, being aware of these problems that we are now legislating for in South Australia, appointed a subcommittee of that conference, consisting of representatives of the environmental departments from each State to consider the matter of non-returnable containers and to make a recommendation to the Ministers' meeting. That recommendation was made on behalf of the officers after an examination of the total Australian picture, and a report was given some months ago to a follow-up meeting of the Ministers.

That report drew attention to the problems of non-returnable containers and suggested that, in view of the upsurge in the sales of cans, uniform legislation should be introduced throughout Australia for a minimum deposit of 10c a can. I was happy to support that proposal, the subcommittee having examined the matter thoroughly; they were recommendations I was prepared to accept. However, I do not think it necessary for me to point out to members of this House that reaction of Liberal environmental Ministers in other States was such that, when the recommendation came forward and I moved that that proposal be adopted, they went a very odd colour, the same sort of colour that L.C.L. members in this State went when the announcement was made.

The Hon. L. J. King: For the same reason, I take it?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: For exactly the same reason. We have seen and heard their nonsense this evening: all that members opposite wanted to do was to get out of it and stall the thing, in spite of the fact that Dr. Cass strongly supported my stand on the issue.

Dr. Eastick: What has he done since?

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: He has been unable to legislate in this matter in the Commonwealth sphere. I assure the Leader that, if he had been able to legislate, we would not be faced with this problem now; we would have uniform legislation throughout Australia, but the Liberal Governments in other States will not pass this legislation. That meeting of Ministers wanted to refer the matter to a Select Committee, exactly the same as has been suggested by members opposite, no doubt under the same instructions as those Liberal Ministers in the other States were under.

Mr. Coumbe: Instructions from whom?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member knows very well to whom I am referring. Whom is he trying to kid?

Mr. Coumbe: Who is instructing us?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The same tactic was followed at Commonwealth level.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: The same tactic was adopted at Commonwealth level as members opposite are attempting to adopt here—to sound off in speeches and to protest how concerned members opposite are about the environment, and to claim how great their policies are on protecting the environment. Members opposite say: "Let us all have a clean-up; let us get this mess out of our rivers and off our roads. But let us do it in the

year 2000. Let us set up a committee to stall it." We know the tactic, and the Government is not prepared to wear it.

Dr. Eastick: Get your feet back on the ground.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The only other argument the Opposition could advance concerned the Jordan committee's report. The committee members looked at the problem and came up with a three-pronged proposal. That committee dealt with many issues, and obviously it could not give adequate attention to this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: You are reflecting now.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not, and I will indicate why I say that. Great progress has since been made by my department. Indeed, at that time, under a Liberal Government, there was no such department.

Mr. Coumbe: But we set up the hist committee.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, the committee was set up under a previous Government.

Mr. Coumbe: That shows initiative.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As has been pointed out by some sections of the community, it avoided the obligation of setting up an Environment and Conservation Department. The three proposals of that committee were, first, to draw attention to the immense problem; secondly, to say something had to be done (and it suggested education as one of the first issues to be looked at and also on-the-spot fines), and, thirdly, a deposit system, as we have implemented it in this Bill. What should be pointed out to members is that this committee, which commenced its work in 1970, did not have the information that we have before us today about the tremendous sky-rocketing in sales of canned drinks in this State.

Mr. Coumbe: When did the committee report?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In 1972. To give members an idea of the information before that committee, it is interesting to note the Australian beverage sales (these are figures from the Bureau of Census and Statistics), showing that beer sales in 1967 were 8.5 per cent in cans and in 1973 they were 25 per cent in cans; so, in a period of six years, there was a jump of almost 20 per cent in beer sales in cans. Soft drinks were 10 per cent in cans in 1967 and 33 per cent in cans in 1973. Obviously there has been a great upsurge in the sales of cans.

Dr. Eastick: Is there any difference in cost?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There has been a marked difference, as has been pointed out by members sitting behind me, in the cost the community is prepared to bear for the convenience of having cans.

Dr. Eastick: Has it been substantiated before the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, but the community is prepared to pay more for drinks in cans containing a smaller amount.

Mr. Dean Brown: They prefer cans?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is obvious the people prefer cans in many instances.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you admit then that this is legislation to ban the can?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No. If the people prefer cans because of their convenience, they will buy them. If they are prepared to pay more for a smaller amount because cans have not the nuisance value of having to be returned somewhere: they can throw them away in the park or drop them overboard from a boat. The test will come whether people prefer cans as a result of aspects that have been promoted or whether they buy them so that they can litter with them. We have

not canvassed the views of the Jordan committee as to whether, with the evidence I have related to members, it would have changed its priorities. I suggest that the committee would have done so, if one takes any notice of a letter of a member of that committee to a newspaper in the past few days. That member has seen the point to which I have referred and has changed his priorities to make the issue of deposit first on his list. The Director of my department, who at the time was a member of that committee, and was a member of the committee of environmental Ministers that reported on the deposit system, has seen the difficulties and has changed his mind.

Mr. Dean Brown: He would look a fool if he didn't back you up.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The recommendation to the Ministers was made before any announcement by the Government about what it was going to do.

Dr. Eastick: What about the brief to send him overseas?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That has been clearly spelt out by Opposition members, but I have not suggested that that was his brief. His brief was to look at the way we could most effectively introduce a deposit system.

Mr. Coumbe: That is a bit narrow: why not the need to see whether there was a better system?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No better system has been pointed out to me, and the Director, after his overseas trip, could not suggest any better system than this one. On the question of the Jordan committee's attitude to education, we should consider what its report actually states, as follows:

The real problem lies with the vast number of containers involved. If 99 per cent of the public behave in a socially responsible way and only discarded their drink containers in bins, this would be regarded as a good response.

That would be a fantastic response, and no Opposition member could argue against that. The report continues:

However, the remaining 1 per cent will be discarding over 1 000 000 cans and bottles over South Australia. The problem becomes therefore one of training a small minority in social responsibility.

Mr. Dean Brown: Training them!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. That is on the basis that the committee considered a 99 per cent result would be the best that could be achieved. I do not think any Opposition member would suggest that, even if we had a total education programme for 50 years, we would achieve a result higher than 50 per cent or 60 per cent, and certainly not 99 per cent. We should consider who can decide what is the solution to the problem. No doubt people closest to this problem are people involved with councils. I know many Opposition members who have been councillors in the past and some have indicated that they supported this sort of proposal. I quote the report of the Local Government Association of South Australia annual meeting which appears in its journal of October, 1973. This matter was debated at great length by people who deal daily with litter problems, and the report states:

Anti-Litter Measure, Deposit: Southern Hills Local Government Association, district council of Meadows.

Resolved that the meeting support the Government proposal to provide for deposits on bottles and cans as an anti-litter measure.

These people would know more about this problem than would officers of my department, the Government, or I, and they can point to the difficulties associated with non-returnable bottles and cans. They support the Government's proposals, because they know how difficult it is to police any penalties that Opposition members have suggested should be applied, but those members have not required

the industry responsible for creating the pollutant to do anything about it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Opposition members forget that a penalty of up to \$200 is provided in the Local Government Act for litter offences, but representatives of councils know that such a provision is impossible to police. Police cars would have to follow other vehicles with officers using binoculars and taking photographs to prove that such an offence was committed. All members realize how difficult it is to convict a person of disposing of litter illegally. It is all very well for Opposition members to suggest alternatives: they are not effective alternatives. They have been considered, but councils still support the Government's move. In relation to the submission made by the member for Fisher on this issue, we know that on this occasion he was sacked from his normal responsibilities on matters of this nature.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

Mr. Coumbe: Will you repeat what you said?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I was referring to the member for Fisher, who was sacked from his normal responsibilities on issues of this nature. The Leader of the Opposition indicated clearly that, despite the fact that the member for Fisher was Opposition spokesman on environment, he would not be leading the debate on this issue. The Leader will not deny that he said it.

Dr. Eastick: I said it, but is that a sacking?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Call it what you like, but I call it sacking. After the honourable member returned from his overseas trip he had a completely independent outlook! He was not convinced by anything he saw or by hand-outs given to him. The honourable member forgets that before he went on his study tour he made a statement to his local newspaper. I think his words are worth remembering, and members will see them if they look through recent newspapers. They are shown as facts 1, 2, 3, and 4. Before the honourable member went away the following report appeared in his local newspaper:

"Gone are the days of preserving fruit and other goods. And of course as packaging increases so does the litter. But litter is not caused by the package, but the person who uses it," said Mr Evans. Mr. Evans explained harsh penalties were one of the most effective ways of curbing the litter problem. In Oregon litterbugs can be fined up to \$500 and if they throw rubbish from their cars, drivers can lose their licences for 90 days. Dumpers can also be forced to spend five days walking the roads picking up rubbish. Mr. Evans said he thought education was the best long-term answer to the rising rubbish problem. "Heavy fines could also be imposed to let people know others care about the community," he said.

It seems to me that, whilst the honourable member states that he went away with a completely open mind, the trip had the effect of confirming his views.

All Government members and all South Australians can see clearly what the Opposition is really trying to do. The Opposition is presenting a united front and expressing tremendous concern for the environment by supporting the second reading, but it wants the Bill referred to a Select Committee, with the aim of delaying its implementation. The Government will not support such an aim.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I move:

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

My reasons for moving this motion are simple, and they are not the reasons that have been alleged by the Minister. He said that the Opposition's reason for wanting the Bill referred to a Select Committee was that the Opposition

wanted to delay the passage of the whole measure. I throw the lie direct back to the Minister: that is not the case.

The Hon Hugh Hudson: You want to kill it.

Mr COUMBE. I believe that the Minister would be well advised to keep out of this debate, in view of the disastrous effects he has had on other debates recently.

The SPEAKER Order! That is not a reason for the motion before the Chair.

Mr. COUMBE. Every member should have the opportunity to have before him an examination of the whole deposit system, which this Bill introduces. For a number of years we have had a deposit system on some containers in South Australia and elsewhere. However, this Bill introduces a new system of deposits on a different type of container. Before this Bill is considered further, the House should have the opportunity of considering the proposed new system to see whether it is the best method of tackling the whole problem of litter, particularly non-returnable containers and cans. I remind the House that the Minister of Environment and Conservation himself said that there had been little or no research undertaken in South Australia, but I believe that such research should be undertaken. Members are entitled to know what evidence is available from expert witnesses. This House should have the benefit of studying the evidence that would be presented to a Select Committee. The whole Bill is based on a preconceived idea which ignores several major aspects of the whole problem. These aspects should be examined by a Select Committee so that all viewpoints can be expressed by expert witnesses.

I sincerely believe that many members of the community would welcome the opportunity to come before a Select Committee and give evidence. The committee might hear evidence from consumers, producers, retailers, representatives of the transport industry, conservationists, and people interested in waterways and roadsides. These are the people from whom the House, through the Select Committee, should obtain information. I do not believe that this Bill is as urgent as the Government has suggested it is. The Government has claimed that the aim of setting up a Select Committee is to waste time. I realize that the findings of the Select Committee could completely uphold the Government's attitude, and I would be the first to accept that finding. However, the committee may arrive at a different finding. The Government, of course, would have the backing of the committee's recommendations. The Select Committee could sit during the coming recess. What has the Government to fear from setting it up? Does it want to hide something?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We don't need—

Mr. COUMBE: Some reference has been made to instructions. I want to make perfectly clear to the Minister that no member of my Party is working to any instructions whatsoever in seeking to have this Bill referred to a Select Committee. I throw that suggestion back in the Minister's teeth. I believe it was wrong of the Minister to suggest such an action. Further, nothing was further from my mind than setting up the committee to delay the Bill. We are trying to seek the facts. I am sure that the people of South Australia would welcome the opportunity to present the facts to this Parliament, the place where their voices may be heard, through the committee, and where the laws are made. Incidentally, this legislation will affect every man, woman and child in the community.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): In supporting the move to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, I do not want my remarks to be misconstrued. The Minister is making menacing laughing noises. He turned the debate into a political

matter earlier when he said that members would regret it or that their districts would know. I do not think the Minister added anything to the debate by making those menacing remarks. He has revealed that he is playing a deep political game in opposing the move to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. I am not saying that the Minister does not have some real motive in trying to cure the litter problem, but he is taking a political view when he is so menacing in his remarks.

The Minister hopes that the community supports him, because he set his course deliberately and early in the piece, but he has been unwise in what he has said. I do not want my remarks to be misconstrued deliberately or voluntarily by the Minister. I support the motion, but we cannot deal with the whole litter problem and divorce cans from it. I do not wish to be associated with those remarks. I believe, as I said earlier, that the Minister is refusing to face reality by moving at this time ahead of the other national view we are looking for. I believe that he should wait for the national view. I am not so sure that the public information which the committee could evaluate would be of much use. We all know of the litter problem caused by cans, whether it be 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 30 per cent.

The SPEAKER Order! In moving that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, the member for Torrens stuck strictly to the requirements. The Bill and any clause in it cannot be the subject of debate. The debate must continue along the lines of referral to a Select Committee, without debate on the Bill or on any clause of it.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker] did not want to widen the debate, but I did not want my remarks to be misconstrued. It appears to be easily done I move not on the basis of opposing finally the matter of a deposit, as that must yet be tried, and perhaps that will be the only way of handling it. However, we should act on a national basis instead of unilaterally. For the reasons I have given, I support the motion.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion. I believe that I am one person who has learned something from seeking information from other people, and I think that the House could benefit from that process. I support the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee to seek additional information, not for the sake of deferring it. I am one (and I think I should say the same about other Opposition members) who heard the Minister refer to a press statement I made, and it was assumed by him that I had made up my mind before I went overseas, because someone else had given me information. I corresponded immediately with the Director on my return from America, and made a public statement while overseas. I decided to seek information that could be made available to a Select Committee. I corresponded with the Directors of Ecology in Oregon, Washington State and Alberta and with the Editor of the *Seattle Times* to obtain their points of view, and it was on that basis that I made a public statement.

I am willing to table the letters and give them to the Minister at any time. People benefit by obtaining information from other people, and the House could benefit by this Bill's being referred to a Select Committee. That applies to this issue or to any other issue. This matter will be of concern to the community, whichever way it goes. I agree with the member for Goyder on the need to see what the other States are doing; after all, they do not all have Liberal Governments; two of them have Labor Governments, and one a Country Party Government. Let us be honest: we are doing this not for Liberal motives but

because we believe in uniformity, if it is possible, especially for tourism, so that people in the other States will know the position.

I have heard a reflection on me. I sought information from other people long before offers were made. That information is available to a Select Committee here or anywhere else. I decided to go overseas. I told my Leader that it would be wise not to lead the debate, because I knew that political slandering and sniping would take place, and I was a good judge of the situation.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the motion. The suggestion has been made by the Government that there are two reasons why the Opposition wishes to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, one of which was made only faintly by way of interjection by the Minister of Education, who said that we wished to kill the Bill. He cannot have much confidence in the Bill if he thinks that a Select Committee is likely to kill it. The other suggestion made was that we wished to delay the Bill, but that is not so. We want to ensure that, when a Bill to control litter is passed, it will be in a proper form and in the best interests of the people of the State. To say that referring the Bill to a Select Committee will delay it and that for that reason the Select Committee should not be thought of is not sound judgment or valid comment. As I have pointed out earlier, if this is good legislation, and if a Select Committee came down with a finding that deposit legislation was worth while, every Opposition member would accept the finding. They would know that the matter had been carefully examined, and they would be pleased to support it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If the committee produced a majority vote in favour of the legislation, what would your position be then?

Dr. TONKIN: I think the Minister is making a hypothetical interjection.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you require a unanimous decision by the Select Committee?

The SPEAKER: Order! The House is debating a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

Dr. TONKIN: The point is that if the Select Committee, having heard evidence, comes down with a report (and I do not say that it should be unanimous or otherwise). I will support it, as will my colleagues. If this is good legislation, the Select Committee will find accordingly. The Minister has changed his tune a little, because earlier he said that no research had been done on the matter. The latest information available to members is the Jordan report and a few snippets that have come to light since then. Now, we hear that the Minister has done much research. I am pleased to hear that, but he should do the House, and indeed the people of South Australia, the courtesy of letting us know what it is. I am not going to say that research has not been done or that the decision that was made to introduce the Bill on the basis of that research was not soundly based. I do not know, and that is the point I am making.

If this is so, the only way of bringing that information out into the open and informing members and the public (because it is the public that will be affected by this legislation) is to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Let us hurry it up and have the committee sit during the recess. That is possible; it is merely a procedural matter. The Bill could be presented again in three months, if necessary, in whatever form the Select Committee decided. The Government is hedging when it says that the Opposition is trying to kill or delay the Bill, and in so doing it is not facing up to the facts. Indeed, it is certainly not considering the Opposition or the people of South Australia.

I hope that the Minister will reflect on this matter and that he will not persist in his present arrogant and completely one-sided attitude.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg cannot continue his remarks along that line on a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

Dr TONKIN: Nevertheless, it is the Ministers attitude that is blocking this matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're the one who is blocking. You just want more time.

Dr. TONKIN. And more information. The people of South Australia also want more information. However, this is a matter about which the Minister cares very little.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I believe that the Minister himself advanced the best case for the referral of this Bill to a Select Committee. He referred to the Southern Hills local government association, saying that it favoured deposits on bottles. Although I have not attended any of its meetings recently, I know that many years ago, before Australia converted to decimal currency, that organization wanted a 6d. deposit on beer bottles. That would convert to about 15c with present money values, or 20c since the Commonwealth Labor Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Heysen that the House is dealing with the motion moved by the member for Torrens that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and that is the only matter that can be debated. The subject matter of the Bill cannot be debated. The honourable member can only explain why he thinks the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr McANANEY: I thought I was doing a perfect job in that respect. The Minister said the Bill should not be referred to a Select Committee. I am merely trying to illustrate from what he said that it is necessary to have a Select Committee straighten out the matter. The Minister assumed what local government in an area wanted, and I believe these people should have the opportunity of giving evidence to a Select Committee. The Minister obviously has not been given any definite information; otherwise he would have given it to honourable members.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It is unfortunate that the Minister of Environment and Conservation has left the Chamber at such an important stage of the debate. I am certain that the embarrassment that the Minister will be saved from what I am about to say, because of his absence from the Chamber, will not be saved by other Government members who are at present in the Chamber. I do not intend to be quite as uncharitable as was the member for Bragg, who said that the Minister was not facing up to the facts. Indeed, I believe the Minister is facing up to this fact: that an investigation of this nature would clearly indicate that we cannot have a discriminatory charge against similar types of receptacle that contain beverages. The Minister knows full well that he could not sustain within his own Party or within the community, particularly in the union movement of which his Party is a major part, an immediate increase in the price of beer because of a 5c deposit on beer bottles.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition was in the House when I explained the position previously. The House is now debating the motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, and that is the only matter that can be debated. The honourable Leader of the Opposition can only explain why he considers the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. However, the situation to which I have referred will apply and, indeed, it will destroy the Minister's case. This would be illustrated early in the Select Committee's deliberations. Referral to such a committee will show that one section of the community or the industry should not be differentiated against. Despite the claim made by the member for Bragg that the Minister was not facing up to the facts. I believe that he is doing so, realizing as he does what would be the result of an inquiry into this Bill, which has been introduced to the benefit of a certain part of the community and to the distinct disadvantage of the remainder of the community.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I have already indicated clearly that I do not intend to accept this motion, for I believe it is only a tactic of members opposite to attempt to delay this legislation.

Members interjecting.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Honourable members can deny that, but that is my view and it is shared by my colleagues.

Dr Eastick: Do you deny that beer will go up by 5c?

The SPEAKER: Order! That interjection is out of order and the honourable Minister will ignore it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I could reply.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister would be out of order in replying.

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: There is some difference of opinion amongst members opposite about what this Select Committee would do. One Opposition member said that it would inquire into the whole problem of litter. Another member said that he wanted the committee to be set up so that it would give anyone who wanted to speak an opportunity to give evidence. The real reason why the member for Goyder supports this motion is that he is concerned about voting against the Bill at this time. He made clear that he was also concerned about the community view on this matter, and well he might be. Members opposite have said repeatedly that the Government has acted hastily in introducing this legislation, and that we have not done sufficient research into the matter. They have said that I have indicated that we have not researched the matter. Members should be clear that what I said on several occasions in reply to questions asked, obviously prompted by the liaison committee, was that I had not researched precisely how many cans there were lying alongside the roads between Adelaide and Victor Harbor and between Adelaide and Murray Bridge. Why should I get the officers of my department to count how many cans are in those areas, in the Flinders Range area, and on the beaches? That does not matter. The Government is concerned that we have at present about 100 000 000 cans—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have told other honourable members who have spoken that they must confine their remarks to the motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee and must not deal with the subject matter contained in the Bill. This is not a ruling of mine: it is the procedure laid down in Standing Orders to be adopted in these circumstances.

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL I am happy to accept what you have said, Mr Speaker. However, suggestions have been made that the Select Committee would elicit information that the Government did not have before it when framing this legislation.

Dr. Tonkin: No information that Parliament doesn't have before it now.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Government said about 12 months ago that this legislation would be introduced. Does the honourable member suggest that this legislation is different from other legislation? If he is honest, he must be duller than I think he is. If he is not honest, that supports my view that he is simply trying to delay this legislation. We do not support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Mathwin, Nankivell, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Hopgood, Langley, and Wells.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.
In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. COUMBE: How long will it take to get this system operating? We are discussing collection areas and collection depots, the refunding of deposits, and all the rest of the paraphernalia set out in the Bill. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the printing of deposit amounts on the containers by the industry; it will take some time to do this, including producing some educational processes for the retailer and the public on the system, if adopted. Can the Minister say how long this will take and can he assure us that all these steps will be taken to protect the consumer and the retailer alike when these provisions come into operation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I can only make a guess, which would be subject to discussion. We would need to consult the people concerned. I guess it would take not less than six months for the procedures referred to by the honourable member to come into operation.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

In the definition of "container", after "container" second occurring, to insert "or a container being a glass container intended for use for containing wine or spirituous liquor whether or not at the material time that container is an empty container".

The purpose of this amendment is to write into the Bill what the Minister on several occasions undertook to do. Some mention was made of doing this by regulation, but would that be a satisfactory way of doing it? I think this is the simplest way to give effect to what the Minister undertook to do.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I accept this amendment, as what the honourable member says I indicated is true. I see no reason why I should not accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. EVANS: The clause provides that "beverage" may mean:

(c) any liquid intended for human consumption by drinking, declared by regulation to be a beverage for the purposes of this Act.

I construe that as including, for instance, milk or fruit juices. Is it intended at some time in the future to include beverages other than beer and carbonated soft drinks in this legislation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is not intended at present, or we would have included those things in the second reading explanation. However, it is necessary to have a provision there in case any dramatic change occurs in the habits of people or the processes involved in this part of the Bill. It may well be that a move will be made, for instance, in the future to provide only cans or cartons as milk containers and we shall need power to deal with that if it becomes a problem. The provision is there to cover any future eventuality.

Mr. ARNOLD: In the second reading debate the Minister indicated it was not intended to include fruit juices. There is no other practicable way of packaging fruit juices, because of their characteristics. The reasons for exempting the wine industry are virtually the same as those applying to fruit juices: that most of the product is marketed outside the State. So it would be difficult to work a deposit scheme.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: By interjection, I did say there was no intention to cover the sort of container to which the honourable member now refers. They are no problem in the country; they do not get thrown around the countryside. They are used mainly in the home. Unless there is a dramatic change in the use of fruit juices and some other situation arises, there is no intention to impose a deposit there.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister's department looked closely at the wax-coated cardboard container used for milk, which is conspicuous as litter? Can the Minister say why that article has not been included in the Bill?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We seriously considered that; it is causing the department and me much concern, but it was thought unnecessary to include it in this clause. We have spoken to the milk industry on that and made clear that, if the use of milk bottles decreases and milk cartons take over in that field, we shall have no hesitation in considering a deposit or some other form of control.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Payment of refund amount."

Mr. EVANS: This provision obliges the retailer to charge a deposit on a container. Does the can have the 5c placed on it when it leaves the manufacturer's premises or when it leaves the retailer's depot?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This matter can be better dealt with under another clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Establishment of collection depots and collection areas."

Mr. COUMBE: How will the metropolitan depot be physically set up, who will pay for it, and how will it operate?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That will be the responsibility of the section of industry to determine in a specified area. Several existing depots could be converted, and we would not object to a hotel acting as a collection depot for the area, whether for soft drink or other containers. A store could also be a collection centre for the neighbourhood. Many options are open, but these will be the responsibility of the industry, as will be the costs involved. At present the mark-up for a retailer on a bottle of soft drink is 50 per cent and on a can it is 33½ per cent. If there

is any inconvenience, despite the price structure, this will be a matter for discussion between the parties involved.

Mr. ALLEN: Does the Minister intend to set up depots in the Far North, particularly in an area in which the local storekeepers refuse to handle cans? Also, what will be the procedure in relation to the cost of getting cans back to a central point?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is the industry's responsibility to decide these matters. Any place can be used as a collection depot, so long as the material can be stored until it is taken away. The question of collecting and returning the product to the manufacturer will be the responsibility of the industry.

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister saying that it is possible to have up to five collection centres in a country town—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Or in the metropolitan area.

Mr. EVANS:—within a short distance of each other? I believe a health hazard will be involved at these collection areas, particularly those that collect different containers.

Mr. RUSSACK: Does the Minister consider that, because it is the responsibility of the industry to arrange the return of bottles and refunds thereon, the price of canned merchandise will increase? If cans are returned to a collection depot, it may be difficult to arrange for the amount of deposit to be transferred from the retail outlet to the collection depot. Does the Minister consider that these costs will increase appreciably the price of the beverages?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It would be foolish to deny that the price will increase to some extent, but I challenge the figures that have been bandied about by the industry recently. We must consider the cost of collecting cans in the metropolitan area and the additional cost in far-flung country areas. Obviously, it will have some impact on the price structure of the cans.

Mr. COUMBE: A hotel or a shop can be an outlet. Let us suppose that over a period 10 dozen cans are sold, each can attracting a 5c deposit. Let us say that eight dozen cans are returned to the depot. I am concerned about the cans that are misplaced, not returned, or dirty. We have a floating number of two dozen cans at 5c each. What happens to that money? In the normal case where the deposit is paid to the outlet by the purchaser, how is that funded to the depot where the refund is paid to the person returning the can?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Let us say that a person is manufacturing a soft drink that has been selling for 15c a can. In these circumstances, instead of selling the soft drink to the retailer at 15c, the manufacturer will sell it to him at 15c plus 5c deposit. The shopkeeper then sells the drink for 25c, including the 5c deposit. The customer returns the can to the collection centre, and he collects his 5c, the can being returned to the manufacturer. At some stage there will be cans that are not returned to the manufacturer. He has received his 5c for them and is naturally not out of pocket.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—"Limitation on sale of certain containers"

Mr. COUMBE: Subclause (1) provides:

On and after the appointed day a retailer shall not sell or cause, suffer or permit to be sold a beverage . . . unless the place or premises from which that sale takes place is situated within a collection area . . .

A retailer may wish to sell a can of drink that has come from another State. Several brands of canned beer come from Victoria, and several brands of canned soft drink come from other States. How does the Minister intend to get over this?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the manufacturer in another State cannot find a person within the designated area who will accept his returns, he will not be able to comply with the provisions of the legislation and will not be able to sell his beverage in this State.

Mr. COUMBE: That is what I thought the Minister might say. Has the Minister consulted with his colleagues on this matter? Does he say that sales of products from other States will not be possible, because of the deposit system, unless the conditions of the legislation are complied with?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Yes.

Mr. COUMBE: So, irrespective of the other legal aspects of interstate trade, the restrictions will apply strictly. People from other States will be prohibited from selling in this State unless they conform to this legislation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes; that is so.

Mr. ARNOLD: Would section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution not override that?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No. There are no problems in that direction.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended to enable the committee to sit during the Parliamentary recess.

The reason for the extension is that several organizations and people wish to give evidence before the committee. Therefore, the committee requests the extension of time so that these bodies may appear before it.

Dr TONKIN (Bragg). I second the motion with pleasure. The work of the committee has been proceeding very successfully and it would be a great shame if it did not have an opportunity to continue its work.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.1 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 21, at 2 p.m.