

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 30, 1975

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITIONS: LOTTERY AND GAMING REGULATIONS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a petition signed by 120 residents of South Australia praying, that the House support the disallowance of the regulations made under the Lottery and Gaming Act regarding cash ticket machines and roulette wheels and permit licensed clubs to install such machines on a ratio in proportion to membership.

Mr. BOUNDY presented a similar petition signed by 90 residents of South Australia.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 120 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 1005 residents of South Australia stating that the burden of succession duties on a surviving spouse, particularly a widow, had become, with inflation, far too heavy to bear and ought, in all fairness and justice, to be removed. The petitioners prayed that the House would pass an amendment to the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

Mr. McRAE presented a petition signed by the President and Secretary of the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union of Australia (South Australian Branch) praying that the House would not pass the proposed beverage container legislation and would seek alternative methods to combat litter.

Mr. McRAE presented a similar petition signed by 280 union member employees of the South Australian Brewing Company Limited.

Mr. ARNOLD presented a similar petition signed by 41 employees of Containers Limited, Berri.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CHILDS ROAD

Mr. WOTTON presented a petition signed by 486 residents of Littlehampton and Mount Barker praying that the House would urge the Government to reverse the decision to close Childs Road, between Littlehampton and Mount Barker, and install a bridge, culvert or similar structure to accommodate two-way traffic.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

MEAT CORPORATION

Mr. GUNN (on notice): How does the South Australian Meat Corporation intend to repay the \$12 469 000 it had outstanding from its borrowing programme as at June 30, 1975?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN : Loans totalling \$6 900 000 will be repaid during the term of the loans by equal half-yearly payments of principal and interest. The remainder of loans will be repaid at maturity and the staggered repayments commence in December, 1977, and extend over the following 26 years. Subject to future capital expenditure, the South Australian Meat Corporation will either re-finance loans as they become due in accordance with normal business practice or repay loans from cash surpluses resulting from profits and internal provisions such as depreciation.

JAMESTOWN HOUSING

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. Why has Jamestown not been listed to receive teacher housing accommodation in the present programme?

2. Was land purchased at Jamestown for the purpose of constructing single teacher units and, if so, when was it purchased and does the Government still own such land?

3. Can the Minister indicate when the present urgent need for teacher housing at Jamestown will be relieved?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Jamestown has not been listed in the present programme because provision was made in the 1974-75 programme for a house to enable accommodation for three single teachers to be supplied at Jamestown. A contract has not yet been let, because of problems associated with land negotiations.

2. Land was purchased to provide accommodation for single teachers. A request was received from the Homes for the Aged for an exchange of land which has been agreed to. Negotiations are currently being finalised.

3. Consideration is being given to placing two two-bedroom units in lieu of the house on the land being acquired. It is hoped that this accommodation will be available during the first half of 1976. Also, land is being purchased as a site for a residence which is to be transferred from Whyte-Yarcowie. This residence will be allocated to the Deputy Principal of the primary school.

DIFFERENTIAL RATING

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce amendments to the Local Government Act relating to differential rating and, if so, when?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, during the present session.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What has been the cost to date of providing replies to questions during the present Parliamentary session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The cost of preparing replies to Parliamentary questions is not available but it would be high. A significant factor has been the considerable increase in the number of Questions on Notice recently: Some of them are trivial and others, like this one, are unanswerable without tremendous research. I do not intend to increase the cost by directing public servants to try to calculate such a figure?

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the Housing Trust and when was each appointed?

2. When does the term of each expire?

3. Is it proposed to reappoint any of the present members and, if so, which ones?

4. If it is not proposed to reappoint any of the present members, why not?

5. By whom are present members, if not to be reappointed, to be replaced and why?

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

J and 2. The members of the trust are:

Mr. M. L. Liberman—appointed May 1, 1975, re-appointed July 24, 1975, as Chairman, term expiring October 24, 1975.

Mr. H. Stretton—appointed January 14, 1971, made Deputy Chairman January 16, 1973, reappointed January 16, 1975, reappointed July 24, 1975, until October 24, 1975.

Mr. R. M. Glastonbury—appointed January 4, 1969, reappointed January 14, 1971, reappointed January 16, 1975, reappointed July 24, 1975, until October 24, 1975.

Mr. J. H. McConnell—appointed January 14, 1971, reappointed January 16, 1975, reappointed July 24, 1975, until October 24, 1975.

Mr. P. B. Wells—appointed April 23, 1970, reappointed January 4, 1973, expiry date January 4, 1977.

Mr. C. D. J. Pugh—appointed January 4, 1973, expiry date January 4, 1977.

Mrs. W. A. Etherington—appointed January 4, 1973, expiry date January 4, 1977.

3, 4, and 5. Decisions on the future membership of the board of the trust will be finalised after the completion of consultation on worker participation.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Land Settlement Committee still required and, if so, for what purpose?

2. If it is considered that the committee is no longer required, what action, if any, does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement is still required. As practically all Crown lands in the good rainfall areas of the State have been either sold or leased, only limited areas of undeveloped Crown lands occasionally become available for settlement. It is not expected therefore that any land settlement proposals will be submitted to the committee in the foreseeable future for consideration in terms of sections 22 and 23 of the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1974. One of the functions of the committee is to consider applications under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, 1963. This Act provides that a guarantee by the Treasurer of repayment of a loan to a person for the purpose of purchasing land for primary production shall not be given unless the Treasurer has referred the application to the committee and the committee has made a recommendation in writing that a guarantee be given. The committee is also required to make recommendations on applications to the Treasurer for deferment of payments of interest on guaranteed loans for periods in excess of two years or of principal for periods in excess of three years. The 1971 amendments to the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1974, relieved landholders of all contributions towards the capital costs of drains constructed. Cabinet has directed that future proposals for any minor drainage works be referred to the committee for investigation and report on desirability of a particular scheme, feasibility, cost and

methods of financing which could possibly include landholder contribution. The Land Settlement Act provides that any major projects, the estimated cost of which exceeds \$60 000 must be referred to the committee for investigation and report.

2. See 1 above.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): During each of the last five financial years:

(a) how many references have been made to the Land Settlement Committee and what were they;

(b) how many meetings has the committee held;

(c) how many reports has it made; and

(d) what have been the fees paid to its members?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

(a) 1970-71—12 applications for assistance under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act.

1971-72—15 applications for assistance under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act.

1972-73—Nine applications (including one deferment) for assistance under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act.

1973-1974—13 applications (including six deferments) for assistance under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act.

1974-75—6 applications for assistance under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act.

(b) 1970-71—3 (plus one inspection of Bool Lagoon)

1971-72—4 (plus one inspection of Bool Lagoon)

1972-73—1

1973-74—5

1974-75—2

(c) 1970-71 Nil.

1971-72 One—(South-East drainage works—proposal to improve water flow through Bool Lagoon) (PP 108 of 1971-72)

1972-75 Nil.

(d) 1970-71 \$3 576

1971-72 \$3 563

1972-73 \$3 595

1973-74 \$3 595

1974-75 \$3 541

INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the present policy of the Government with regard to:

(a) the establishment of new industries; and

(b) the expansion of existing industries at Murray Bridge?

2. When was this policy adopted?

3. Is it now likely to be altered and, if so, why and when?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has a general policy of attracting new industries to the State and assisting the expansion of existing industry. No stipulation is made at present that a firm must build in any specific area within the State—except under industrial zoning legislation—but in discussions with companies the advantages and disadvantages of various locations are discussed. Financial assistance may be given to industries in various ways, namely bank guarantees and

provision of factory premises (through the Industries Development Committee) and grants, loans and equity participation under the State Industries Assistance Corporation. Murray Bridge is included in this general policy. In addition to the above, because of the potential of the Murray Bridge area for industrial development, the South Australian Housing Trust, after consultation with the Development Division, recently acquired two large areas for industrial development, one in the general industry area west of the town near Morris Road, and the other in the light industry area south-west of the town near Hindmarsh Road.

2. The above policy is a continuation of the Government's development policy enunciated when the Government took office.

3. The present incentives are under review in the light of the moves being taken to attract industry by other Australian States.

CAN-MAKING REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the Government, during the week beginning Monday, September 15, receive a report from the Premier's Department on employment relating to the can-making industry and if so:

- (a) when was the report requested and by whom;
- (b) on what day was it received;
- (c) what does the report show;
- (d) will the report be made public and, if so, when; and
- (e) if the report is not to be made public, why not?

2. If such a report has not been received, does the Government propose to obtain one from the Premier's Department and if so will it be made public when received and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

- (a) The report referred to was prepared at the direction of the Director, Development Division, as a normal procedure associated with industrial activity within the State.
- (b) September 17, 1975.
- (c) The report indicates that much of the information came from the industry and the Director, Development Division, concludes that it is not possible to predict accurately the effect of the legislation on can-drink sales and meaningful statements on unemployment cannot be made.
- (d) The report is an internal report of the department not designed for public release.
- (e) See (d).

2. See 1.

CARCLEW

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (September 16).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the Budget debate, I was asked whether the proposed allocation of \$9 000 would enable completion of the restoration programme of Carclew. I have since established that the provision of \$9 000 includes allowance for the following:

\$2 600, balance due to Public Buildings Department for clearing and improving the outside walls, etc., concluded in March, 1974;

\$1 000, provision of improved fire doors in main building and adjacent Stable theatre; and

\$5 400, towards cost of improvements to interior and/or provision of new toilet and shower facilities, subject to negotiation of extension of lease with Adelaide City Council.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN and Mr. MILLHOUSE (September 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the Budget debate there were questions about two letters relating to the report of the Working Environment Committee submitted to the State ALP Conference, and I replied that I had the first but not the second letter. In the circumstances, an exhaustive search was subsequently made in my office for the missing letter, and I advise that, having discovered it caught up amongst other papers, I have now replied to Mr. Bashford.

ARTS DEVELOPMENT

In reply to Dr TONKIN (September 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the Budget debate, I undertook to obtain information for the Leader regarding the Arts Development Branch expenditure for 1974-75, which is as follows:

	Actual Payments
<i>Salaries and Wages and related payments</i>	\$
Arts Development Officer and clerical staff	42 402
<i>Contingencies</i>	
Operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries.....	2 270
Purchase of office machines and equipment	—

BUILDERS LICENSING BOARD

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (September 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the Budget debate the honourable member sought information regarding the finances of the Builders Licensing Board. The figures at June 30, 1975, were:

	\$	\$
Receipts.....		154 000
Salaries and board members fees and related payments	112 000	
Other operating expenses . . .	19 900	131 900
Excess of receipts over payments		22 500

The above expenditure does not include fixed and semi-variable expenses such as rent, telephone, etc. The Auditor-General commented in his report that there was need to increase licence fees if the board's expenditure was not to exceed its revenue, and this will be considered.

FILM LIBRARY

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Film Library does not charge hiring fees for films used by borrowers. It is a condition of borrowing that users are liable for the cost of replacing badly damaged films. The four films damaged beyond repair in the last financial year were all damaged whilst being shown at schools. No charge was made for replacements, but the Education Department was informed of the damage so that preventive action could be taken in the future. The sum of \$67 965 was made available for

the Film Library under the Urban Unemployment Relief Scheme in 1974-75. This was used for:

- (a) Recataloguing, cross-referencing, cleaning, relabelling, respooling, and recanning library films.
- (b) Reviewing catalogue assessments and printing a supplementary catalogue.
- (c) Liaison with community groups of potential film borrowers.
- (d) Revision of the book library and amalgamation of catalogue and reference systems.

In the last financial year the corporation added 1 081 film prints (771 titles) to its collection and at June 30, 1975, held 13 212 film prints (7 556 titles).

FILM CORPORATION

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Each year a sum is provided in the Estimates under the Premier's Department Miscellaneous Payments line for the production of all films for Government departments by the South Australian Film Corporation. A Government Film Committee has been set up to determine allocations and priorities among departments and to monitor expenditure. When a sponsor department briefs the corporation on the requirements for a film, the corporation initially requests payment of an advance to cover the cost of commissioning research and scripting by a writer in line with the departmental brief. This first advance is released to the corporation by the Government Film Committee. After the sponsor department has approved the final draft script, the corporation lets a production contract at a price agreed by the department. Prior to commencement of actual production, the balance of the funds needed for the film is released by the Government Film Committee and lodged by the corporation in its Treasury account.

This procedure is quite proper, as the corporation is liable to pay film companies a percentage of the contract sum immediately on execution of a contract and to make progressive payments at agreed stages thereafter. The Film Corporation also invoices commercial sponsors in advance under similar conditions. This arrangement simplifies accounting procedures and avoids having the corporation incur interest charges on payments made from its borrowed funds in advance of recoveries from sponsors. The corporation is at risk to the extent that, if a contracted film does not come up to its high standards, the corporation will, if necessary, remake the film without additional cost to the sponsor.

ELECTORAL ROLL

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 10).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The print of the electoral roll contains 95 names to the page. This size of print has been used since June, 1971, and for all Federal and State elections since that date. Fewer names per page results in an increase in the number of pages to be printed at the very time the Government Printer is hard pressed to provide the necessary rolls. A short period between writ, nomination and polling days makes it imperative that rolls are available for distribution at short notice. An increase in size of print would aggravate an already serious problem.

This department is well aware of the task and is constantly investigating improved methods of roll production. It is understood that the Government Printer has equipment on order that will facilitate type setting by a high-speed

sophisticated process. This will replace the existing method of photographic reduction of computer print and provide a better standard print of roll.

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 10).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The total cost of printing the electoral roll was \$47 860, half of which is borne by the Australian Government under the Joint Rolls Agreement. The printing of four divisions, namely Hawker, Adelaide, Kingston and Hindmarsh, was completed by private contractors at a cost of \$10 611. Had these four divisions been printed by the Government Printer, he estimates that the cost would have been \$8 140. The outside firms had to use overtime to produce their commitments in the given time. Their printing was not carried out more efficiently than that of the Government Printer whose methods of production are considered to be as efficient as any available and have been studied and adopted by Government Printers in other States.

ELECTORAL STAFF PAYMENTS

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (September 10).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The majority of organisations involved and individuals who have been employed in connection with the recent periodical and general elections have been paid. Polling staff are paid on the day of the poll. Returning officers' accounts are being checked, but advance accounts have not yet been brought to debit with the Treasury.

PUBLIC SERVICE

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (September 16).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In response to the Leader's inquiries regarding the growth rate of the Public Service, a target of 5.37 per cent growth on the size of the Public Service was set for the financial year ended June 30, 1975. The actual percentage growth achieved was 5.2 per cent. The individual targets set for each department for 1975-76 and the final growth figures as at June 30, 1975, are given in the following table. The figures in brackets in the second column of the table indicate a decrease in the number of staff employed at June 30, 1975 as compared with those employed at June 30, 1974.

Department	1975-76 Allocation	1974-75 Increase
Agriculture.....	50	26
Art Gallery.....	1	(2)
Attorney-General's.....	20	10
Auditor-General's.....	8	3
Botanic Garden.....	2	1
Chemistry.....	3	—
Chief Secretary's.....	—	(3)
Community Welfare.....	38	60
Correctional Services.....	20	(3)
Crown Law.....	2	1
Education.....	50	128
Further Education.....	25	20
Electoral.....	—	(1)
Engineering & Water Supply . . .	50	55
Environment & Conservation . . .	15	31
Fisheries.....	7	(7)
Government Printing.....	3	22
Government Reporting.....	—	—
Highways.....	16	(1)
Hospitals*.....	81	181
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.....	4	9
Labour and Industry.....	12	19
Lands (including Land Commission)	20	29
Libraries.....	8	(11)
Local & District Criminal Courts . .	—	20
Marine and Harbors.....	1	(2)
Mines.....	—	12
Minister of Agriculture	—	—
Minister of Education.....	—	—
Minister of Works.....	—	(1)

Department	1975-76 Allocation	1974-75 Increase
Police.....	3	5
Premier's.....	8	7
Produce.....	—	3
Public Actuary.....	1	1
Public Buildings.....	50	32
Public Health.....	55	40
Public Service Board.....	15	(12)
Public Trustee.....	3	(2)
Registrar-General's.....	15	(14)
State Supply.....	1	
State Taxes.....	10	1
Superannuation.....	2	(1)
Supreme Court.....	2	(2)
Tourism, Recreation & Sport . .	6	17
Transport—Minister's Office ..	9	}60
—Motor Registration	16	
Treasury	1	2
Valuation.....	5	3
Woods and Forests.....	10	(2)
	648	731

*Does not include provision of staffing for Flinders Medical Centre.

ELECTION COST

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 10).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The actual cost of the elections held in July, 1975, cannot be given until all returning officers' accounts are received, checked and the expenditure on follow-up action is known. Returning officers' advance accounts will be finalised with Treasury, and the actual expenditure can then be determined.

RAILWAY DEFICIT

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (September 18).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The total estimated expenditure to be appropriated under Railways Department is \$81 300 000. The total of estimated receipts is shown as \$50 300 000. The difference between these two figures, which may at first sight appear to be the measure of the estimated railways deficit, is \$31 000 000. However, the references to the estimated metropolitan deficit and to the expected recoup from the Australian Government on account of the non-metropolitan deficit imply that the overall deficit is likely to be about \$60 000 000.

The difference between the \$31 000 000 and the \$60 000 000 is accounted for by two factors. First, the appropriation under Railways Department is at wage rates and price levels effective at June 30, 1975. The actual expenditures will be higher than this as the Railways operation absorbs:

- (a) part of the round sum allowance of \$82 000 000 set aside to cover the costs of new wage awards after June 30, 1975, for all departments and authorities.
- (b) part of the round sum allowance of \$16 000 000 set aside to cover the costs arising from higher prices for supplies and services for all departments and authorities.

Secondly, there are expenditures on account of the railways operation which are appropriated on lines other than Railways Department. These include debt services and superannuation in the special Acts provision and debt services under Treasurer—Miscellaneous.

STATE TAXES DEPARTMENT

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 18).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In his reply to the honourable member during the Committee stages of the Bill, the Deputy Premier set out in detail the reasons

for the increased provision. As is standard practice, only wage and salary increases known at the time of the preparation of the Budget were included in this line. The cost of any further increases has been provided for in the lump sum allowance of \$82 000 000.

ELECTION STAFF

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 10).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Whenever periodical and general elections are held, additional temporary staff are employed in this department, the number so engaged depending upon the work load involved. As the total staff is used on a variety of essential urgent tasks, it is not possible to state the number of additional temporary staff employed to handle the many postal vote applications. The number of additional staff employed in the department at the recent election was six officers, who dealt with the whole range of electoral duties, including postal voting. The cost of the six officers was \$3 817.07. The majority of postal vote applications are issued by the 47 House of Assembly returning officers, who employ casual staff as required within a set financial allocation. The total staff employed at the State Electoral Department in Currie Street at the time of the recent elections was two fewer than the periodic and general elections in 1973.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE SCHEME

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (September 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The grant of \$500 000 to the Law Society of South Australia is for the purposes of the Legal Assistance Scheme. The benefits under this scheme are available to eligible persons irrespective of where they reside in South Australia.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (September 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The allocation of \$20 000 for compensation for injuries resulting from criminal acts is considered sufficient. There is no proposal to increase the maximum amount that may be awarded under the Act, and it is considered that the scheme is working satisfactorily.

TITLE NOTATIONS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member is referring to certificates of title that have been marked "survey required", there is no means by which the total number of notations of this nature can be ascertained. Some of these notations were made years ago when the title data first became suspect. The accuracy of the data shown on certificates of title often remains unchallenged until such time as the department receives a new survey of land in the area, disclosing that the title data is incorrect and requires correction. The principal causes for the necessity to correct are as follows:

- (a) lack of data in early land grants and certificates of title;
- (b) incorrect surveys disclosed by subsequent surveys which reveal a surplus or shortage; and
- (c) encroachments.

The Registrar-General regards the establishment of accurate title data as being one of his primary functions. Therefore, whenever substantial discrepancies in measurements or fixings become apparent, the Registrar-General will call for a survey to settle any conflicts. A discretionary power to call for a certified survey is conferred on the Registrar-General by section 220 (8) of the Real Property Act, 1886-1975.

ADMINISTRATION OFFICERS

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (September 11):

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the Budget debate, the honourable member asked for details of the duties and salaries of all personnel involved in the Policy Division and the Economic Intelligence Unit. They are:

POLICY DIVISION**1. Functions of the division**

The Policy Division's primary task is to provide the Government with an independent assessment of policy issues. This includes the analysis of various policy items as well as review and co-ordination services. The division may also recommend policy initiatives to the Government.

2. Details concerning the salaries and positions of the officers of the division are as under:

Name	Position	Salary per annum \$
<i>Males—</i>		
K. J. Bertram	Administration Officer .	11 189
G. L. Bleeze	Clerk.....	8 936
G. Foreman	Project Officer	13 364
B. Guerin.....	Senior Project Officer . .	15 592
G. S. Lewkowicz . .	Project Officer.....	11 655
G. Maguire	Project Officer.....	13 364
G. M. Stokes	Temp. Graduate Officer	8 651
M. U. Sullivan . . .	Co-ordination Officer . .	13 364
S. Tully.....	Clerk	5 920
W. Voyzey.....	Assistant Director	21 756
<i>Females—</i>		
H. Barrett.....	Research Officer	8 651
J. Bennett.....	Steno-Secretary.....	7 434
H. Turner.....	Office Assistant Gr. II	5 184

ECONOMIC INTELLIGENCE UNIT**1. Functions of the unit**

The Economic Intelligence Unit is a service unit to the Premier's Department. Included in its duties is the provision of a monthly report on the state of the economy, submitted through the Permanent Head of the Department to the Premier and Cabinet. The report covers aspects of South Australia's general performance compared with the rest of Australia as well as offering comment on the prospects for the national economy.

The unit's officers also serve on numerous committees and working parties where economic expertise is required, for example, the State Revenue Working Party, Bread Industry Inquiry, State Energy Committee and various Commonwealth committees such as the Special Committee on the Wine and Brandy Industry and the Immigration Task Force for South Australia. The unit also prepares briefs for the Premier for his discussions with Federal and other State Governments and Ministers.

2. Details concerning the salaries and positions of the officers of the unit are as under:

Name	Position	Salary per annum \$
<i>Males—</i>		
J. L. Byrne	Economist.....	10 287
N. W. Lawson . . .	Research Officer . . .	9 987
R. S. Ruse.....	Economist.....	11 655
A. M. Smith	Senior Economist . . .	18 648
<i>Females—</i>		
J. R. Tully	Office Assistant Gr. III	5 917

PLANNING APPEAL BOARD

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the Supply Bill, I was asked to furnish information regarding Judge Ward and hearings of the Planning Appeal Board. I have since been informed that, for the period commencing September 1, 1975, until the Christmas holidays this year, cases have been set down before the Planning Appeal Board on the assumption that His Honour Judge Gerald Ward will be able to give three weeks out of every

four weeks to the affairs of the board. It is not possible to predict what calls may be made upon the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas in the future under the existing legislation which relates to it, as that depends entirely upon the actions of councils. It is equally impossible to indicate what calls would be made upon the Royal Commission if Parliament gave legislative effect to its third report.

The Planning Appeal Board is always conscious of the fact that the present period is one of great escalation in prices. That escalation affects almost every person or company who wishes to enter upon any developmental or building programme. The board tries to hear all appeals as quickly as possible. For practical purposes, all appeals lodged with the Planning Appeal Board before July 1, 1975, have been given hearing dates during the 1975 calendar year.

From July 1, 1975, to September 17, 1975, some 115 proceedings have been instituted before the Planning Appeal Board. Of those, 57 have been full appeals and 58 have been applications of other kinds. Every one of those applications comes on for hearing usually within a week of being lodged. Two of those 57 appeals have already been dealt with, and another eight have been given hearing dates in 1975, where, as a result of previously listed cases concluding more quickly than was expected, vacant days have arisen. However, some 47 appeals have been lodged since July 1, 1975, for which no dates have yet been set, as all three divisions of the board are heavily committed to previously listed cases. Where presently listed cases finish earlier than expected or "drop out", every endeavour is made to fill vacant periods with previously unlisted cases. However, it is not always possible to arrange for such cases to be introduced at short notice.

It is necessary to appreciate that the board must not only find time to hear each appeal but then needs time to consider its decision and to reduce its reasons for that decision into writing as required by the Planning and Development Act. The judges who act as Chairmen of the board are actively engaged in considering means whereby procedures can be introduced which will reduce the amount of time involved in hearing individual appeals. All such procedures must ensure that all parties have full opportunities to present their cases.

PAY-ROLL TAX

In reply to Mr. COUMBE, Mr. GOLDSWORTHY, and Mr. VENNING (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: From the time of the introduction of pay-roll tax during the Second World War to the transfer of this levy to the States in 1971, State Government departments were required to pay the tax. When the State Government took over the charge it was thought that an exemption for Government departments would save unnecessary book-keeping and administrative work. However, much work is done by departments for outside bodies and in these cases it is only appropriate that the Government should be on the same footing as private enterprise in setting its charges. When the Pay-roll Tax Act was amended in 1973 to raise the rate to 4½ per cent, therefore, the opportunity was taken to restore the levy on Government departments. The second reading explanation of the amending Bill is at page 358 of *Hansard* for the second session of the Forty-First Parliament.

I point out that both New South Wales and Victoria apply the tax to Government departments, and while South Australia was a claimant State it was necessary to undertake a great deal of clerical work for the Grants Commission

to place the accounts of the three States on a comparable basis. This argument no longer holds, of course, but interstate comparisons are still frequently made and there are, therefore, considerable advantages in having the accounts of the States as uniform as possible. Budget allocations to departments are set in the full knowledge that an appropriate amount must be set aside for pay-roll tax. If liability for pay-roll tax was removed from Government departments the allocations to departments would simply be that much lower. Alternatively, if pay-roll tax was levied at 10 per cent, instead of 5 per cent, the allocations would be that much higher.

NATURAL DISASTERS

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 17).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State Disaster Committee has been set up and had its first meeting on September 18, 1975, to consider the framework of a State disaster plan. Once this framework has been established various committees will be set up to co-ordinate the many and varied services required in a disaster situation. I would here like to stress the value to South Australia of its volunteer organisations, and it is proposed for them to be represented on appropriate subcommittees to enable co-ordination of their efforts..

AGRICULTURAL MISSION

In reply to Mr. RODDA (August 21).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The official purpose of the mission to the Middle East by the former Minister of Agriculture was to confer with oversea agricultural and meat marketing authorities with the aim of establishing friendly working relations between them and South Australia and promoting or expanding exports of carcass meat, live sheep, agricultural machinery, seeds and technology from South Australia. The mission was a success and a number of matters have been set in train as the result of discussions held. These include formal contact with South Australian seed and grain marketing authorities on behalf of two North African countries and one Persian Gulf State, an official visit to South Australia by a party of agricultural officials from Algeria and negotiations with the Governments of Algeria and Iraq in relation to the provision of technical expertise for agricultural development projects. There has been a renewal of working contracts for technical experts seconded to the Libyan Government together with negotiations for the recruitment of additional technical experts for work in Libya and the training of Libyan technical staff in South Australia. Negotiations for the sale of meat and livestock in several of the Middle Eastern and North African countries visited have led to, or should result in, clearcut benefits for South Australia. However, it is inappropriate to release full details of these at this stage. In conclusion, the Minister's mission created good will and understanding at Government level between South Australia and the eight countries visited and did much to ensure a continued expansion in the sale by private companies of meat, livestock and agriculture equipment and seeds to that area.

MURDER RE-TRIAL

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (August 26).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The considerations which render a reference of the petition to the Full Court inappropriate are as follows:

1. The case presented against MacDonald at the preliminary examination was extremely strong.

MacDonald volunteered to the police that he had killed the deceased; he admitted that the killing was planned and he explained the motive for his actions.

2. There was never any suggestion of a legal defence to the charge, either in the answers which MacDonald gave to the police or in the evidence of witnesses at the preliminary examination. The petition refers to the fact that the police ballistics expert gave evidence that the firing mechanism of the rifle was defective. The expert stated in evidence that there was a faulty safety catch on the rifle. If the weapon was placed in the cocked or fully loaded position with the safety catch applied and pressure was then placed on the trigger, the firing pin mechanism disengaged but it did not travel forward. However, if the safety catch was then released and pushed forward the weapon discharged. Nevertheless, at no time did MacDonald say that the weapon discharged accidentally in this or any other way. His description to the police of what he did in loading and firing the weapon would not give rise to the possibility of accidental discharge in the manner referred to above.
3. The complaint that MacDonald did not consult with his family could not lead to a quashing of the conviction. MacDonald was advised by Mr. K. V. Borick, a most experienced advocate in the criminal court. It is standard practice to obtain written instructions in this type of case.
4. The courts are loath to interfere where an accused person has pleaded guilty to a charge, been sentenced and then desires to have his case re-opened. An appeal court will not interfere in such a case unless the circumstances are exceptional. The petition in this case does not disclose any such ground.

If desired, I will make available to the Leader of the Opposition the depositions taken at the preliminary examination.

POSTAL VOTING

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 21).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is currently examining the Western Australian legislation whereby a register is maintained by the Chief Electoral Officer of those electors who apply and whose applications are accepted (from electoral districts which have been declared as remote areas). Postal ballot papers are sent to those electors as soon as practicable after nominations have been declared.

SUNKEN KETCH

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (September 9).

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: The *Moorara* sank in 4 metres to 5 metres of water and at high tide the sides of the vessel project about 1 m to 1½ m above sea level. As the vessel is visible at all states of the tide and is not in the regular shipping channel, it is not intended to mark her position in any way. However, a Notice to Mariners is being issued. The owners are salvaging parts of the vessel and are believed to have already received one offer for salvage and are expecting another. It is understood that the council of the Point Pearce Aboriginal community will consider the vessel's future later this month?

DARTMOUTH STORAGE

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (September 9).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The main contract for the Dartmouth dam is scheduled for completion by March 1, 1978, but the dam cannot be declared operational until adequate storage is impounded. As regards the outlet gates at Lake Victoria, a programme is in hand to electrically operate these gates and prior to this installation they must be checked for free movement. With this in view one outlet of the three has been coffer dammed off with timber stop logs for some time but river conditions have caused a delay in the dewatering and inspection. The operation of Lake Victoria works can be undertaken at any time by the use of two outlets only.

WATER STORAGE

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 11).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: An assessment is taking place of all older reservoirs and dams. Changed use of reservoirs has led to more rapid draw-down of the water levels than previously, and it is necessary to check that earth dams are able to accommodate this without impairing the structure. As a result of inspections of dams and their record of performance, the following actions have been taken:

1. The spillway capacity at Warren reservoir was increased by lowering the level of the weir.
2. The spillway at Baroota has been modified by temporary works, and plans are in hand for permanent modifications to prevent further erosion by floods.
3. Baroota dam was found to have undergone some settlement. The crest has been levelled by placing up to half a metre of fill on it to maintain adequate freeboard above flood level.
4. The top section of Mount Bold dam was strengthened following the addition of spillway gates to increase the capacity.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (September 16).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At June 30, 1975, there was a total of 171 dwellings under construction in Murray Bridge. The following table shows the positions of the contracts involved at that date:

Type of Unit	No. of Contracts	Work Commenced			Total Units on site	No. of Units under construction at June 30, 1975
		1973	1974	1975		
Veneer single units	1	—	1	—	2	2
Timber single units	12	—	6	6	26	22
Veneer double units	2	1	1	—	74	60
Timber double units	4	1	3	—	34	24
Veneer single storey maisonettes	2	—	2	—	63	63
	21	2	13	6	199	171

From the above it can be seen that at June 30, 1975, there were 21 current contracts under way in Murray Bridge and of these only two had been started before 1974.

SPORTS SUBSIDIES

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (September 9).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Division of Recreation and Sport of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department offers two forms of subsidy to associations and organisations seeking financial assistance. These are:

1. Capital assistance for development of sporting and recreation facilities for—

Major projects

Minor projects.

2. Financial assistance for junior sports coaching.

Explanatory notes and application forms are forwarded to associations and organisations, and if further assistance or information is required, officers of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department are available for consultation. All 136 councils in South Australia are aware of this scheme through circulars which have been posted to them. Advertisements appear in the press (*Advertiser*, *News* and *Sunday Mail*) at various times throughout the year advising the public that applications for a particular scheme should be lodged with the department. Arrangements are in hand to forward application forms and explanatory notes to all members of Parliament.

PRIORITY ROADS

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (September 11).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The creation of priority roads within the built-up area of the city is the prerogative of the Adelaide City Council. The Highways Department has no plans for the implementation of priority roads within the city of Adelaide. By arrangement with the council some radial routes have already been treated (eg Anzac Highway) and have been marked as priority roads as far as the inner terraces. However, since there are no side streets involved within the park lands, these arrangements are only nominal. The establishment of clearway conditions in Melbourne Street was suggested to the council by the Commissioner of Highways, but the council's initial reaction was not favourable. Subsequently, both the Director-General of Transport and the Commissioner of Highways have asked the council to reconsider its attitude and a reply is still awaited.

GRAIN SILOS

In reply to Mr. VENNING (September 9).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As indicated by the Premier in reply to the honourable member's question, the matter of grain silos was subject to question during the passage of the Railways Agreement South Australia (Bill) in the Australian Parliament on August 26, 1975. The full report of the debate is contained on pages 511 to 519 of the Australian *Hansard* and I commend this to the honourable member's reading; particularly would I draw attention to the comments of the Australian Minister in closing the debate, as reported on page 518.

ROADWORKS

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (September 16).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An amount is provided annually in the Highways Department works programme for expenditure on tourist roads. Grant amounts are decided and allocated on the recommendation of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department following consideration of proposals submitted by councils. Councils are required to expend, from their own resources, an amount equal to the Government grant for tourist road purposes. Over the five-year period ended June 30, 1975, a total of \$100 000

was provided for work on tourist roads and \$67 000 was allocated. Of the \$20 000 provided for expenditure on tourist roads in the 1975-76 financial year, \$12 500 has been allocated to date.

PUBLIC PARK FUNDS

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (August 26).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is very difficult to provide any effective way whereby public parks funds can be allocated so that councils will be able to purchase land in the knowledge that funds will be available. The Government does not know the requirements of councils until they apply for assistance. At this stage, consideration is given to every application and advice forwarded to the council that funds are either available immediately or in the near future when further funds might become available. Accordingly, there would be few councils that are not aware at this stage as far as their applications are concerned as to when funds will be available. Considerable demands for assistance are received and an endeavour is made to apply priorities in accordance with the funds which might be available. Most applications are approved even though there are instances where available funds may mean some delays in subsidies being approved and paid.

The \$250 000 referred to by the honourable member was Loan funds made available last year. These were not the total funds available as revenue allocations were also made. Total payments made in connection with public parks for the 1974-75 financial year amounted to \$546 380 and involved numerous grants to numerous councils. The smallest grant paid to a council was \$200 to the District Council of Burra Burra and the largest grant was \$150 000 for the acquisition of land in the West Lakes area. In between these amounts of varying sums were made available to councils both in the metropolitan area and in the country for both the acquisition of land and development of land. It would not be practicable to list the numerous grants made. The sum of \$300 000 has been made available from Loan funds for the 1975-76 financial year and a like amount from revenue funds. At this stage there appears to be little doubt that the total funds will be fully committed during the current financial year.

MAIN ROAD No. 34

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (September 11).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Work on the Swan Reach to Maggea section of the Nuriootpa-Loxton road has been suspended due to rising costs, limited overall funds available, and the requirements of the Australian Government Road Grants Act, 1974. The Highways Department intends to complete this project as soon as possible consistent with overall priorities and needs. However, further work does not appear likely next financial year and the position beyond that period is unknown pending following Australian Government legislation for aid for roads.

VALE PARK KINDERGARTEN

In reply to Mr. SLATER (September 11).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Construction of the kindergarten at Vale Park commenced on September 1, 1975, and provides for a 26-week contract. If the contract period can be adhered to the kindergarten should be ready in the first term of 1976.

LUCINDALE AREA SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. RODDA (September 11).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Although a feasibility study for a future new building at Lucindale has commenced,

I regret to have to say that there are no definite proposals to proceed with any major building project at that school at the present time.

ASBESTOS WORK

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (September 17).

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Industrial Safety Code Regulations made under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972, include extensive provisions relating to the use of asbestos in industrial premises. The provisions concerning the use of asbestos will come into operation on September 1, 1976. However, there are no similar regulations concerning the use of asbestos on building work, which I understand was the matter referred to by the honourable member in asking his question on September 17, 1975. I have now referred to the tripartite Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board, constituted under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act for investigation, report and recommendation whether or not a regulation should be made to control the use of asbestos material on construction work as defined in that Act, and the precautions that should be taken to protect persons in construction work who use, or may be affected by, that material. If the board concludes that a regulation should be made I have asked it to recommend the form of the regulation.

APPRENTICES

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (August 26).

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member referred to "the new industrial training legislation in Victoria which provides for pre-apprenticeship training for school leavers". The position is that the Victorian scheme provides secondary school leavers with full-time instruction to enable them to enter apprenticeships under special conditions, but in South Australia it is not limited to school leavers. Successful pre-apprenticeship training schemes have operated in the bricklaying trade, where the candidates have been, in the main, those already in the work force. It is proposed to continue efforts to initiate pre-apprenticeship training in other trades.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the serious unemployment situation in South Australia, will the Premier give details of the number of school leavers expected to be seeking jobs at the end of this school year and of what job opportunities will be available to them, both in the private sector and in the Public Service? Unemployment is one of the major problems facing us today, and indications are that it will not get any better in the near future. This year, many students who were ready to go out to work returned to school, simply because no jobs were available to them, and it seems that many more students will face this situation again this year. This is the time of the year when students are looking at what careers are open to them. This year they are seeking not careers but any employment. These young citizens of the future have a right to know exactly what they are up against, and that having details of how many will be leaving school, the jobs for which they can apply in commerce and industry, the Government, etc., and whether they should accept the first job that comes along, or whether to hold out longer for something with more scope. If they all stay on at school, there will be an overloading of the education system, particularly in the top years. In the light of any positive Government initiatives to relieve the unemployment situation, these young people should at least be informed of what they can expect.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will try to get a report with as much information as the Government has available. The situation facing school leavers in employment in Australia today is a serious one.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why would that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is serious in all comparable countries at present, and I point out to the honourable member that it is less serious in South Australia than in any other State: we have a lower proportion of the work force unemployed than is the case in any other State.

Mr. Dean Brown: Not on seasonally adjusted figures.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will get the report. I will provide the figures to the House and the details of the position facing school leavers in South Australia at present. The position is necessarily and naturally very worrying to the Government, but it has been reviewing the situation to ascertain in which areas it is able to assist.

SPRAY PACKS

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier consider banning the sale of a product which is publicised in this morning's *Advertiser* and which is known as the "Sheriff"? Last week, I heard a radio advertisement for this substance, which, apparently, is an irritant contained in an aerosol can. It is claimed that this substance will act as a deterrent against people who may attempt to assault women. The object is to aim the nozzle of the can at an attacker's eyes, press the button, and the person at whom the chemical is aimed will be blinded for a period of 15 minutes. It is obvious that a substance of this kind could be used in a very dangerous way against many people (bank clerks, people on the street, and police officers making arrests), and I believe that its sale should be banned in South Australia immediately. I should be interested to know whether officers of our very fine Police Department were consulted before this material was placed on sale in the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The department was not consulted before the material went on sale. However, when it was placed on sale I asked for a report from the Commissioner, and that was received today. It pointed out that in fact the carrying of an aerosol can containing material of this kind would be likely to render the person who carried it subject to prosecution under section 15(1) of the Police Offences Act. The report from the Police Department surveyed the legislation in Australia relating to matters of this kind, and pointed out that in New South Wales there was a specific prohibition against carrying spray cans or things of this kind that could be used to harm other people. However, the department's view is that the matter is coped with by section 15(1) of the Police Offences Act, and did not recommend any amendment to the present legislation.

PETROL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I had in mind asking a question similar to that asked by the member for Florey, but there are many other matters on which we can question the Government. Can the Premier say whether the State Government has taken action to stockpile petrol as a safeguard against any future petrol strike, as was experienced two years ago, and whether the Government has considered building its own storage facilities for such an eventuality? Two years ago the State was faced with a crisis in which I believe many people bought excess stocks of petrol in panic. As we are subject to industrial disputes at Port Stanvac from time to time, and a crisis can occur in

the State because of any industrial action, has the Government considered storing petrol or building facilities that will enable it to do so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not considered building storage facilities to stockpile petrol owned by the Government. Following the events to which the honourable member has referred, a working party was set up that keeps in touch with the oil companies about the position of supplies within the State and keeps the Government informed on anything that may arise. That is on-going work, and we keep an eye on the situation. The honourable member might not have been aware of it, but, just after the recent State election was called, a situation arose that could have placed the State in quite serious difficulties. However, the Government intervened and obtained the release of the necessary fuel, making sure that the State would not face difficulties. This is on-going work of the Government, and we keep up with the supply situation to see whether any emergency action is necessary.

WAGE INDEXATION

Mr. GROTH: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether weekly-paid State Government employees will have indexation of over-award and service payments back-dated to May last?

The Hon. I. D. WRIGHT: The Government has made a decision in relation to the indexation of over-award payments and service pay.

Mr. Gunn: Lucky you had a reply ready.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In case the member for Eyre did not hear me I repeat that the Government has made a decision regarding the indexation of over-award and service payments. If that enlightens the member for Eyre I am delighted. The Government was faced with two problems in this area.

Mr. Gunn: Do—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call honourable members to order. The Minister must be given an opportunity to reply to the question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government had to decide on the principle of indexation relating to applying it to its own employees. Until its recent decision, the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission had not recommended the indexation of over-award and service payments. In the decision of the Commonwealth Full Bench on that matter Justice Moore made clear that these payments should be made by all employers. There is no question of how that judgment was framed. The Government, being a strong supporter of wage indexation, had no option but to accept that principle. I remind the House that last year the Premier was one of the initiators of this form of productivity payment.

Mr. Gunn: You'll get on!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am on. I am all right, thank you. As the South Australian Government as a whole strongly supports this concept, it though it was only proper that it should revert to the original decision made in May to ensure that State Government employees were at no disadvantage compared to Commonwealth Government employees. I think it is necessary to explain to the House what that means. Although Commonwealth Government employees receive what are commonly known as "service payments", "increments" or whatever they are called, they are embodied in the total rate paid. As a consequence, because the South Australian Government does not disagree

with this principle and because Commonwealth employees were receiving it, the South Australian Government will pay it. Having supported the Commonwealth Government in its wages policy, we thought it only proper to extend this privilege back to May 15 this year for workers in South Australia. About 33 000 State Government employees will receive benefits from the indexation of overaward payments at a cost to the Government of about an extra \$500 000. If the decision had been back-dated only to September of this financial year it would have cost South Australia \$1 000 000, and will cost an extra \$500 000 to back-date it to May 15. I believe the Government has acted wisely in this matter.

WEST LAKES SAND DUNES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister for the Environment say whether it is true that part of the 4.5 hectares of land that the South Australian Government is buying back from West Lakes Limited is to be used as a car park? In 1969, about 712 ha was purchased at \$750 for each .405 ha. This area included the sand dunes. I understand the Government now intends to buy back an area of about 4.5 ha in an effort to preserve some of the dunes, and that the land will cost the Government \$43 000 for each .405 ha. The land is not suitable for building and is under the protection of the provisions of the Coast Protection Act. I therefore ask the Minister what land, if any, is to be used for car parking and why the area is to cost so much if it is not even suitable for building.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think the honourable member is attempting to misinform the House, as he did late last week when he suggested who might win the football grand final. From the clothing he is wearing today I wonder whether anyone has told him who won.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Part of this area will be used as a car park. Before the Government decided to purchase this dunal land to which the honourable member refers—

Mr. Gunn: Are they going to be paid—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Before it was decided to purchase this land the Woodville Council and West Lakes Limited had set aside an area, to the north of the section that the Government had purchased, to be used as a car park for people visiting the beach in that area. After it had been decided to purchase the land, the Coast Protection Board came, I believe rightfully, to the conclusion that a strip of the land immediately adjoining Military Road which had been levelled and on which the sand dunes had been cleared would be a better location for the car park. As a result of this, the board negotiated with the West Lakes authorities, through the Woodville council, to obtain the land that had been set aside for car parks originally, which land also was dunal land, to be part of the reserve, in lieu of the cleared land that had been purchased in the other area. What the Coast Protection Board sensibly did, of course, was transfer the car park area from land that was ecologically useful to a level piece of land, so that the total area that would be provided as a dunal area would contain the best sections of the area. I should be pleased to give the honourable member a map showing the outlines of the area and the transferred pieces of land so that he would be better informed and would not suggest that something improper was happening in this case.

GEPPS CROSS NOISE

Mr. JENNINGS: I address my question to the Minister of Works. Recently I have received several complaints from constituents from the northern part of my district about noise emanating from a comparatively new—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question first.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am sorry, Sir; I am going back to the old days. Will the Minister have investigations made into complaints about noise emanating from the Electricity Trust transformer at Gepps Cross? I have been receiving complaints from constituents in this area about noise emanating from the area. Last Friday I visited the place and discussed the matter with the executives, who admitted that they, too, have had complaints but there was nothing they could do about it from their level. Therefore, I now ask the Minister whether he will take up the matter with the trust to find out whether something can be done to solve the problem.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I say this quite seriously, because I do not think any public announcement has been made about the fact that, since the new Ministry was appointed, responsibility for the Electricity Trust has been transferred from me, as Minister of Works, to the Minister of Mines and Energy, where it properly should be. This question provides an opportunity for me to make that announcement to the House and, at the same time, to assure the honourable member that this question will be dealt with.

McNALLY DEATH

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Community Welfare yet state the results of the investigation at McNally Training Centre into the unfortunate death of an inmate? I do not in any way want to imply criticism of the Minister, the officers, or the department, but I believe that the investigation that was to be carried out on that matter is of much public concern and it is important that an announcement be made as quickly and concisely as possible.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I cannot at the moment give to the House the information that the honourable member has requested. However, I should like to say that I appreciate the way in which he has asked the question. I found it very decent of him, really, to use the phrase that he used and to stick to that. He has not tried to make anything out of the matter and has only tried to obtain information. When I have the information, I will make it available.

TWO WELLS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BOUNDY: In the absence of the Minister of Education, I assume that the Minister of Mines and Energy will deal with my question. Can the Minister say how it is that the Loan Estimates document, Parliamentary Paper No. 11A, which was presented to this House on August 14 and which allocated \$450 000 for Two Wells Primary School for construction of a Demac school, to commence during 1975-76, has become inaccurate 14 days later and no work is to be done at that school during this period? During the Loan Estimates debate, I asked the Minister of Education what were the time tables and details regarding the Two Wells school, and he promised to get a report. On September 10, I received that report, part of which states:

I regret to have to say that it is not possible to make any provision for expenditure at Two Wells in the 1975-76 financial year. However, present plans are to make some financial provision later on.

I notified the Principal of the Two Wells school of this reply, and he expressed dismay on behalf of that school and community regarding the change. I understand that the former Minister of Education assured the local community that an early start would be made on work at the school. Parliamentary Paper No. 11A confirms that promise, but the subsequent written reply to my question contains no promise at all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the absence of the Minister of Education, who is indisposed, I am sure that I can give a reply completely in line with what my colleague would say. When the Loan Estimates were drawn up, the Commonwealth Budget had not been introduced and the Loan Estimates contained particulars of funds expected to be received in 1975-76 from the Australian Schools Commission. The first half of 1975-76 covers the original biennial period of the first Karmel report, but the first six months of 1976 were to come into the next period. If the Commonwealth Government had accepted the commission's recommendations, the estimates provided in the Loan Estimates for the school building programme would have been correct and, doubtless, the Two Wells school could have continued. However, as I am sure honourable members, including the member for Goyder, know, there were substantial cuts in the Commonwealth Budget, most unfortunately, and these affected the amount of money available for Schools Commission capital purposes. That meant that, after the Loan Estimates had been agreed to by this Parliament, the sums of money for school-building purposes and some other purposes were reduced. I think the Minister of Education has explained subsequently in this House that, where the money available for school building has been reduced, there is no alternative but to defer some replacement projects. The projects that are required because of additional children in various parts of the State must go on willy-nilly, because those children will be there and will have to be housed. In circumstances of any financial restriction, the penalty, unfortunately, falls on replacement projects and, doubtless, Two Wells is one of them. I will ask my colleague whether he can give the honourable member more precise information about when the Two Wells project will get under way. I shall be pleased to inform the Minister of Education of my own views in relation to the Two Wells school, and I am fairly confident that he would confirm them.

WATER FLEAS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works say what action has been taken by his department to eradicate the flea-like objects from certain sections of our water supply? So far I have received no complaints from householders in my district, but yesterday I visited the local bowling club, where members were perturbed about these insects appearing on the greens. Officers of the Agriculture Department called at this club to investigate the matter, but, from a report in the *Advertiser* this morning, it seems that these insects have been found in more than one district.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I made a press release earlier today about the problem known as daphnia in the Wattle Park service reservoir, and indicated that the problem would be rectified by chlorination. The action has been taken following a report by an Erindale resident yesterday. It was reported in the *Advertiser*, I think, and not to the department, so we could not do very much about it until we read about it this morning. The Crustacea are normal in any river, and I stress that they are not dangerous and can appear in a stream or a reservoir.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are they edible?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been told that they taste like crayfish.

Mr. Dean Brown: I assure you they don't.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Then the honourable member must have tried them. I did not know he was so well informed about this matter but, as he has tried them, maybe he could confer with my officers and tell the officer who said that these things tasted like crayfish that he was wrong. However, they are fairly rare in a reticulated system.

Mr. Dean Brown: Not in our area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They are harmless: they will not hurt even the member for Davenport if he eats them. In fact, I have been told they are beneficial because they evidently eat other organisms that could be harmful. I was undecided about whether I should leave these animals in the water, but, for several reasons, I thought they must be eradicated, so I have ordered that the reservoir be taken out of service, its level dropped, and the water chlorinated and checked before the reservoir is brought into service again.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why didn't you take action on the report in May?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware that it was first reported in May, but I will find out whether it was. My attention has not been drawn to the matter before today. I knew some red worms were present in the supply some time ago, but not the Crustacea to which we are referring. They were red and not brown worms.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Incessant interjections must cease immediately.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: These worms were harmless. I should think the honourable member, instead of being critical, would be pleased to know we have taken action to protect people living in his district. I will check his comment about an earlier report and, if he is correct, I will let him know: if he is incorrect, I will also let him know. If the first report about this matter was raised in May, it seems to bear out my statement that the Crustacea are harmless.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what plans the Government has to build a suitable headquarters for the Agriculture Department? Members would be aware that the Government intends to transfer the Agriculture Department as well as the Lands Department and Environment and Conservation Department to Monarto. It now seems that Monarto, if it ever gets off the ground, is something for the future, or probably never. Because of the importance of the Agriculture Department in protecting the vital primary industries of this State it is shocking that it is provided with such poor facilities. At present, it is housed in most disgraceful offices that no-one in a Government department or private enterprise should have to use. I do not blame only this Government, because this situation has arisen over many years, but it should not be allowed to continue.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member referred to previous Governments, because I point out that, from 1965 to 1968, the Walsh Government, and then the Dunstan Government, were the prime movers in having the present State Administration Centre building erected. They were also instrumental in

obtaining rental accommodation to house public servants in reasonable accommodation. Since the present Government has been in power another building behind the present State Administration Centre, sometimes referred to as the Education building (although it is not necessarily that) has been commenced, and it will be completed, I think, in about the middle of next year. It is a fine building, and I was rather amused when the member for Fisher once pointed out to the Government, or front bench, that we ought to look across the road to see what private enterprise could do.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I invite him and the member for Rocky River and any other honourable member if they wish, to look at the buildings being erected behind the State Administration Centre, not only the Education building but also the new Motor Registration Division building and the Forensic Science building. They should have a look and see what the Government can do in regard to contracting. The honourable member would be very agreeably surprised. However, I will refer the question to my colleague. I point out to the honourable member that the new headquarters for the Agriculture Department will be built in Monarto, but action has been taken to relocate the department in modern accommodation until it moves to Monarto.

Mr. Dean Brown: They're still in tin sheds.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get for the honourable member exact details about when this move is to occur and when it is expected that the new headquarters will be built in Monarto.

MEDIBANK

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to consider the opening of a Medibank office in the town of Millicent? At present there is no Medibank office in the town, and considerable concern has been expressed by local people at the situation. They consider that a town of the size of Millicent should have easy access to the Medibank system.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable member that this is a Commonwealth matter.

Mr. Chapman: The Minister can make representations on our behalf.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I request permission to rephrase the question.

The SPEAKER: Permission is granted.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister of Health ask the Commonwealth Minister for Health to open a Medibank office in the town of Millicent? At present there is no Medibank office in the town, and concern has been expressed by the people. They believe it is important for a town of the size of Millicent to have easy access to the Medibank system. They believe it is deplorable that a town of this size is denied this service. Access to application forms and information is made difficult and, unless people drive 48 kilometres to Mount Gambier or send correspondence at 18¢ a letter, they are considerably inconvenienced. I hope the Minister can do something to improve this situation forthwith.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will bring the matter to the attention of my colleague.

PARACOMBE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report about whether any further delay is expected in the reseeded of the Paracombe Primary School playground? On May 21 this year, in reply to correspondence forwarded by me to the Minister of Education, I was informed that, when the oval (I assume he was referring to the playground) was originally topdressed, it was policy for the reseeded to be the responsibility of the school. However, that policy has been changed and the Public Buildings Department is now responsible for such work. The school had been informed of this fact, and it was initially thought that the school would tender for the work. However, the school council has obtained quotations from three private contractors and submitted them to the Public Buildings Department for consideration. The Minister of Education also informed me that he had been told that the work would proceed when the weather permitted. The school council has asked me to raise this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to check with my department to ascertain the current situation. I think the honourable member said that the work would proceed when the weather improved, and I guess it is about to improve. Anyway, I will make inquiries.

COUNTRY TRANSPORT

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government intends to provide public transport commuter services in regional rural centres such as the Riverland to cater for those members of the community who have no access to private motor vehicles? The Government subsidises public transport in the metropolitan area, and I believe it also subsidises public transport in Port Pirie and Port Augusta. A brochure entitled *Some Social Aspects of Transport*, distributed by the Transport Department at the recent Royal Show, had the following to say about transport for old people:

Another significant problem is the question simply of mobility for old people. They have just as much need to make trips for social and recreational purposes as anyone else in the society and they may to a greater extent have need to make trips to doctors or other sorts of treatment centres. The large number who don't have easy access to a motor car, depend on public transport systems, which are often difficult for them to handle, both physically and emotionally. In the United States, for example, many millions of dollars are being invested to research ways of improving public transport for the elderly and disabled. The same trend is emerging in Australia.

In view of those comments, I ask the Minister whether the Government intends to extend public transport systems and commuter services to people living in country regional centres. I used the Riverland as an example, because 30 000 people live in a district no more than 48 kilometres in diameter. Aged people and others in the community who have no access to private vehicles are at a distinct disadvantage in commuting from town to town to visit relatives and for medical reasons.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the record of this Government stands high and above the record of any other Government in what it has done for public transport, and I am delighted at long last to hear one voice on the Opposition benches supporting the Government policy of subsidising public transport. All the other voices on the other side have always supported building roads so that we can have more cars and then build more roads to choke them up again.

Mr. Arnold: Are you going to extend them to country areas? Answer the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The policy adopted by the Government in relation to public transport in country towns is unique in Australia. We are the first Government to enter into arrangements to subsidise existing town buses in country centres, provided the buses are operated by the local government authority: that is another indication of our support for local government. We have already completed arrangements to subsidise bus services in Port Pirie and Port Augusta. The member for Whyalla informed me today that the Corporation of the City of Whyalla last week finalised its acceptance of the Government's proposal by a unanimous vote. Plans are proceeding to assist the Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier councils (and I know the member for Flinders is a supporter of this plan, as I hope will be the member for Mount Gambier). When those two arrangements are completed, the South Australian Government will be subsidising every country town passenger service in South Australia. As the Riverland has no town bus service, I assume that the local government body and the member who has shown concern for those people believed that they had an alternative means of getting about in the past, and no doubt they will be able to continue to use that method in the future.

WOMEN'S SHELTER

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Unfortunately, I am precluded from asking a question about the Wattle Park water fleas, so I will ask the Minister of Housing what arrangements, if any, he has made to ensure that additional housing is made available immediately for the 28 women and children at the women's shelter at Ovingham. At present, 28 women and children are in the care of the women's shelter at Ovingham; 18 of these women and children are living in one cottage and the other 10 are squatting in a condemned house in Prospect. Because of their crowded conditions, there has been an outbreak of scabies amongst these women and children. I understand that officers of the Public Health Department visited the shelter this morning to try to tackle the problem. A deputation visited the Minister about two and a half weeks ago. I understand that the only assistance given by the Minister since that deputation visited him has been to get the women to fill out high priority forms for the South Australian Housing Trust, but I understand that these will take two months to process through the normal channels. The situation is critical. The women need housing urgently. The Minister must stop procrastinating and take action to help these unfortunate women and children.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I presume that Mrs. Willcox has been in touch with the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I presume that the statement the honourable member has given to the House is based on information supplied by her.

Mr. Gunn: Isn't that statement correct?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:] would have presumed that the honourable member for Davenport would handle the information with a little more care than he has shown. Mrs. Willcox was informed, when she saw me and the Housing Trust's Manager (Estates) (Mr. Crichton), that any applications that she made on behalf of the people at the shelter would be considered each week at the meetings of the trust's Emergency Accommodation Committee. It is untrue that there is necessarily a two-month wait in the provision of emergency accommodation in

extreme circumstances. All cases have to be considered, and the cases for emergency accommodation come to the trust from all welfare agencies, and not just from the Ovingham women's shelter. It was not until that meeting with Mrs. Willcox that she indicated in a preliminary way that she would be willing to arrange for applications to go to the trust for emergency accommodation. It was not until that time that any of those arrangements were made, and I asked Mr. Crichton to provide her with the necessary forms so that those applications could proceed.

Mr. Dean Brown: They want a house a month; that's all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member apparently considers that it would be possible to run a housing policy for emergency accommodation by saying to the women's shelter, "You can have a house a month," without any consideration of all the other emergency problems that come to the trust from other welfare agencies and from the trust's own letting officers. Every member comes across these emergency problems, and it is absolutely essential that, if housing is to be allocated on an emergency basis, all cases have to be considered. It is not proper to give priority to one group without considering how other people might be placed with respect to other applications for emergency accommodation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He only wants publicity.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As well as the weekly meeting of the trust's Emergency Accommodation Committee, there is a monthly meeting of another committee. I hope the honourable member might care to listen to what I am saying, because he displays considerable ignorance on the subject, and it may help if he would care to get himself informed. The committee meets monthly; it comprises two representatives from the South Australian Council of Social Services, one from the Community Welfare Department, Mr. Crichton from the trust, and the trust's Chief Letting Officer, and every month that committee reviews the guidelines under which emergency accommodation is allocated by the trust on a weekly basis. If any voluntary agency, including the Ovingham shelter, has any criticisms of the trust's policy in this matter it is entitled to make representations to that committee, and other organisations do so. It is the actions of that monthly review committee which lead to the establishment and the review of the guidelines used in allocating emergency accommodation. Those procedures are perfectly proper. They were explained in detail to Mrs. Willcox, and I requested her to co-operate with us in following those procedures. I understood that that was what she intended to do; however, later that day the decision was made, apparently, to find somewhere to squat. In addition to that, the trust is upgrading a house for that shelter, but I do not know whether Mrs. Willcox told the member for Davenport of that fact.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He didn't want to hear it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The upgrading of that house to be provided for the shelter has been given top priority, and it will be completed as soon as possible. It is important in this matter that emergency accommodation be provided, but that it be provided so that everyone in the community may be treated equally. It is simply not good enough for a policy regarding emergency accommodation to be followed so that, if the person attaches himself to one of the voluntary agencies, he gets prior treatment to someone who has gone directly to the trust. I should have thought that, instead of making the comments the

honourable member has made today, he would have taken a little more trouble, as a so-called responsible member, to ascertain what were the facts of the situation. I hope that he will at least do this Parliament the courtesy of finding out the facts in future.

KINGSCOTE AREA SCHOOL

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am delighted that I have the opportunity to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, in the absence of the Minister of Education, because I would like to ask the Minister of Education to review his decision to delay the commencement of work on the first stage of the rebuilding of Kingscote Area School and, if possible, to revert to the commitment made by his predecessor (Hon. Hugh Hudson), who promised the school council and the community to which I refer that work on the completion of the first stage of replacing that school would be carried out by February, 1976. Last week, I received correspondence from the Minister in which he said that the commencement of the work referred to was subject to an extensive delay, and I note a report appearing on the front page of the *Islander* newspaper dated September 24, and appreciate first hand both the desperate need that exists there and, of course, the commitment which the Minister of Mines and Energy, in his capacity as Minister of Education, made to the community. The report, headed "School council 'dismayed'", states, in part:

Start on new school postponed . . . this is despite the promise made on the island by the then Minister of Education, Mr. Hudson, that the first stage would be ready for occupation by February, 1976 . . . The *Islander's* attention was drawn recently to the astonishing state of the school buildings by an amazed parent who, in the maze of old structures, was looking for her child's classroom.

In the article, the school principal went on to say that, regarding the Minister's commitment, the Superintendent of Buildings (Mr. Kearney) had gone on record as saying that the single units, and more particularly the science facilities, were the worst in South Australia. I do not know whether they are the worst in South Australia, but I am sure that the Minister of Mines and Energy would recall, during his visit, the disgraceful conditions that applied in parts of the school. It was a most welcome promise he made that work would commence so as to allow the first stage to be completed in 1976. I seek not only the Minister's support but also that of the Minister of Education in trying to review the decision.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position at Kingscote is much the same as that at Two Wells, and I think it is the case that the Loan Estimates documents, as presented to the House, provide for a preliminary expenditure in relation to the replacement of Kingscote Area School. That was on the assumption that capital funds available to the State from the Schools Commission would be made available by the Commonwealth Parliament. I think that, of the \$40 600 000 for school buildings in the Loan Estimates, about \$15 000 000 or \$16 000 000 was expected to be available through the Schools Commission, the remainder being provided from State funds. The honourable member knows that that did not turn out to be the case. The Australian Budget involved a substantial cut, and the Minister of Education has deprecated that cut, and so have I, and I hope that members opposite would join us in supporting the original recommendations of the Australian Schools Commission, because I believe they should be implemented. With the best will in the world, the commitment for Kingscote Area School was made at a time when funds were expected to be at a certain level, and that commitment and that expectation were quite

honestly assessed, and were continued by the present Minister in his submission of the Loan Estimates to this Parliament. Subsequently, the money available was reduced, and in these circumstances the Education Department has no alternative but to continue with those projects that are required because there are extra numbers of children coming along, and to defer projects that involve replacement or upgrading. Priorities have to be assessed and the decision made on which project is to be deferred. That is unfortunate, but I am afraid that in present circumstances it cannot be avoided. I agree that Kingscote Area School needs to be replaced: it is not the only one in South Australia, and I would not say that it is the worst. I believe that the best thing I can do is make a further inquiry of the Minister about when work might be expected to begin, but that will depend on an assessment of future funds to be made available. I believe that all members can support this cause by committing our Canberra colleagues on either side of the fence to the implementation of a Schools Commission recommendation because, unfortunately, we do not have Mr. Fraser or his colleagues committed to anything like the implementation of the Schools Commission recommendation. I ask the members opposite to use their good offices with their colleagues in Canberra, in the same way as we will use our good offices with our colleagues in Canberra, and so will get a co-operative to make sure that the school projects that need to be undertaken are undertaken.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Premier consider giving a partial remission of third party motor vehicle insurance premiums at present paid by age and other pensioners? The cost of third party insurance has risen more rapidly than have pensions, and in many areas of the State no public transport system exists and pensioners are compelled to use private vehicles. Pensioners are means tested up to 69 years of age, and this group is statistically recognised as being among the safest of our drivers. Also, they have a test each year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how I would make such a remission, but I will examine the matter.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PAY-ROLL TAX

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a previous occasion I indicated to this House that, following a meeting of State Premiers in May, 1975, Treasury officials were requested to report on problems relating to the general exemption level from pay-roll tax, having regard particularly to the impact of inflation and the problems of multiple employers. State Premiers have now received and considered that report which was unanimous in its view that: (a) whilst some increase in the exemption level for small businesses was justified there appeared to be no real justification to continue the exemption provision for large organisations; and (b) it was desirable to maintain uniformity in the States' pay-roll tax legislation, particularly as many companies operated in more than one State.

As a result of that report, all States have agreed to raise the exemption from its present level of \$20 800 to a new level of \$41 600; that is, a business with a pay roll of \$41 600 or less will not be required to pay pay-roll tax. New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania have adopted the report's recommendation concerning large

businesses, and those States intend progressively to reduce the exemption level of \$41 600 so that it is completely eliminated at a pay roll level of \$104 000. Queensland has indicated that it intends to reduce progressively the exemption of \$41 600 back to \$20 800 at a pay roll level of \$72 800, at which stage a \$20 800 exemption will be available on all pay rolls in excess of \$72 800. As far as I am aware, Victoria has not yet declared its intentions.

South Australia intends, in the interests of maintaining substantial uniformity, to follow New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania in this matter; that is, it will increase the exemption level to \$41 600 and progressively reduce the exemption so that it is eliminated at a pay roll level of \$104 000. I expect relevant legislation to be introduced into this House during the next week or so, so that small businesses may have the benefit of the increased exemption from January 1, 1976, the date on which all other States intend to implement their new exemption levels. The legislation will also provide measures to overcome the avoidance of pay-roll tax through company splitting, which I understand has become a prevalent practice both here and in other States. I have been informed by the Premier of New South Wales that in introducing his Budget this afternoon he intends to make a similar announcement in relation to the New South Wales legislation.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTIONS)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill, which amends the principal Act, the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, is to ensure that, so far as is possible, each time a general election for the House of Assembly is held, an election to return half of the members of the Legislative Council is also held. Members will be aware that honourable members of the Legislative Council are at present elected for a minimum term of six years. When successive Houses of Assembly run for their full term, that is, about three years, half of the members of the Legislative Council do, in fact, retire at each general election for the House of Assembly.

However, if for any reason a House of Assembly does not run its full term, it is possible that an election for half the members of the Legislative Council will not be held to coincide with the relevant Assembly election, for the reason that no members thereof will have served for the minimum term adverted to above. In some cases, therefore, a member of the Legislative Council could serve for almost nine years before being required to face the electors. If this measure is enacted into law, save in one set of circumstances only, an election for half the members of the Legislative Council will coincide with each general election for the House of Assembly. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 13 of the principal Act by repealing subsection (1) of that section. This is the provision that provided for a minimum term of six years for members of the Legislative Council. As amended this section will now deal only with casual vacancies. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section

14 of the principal Act and provides that, in effect, half the number of members of the Legislative Council will retire at each general election for members of the House of Assembly. Actually the amendment provides for 10 members to retire at the next election and thereafter for 11 members to retire. This recognises the progressive increase in the size of the Legislative Council from 20 to 22.

Subsection (3) of this proposed section makes an exception following a dissolution of both Houses, since in those circumstances in section 41 of the principal Act an "entrenched provision" provides for a minimum term of three years for a member of the Legislative Council. Clause 5 repeals and re-enacts section 15 of the principal Act, which sets out an order of retirement of members of the Legislative Council. In effect the application of this section will result in half the Council retiring upon each general election, the members to retire being those with the shorter period of service. The provision in this section for the determination "by lot" of members to retire will only be called in aid when more than the required number have the same period of service. This could only occur following a double dissolution.

Subsection (2) provides that the term of a person appointed to fill a casual vacancy will be determined by the term of the member he replaced. The reason for the foregoing exception is (hat the minimum term of half of the members of the Legislative Council is provided for by section 41 of the principal Act, which is an "entrenched provision"; that is, pursuant to section 10a of the principal Act it cannot be altered except by a Bill passed and approved of by referendum. In the Government's view the expense of a referendum is simply not justified to authorise such an insignificant departure from the principle sought to be given effect to by this Bill.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMISSION)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill gives effect to the Government's election mandate to ensure that the single member electorates of the House of Assembly are redistributed on the basis of one vote one value; that is, with as nearly as practicable equal numbers of voters in each electoral district, but with a tolerance from an electoral quota of 10 per cent either way. The Government has stood for and voted for electoral reform on the basis of one vote one value ever since the Labor Party was founded. It was a principle of the original resolution of the South Australian Legislative Council, which preceded responsible Government and which enunciated the basis of the Constitution for election to the House of Assembly. However, as members know, the drift of population and the subsequent conservative requirement that there be two country seats for every city seat, adopted in 1872, overthrew that part of the original constitutional visions.

The Government believes not only that there should be a redistribution but that the Constitution should provide that all future redistributions shall be on this basis, and therefore that part of the Constitution will be entrenched; that is to say, it may not be altered without a referendum of citizens supporting the alteration. The Bill provides for a

permanent Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission consisting of a senior judge, the Electoral Commissioner, and the Surveyor General, who will be charged with periodic redistributions, and the redistribution which they determine in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution will take effect without any intervention by Parliament.

In other words, electoral redistributions will not be subject to political manipulation by a Government which might chance to have a majority in both Houses at any one time, and which sought to alter the provisions in its own favour, as has happened under conservative Governments previously in South Australia. There are special clauses in the measure that are designed to ensure that there can be no political interference by administrative means with the independence and continued work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. It is not intended in this measure to alter the number of seats in the House of Assembly, and in consequence the next redistribution will be for 47 seats.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 re-enacts section 27 of the principal Act by removing some exhausted provisions. Clause 5 repeals and re-enacts section 32 of the principal Act and, since the section as re-enacted is so important, its provisions will be dealt with *seriatim*. New subsection (1) sets out the present position. New subsection (2) foreshadows the operation of the commission to be established under this measure. New subsection (3) provides for a period of delay before an "order" of the commission becomes operative. This period of delay is necessary lest electoral redistributions are effected too close in point of time to the day of an election. New subsection (4) provides for single member districts. In relation to this provision, I refer members to the comments on proposed new section 88. New subsection (5) sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this section.

Clause 6 amends section 37 of the principal Act by removing some exhausted provisions. Clause 7 enacts a new Part to the principal Act and the sections making up this Part will be dealt with in order. Proposed section 76 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Part and is commended to members' special attention. Proposed section 77 sets out the basis of redistribution which, in summary, is that districts will not vary by more than 10 per cent up or down from an established "electoral quota". Proposed section 78 establishes a commission consisting of a Supreme Court judge and two named public servants and is generally self-explanatory. However, I draw members' attention to the fact that the members of the commission derived their authority from the legislation itself and not from appointment by a specified person and pursuant to proposed subsections (3) and (4) steps have been taken to ensure that no vacancy can occur in the office of a member.

Proposed section 79 incorporates the commission and is in the usual form. Proposed section 80 provides for meetings of the commission, which cannot be held in the absence of the Chairman, that is, the judge, and also that all decisions must be concurred in by the Chairman. Proposed section 81 provides for the appointment of a Secretary. Proposed section 82 is a most important provision and sets out the times at which redistribution must be made. In brief a redistribution must be commenced:

- (a) within three months after the commencement of the Act presaged by this Bill;
- (b) as soon as practicable after the alteration of the number of seats of which the House of Assembly is comprised;
- (c) after each third general election if five years or more have elapsed since the last redistribution.

Proposed section 83 sets out the matters that must be taken into account by the commission in making a redistribution and is commended to members' attention. Members will see that these provisions are fairly standard for the matter to be taken into account by the commission. Proposed section 84 applies the Royal Commissions Act to inquiries by the commission. Proposed section 85 makes provision for representations to the commission. Proposed section 86 provides for a review of any order of the commission by the Full Court of the Supreme Court. An appeal may be made against an order of the commission but only, in effect, on the grounds that the commission has not acted in accordance with the provisions of the Act. In other words, there is not a review by the Full Court but an appeal under the normal appeal provisions. The appellant would have to show that the provision of the Act had not been complied with and that the commission could not have made the order had the provisions of the Act been complied with.

Proposed section 87 provides for the moneys required for the purposes of the commission. These moneys are payable on the certificate of the Auditor-General, supported by a continuing appropriation. Proposed section 88 provides for the "entrenchment" of this Part and section 32 of the principal Act. However, it will be possible to amend this Part, or section 32 without a formal referendum if the Chief Justice has certified that the principles set out in paragraph (a) of proposed subsection (2) are not offended against. In other words, as long as the principles of this redistribution and the principles of a redistribution by an electoral boundaries commission independent of political control are not offended against, the details of the Part could be amended. Otherwise, any amendment will have to be ratified by the electors at a referendum before presentation to the Governor for his assent.

To this extent the principle of single-member districts is not entrenched. A future House of Assembly could decide on multiple-member districts, but the only departure that can be made is that each district must return the same number of members. It will not be possible to alter the principles by having multiple-member districts.

Dr. Tonkin: Could it be 47 or 94?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The point is—

Mr. Millhouse: There could be five members in each of four seats.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly; the seats must be equal in the number of electors and they must elect the same number of members to the House. Clause 8 is consequential. This is a most important Bill because, on its passing this Parliament, the principles for which so many of us have fought to obtain a democratic Constitution for the people of South Australia and the State Parliament will have been achieved. I believe this is a vital measure for the people of South Australia, and I commend it to the House. Although this Bill will appear on tomorrow's Notice Paper, members will not be required to debate the measure until Tuesday of next week and will have sufficient time to enable them to examine it.

Dr. Tonkin: But we haven't got the Bill yet.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members will receive the Bill promptly (the last copies arrived only this morning) and will have ample opportunity to examine its full implications.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the National Trust of South Australia Act, 1955. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose is to revise the principal Act with a view to isolating from the Act the rules which are contained in the schedule to the Act and which, under those rules and section 9 of the Act, have been capable of modification, repeal and being added to in accordance with procedures laid down by that Act, as well as by section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915, as amended. Under the Act the rule-making authority is the council of the National Trust. It is basically a consolidation measure, and I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Unfortunately, there appear to be insufficient records kept by or on behalf of the council from which the rules, as amended to date, or the procedure followed when making some of them, can be ascertained with any certainty. Moreover, it would appear that the validity of some of the resolutions of the council purporting to amend certain of the rules (for example, the alterations in the classes of member) is not entirely free from doubt, and those and other purported amendments are not in every case capable of incorporation in a consolidation of the Act under the Acts Republication Act. These situations are not uncommon in cases where Acts are made capable of amendment by rule (or regulation) and the correct procedure for making rules (or regulations) is not followed. It is for this reason, as well as to expedite consolidation of Acts, that Parliament has, in recent legislation, adopted the policy of isolating Acts from the rules (and regulations) that may be made under them, thus keeping the rules (and regulations) separate and distinct from the Acts under which they are made. This policy also facilitates the Acts to be consolidated separately from the rules (and regulations) without any interference with the rule-making power, and without loss of Parliamentary control over that power.

With a view to facilitating the consolidation of the Act and curing any past irregularities and defects in the amending rules of the trust, the Bill repeals the schedule to the Act (clause 4), at the same time conferring on the council the same powers to make rules and by-laws as it possessed before the repeal of the schedule. Power is also included to extend those rule and by-law making powers by proclamation, new section 9(1) to be enacted by clause 3. In order that the rules of the trust might be revised and up-dated to meet present policies and situations, subsection (2) of proposed new section 9 makes provision that the council must, within a period of six months after this Bill becomes law, or such further time as the Minister may in writing allow, make a new set of rules and a new set of by-laws, under, and for the purposes of the Act and that, until those sets of rules and by-laws have been made and have taken effect, the existing rules and by-laws shall, notwithstanding the repeal of the schedule to the Act, continue to be the rules and by-laws of the trust. Subsection (3) of proposed new section 9 clarifies and is substituted for provisions of the Act that are being repealed by the Bill.

The Bill, if approved by Parliament, would enable the trust to bring its rules and by-laws up to date and into line with present circumstances and situations and would also enable the Act to be consolidated under the Acts Republication Act, without the inclusion of the schedule, some of the amendments to which could, possibly be of doubtful validity or unincorporable because of the insufficiency of records from which they could be ascertained with any certainty, and because of possible irregularities and defects in the procedures followed when some of the rules were amended.

Mr. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL THEATRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Adelaide Festival Theatre Act, 1964-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that the principal Act, the Adelaide Festival Theatre Act, 1964, as amended, was last year amended so as to give the Adelaide City Council certain future financial obligations under that Act. At the same time, provision was made to reimburse the council amounts equal to amounts expended by the council in meeting payments on moneys previously borrowed by it for the construction of the festival theatre, the provision in question being section 7c(1)(b) of the principal Act, which provided for annual payments by the Government.

The purpose of this short Bill, which arises from representations made by the council, is (a) to provide for payments by way of reimbursement to be made at less than annual intervals; and (b) to ensure that payments made by the council to a sinking fund for the redemption of its debt will attract reimbursement from the Government. Clause 2 of the Bill, the only operative clause, gives effect to the matters set out above.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PEST PLANTS 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.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the control of pest plants within the State; to repeal the Weeds, Act, 1956-1969; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its objects are to repeal the Weeds Act and to provide a more effective and workable system for weed control in this State. It has long been apparent to those concerned with weed control that the present Act is quite inadequate as a basis for achieving effective weed control or for carrying out co-ordinated control programmes throughout the State. Whilst the major responsibility for these matters remains with individual councils, there will always be the problem of piecemeal action. In some instances, various councils have been lax in discharging their duties under the present Act and there is little that anyone can do to remedy such an unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Furthermore, the present Act was, and still is, framed as primarily an agricultural measure and has accordingly hampered the efforts of the Weeds Advisory Committee

to initiate control measures in respect of plants that are not necessarily harmful to agriculture but nevertheless ought to, and could, be eradicated or kept down to harmless proportions. It is time indeed to move into the area of plants that are harmful to the health of the community or detrimental to the environment, and for this reason the phrase "pest plant" replaces the word "weed" (the latter is felt to have rather limiting connotations).

Accordingly, when the Weeds Advisory Committee was reappointed under the present Act in 1972, it was charged with the specific task of reviewing the whole subject of weed control in this State and of reporting to the Minister on the measures, legislative or otherwise, that ought, in its opinion to be taken to improve the situation. The committee carried out its task very effectively, and, during the course of its investigations, consulted the councils, various farmer organisations, and other Government departments, and examined similar overseas and interstate legislation. This Bill is the culmination of the committee's work and the report subsequently made to the Minister.

The Bill basically provides for the creation of boards by the grouping together of various councils, and these boards will be responsible for discharging the various functions and duties that presently rest with individual councils. Thus, weed control will still be a matter for local government which is, in my opinion and in the opinion of the committee, best suited and equipped for such work. The system of boards provided in the Bill will be flexible and will ensure that councils will reinforce each other in effecting co-ordinated weed control programmes.

An independent commission will replace the present Weeds Advisory Committee and will have the task of initiating and supervising State-wide control programmes and of generally ensuring that each control board is a workable and effective unit. Many functions that are now Ministerial will be discharged by the commission. The commission will year by year determine the amount of general rate revenue that each council must contribute to board funds, and it is intended that this will be achieved largely by negotiation between the councils and the commission. It is proposed that the Government will subsidise each board fund to the extent of 50 per cent of the amount contributed by the councils. The Government will also make special grants in certain circumstances, and so boards with an unavoidably low revenue will receive financial aid that will prevent them from being totally ineffectual.

The province of weed control is no longer delimited by simple agricultural needs. World markets are demanding top quality produce free of any contamination whatsoever. In the future increasing population will demand that all available food-producing land be put to the best and most efficient use. Even now certain plants constitute hazards to health and to the preservation of the environment, and, as we are only too well aware, such hazards can so easily get out of hand. I commend this Bill to members as a step that can be taken to equip ourselves to deal with such present and future problems.

I ask that the explanation of the formal provisions in the Bill be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1, 2, 3 and 4 are formal. Clause 5 sets out the various necessary definitions. It will be seen that there are, for the purposes of the Act, three different types of pest plant—primary, agricultural and community. Primary pest plants are those that the commission believes ought to be destroyed; agricultural pest plants are those that the commission believes are detrimental to any primary industry

and ought to be controlled; and community pest plants are those that the commission believes are detrimental to the community or the environment and ought to be controlled. I ought perhaps to refer to the definition of "member council"—this means a council that forms, either alone or with another council or other councils, a control board.

Clause 6 provides the usual transitional and vesting provisions. Clause 7 constitutes the Pest Plants Commission as a corporate body. Clause 8 provides that the commission will be comprised of six members. The Chairman will come from the Agriculture Department. Two members will come from the Public Service, and it is contemplated at the moment that one will be from the Agriculture Department, and one from the Environment and Conservation Department. Two members will come from the councils. One member will represent farmers and graziers and other similar groups. Members will hold office for terms of three years with eligibility for re-appointment.

Clause 9 empowers the Governor to appoint deputies of members of the commission. Clause 10 empowers the Governor to remove members from office on certain grounds. Provision is made for vacation of office and the filling of casual vacancies. Clause 11 provides for the remuneration of members. Clause 12 validates any acts of the commission done whilst there is any vacancy in its membership, etc.

Clause 13 makes the usual provision for the conduct of business by the commission. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of an Executive Officer of the commission and other necessary officers. The commission may itself employ persons who will not be subject to the Public Service Act in such employment. Clause 15 sets out the general functions of the commission and provides a power of delegation. Clause 16 empowers the commission to act as a control board with respect to pest plant control in those areas of the State that are not under the jurisdiction of any council.

Clause 17 provides for the creation of control boards and their areas. The Commission will recommend the grouping together of the whole, or part, of the areas of various councils on a "geographical" basis. Such a recommendation will be made only after consultation with the councils involved. The areas and boards will then be proclaimed. Subclause (3) provides for the situation where one council only will constitute a control board, the area of the board being either the whole, or part, of the council's area.

In such a case, the council itself constitutes the board, and no control is sought over the manner in which the council executes its business as a board. It will be possible therefore for a council to have its area divided between two or more boards. A council that has mostly urban land may well be constituted as a board in respect of that land and its rural land may form part of the area of another board, of which the council will of course be a member council. Subclause (4) provides for boards comprised of more than one council. The proclamation creating such a board will contain provisions for the appointment of members of the board by the member councils. Subclause (5) empowers the Governor to repeal or vary any proclamation creating a board and its area. Thus, it will be possible, as experience demands, to reconstitute boards in order to achieve a fully workable system.

Clause 19 provides the corporate status and powers of all boards constituted under this Act. Clause 19 to 23 inclusive relate to those boards that will be comprised of more than one member council. These clauses provide

for the appointment of members of the board, the Chairman and deputies; for the removal of members from office and the filling of casual vacancies; and for the appointment of a Secretary to a board. Clause 24 makes provision for the keeping and auditing of accounts by boards. Copies of these accounts must be sent to the Commission at the end of each year.

Clause 25 provides for the conduct of business by boards. A board must hold its first meeting within two months of being established, must hold at least four meetings a year and must permit an authorised officer from the Agriculture Department to attend its meetings. Clause 26 relates to the appointment of an authorised officer for the purposes of exercising the various powers of inspection and investigation under this Act throughout the whole of the State. This officer will act at the direction of the commission. Clause 27 relates to local authorised officers. Each board must appoint at least one such officer to operate within its area. Local authorised officers must have the qualifications or experience in pest plant control prescribed in the regulations.

Clause 28 sets out the powers that may be exercised by any authorised officer, State or local. An authorised officer may, in addition to the usual powers of search and investigation, advise any person as to that person's obligations under this Act. Most importantly, an authorised officer may take possession of any livestock, produce, etc., that he believes to be contaminated with any pest plant and take measures to destroy any pest plant found thereon. This power is most necessary in relation to inspections at the State borders and in towns near to such borders. Prompt action is needed where evidence is found of such dreaded plants as noogoora burr, which is frequently carried by sheep coming from certain other States.

Clause 29 appropriates moneys for the purposes of this Act in the usual manner. Clause 30 provides for the establishment of a fund by the commission, to be kept at the Treasury. The commission may invest any surplus not immediately required. Clause 31 provides for the establishment of a fund by each control board, consisting mainly of contributions from the member councils and subsidies and grants from the commission. A board may invest any surplus, or borrow any moneys, with the consent of the commission.

Clause 32 provides for the determination by the commission each year of the amount to be contributed by each member council of a board into the board fund. The total contributions will be based upon the work estimates of a board for the ensuing year. Individual contributions will be based upon that part of the member council's area that lies within the board area. The contribution in respect of rural land will be a percentage of the general rate revenue to be derived in respect of such land during the current financial year. The percentage may not exceed 3 per cent and is to be determined by the commission after hearing any representations of the board or member councils.

The contribution in respect of urban land will also be determined by the commission by negotiation. Payment of the contributions into the board funds must be made by the councils by the end of the month of February next following, by which time most of a council's rate revenue has been received. There is, of course, nothing to prevent member councils from voluntarily paying into the board fund a greater sum than the amount determined by the commission. Any such extra payment will not, however, attract the commission's subsidy.

Clause 33 requires the commission to pay a subsidy to each control board of 50 cents for every \$1 paid into the board fund by the member councils. Therefore, if a member council fails to pay its contribution, the Government subsidy is reduced accordingly. Provision is made for the making of special grants to any board, at the discretion of the commission. Clause 34 empowers the Governor to proclaim any plant as a pest plant of a specified classification. A proclamation declaring a plant to be a primary pest plant must also declare the plant to be a primary pest plant throughout the whole State. Agricultural and community pest plants may be declared to be such pest plants in any part, or the whole, of the State.

Clause 35 requires the owner of land to notify his control board if he finds any primary pest plant or other notifiable plant on his land. A control board may declare an agricultural pest plant to be notifiable for a specified time. A control board must notify the commission if it becomes aware of the existence of any primary pest plant on land within its area. Clause 36 requires control boards to publish annual lists of plants that are pest plants within its area, and also to publish any alteration made during the year to such a list. Clause 37 sets out the general functions of control boards under this Act. Clause 38 requires boards to destroy primary pest plants and control agricultural and community pest plants on certain lands and all public roads within its area.

Clause 39 empowers a control board to recover from owners of land adjacent to a public road upon which the board has destroyed or controlled pest plants, the cost of carrying out such measures upon the section of road abutting the property, up to the middle of the road ("public road" has earlier been defined as including all land lying between the boundary of the property and the edge of the constructed carriageway). A board may fix a charge for doing this work. The usual recovery procedures are provided. It should be noted at this point that the cost of controlling community pest plants upon public roads cannot be recovered from adjacent landowners. Subclause (6) provides for reimbursement of a landowner in certain situations—such as where he has cleared community pest plants from his side of the road at his own cost, and this is later covered by a grant from the commission to the board.

Clause 40 provides for the making of grants by the commission to boards for approved pest plant control measures taken by the board on certain lands, and, in relation to community pest plants, on public roads. Subclause (2) provides for the present intention that the commission will bear the cost of all pest plant control upon the "shoulders" of certain roads (that is, the strips of land 5 metres wide that edge the constructed carriageway). Clause 41 requires boards to co-operate with any directions or assistance given by a State authorised officer or the Executive Officer of the commission.

Clause 42 sets out the general duty of a landowner to destroy all primary pest plants and control all other pest plants found upon his land. Clause 43 empowers a control board to require a landowner, by notice, to take certain pest plant control measures if that owner is in default under the Act, or for the purposes of a co-ordinated control programme. A right of appeal to the commission is given to such a landowner. Clause 44 empowers a board to step in and carry out pest plant control measures on any land, where the owner of the land has failed to comply with a notice. The cost of such measures may be recovered by the board from the owner of the land. Clause

45 empowers the Minister to exempt any person, or class of persons, from any obligation or liability under this Division.

Clause 46 empowers the commission to declare that certain areas of the State be quarantine areas from which it will be an offence to move any livestock, soil, plants, etc. A defence is given to a person who obtains the prior approval of an authorised officer and moves the livestock, etc., in accordance with the terms of that approval. Clause 47 prohibits the selling of any livestock, plants, soil, etc., that are carrying any pest plant. A defence is given to a person who takes certain precautions before the sale or who believes on reasonable grounds that the goods were free of pest plants.

Clause 48 similarly prohibits the moving of any contaminated livestock, etc., from land on to a public road, or along a public road. A similar defence is given. Clause 49 requires a person to take reasonable care that roadside trees are not unduly damaged during the course of pest plant control. Clause 50 empowers certain persons in authority to enter any land for the purpose of any research programme, or any investigation under this Act. Clause 51 gives a control board a right to appeal to the Minister from any direction or decision of the commission. Clause 52 provides that any moneys owed by a landowner under this Act become a charge on the land and may therefore be recovered, if necessary, from a subsequent owner.

Clause 53 requires the commission to submit an annual report of its business to the Minister for tabling in Parliament. Clause 54 requires a control board to submit similar reports to the commission. Clause 55 provides the usual immunity for persons in authority acting in good faith under this Act. Clause 56 provides for the execution of certain documents by the commission and the control boards. Clause 57 is the usual evidentiary provision.

Clause 58 provides for the issue and service of notices by control boards. Clause 59 relates to proceedings under this Act. Clause 60 provides that penalties for offences prosecuted by a control board shall be paid to that board and penalties for offences prosecuted in any other manner be paid to the commission. I should perhaps refer at this point to the fact that all penalties in the Bill have a specified minimum as well as a maximum. The highest minimum penalty is \$50 and the power of a court under the Justices Act to go below any specified minimum has not been abrogated. Clause 61 provides a regulation-making power.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GIFT DUTY AND STAMP DUTIES) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from September 18. Page 883.)

Clause 5—"Remission of gift duty under five dollars."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I asked that progress be reported on this measure in order to get for honourable members more information on several topics. One of the matters that was raised during the Committee discussion was the question of the remission of the Real Property Act fees at the Lands Titles Office (normally about \$12 a transaction) in the case of those properties that were being transferred from one spouse to joint names. The Government has examined this matter and has decided to give an instruction for the remission of that amount. As soon as administrative arrangements can be made (and I expect this will be very soon), we will remit that particular fee.

Members also raised the question of the cost of valuations. The position is that the Commissioner of Taxes is willing to accept the normal governmental valuation of a matrimonial home up to \$3 0 000 without requiring a separate valuation. However, his advice to us is that, in the case of properties valued at more than \$30 000, in fact, in his view, in many cases the real valuation is substantially higher than the Government valuation, and he believes that he cannot accept for rate and taxation purposes the value by the Government valuer without requiring a separate valuation. Therefore, at a figure above \$30 000 he will require a separate valuation.

Members also raised the question of the transfer of a matrimonial home that was actually on a farming property and part of a larger title. The position about this is that, in order for it to be separately assessed for succession duty purposes, it would have to pass separately and, therefore, be on a separate title. There must be a transfer of property also if the Commissioner of Taxes is going to assess a remission of duty. Under this Act, if the transfer is of a property in excess of .2 hectares, the Act would apply to remit duty only in respect of the value of the home and the value of land up to .2 ha. Limitations under the Planning Act provide some administrative difficulties in providing a separate title. In order to obtain detailed information, Mr. Carey obtained from the Director of Planning a letter that I have circulated together with the planning information documents released by the State Planning Office. Members will realise the difficulties, particularly if the property is in the middle of a farming area and not on a public road. There may be no real benefit in transferring the matrimonial home to a separate title and perhaps the general remission applying to rural properties should be relied on.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier indicate the cost involved or the likely cost to the Government of an amendment that would allow a matrimonial home on a rural property to be considered separately from the normal requirements of a title, or having it in some way an addendum to the title of the house with no new title issuing? We should be assured that all possibilities have been investigated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have considered the problem but can see no way of solving it. To provide some notional basis of passing property without its being within the framework of the State law would create more difficulties to inheritors than would be created by leaving things as they are. I cannot devise nor can my officers suggest an alternative.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that the material circulated concerning subdivision of rural land was concerned with the Premier's explanation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The letter refers to the documents and explains them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am aware of the difficulties in trying to subdivide land, particularly in the watershed areas: in fact, it is impossible to subdivide that land. At the recent election the Government promised an exemption on the matrimonial home up to the value of \$40 000 for the spouse, but it seems that rural people have not been considered. I think the Premier should not have the gall to say that rural people will have to rely on present exemptions. The Premier is not honouring an election promise made to people living in rural areas.

Dr. EASTICK: Because of the problems involved, I ask that progress be reported so that Opposition members can discuss the matter with the Parliamentary Counsel in

order to consider possibilities of an amendment that may allow this legislation to do what was originally intended.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not want this measure delayed significantly. Before the recent election we said that the passing of a modest matrimonial home valued at up to \$40 000 would be able to occur without payment of duty. It would be difficult to interpret from that, that if a matrimonial home is situated on a large property valued at much more than \$40 000, the Government is held to have promised to create a new system by which the matrimonial home could pass separately.

Dr. Eastick: It's still a matrimonial home.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Previously, people have not sought to put them on separate titles or to pass them separately. If members like to discuss this with the Parliamentary Counsel this afternoon, I am willing to put this matter on motion to see whether they can devise some proposal, but I wish them luck devising one because I find it beyond my capacity to do so.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

In Committee.

Clause 5—"Remission of gift duty under five dollars."

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Committee that Standing Order 422 provides that a member may in Committee speak only three times to any question. The member for Light has spoken three times on clause 5 and, therefore, cannot further speak to this clause.

Mr. COUMBE: As the member for Light sought the adjournment in this matter for a specific purpose, I wish to move that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow him to continue.

The CHAIRMAN: I inform the honourable member that one cannot suspend Standing Orders in Committee.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should—

The CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the Deputy Leader that he is in the same position as that applying to the member for Light.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know who did the counting, but I spoke on one occasion on clause 5 in the Committee debate, unless you, Mr. Chairman, are referring to the previous week, but even then I asked the Treasurer one question on an earlier matter, and I suggest that you check with the Clerks on the accounting methods to verify that point.

The CHAIRMAN: I inform the Deputy Leader that, according to the Clerk, he spoke twice on September 18 on clause 5.

Mr. COUMBE: I have had the opportunity of speaking to my colleagues and they are not at all satisfied with the position as it now stands. There might be opportunity in another place to correct the matter, but the member for Light sought an adjournment to clarify the position, and the clarification has only strengthened the resolve of our previous comments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I point out to honourable members that there is considerable difficulty in the proposition which they were earlier pursuing in Committee. In fact, it would militate against there being any sort of advantage to the people whom members opposite are seeking to advantage by such amendment. The excising of the matrimonial home area from a farm property for the purpose of getting a succession duty remission on the home alone is not likely to be of any real benefit if, in fact, the spouse is inheriting the remainder of the farm as well, because the exemption

provision is part of a provision that looks eventually at the overall amount that is being inherited.

The amount of any remission designed to be a remission in respect of a matrimonial home is likely to be deleted in the case of the inheritance of most farm properties. In addition, there is a further disability if the matrimonial home is excised for succession duty purposes from the farm property. In those circumstances it will not be a deduction for Commonwealth taxation purposes if repairs, alterations or maintenance are carried out on the house. What will happen is that the Commonwealth Taxation Commissioner will not treat such repairs, alterations and maintenance as part of the total farm enterprise.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's not a deduction now.

Mr. Boundy: Only on an employee's home is it a deduction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My information was that there could be a deduction in that area.

Mr. Coumbe: How many farm properties do you have in the Norwood district?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have only one, but I have not put that in for rural taxation provisions.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You are saying that you cannot repair the house for tax purposes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You should be able to.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If that is so, I have been misinformed. Perhaps the honourable member could take up the matter in another place if he believes there is to be any advantage. In most cases it is highly unlikely that any advantage could occur if the property were excised in any event.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. On the two occasions I spoke on this matter I asked the Government to postpone further debate in Committee until additional information was available. I ask you, Sir, whether that meant that I had spoken twice in Committee or whether I had, in effect, sought leave to continue my remarks and therefore safeguarded the opportunity to speak again as a continuation of the original contribution.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not the honourable member's prerogative to seek leave to continue when in Committee. It is reported in *Hansard* that the honourable member spoke on two occasions and that this is the third occasion, so I must rule accordingly under the provisions of Standing Order No. 422.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Conveyance operating as a voluntary disposition *inter vivos*."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As the matrimonial home is referred to several times in this clause, I suppose it is in order to refer to that matter here. I believe the Treasurer has misinformed the Committee, not deliberately, that repairs and maintenance on the matrimonial home are not a tax deduction if it is the owner's house. Such a house would normally pass from one spouse to the other. My understanding is that improvements made to an outhouse or an employee's house, when that employee is employed by the owner, are tax deductible. Therefore, to further advance the argument, the necessity for including those matrimonial homes on farms is removed because the other concession does not hold water as it does not exist. One readily acknowledges the difficulty of cutting off a segment of the property if the matrimonial home does not abut a road. However, it seems to me that an amendment could

be devised whereby if that was desirable the value of the house could be deducted from the total estate without much difficulty. That seems to be a fairly simple solution.

Dr. EASTICK: I differ in my approach to this matter from that of the member for Kavel because professional advice I took earlier this evening, after the Treasurer reported progress so that the matter could be further considered, indicated that the Treasurer's statements are basically correct since it depends on who is your accountant or lawyer whether you can get away with certain matters. I believe this matter needs to be further considered. It was on that basis that I asked the member for Torrens to indicate it would be necessary for the matter to be considered in another place to consider other advice that could become available. On advice I received earlier today it would seem that several people in rural areas are obtaining the type of concession referred to by the Treasurer. I think it is only proper that this matter should be put straight.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 11. Page 713.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This legislation is before us today as a result of the 1973 Australian Labor Party Conference, when it was decided that ALP policy would include beverage container legislation based on that operating at that time in the State of Oregon. Unfortunately for the House and the people of South Australia, the Australian Labor Party Conference did not research the proposal properly before it passed the resolution that committed the Government to introducing this Bill. That was unfortunate because it deals with only 10 per cent of the total litter problem, and any legislation dealing with only 10 per cent of the problem is ill founded. I believe it is essential to introduce as quickly as possible legislation to deal with the total litter problem in South Australia. No-one on this side is trying to dodge the issue of litter in this State, but we are not prepared to tackle only 10 per cent of the problem. We want to see the problem tackled completely so that all forms of litter are covered in the one Bill.

The Bill is discriminatory, it will create further unemployment, and it will do little to solve the overall litter problem. Although the Bill includes the beer bottle, it is obvious from statements made by the Minister for the Environment that the Government does not intend to include the beer bottle in the deposit scheme. If the Government sees fit to place a 10c deposit on every can sold, it should do likewise with the beer bottle, which is as big an item of litter as is the can and which causes greater risk to the community. The incidence of broken glass was extremely high before cans were introduced. Now we have a problem with cans, but at least the can is not as dangerous as is the broken bottle. I am sure this legislation will effectively ban the can in South Australia, but in doing so we will see the return to the use of beer bottles. Consumption of beer will not drop but the type of container will change and we will have a return to the beer bottle. The can manufacturers now have the technology and ability to manufacture and market the push-in type can. This will eliminate the problem of the ring pull can and the dangerous part that is left after it is detached from the can. With the use of the beer bottle there is the problem of not only broken glass but also the

crown seal, which can also be dangerous to bare feet. We will not have solved the problem involving safety.

The Bill is wide open in that by regulation the Government can do whatever it likes with this Bill. It can include or exclude any type of container at any time, and I believe it is the Government's responsibility to tackle this problem completely. If the Government had gone a little further in its inquiries (and unfortunately it did not carry out any inquiries until after a decision was made to proceed with this type of legislation), I am sure it would have chosen the type of legislation that exists now in the State of Washington instead of the legislation existing in the State of Oregon. The State of Washington imposes a tax at the rate of \$150 for each \$1 000 000 of turnover, and this is levied on all categories of container and packaging contributing to the total litter problem: I refer to cigarettes, confectionery wrappers, food packages, groceries, all beverage containers, newspapers, magazines, glass, plastics and fibre containers. There is much more involved in litter than just the beverage can, and analyses have shown clearly (I do not think the Government will dispute this) that the can makes up about 10 per cent of the litter problem. There is no denying that that 10 per cent is a visible 10 per cent of the total litter problem, but it is still only 10 per cent.

We on this side are interested in the total litter problem, and I think the Minister will readily agree that, with the meagre finance available to Kesab, the overall litter problem has been reduced dramatically in South Australia during the past three or four years. Four or five years ago at the Royal Show litter bins were few and far between, and visitors to the show were knee deep in litter. The Minister may have noticed this year the number of litter bins available at the showgrounds and also the extent to which people were using them. There was surprisingly little litter lying on the ground. People can be educated and, if the Government had the necessary moneys available to it to offer to organisations such as Kesab and councils throughout the State to provide adequate litter bins and the manpower to service them adequately to see that they were kept clean, the problem would be solved quickly. So often, one can walk down a street even in Adelaide and see that the few litter bins provided are overflowing, whereas, with adequate litter bins, adequately serviced, a strong educational programme and the enforcement of adequate laws for littering, the total litter problem could be solved. Unfortunately, this Bill will do little to solve the overall litter problem.

The Minister has often said that, in opposing this legislation, we are opposing it on behalf of industry and of people with vested interests. I will not refer to the submissions but, if the Minister was really interested in the Select Committee conducted by another place and went through each of the submissions, he would find that many of them did not line up with this legislation. What is more, many of the submissions in no way involved vested interests.

Although the Government has provided \$50 000 in this year's Budget for research into litter, I point out that, in the past, it provided only \$5 000, which was not even enough to pay the wages of one person for a year. This was the Government's total contribution to litter removal in this State. As I have already said, the progress made by Kesab in reducing the State's total litter problem has been remarkable, considering the meagre finance made available to it.

Mr. Keneally: Where does it get the rest of its money?

Mr. ARNOLD: From contributions from industry, because of the Government's meagre contribution. To support its legislation and to keep the State tidy, the Oregon Government contributes between \$600 000 and \$700 000 a year and, with the escalation of costs, it will probably contribute from its revenue this financial year about \$1 000 000 to back up its bottle deposit legislation to keep the State clean. This is in complete contrast to the approach that has been adopted in Washington, which imposes a tax on the overall component that makes up litter. The Washington Government has sufficient income from that tax to control adequately the total litter problem in that State. The Minister may refute the information that has been provided, but that State has reduced its total litter problem by between 80 per cent and 90 per cent. If the Minister has proof that that information is incorrect, I should be interested to hear him say so.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It wouldn't change your attitude, though.

Mr. ARNOLD: No, because I am interested in a practical approach, not the theoretical approach which this Government usually adopts and which has little practicable application. Some years ago a Liberal Government commissioned Professor Jordan to inquire into and report on the environment in South Australia. Once again, the Government will probably claim that this is a biased report and that it is tied up with vested interests, but I cannot go along with that kind of approach. If the Minister believes that the Jordan report was heavily influenced by industry, I should like to know on what he bases his theory. It is interesting to note that the Jordan report does not in any way support the type of legislation the Government has introduced; in fact, the report regards the legislation as something that should be used as a last resort, if everything else fails. I will refer to the sections of the report that can be related to the legislation. The report refers to the total environment, namely, noise pollution, etc. The can has no real significance to the problem of noise pollution, although it may have an effect on the person who consumes its contents. Recommendation No. 17 of the report states, in part:

The collection of refuse in the Adelaide metropolitan area needs to be planned and conducted for the whole area. The methods of disposal must be considered in conjunction with a supplementary development plan, and areas to the north and to the south of the city set aside for the disposal of waste.

Recommendation No. 18 states:

A central authority should be set up for the Adelaide metropolitan area to control the collection and disposal of refuse of all kinds including garden refuse.

This is where where we come to approach the matter in relation to the total problem, not just the can. Recommendation No. 25 states:

A guiding principle in all waste collection procedures should be the re-use of resources. This may involve either a Government subsidy, or a disposal tax applied at the time of purchase to aid in the collection of certain articles.

Once again, we come back to the legislation that eventually developed in Washington, and this is primarily what that legislation is all about. Recommendation No. 26 states:

The packaging of some articles is unnecessarily elaborate and excessive. The public should be encouraged to reject superfluous packaging. Packaging materials, eg paper, board, etc., should be salvaged whenever possible. Action should be taken to prevent the packaging industry from wasting resources and adding to the refuse problem by over packaging.

I think we all readily agree that many of the articles we produce, especially the grocery lines, are very much over-packaged for the purpose of trying to present them for sale. Recommendation No. 27 states:

A more 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.

I think that that is possibly one of the key points in relation to the Bill, namely, a more vigorous educational programme, and this is something that the Government has not been willing to try. The Government has introduced its deposit-type legislation without even trying the alternatives that could control the overall litter problem. Any educational programme should start in primary school and work right through. Schools, television and other means could be used to get across to the public and, what is more, the public can be educated. To say that the public cannot be educated is, I believe, a slight on the public. It is extremely important that, if the Government had provided sufficient funds during the past three or four years, it would not be faced with the litter problem it is now facing. Obviously, the Government has accepted this fact to some degree, because it has provided \$50 000 in this year's Budget compared to the \$5 000 it has provided in the past; this, after all, could hardly be considered an honest attempt to control litter in South Australia. Recommendation No. 28 of the report states:

The Adelaide Metropolitan Development Plan should be revised to incorporate many matters concerned with the quality of the environment.

An educational programme could cover many aspects, and the State Planning Authority should be involved in the overall litter problem. If that authority played its part, everything would fall into place. Unfortunately, the Minister is committed to the decision of the ALP conference and, obviously, the Government is not master of its own destiny, and has to proceed with whatever is placed before it.

Mr. Duncan: You sold your souls!

Mr. ARNOLD: The member for Elizabeth can be quite offensive at times.

Dr. Tonkin: He's being his usual self.

Mr. ARNOLD: The day I have to sell my soul, I will let the member for Elizabeth know. I am just pointing out one or two home truths, one of which is that the ALP conference in its wisdom at that time, without investigating the subject, jumped on the environmental band waggon when it heard of the legislation in Oregon. Unfortunately, that Party did not research it and find out its pitfalls and what was required to prop up that legislation to make it seem effective. I have already told the member for Elizabeth that the Oregon Government is now contributing about \$800 000 annually to keep that State clean. If the South Australian Government were to contribute \$1 000 000 annually to councils throughout South Australia and to other worthy organisations, such as Kesab, Rotary, Apex and the various service clubs that are in our community, it would not have any litter problems.

Without taking money from the general revenue of the State, the Washington approach has been to impose a small tax at the rate of \$1.50 for \$1 000 000 turnover, and that is adequate to provide money to keep the State of Washington totally clean, and not only clean of cans. Unfortunately, this Government finds itself unable to do anything about it, and many Government members recognise this position. They realise that many people will lose their jobs, and I am sure that some Government members

are not happy about that situation. However, the people of South Australia will have to face this problem if the Government forces this legislation through Parliament. The Government seems to have some strange ideas about Kesab because some of its finance comes from industry.

Mr. Duncan: Which industries?

Mr. ARNOLD: Perhaps Government members believe that Kesab is a profit-making organisation in which people are trying to line their pockets.

Mr. Duncan: No, we do not believe that.

Mr. ARNOLD: Why do Government members make the accusations and insinuations that Kesab is in some way peddling the line that industry puts forth? This organisation is the only one that has tackled the problem, and it has operated in a way that the State Government should have used. The South Australian Government's contribution to this organisation has been only \$5 000 a year, whereas in Victoria (that nasty Liberal State!) the Government contributes \$30 000 annually, and in Western Australia \$20 000 is contributed, plus a car and an office. I point out that the Government has recognised the work of this organisation, because it has provided \$50 000 in this year's Budget, a commendable action.

Mr. Keneally: Why are you reluctant to name the manufacturers who contribute to Kesab?

Mr. ARNOLD: There is no reluctance; the honourable member knows them.

Mr. Keneally: Why not list them?

Mr. ARNOLD: I shall give the honourable member a complete list. All industries involved in the beverage can industry contribute, because they recognise that we have a litter problem and are pleased to—

Mr. Duncan: Toy with it!

Mr. ARNOLD: —do what they can to solve the problem. It seems that the attitude of Government members is that if there is a problem something must be banned. We have the problem of people being killed on our roads, and perhaps Government members would consider banning the motor vehicle in order to solve that problem. Unfortunately for the Government, people must go on living, and there are certain requirements they need with conveniences and privileges that, in the past, have been part of the Australian way of life. The Government's attitude gives no thought to the effect on people of the convenience of certain containers, and the unemployment that will follow as a result of this legislation. I pay a tribute to Kesab for the remarkable work it has done in recent years, and the results it has achieved. If we consider the increase in population and the normal increase in bottles, cans, and litter, there seems to have been an overall reduction as a result of the work of this organisation. Government members will recall the litter problem that previously existed at the Royal Show. By the use of adequate finance people can be educated not to throw away items that contribute to the litter problem. Unfortunately, the Minister concerned with this legislation has left the Chamber.

Mr. Keneally: He'll listen to you on the loud speaker.

Mr. ARNOLD: I hope so, because I should like some replies to statements on this matter by people in other countries, and should like the Minister to say whether he accepts them as being true or false. I refer to a statement made by Mr. Biggs, Director of Ecology, Washington State Department. He states:

Washington State's litter law, which is far less expensive to consumers and industry than Oregon's mandatory deposit law, is also much more effective. Recent litter surveys have shown an 80 per cent to 90 per cent reduction in roadside

litter within a one-year period. Our programme gets better results than Oregon's because of its adaptability and flexibility and because it includes all litter, not just beverage containers.

That statement was made by a responsible person, the head of a Government department in the State of Washington, United States of America. I have no reason to doubt that that statement is honest; it can easily be checked. If members opposite have proof to the contrary, I would be interested in that proof. Washington State's legislation has reduced by between 80 per cent and 90 per cent the total litter problem. If the South Australian Government's proposed legislation is completely successful, it will reduce the overall litter problem in South Australia by only 10 per cent.

Mr. Keneally: Ten per cent of what?

Mr. ARNOLD: Of all litter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: Members opposite are arguing with a survey undertaken by an independent body. It is stated clearly that this State's legislation will control only 10 per cent of the total litter component. Members opposite are obviously dull, because surveys carried out by the Kesab organisation have shown that the can component contributes 10 per cent to the total litter problem in South Australia.

Mr. Keneally: But 10 per cent of what?

Mr. ARNOLD: It is quite clear. If members opposite can produce a survey that will show otherwise, I shall be interested to see it. I intend to refer to several submissions made to the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Beverage Container Bill. The Nature Conservation Society of South Australia (which would hardly be regarded as a body that is in the pocket of industry) stated in its conclusions:

If implemented throughout Australia, a sales tax system in which a tax equivalent in magnitude to a sensible deposit was placed on new containers of all types—

“of all types”—we come back to the total litter problem—and the money thus collected used to assist local councils and to fund genuine, ecologically orientated educational programmes is seen as the best method of solving this problem. Small paper wrappers would be taxed on the basis of the kind of problem they create. Such a system necessarily would encourage the consumer to buy goods supplied with minimal packaging or in returnable containers and would encourage industry to cater increasingly for this market.

That statement clearly bears out the argument that the Opposition is putting forward regarding this legislation. The Australian Conservation Foundation in its submission stated:

The foundation believes that 5¢ may not be enough to ensure a high rate of return. To ensure maximum recovery and recognising current inflation rates, the foundation believes the Bill should be amended to provide for a refund of at least 10¢ on cans, non-reusable glass and plastic cardboard containers, and soft drink bottles, and not less than 5¢ for reusable beer bottles.

The Government has already stated that it is not game to include beer bottles because of the effect it would have on it electorally.

Mr. Max Brown: No-one has said that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister stated that beer bottles would not be included in the legislation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: The Australian Conservation Foundation points out that at least a 5¢ deposit should be imposed

on reusable bottles. If the Government is genuine in introducing this measure (and it is obviously not genuine, because of the effect such a move would have on it electorally), it would include such a deposit. The selection of submissions I have referred to have come from bodies completely independent of industry, bodies involved purely with the environment and conservation in South Australia and Australia as a whole. If members opposite had taken time to study the submission made to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation (chaired by a Labor Party member) by the member for Fisher, they would find much valuable information. The member for Stuart can smile, but, if he can show that the statements made by the member for Fisher in his submission to the committee and commended by the committee are incorrect, I shall be pleased to hear from him.

Members opposite should go further afield and try to enlighten themselves on the overall litter problem instead of merely carrying out a study of one example—the Oregon “Bottle Bill.” That is the unfortunate situation we face today. The member for Fisher referred to the Oregon situation as follows:

Perhaps the most publicised deposit system in the world is the Oregon “Bottle Bill” legislation introduced on October 1, 1972—

in 1973, following the introduction of this legislation in Oregon, the South Australian State Conference of the Australian Labor Party got wind of the legislation, hopped on the band waggon and thought it would be the answer to the litter problem in South Australia, but unfortunately it has proved not to be the answer to the overall problem whether that problem be in Oregon or in South Australia—to place a mandatory deposit on all carbonated beverage containers.

We would all recognise that Oregon is not a manufacturing State but is largely a tourist and recreational State. The member for Fisher continued:

Often the publicity has been due to the personality of the State's Governor, Tom McCall, but nevertheless the Oregon Bill has done much to promote the deposit system and advertise the virtues of Oregon State as a clean place to go for a holiday. However, while I commend the State on its obvious desire for a litter-free environment, the “Bottle Bill” does not appear to be the absolute reason. Mr. Don Waggoner, of the Oregon Environmental Council, the man considered to be the architect of the “Bottle Bill”, has inferred that the effects of the Bill on litter was only a side issue because the main intent was to change to an all-refillable container system. In 1975 (the next legislative year for Oregon) it was intended to embrace wine containers and hard liquor containers even though United States Federal Law prohibits refilling hard liquor bottles. If the Oregon “Bottle Bill” has been so successful in cleaning up litter then the following statement by George M. Baldwin, Director of Transportation in Oregon, would seem out of place. On November 19, 1973, Mr. Baldwin said: “In fiscal year 1968-69, we spent \$158 845 picking up highway litter. And the public clamored for more attention to highway litter, writing letters by the hundreds. So the Legislature authorised more highway funds for litter pickup. During the next fiscal year, the cost of litter cleanup rose to \$332 523. The cost climbed to \$589 076 the following year, the highest in the State's history. The year after that, the cost dropped to \$501 311. Last year, fiscal year 1972-73, we spent more than \$600 000 picking up other people's litter along Oregon's beautiful highways.”

The Government in the State of Oregon spent \$600 000 to have litter picked up, even though the Oregon bottle legislation already was in operation. The Government provided that amount to try to keep the highways clean, and in South Australia, as I have said, the Government has been contributing an average of \$5 000, so there is a

variation between the litter problems in this State and in Oregon. The report continues:

These clean-up figures appear directly relevant to the outspoken comments by environmentalists that the Oregon deposit system is the answer to the litter problem. If the Oregon “Bottle Bill” is a success, why does the State of Oregon have such a high expenditure in pickup, an expenditure that appears to be spiralling? In fact, it has been stated in Oregon that the actual highway litter pickup for this year will be in excess of \$850 000.

The amount is increasing all the time and the Government must contribute nearly \$1 000 000 to make the Oregon bottle legislation seem to work. The report continues:

The Police Force in Oregon has 110 officers who have the duty of policing the beaches, streams, hunting and other recreational areas to enforce all types of laws including severe anti-litter penalties. In the fiscal year 1972-73, the State Department of Police in Oregon reported that 288 people were warned for offensive littering, 371 were arrested, 27 were acquitted and penalties totalling 83 days gaol and \$6 104 fines were imposed. For throwing away lighted materials, 99 warnings, 236 arrests, 18 acquittals, 58 gaol days and \$1 059 in fines.

This is a far cry from merely introducing a deposit system on bottles. If we considered the stringency with which the Government in Oregon is imposing its anti-litter laws, together with the fact that it is contributing nearly \$1 000 000 a year, we see that it is farcical to say that the Bill before us will do anything to solve the total litter problem in South Australia. The report continues:

Oregon has three youth groups aged between 16 and 22 employed during their educational vacation to pick up highway and recreational area litter. The three groups are the Oregon Youth Patrol, the Oregon Youth Corporation, and the Federally-organised Neighbourhood Youth Corporation. It was difficult to establish an accurate figure on the numbers employed in these campaigns but it was estimated between 600 and 800.

Once again, if the State had the revenue that would be provided by the Washington-type litter legislation, it would have available money that would enable an increase in employment, whereas the Bill before us, as I have said, will result in many people being dismissed, whether in Adelaide, Port Pirie, Berri, or many other parts of the State. The total number of people who would lose their jobs probably would be about 300 to 400, and we have the effect of that on their families, whereas the opposite type of approach, the Washington approach, would create employment and solve 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the litter problem.

Here we are going to put 300 or 400 people out of work. We are going to try to resolve 10 per cent of the litter problem, and the Government is stuck with this legislation, not knowing how to get rid of it. The only way it can be got rid of this time (since the Government can do nothing about it, because it is a commitment by the annual conference) is to have the legislation defeated and to have total proper legislation introduced as quickly as possible.

To back up a total educational approach to litter, I gave notice earlier today of my intention to introduce a Bill to deal with the total litter problem, a Bill that would provide for on-the-spot fines and also contribute to the finance required for overall policing of the litter problem and for the convicting of offenders. At present there is no incentive for people not to litter, but, if on-the-spot fines were imposed, whereby it would cost offenders \$10, there would be an incentive to the public to deposit rubbish in a bin. When sufficient funds were available to be distributed through councils and voluntary organisations to provide adequate litter bins, we would find people making much more use of them than at present. In continuing to read the report by

the member for Fisher in relation to the Oregon situation, I refer to the three groups that I have mentioned. The report states:

They are employed at the rate of \$US1.75 an hour, and of course it is obvious that a work force of this magnitude operating for two periods each of six weeks duration must have a significant effect on the litter problem . . .

If we have 600 to 800 people in the field for two six-weekly periods through the year, that must have an enormous effect on the litter problem on the highways in the State of Oregon. The report continues:

Another effort to establish funds and add to the public education against litter is a special car registration plate available for a \$US25.00 fee on which the owner may use any letters he desires not exceeding six in number.

This is simply another method of raising revenue to pay persons to collect litter in the State of Oregon, where we have this Oregon bottle legislation that would seem to solve the overall litter problem. This shows the extent to which the Oregon Government has to go to make it appear as though the Oregon bottle legislation is working. This scheme of licence plate numbering returns about \$90 000 to the Oregon Highways Department a year, and this is used for financing litter pick-up by the Oregon Youth Patrol.

It is obvious from the report and explanation given by the member for Fisher that the Oregon litter legislation by itself is not effective; it is by the back-up legislation providing stiff penalties for littering and the provision of 700 to 800 people for two periods of six weeks during each year to carry out the total clean-up campaign along the highways that the State of Oregon is solving its litter problem at a total cost to the Government of almost \$1 000 000 a year. If the Government believes that this Bill will solve the litter problem in South Australia, I think that it has a rude shock awaiting it. The report of the member for Fisher also states:

Brief reference was made earlier to the State of Washington's attack on the litter problem and it amazed me to find that all interested parties attended a meeting held at the Department of Environment offices in Olympia while I was visiting, including beverage manufacturers, brewers and container manufacturers and there was general agreement that their anti-litter programme was working satisfactorily. The four main activities conducted in Washington State were:

- (1) a very intensive education programme carried out by the Department of Environment with support from industry and associated bodies;
- (2) the moneys for this programme were obtained by imposing a tax on all industries that manufactured or marketed goods with a potential to become litter. This tax is imposed at the rate of \$150 per \$1 000 000 turnover at no more than three points of sale: manufacturing, wholesale and retail. The categories of industry obliged to pay the tax, cigarettes and tobacco, food producers, groceries, all beverages, newspapers and magazines, paper products, glass, metal, plastic and fibre containers, toiletries and cleaning agents;
- (3) it was made compulsory for all motor vehicles operating within the State to be fitted with a litter bag; and
- (4) enforcement of the law, although it should be pointed out that the authorities in Washington State have not been anywhere near as severe in this field as Oregon.

There are two totally different approaches to the problem: one is aimed at the total litter problem and the other is aimed only at the beverage container—the can. The results have been remarkable, since there has been an overall reduction in the total litter of between 80 per cent and 90 per cent. However, the Washington approach is financing itself, but the Oregon legislation is costing the Govern-

ment of that State about \$1 000 000 a year to prop it up, for a population two-thirds that of the State of Washington. If South Australia's Government has a spare \$1 000 000 floating around that it wishes to contribute each year to prop up this legislation it will certainly be needed if it is to have any effect on the elimination of Jitter.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who do you reckon pays the tax in Washington?

Mr. ARNOLD: The people who use any packaging that contributes to the total litter problem, but it is not at the rate of 10¢ a can; it is at the rate of \$150 for each \$1 000 000 of turnover of packaging material, and that is a minute tax. Although that taxation is infinitesimal, it is sufficient to provide the Ecology Department in the State of Washington with sufficient funds to provide the manpower required to keep that State clean, and it creates no problems for anyone. We are not forcing—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It comes from some magical source?

Mr. ARNOLD: There is nothing magical about that. It is no different from any other form of taxation.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I am pleased to hear you say that; I thought that you were suggesting it wasn't.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is a specific tax to solve a specific problem. Last session, the Minister for the Environment introduced legislation to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act in which provision was made for hunting permits, and we insisted that moneys collected from hunting permits be paid into the parks and wildlife conservation fund. The tax that was collected from a specific section of the community went back to a specific area to improve habitats and the general environment of wild life. The proposal in Washington is designed in exactly the same way. A tax is collected to do a specific job, and it is doing it remarkably well.

I have mentioned many submissions made to the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Beverage Container Bill by organisations which I claim have no vested interest in the industry (I think that can be verified). Basically, these organisations are primarily interested in the environment of South Australia. None of the submissions I have quoted supports the provisions contained in this Bill; in fact these organisations believe that this legislation should be introduced as a last resort. For that reason, we oppose the Bill, as it is aimed at only 10 per cent of the total litter problem and will create more unemployment at a time when South Australia can ill afford additional unemployment (I do not believe that the Government can afford to have further unemployment, either). The Bill will cause increased use of beer bottles, so that we will have an increase in the incidence of broken glass. It will effectively ban the can, which is a popular and convenient container. On those grounds I oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): When I first examined this legislation when it came before the House some time ago, I thought that it was ill-considered and rather futile, and I see no reason to change my mind on this occasion. Indeed, the only difference as far as I can see is that the Government has had another look at the matter and is coming to the same opinion. However, the trouble is that the Government does not have the courage of its own convictions and will not move to withdraw the Bill and replace it with something better, or even consider the matter, notice of which has been given today. While no-one in any way disagrees with the need for general conservation and for the recycling of products (matters

which are so important to the future of this State, country and, indeed, the world) and while no-one could be more critical of the rubbish and litter that line our main highways and could discredit more the attitude which is so widespread in our community of people dropping litter wherever they go, without thinking to put it in a bin, I believe that this legislation does virtually nothing to control any of those matters. South Australia is not as well off as, for instance, Singapore, which has an anti-litter fine of \$500 Singapore, or Melbourne, which imposes fines of up to \$200 for littering.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you think the Singapore legislation would work here?

Dr. TONKIN: It is one of the factors that ought to be considered.

Mr. Duncan: What about the gaols?

Dr. TONKIN: What a peculiar point of view the honourable member has, but that has become typical of him, and we are getting used to his outlook on life now. In those places, the whole litter problem has been dealt with as a whole. Heavy anti-litter fines are imposed, and the system has worked reasonably well. I think we should look, first, at the fundamental requirements and the necessary components of an effective anti-litter campaign, because I think that is what the Government is trying to achieve. However, I am not sure about that; it is not apparent from the legislation that the Government is concerned about litter generally.

Let us consider the necessary components for a successful anti-litter campaign. First comes education. We should have an educational programme which goes through schools, which must be reinforced at home, which must be moved out into the community (particularly by way of example when parents have their children with them), and which must work in the community generally. There must be adequate litter bins and receptacles and, at this stage, I pay tribute to the work Kesab has done throughout the community, but certain Government members have been critical by way of interjection of Kesab's work. I think it does the Government no credit to reflect on the integrity of Kesab and on the fine work it has done.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: We would be in a far worse situation with regard to litter if it were not for that organisation's work. From education we move to enforcement, and there is a place for anti-litter fines, because, undoubtedly, this is the only language that some people will understand. Fines would help to raise revenue, perhaps sufficient revenue to finance litter collection by local government, the Highways Department, and voluntary bodies.

Mr. Keneally: Why don't you just read the speech you made in a previous session?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I recall the Premier not long ago at a Kiwanis Club lunch roundly criticising Walkathon and saying that litterthons would be far more useful and practical. He decried the use of any method other than education, but he mentioned in passing, I believe, that some people had to be persuaded, and I think that this is the role of the on-the-spot fine, which has a real role to play. If it can work in Melbourne, I see no reason why it should not work here. The member for Elizabeth would probably say that Melbourne had bigger gaols, but I cannot for the life of me see what those red herrings have to do with the subject under debate.

Mr. Duncan: Melbourne has the same problems as we have.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Are these measures we are considering necessary to deal with the problem, when we can add to the financial provisions by the type of taxation in the Washington State system, and when we can get finance from Government grants (\$50 000 is provided in the Estimates—or what we saw of them)? We would assume that any programme to enforce anti-litter measures would naturally appear in the Bill; so, let us have a look. The Government has had the benefit of expert advice and of the wealth of experience available from overseas and from other States, but there is no sign at all anywhere in the Bill of the general fundamental requirements for a successful anti-litter campaign.

This Bill deals with only one subject: the matter of deposits on beverage containers. Perhaps the Bill goes some of the way. There are many containers which can give rise to litter: there are bottles, cans, cartons, and take-away-food containers; there are food wrappings, packages and milk cartons; all these things add to our litter problem. Any number of these things can be seen at any time of day on any main road out in the country. How many of these items are dealt with in the legislation? Are wrappings, milk cartons, food packaging, bottles or cans dealt with? As far as I can see, the legislation applies basically to cans, but bottles may be included. I shall be very interested to see whether any move is made against the beer bottle.

Mr. Duncan: There is no need, because they are returnable.

Dr. TONKIN: What is the difference between returnable and non-returnable? is the returnable bottle any less polluting?

Mr. Langley: Yes, because there's an incentive to pick them up; the rubbish man picks them up.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot see that at all. The legislation deals only with bottles and cans.

The SPEAKER: Order! Opposition and Government members will have equal opportunity to refute any statements made at the proper time. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN: I seriously doubt whether members opposite will take advantage of your kind offer. This legislation deals with cans and bottles, and by the Government's own admission does not deal with all bottles; there is some doubt that that part of the legislation will work, anyway. Obviously, the legislation is concerned with cans and only cans. There is one good feature in the Bill: it gets down to rather fine detail and refers to ring tops, and I agree with the provisions dealing with ring tops, because they cause considerable trouble. However, those cans are now being replaced by push top cans, and they were being replaced well before this legislation could have possibly come into effect. I think that it is a tribute to the industry that it has seen the need to replace the ring top with the push, top, and this is a good thing.

This is one of those cases where education can persuade people to take the right action and adopt the right point of view. Will the legislation provide the necessary finance for general education? The answer is "No, in no way." The only way in which it can provide finance is by way of the fines the Bill will impose on those people in charge of collection depots who, for instance, could be fined up to \$500 for failing to accept containers. That is the only way in which the legislation provides for any income at all. Will this legislation stop people from littering? If it is to apply only to cans and not to other forms of litter, some

people may not throw money away but will take the trouble to keep their cans and hand them in, but those people will not be too worried if they do not have a sense of community responsibility and will throw their other litter away. If they are irresponsible enough to litter anyway, I do not believe they will be bothered about returning cans and will throw them by the roadside, in spite of any deposit. Those sorts of people, if they are faced with a choice of buying two cans of beer and paying two 10¢ deposits or buying one bottle of beer without having to pay a deposit, will, I have no doubt, buy the bottle every time and will throw it on to the roadside, as they would do with the cans, anyway.

The whole situation is ridiculous, as put forward by the Government. The Government knows it is ridiculous. It is a ridiculous situation to single out the can and not to deal with the whole litter problem. I can recall not so long ago travelling on the main highway from Accommodation Hill to Truro on a Saturday afternoon and being stuck behind a carload of youths who were drinking as they went along and who were throwing out bottles on the side of the road at 5 km or 6 km intervals. This practice went on until they had thrown out about four bottles.

Mr. Keneally: What sort of bottles?

Dr. TONKIN: They were beer bottles.

Mr. Keneally: What type of beer bottles?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: They were 760 ml beer bottles. I was not impressed by their behaviour: it was totally irresponsible and was causing danger to other people driving on the road. The effect of their behaviour would have extended much farther than on just that section of road. It is always extremely difficult to know what is the answer when one sees that sort of situation.

Mr. Keneally: Was it difficult to keep up with them, because they were probably doing about 144 km/h?

Dr. TONKIN: No, thank goodness they were not travelling at that speed. Anyway, I do not believe the car they were driving could have achieved that speed, and the condition of their car was another cause for complaint. This legislation, dealing as it does with cans, will not stop the overall problem of littering. All it will do is reduce the incidence of cans, with all the advantages they offer, at the expense of increasing the number of bottles. That is the changing pattern we will see in roadside littering: it will simply be an increase in the number of bottles on the side of the road. Cans do not break, but bottles do break and the danger is multiplied accordingly. Will this legislation help in the general collection of litter? Why should it? What on earth is there to say that this measure will help in the collection of litter generally? It will not give any more incentive to people to place refuse in litter bins. If children are motivated only by thoughts of a deposit, it is likely they will collect the cans and leave other litter. If, through a community service, a service club, the scouts or—one of the Premier's bright ideas—a litter-thon, people are going to be responsible enough to collect all litter the deposit system will not make any difference to them.

Mr. Keneally: Are you going to move that the deposit on cool drink bottles be removed?

Dr. TONKIN: What a ridiculous interjection. I hope it has been noted in *Hansard*. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, have made a clear note of the interjection and that you are disappointed in the honourable member for making it. If litter collection is being undertaken as a charity drive, those responsible people will collect cans, bottles and other refuse

regardless of whether or not there is a deposit. Incentives could be given to service clubs and charitable institutions to go out and collect litter. Payments could be made available from a fund that should be set up to deal with the total litter problem. The deposit system as outlined will not provide these funds; it is clear it cannot provide the funds. This measure deals with a deposit system—nothing more nor less. If anything, the system will cost the Government money. It is a ham-fisted, inefficient and totally unsatisfactory way of tackling the general litter problem in South Australia. It deals with only one facet of the problem and ignores totally the major part of that problem.

This Bill is indeed difficult to amend: it is such a mess. It is so slanted one way that I cannot see how it can be amended. I congratulate the members for Eyre and Chaffey for their joint action in preparing and today giving notice of a Bill to provide litter finance. We will do everything we can to support them and to oppose this Bill, because it is so inadequate. We will support other measures that we believe will be far more effective in solving the problem as a whole. Our Opposition grows when we consider the effects of the Bill on employment. The member for Chaffey dealt fully with this aspect of the problem. Unemployment will be created (as is well known) in the can-making and the beverage industries. Jobs will be lost: there is no question about that. In the interests of overall conservation it may be necessary sometimes to make this sort of sacrifice, but that does not help the people who lose their jobs. It may sometimes be necessary to make that sort of sacrifice but not in these circumstances, not in today's economic circumstances and certainly not as the result of a stupid Bill such as this.

This is certainly not the time to run the risk of increasing unemployment just for the sake of this single-minded, narrow Bill. You, Sir, know perfectly well what is the position in Port Pirie. That position will be reflected in Adelaide. Soft drink bottlers in Port Pirie supply a large area of the Northern Territory, as far north as Tennant Creek, with soft drinks. Cans will be shipped there from the Eastern States, if we revert to bottles for that trade, because transport costs on bottles compared to cans will be prohibitive. Breakages will occur, and it will not be worth the manufacturers' while to stay in business, because the charges associated with returning bottles to Port Pirie will be too high.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Government members may laugh, but I am sure you, Sir, and members on this side of the House are not laughing. South Australia cannot afford to lose any industry. The Government is embarrassed by having to proceed with this legislation. The Jordan report recommended against this measure. Ail overseas experience shows clearly that it is not the best course to follow and that better measures can be taken. If the Government were honest it would take the advice of many learned people and withdraw the Bill and be done with it. Perhaps it could support the Bill we will introduce or bring in a better Bill of its own.

The Opposition supports litter fines, and has moved in that direction. We will support wholeheartedly any educational programme and the activities of Kesab and other voluntary organisations that will collect litter as a community service. We will support a tax of the Washington State type on packaging to finance the entire programme. Education, enforcement, collection and the

processing of litter are the fundamentals involved in this problem. The Washington State model has been spectacularly successful in achieving all these ends. I cannot support this legislation, because I believe it is ridiculous; it is surface scratching; it is pure window-dressing; perhaps it is a public relations exercise to keep conservationists happy. I believe that even they cannot be terribly pleased with the limited scope this legislation covers. This measure will not solve the litter problem, and we as a community must do everything we can to solve that problem. We must enlist the help of every member of the community to solve the problem and persuade them to avoid littering in the first place and, in the second place, to be willing to clean up litter. Those people who are irresponsible enough not to want to co-operate in the community effort should be persuaded, and we believe that to do that would not do any harm. I repeat that this legislation does nothing to solve the general litter problem. We cannot support the Bill and we look forward to more significant and worthwhile legislation soon.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not support the legislation. I have been through this exercise once previously and my views are recorded in *Hansard*, but I suppose that it is necessary to go over some of the old ground and state my view.

Mr. Duncan: Are you going to give us another travelogue?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I will come back to the member for Elizabeth, but I think it fair that I should refer to the report that I gave to the Commonwealth Government inquiry on the matter of litter. So that there will be no misunderstanding of where I stand on the subject of litter and deposits, I refer to my conclusions. I stated:

(1) My suggestions are basically the same as those in the Jordan report. An intensive education programme should be carried out.

(2) More equipment should be made available, with signs advertising them, to encourage people to act more responsibly.

(3) The obligation for every motorists to have a litter bag in his vehicle.

(4) Enforcement of the law.

Perhaps we need stronger and better litter laws. I concluded by saying:

(5) Then, if there is any article that is constantly causing a litter problem action should be taken to rectify the problem, even if it means banning that product.

I do not oppose the banning of products if the Government and the departments take a responsible approach in the first instance. We have not done that in South Australia in the past, regardless of what political Party has been in office. Members will recall that I went overseas at the expense of industry, and I remember that the Minister made a snide remark, saying that I had been bought. If anyone wants to assume that I have been bought, good luck to him, but, by going to other countries and States, I learnt one thing, namely, that the only information the Government, or the Minister through the department, was making available to South Australia and to the Opposition in particular was that part that suited the Government's cause.

After the departmental officers came back to Australia, we found that they had been sent to Oregon to find out how the Oregon law worked, not to find out whether there was a better way to attack the litter problem. The Government cannot deny that, because the Director of the department admitted it at the time. His object in going to other places was to come back and show how the Oregon

law worked. Would not the proper way to use public money be to ask officers to find the best means of solving the litter problem? That was not the instruction.

I understand that Oregon has slightly more than 2 100 000 people, and it is a clean State. Much money is spent in jacking up their deposit legislation. I will come back to that matter, because it is worth considering the action that that Government is taking. However, the neighbouring State of Washington is equally as clean as Oregon, and it does not have the imposition of deposits on containers. The member for Chaffey, as shadow Minister for the Environment, has dealt with that situation.

Washington has not the problems in industry. There was no loss in the work force there. In fact, perhaps the number employed increased slightly in the field of education, through the money made available from the voluntary tax agreed to by the total industry that produced litter-potential packages. However, in the neighbouring State of Oregon there were substantial losses in employment. It is no good members ducking their heads. The people working in the industries affected by the Bill know that their jobs are in jeopardy. They have been living with the mental trauma for many weeks, and perhaps one can come to only one conclusion, with this Bill being forced through today, as it is accepted that it will be: these people will know the position of their jobs in the future. They will know that they have a limited time in which to find other employment. They will know that they will not be able to get jobs in the same kind of industry in this State. They may be lucky enough to be able to transfer to another State to work in the field of technology that they know. They know that there will be an increase in production in the Eastern States to supply the north of South Australia and the Northern Territory with cans. Their managers and directors also know that, and we politicians know it.

Therefore, the only consolation those men will have about their jobs in your town, Sir, as well as in other country areas and in the metropolitan area is that they will have a short time in which to look for other employment.

More than 100 people will have their job affected, and that does not include the families, the children and wives. Those people also have the mental trauma. They know their schools, schoolmates, and their environment, and a change could affect their total life. It is no good any honourable member denying that. It annoys me that we have not had the guts to carry out the actions that we should carry out and tackle the total litter problem. The member for Elizabeth has made clear that he believes in banning the can. If he had his way, he would do that. Doubtless, this form of legislation is a way to ban the can. Under the legislation, the collection centres will not be set up by the Government, or by the shopkeeper, in the sense that he will pay for them. The centres will be a burden on the industry, with no guarantee even that they will get sales through having them, so will the people concerned commit themselves to a large amount to set up collection centres at the Minister's whim, which is what it will be?

The Minister will say where he wants the centres and the industry will have to set them up, but the industry knows that its can sales will decrease significantly. Who will pay a deposit on two cans of beer, containing 13oz., as against one bottle of beer, with no deposit? Who will pay the deposit on the beer can? Therefore, the cans will not be sold, and so the industry knows that there is no

benefit in setting up collection centres and the industry will not be bothered spending the money necessary to set (hem up. The Government knows clearly that this legislation effectively bans the can. Nothing is clearer or more concise in the Government's thinking. Some Government members like to knock industry as often as possible, even if that acts against the stated intention of looking after the jobs of those who work in industry. Government members are not doing that. They cast them aside at every opportunity. In this year's Budget \$50 000 is provided for an anti-litter campaign.

Up until this year, all that the Government has made available to Kesab or to any other organisation is a miserable \$5 000 in one year to attack the litter problem. The news media, the television stations, and the radio stations made available to Kesab in one year over \$100 000 through free time. Some members opposite said that industry contributed to Kesab. Who is denying that? Thank heaven someone made the money available, because the Government was not prepared to do so; it ran away from the challenge.

If the Government had made available enough money to Kesab to carry out a total anti-litter campaign to attack the problem, there would have been no need for industry to make any contribution at all. You, Mr. Speaker, and other honourable members know that the Government shirked the responsibility of making a contribution so that it could start a little bashing; but now it has introduced this Bill, and at precisely the same time it puts in the Budget \$50 000 for an anti-litter campaign. It does not need much intelligence to appreciate what the \$50 000 is there for: it is to start an anti-litter campaign of education, attacking the litter problem in total, so that the Government can then say, "Look, the Beverage Container Bill is working perfectly." In other words, it is doing, on the one hand, what we are recommending: it is attacking the problem with education, enforcing of the law, the supplying of equipment, and an encouragement not to litter with the \$50 000. On the other hand, it is putting a compulsory deposit on certain containers. If we look at that reasoning, we shall see the fallacy of the whole argument and how unsure the Government itself is that the legislation will work: it knows it will not.

I return to the point made by my Leader regarding the can versus the beer bottle. Does any member really believe that we can, in all honesty, place a deposit on the non-returnable bottle and the non-returnable can and not on the beer bottle?

Mr. Duncan: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: Does any member really believe we are doing that for an anti-litter purpose? It is not the purpose. It may be an attempt to save resources. Let us look at it. Not one member in this Chamber or indeed one person in Australia has carried out a complete research study of the cost of recycling non-returnable containers as against using refillable containers over a period of time. With the refillable containers, we have to heat water, use detergents (which mean pollution), and have a heavier carton to cart the bottles throughout the country so that they do not break when banging against each other. The container must be much heavier in design to stand the strain. It needs much more material to produce such a container than for an ordinary container and, when we break one, we lose about eight times the material used for a non-returnable container, with a similar type of material.

On top of that, if we are carting goods for great distances, an aluminium can is 22 times lighter than a glass

container of the same size; so, if we are carting X amount of drinks from Port Pirie to Ceduna and if it takes 10 tonnes of aluminium containers to get that drink to Ceduna, if we were to put the drink into bottles, we would need 220 tonnes of bottles to cart it there. What about the energy used in that resource carting it there and then returning it? That is what we are talking about in this proposal. There is not one person in Australia or anywhere who has carried out a complete study of that aspect; yet environmentalists (whose views I respect) and others say that the non-returnable system uses up more resources than the returnable system. No-one has proved it, and no Government has set out to attempt to prove it.

Let us consider the ring pull top. I agree with the move to ban the ring pull top; it is a good move. I think industry accepts it even though the ban may impose some burdens on it. It accepts it as a responsible move and can cater for it without having to sack its employees. As regards the beer bottle top, has anyone ever thought what would happen and how long it would be before we had to ban the beer bottle top (or, as we call it, the crown top)? Which is more dangerous on a picnic ground, on the surrounds of a football oval, or in any other area, like the beach—the ring pull top or the crown beer bottle top? Which is more likely to cut the feet of people without shoes or cut other parts of their bodies? We have not thought about that; there has been no comment about it, and, environmentally, they are no more attractive.

I do not oppose the ring pull top provision. That is a sensible move and is one that can be carried in the industry without there being a loss of jobs and without the displacement of many persons from the industry. But I make the point about the beer bottle top, because it is worth remembering. What about the beer bottle itself? I know that beer cans, cool drink cans, and milk cartons are thrown on the sides of the road; and so are beer bottles. No-one picks them up once they hit the guard-rail or the stobie pole. Some young people find no better exercise, when driving a vehicle, than to see whether they can hit a stobie pole with a beer bottle. If they succeed, the Highways Department has the difficult task of picking up not just one container but many fragments of a container, which are more dangerous than the complete container, whether aluminium, cardboard, steel, or glass. If the Government goes on with this Bill as it is now, providing for deposits on non-returnable bottles and cans and on no others, we shall encourage the use of the beer bottle.

Those members who travelled the country in the early 1960's, before cans became so popular as a convenient form of packaging for the individual, know that we had the great Australian daisy, the beer bottle, scattered all along the roads and highways, and that was at a time when money was much more important to the individual than it is today. People do not really concern themselves about 1¢, 5¢, or 10¢ as much as they did at one time, and in the late 1950's and the early 1960's every member here knows that within the community there was an outcry against the broken bottles on the beaches and in the parks. If we are to make a move, let us be honest and courageous and put it on the line—the cans and the bottles in the case of those drinks that are used in soft drink and the beer drinking field.

Mr. Keneally: Will you move a suitable amendment?

Mr. EVANS: For the member for Stuart's information, I said at the beginning that, if any Government department will go out to tackle this problem as a total problem and try by education, enforcement of the law, and supplying equipment and encouraging people to use that equipment,

and that fails, whether it be beer bottles or cans or any other thing that is causing the problem, I will be prepared to see it banned; but let us do it honestly, not dishonestly, as we are here.

Mr. Duncan: What is dishonest about it?

Mr. EVANS: It is dishonest in the sense that it is putting the can out of the market, beyond any shadow of doubt. It will be off the market in this State, because no-one will set up a collection centre. That is a dishonest approach that will not work. I come now, briefly, to equipment. I think Kesab carried out a wonderful experiment with its LARM project. It worked with two or three councils, and Glenelg in particular. The Glenelg council increased its number of litter receptacles considerably, and if anyone wishes to go down there he will see that there has been a general reduction in litter. Let us take the example of the Adelaide City Council, as an alternative. I do not want to attack the council, except to point out that its receptacles, which are generally small, are fitted to posts, and one or two larger receptacles are placed on the pavement. I invite any honourable member to have a look of a Saturday evening, or on many evenings during the week, or even on a Sunday morning, and he will find that the bins are full to overflowing. The public has made a genuine attempt to get rid of its litter, but what has happened? The containers will not carry it, and the litter falls to the roadway. Along highways, where a limited number of containers are available, one will see the same thing, but I will leave that point to some country honourable member to cover later.

We have not really taken up the challenge in the supply of equipment for litter, not even in our schools. At many of our schools the children have to walk a considerable distance to place litter in a container, and the attitude of mind has not developed to the point where people are disciplined in their own minds to do that. I pay the Education Department, through its teachers, a compliment by saying that there is a greater awareness in young people today of our litter problems than there has ever been before.

Mr. Venning: They're educating them.

Mr. EVANS: That is right, and the move is on, without the Government's really giving it any backing. Even in kindergartens the children are aware of their responsibility not to litter. Let me talk about the law in regard to littering. Within this State we have laws that make it an offence to litter, and they impose a fine of up to \$200, but how many times has the law been enforced or encouraged to be enforced by the Government? I recall the member for Elizabeth saying, "We will gaol them all." Few people are gaoled in this State for any kind of offence, and the member for Elizabeth knows that. His was a stupid statement.

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

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Fisher misrepresented me. I did not make the statement he has alleged I made.

Mr. Gunn: Of course you did! Sit down!

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Fisher said that I had said in the debate that I recommended putting all litterers in gaol. That is incorrect. I made no such statement, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, as the honourable member has an opportunity to reply and to refute any statement made by the Opposition. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: In fairness to the member for Elizabeth, I think he implied that we would not have enough gaols to hold all the people if they were penalised. The interpretation could be the same; so, I put it in that category. The member for Elizabeth said that, if the Singapore legislation was introduced, our gaols would not hold them all. This State has provisions to fine people, but we do not do it very often, except for serious offences. The Government sent its offices to Oregon to compare our laws with Oregon's laws, but the Government has never disclosed the severity of the laws there. People in Oregon have hunting, fishing, boating and driving licences, which are cheaper than ours. If a person is caught littering when fishing, hunting, boating or driving, he loses the licence being used at the time of committing the offence. He does not get away with it: he loses some privilege. I would support that system being used here. I would not object to the enforcement of the law. I agree with the member for Elizabeth that, regarding Singapore, it would be difficult for us to implement its laws.

Mr. Duncan: We wouldn't want them.

Mr. EVANS: Singapore's wages are so low that it can afford, with a population of just over 2 000 000, to employ 600 inspectors to enforce the litter laws on a continuing basis. In this State, which has a Police Force of about 2 300, we could not afford to have 600 officers policing that type of law. Oregon's youth patrol picks up litter, and its laws provide for gaoling for littering more than the second or third time and for suspending licences or certain privileges. Oregon has university students walking along the beaches as cadet patrols saying to picnic groups, "Don't leave your litter there when you have finished because, if you do, you may be reported and fined, or even lose your licence. Please pick it up." Oregon employs people on a low student-type salary to advise people, and it helps in educating the public.

Mr. Mathwin: Life savers could do it.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, and it works. Either the Government has never, nor has its departmental officers, been informed enough to make this information available to us, or if they have been informed they have deliberately withheld the information. When this Government came into power, it supported its Commonwealth colleagues in power and supported its belief in open government but you, Mr. Speaker, being the deciding vote in the Chamber on many issues, know that the Premier of the State has in his hands a report that was produced by his departmental officers on the likely effect of this Bill, if implemented, on this State's industry. Do you, Mr. Speaker, know that the Premier had not even read the report at the time the Bill was introduced and that the Premier has not had the courtesy or decency to honour the obligation he gave with regard to open government to bring the details of that report to Parliament or to say to any Opposition group, "Here's a copy of the report to read on what is likely to happen to industry if the Bill is implemented"?

I invite you, Mr. Speaker, when you have the opportunity, to stand up and say whether you have read the report and, if you have not, then only someone on the Government's side (it may only be the Premier himself) has read that report. Perhaps he is so convinced about the overall issue that he has not even had the respect for the people in the industry to read the report. That report should be made public. Why should we be denied the opportunity to know what departmental officers found would be the likely effect of the change in the law in this State that would adversely affect the livelihoods of many people. I

say it is a shame on a Government, which says on many occasions that it believes in open government, but where is open government in that? The people's money paid for the report. The people in the Premier's Department are employed by the people to be able to tell them what is the likely effect, but what do we get? Where is open government? It is so secretive that not one Government member is willing to say, "We will make it available", because he knows that he will be lucky himself if the Premier will allow him to have even a little peek at it. The Premier will keep it secret in his own department.

My one last point deals with resource recovery. I said at the Commonwealth inquiry, and I will say it here, that the present Minister, who is absconding from the job soon, always said that he believed in a waste-disposal authority. I hope that we never have a waste-disposal authority here, but I hope that we have a resource recovery authority and set out to recover as many of the resources as we can—not just glass and metals (ferrous and non-ferrous), but paper, cardboard, etc. Let us make full use of it. Let us not go at it piecemeal, as is being done in the legislation. It can and should be done. I support the concept of education, supply of equipment, enforcement of the law, and encouragement to people to report their neighbour for littering, if necessary, if we want to clean up litter in the community. If that does not work, I say clearly and concisely that if it were tried I would support the deposit system on any article that was causing a real problem. However, we have not attacked the problem in a responsible manner, so I challenge the Premier to make the report available. At this stage I oppose the measure.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Since speaking to this Bill on March 20, 1974, I have noted in my district (which includes the council areas of Henley and Grange, West Torrens, and Glenelg, and which is probably one of the most popular parts of the metropolitan beach front, including West Beach and Glenelg) that there has been a concerted effort not only by councils or industry but also by Kesab and the community generally to try to overcome the litter problem. I believe the litter problem should be considered as a whole. No-one has asked more questions or raised more doubts about litter and litter control in South Australia and about its effects in my district than I have.

Representing two popular metropolitan beach-front areas where residue is washed from suburban streets into the drainage system ultimately ending in the Patawalonga Lake, I have a good guide to the type and amount of litter left lying around the city. My observations in the past 12 months have shown that the litter problem is not as great now as it was 12 months ago. I do not believe it is as great as it was three years ago; however, it is still there and is still a problem. To isolate a section that contributes to the litter problem does not seem to be tackling the whole problem head on. When the Minister introduced this Bill last year he stated:

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

So I do not believe the Minister has really changed his attitude. The member for Chaffey has told the House that cans make up 10 per cent of the litter problem in South Australia. Many suggestions have been made about how we should overcome that litter problem, but I will deal with that in a moment. The comments of councils in my area vary. One council has said that it does not believe the litter problem has improved and that the problem is as great as ever, especially on the beach. Another council has stated that it is not aware of any improvement,

although it seems some effort is being made by people to reduce the litter problem.

The situation at Glenelg has improved, because the Glenelg council has been fortunate enough to receive many litter bins and has placed them strategically throughout the Glenelg area. No matter how many bins there are and no matter how frequently they are emptied, not all litter will find its way into them. However, there has been a great improvement in this regard. My electorate office is not far from a fish and chip shop. I do not know how many people frequent that shop at 3 o'clock in the morning, but I am surprised to see paper and the remains of fish and chips strewn around the area by people who just dump it out of car windows, especially at weekends. What does this measure do to stop that situation? Two litter bins have been provided outside the shop. It must be difficult for people to have to walk from their cars to put litter in bins. It all contributes to the problem. The Patawalonga area is a wonderful example of what suburban litter consists of: all sorts of cartons, toys, household waste and, of course, cans, but they are not as prevalent as they were.

Mr. Keneally: The cans might be on the bottom of the lake.

Mr. BECKER: Not necessarily, because the lake was dredged a few years ago and cans were not very obvious. Anyway, the waste does not stay in the lake for long: it is washed out to sea and ultimately washed back on to the beach. Right along the beach front the situation has improved because of the number of litter bins provided on the roadways or, where there is sand, on the sand. Councils, during summer, are attempting to empty bins each day. The public is making a genuine effort to deposit litter in the bins provided. We must now tackle the whole litter problem head on. As the Government has provided \$50 000 in the Budget for its litter programme, no doubt, in a grandiose fashion (to which we have become well accustomed) it will make full use of its media resources and the Premier will, in a new type of board shorts (probably a red and blue pair after last Saturday), introduce and lead a litter education programme. Why not (as the public is generally aware of the litter problem) continue with the litter education programme? Why not inject funds into Kesab and back it up where we can with a wholehearted litter education programme?

I should like to see that sort of approach tried before we impose deposits on drink containers. To discriminate against one section of the beverage container industry is most unfair. The public must be given the opportunity to prove that, if incentive is there and if the public takes the initiative, without being forced by means of a deposit, to be litter conscious, there will be genuine effort to control the problem. It must be remembered that most people who use cans (and I am speaking from family experience) are children, but they do not throw cans all over the place. Considering how many cans are manufactured and sold in South Australia, someone must be the main offender.

Mr. Keneally: Soft drink in cans is a rip-off compared with bottles, and you know it.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member can say that, because he has a large family and would know what it costs him to buy soft drink. I consider the honourable member would be a good parent and would each week take his children to the various sporting activities similar to those many other children also attend. I have noticed after my daughter plays basketball that she wants money

for a drink and that the drink is usually in a can. It is convenient, it is cold, and it is what the children want.

Mr. Keneally: Or in a bottle.

Mr. BECKER: But bottle sales are not high. Children prefer canned drinks. Let us be guided by the consumer. We must consider that, while the consumer is Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, the pressure is put on them by children. I am far more pleased to see children drinking from cans than from bottles. I have seen the tops of bottles chipped when the cap has been removed hastily. I know that straws solve that problem but they are not always available. Generally, children prefer canned soft drink, and I accept that choice. However, if we put a 10¢ deposit on cans, we will do one of two things. First, we will ban the sale of these types of container at sporting activities (so that the people who run the canteens will have to use an alternative system, which may not be what the consumer wants) or, secondly, we will force parents to do what we must do when we go to, say, Football Park: mix up our own type of drink, such as tea or coffee, and take it in a thermos flask.

I now prefer to go to the football and not have an alcoholic drink at all. I will not go to the bar at Football Park to buy a beer in a small plastic cup, because that would be the greatest rip-off ever. Of course, one has to get in there and be pushed, shoved and kicked around in order to buy a drink, and one is lucky to get the drink to one's mouth, anyway.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you sober at the football?

Mr. BECKER: It is bad luck that the Minister has interjected on that subject. I have seen him at the football several times and, as he knows, we are both always sober there. The Minister knows that I am not a great drinker. I do not think the alternatives offered are satisfactory at this stage, and I still believe that the community must be given the opportunity to prove that it has sufficient concern for the environment. We will have to remind the people (and I am willing to ensure that we do so) to keep our city beautiful.

I think Kesab has done a wonderful job. It has used the facility of young people, and I refer particularly to the Leo's Club at Glenelg. This group of young teenagers mans the Kesab buggy and drives it along the beaches during the summer. During the football season its members have been at major ovals, handing out litter bags, collecting the litter, and disposing of it. When this sort of personal effort is involved in these campaigns, we will achieve success.

I was also present at a recent function at which the Premier said he believed that community groups that go on walkathons or runathons were not achieving anything at all. The fact that those concerned were walking or running to raise money for charity did not seem to interest the Premier. He thought it was a waste of energy and that community groups and/or service clubs, referred to by the Leader, should direct their energy into physical efforts in the community. Therefore, if we had a litterthon, in which service groups and/or community groups went out and physically picked up litter, there would be a greater reward. Members have been subjected to this many times during summer along our beaches. The campaigns have been highly successful, and some have even complained that there has been nothing to pick up.

This is the way to get the message through: we can get this through in our education programme, but this takes money. Why should we not look at the whole litter

problem, and go to all the industries that manufacture the various types of package, saying, "We want Kesab to work and, in the interests of the community, we should appreciate a contribution from you so that we can keep it going in this State"? Why should we in South Australia be the first State to pass legislation that plonks a deposit on cans and certain types of bottle? Mention has been made of the beer bottle—the Australian brown daisy, as it has often been referred to. If a 10¢ deposit is put on it, what sort of discrimination is involved? Why should we be the first State to do such a thing? Why should South Australia always have to be the first model State to pick on a small area in order to tackle something that is really an overall problem?

Mr. Keneally: If something needs doing, then it must be done, whether we are first or last.

Mr. BECKER: It is all right for the member for Stuart to talk about the State that Don has built, but he is destroying it rapidly. As we can see, the threat has been made. The prospects are that several hundred people will lose their jobs if this Bill passes. We should be trying to create jobs and surely, by means of an education problem, backed by Government money and contributed to by the industry, we could do so. We could attach education officers to councils and Kesab. Those people could be employed to educate and supervise, to ensure that Litter was picked up, and that fitter problems were not created.

On-the-spot fitter fines have been discussed many times. I have moved amendments to the Local Government Act, and I think the member for Glenelg has also tried to do so. We have also asked questions about it. Once, I received the staggering reply from the Minister that he did not want to turn other people into pimps. What are we going to do? If we are not going to let anyone supervise or do anything about the matter, how will we go about it? We turn around and set about destroying an industry in which a consumer demand has been created. All members have received a letter from the Australian Hotels Association, which is concerned about the prospects. In its letter, the association says:

We are taking the somewhat unusual step, for us, of writing to you and all other members of both Houses of Parliament to express our concern about the Beverage Container Bill. Since the recent publicity about the Bill, many hotelkeepers have approached us expressing grave concern about the effect of this proposed legislation should it become law.

We are fully aware of the general litter problem and, like other responsible sections of the community, we will do what we can to assist in any programmes which, as regards beverage containers, are reasonable alternatives to the mooted deposit system. Why, for instance, is the 740-ml. size of beer to be loaded with a deposit—a deposit which is rumoured to be as catastrophically high as 10¢? Surely the present turn-round of the ordinary beer bottle is working satisfactorily. How is the hotel keeper to cope with the return of empty bottles—a volume possibly far in excess of his sales?

I spent the first 19 years of my life with my relatives in a country hotel. As a child, my job, when the customers returned empty beer bottles, was to stack them in the yard and pay 1¢, or whatever the price was, for the bottles. It was a tremendous problem, because a hotel, particularly a country hotel, would order its beer from the brewery. The beer would then be sent up by train, the full beer bottles would be stacked away, and the empty crates taken out the back. Then, one would find that one had two or three times as many empty beer bottles as one had crates. The brewing company would not take them back unless they were in crates, so that, when one placed one's order, one

would have to ask the brewery to send up an extra 20 or 30 empty crates to enable the empty bottles to be returned. Whether or not one could get rid of one's empty bottles depended on the room available in the truck on its return to the city.

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

Mr. BECKER: I think that most publicans would not favour the continual need to store surplus beer bottles or, if the area is extended, other types of beverage container, such as wine bottles and whisky bottles. The letter from the Australian Hotels Association continues:

What about his outlay for refunds, the security of stocks of empties, provision of storage space, etc.? How does he afford the time of his staff to check empties to see if there is a refund entitlement?

I think I have explained that, generally, someone in the family must do that. The letter continues:

In country areas, particularly one-hotel towns (and there are 163 hotels in towns where there are not other hotels) how is the hotelkeeper to sell cans? Must he seek to become a collection depot? Must he involve his staff in can sorting, storing and packaging for return to a main receiving depot?

This is a problem in country towns where there is one hotel, but it also could apply to the one-storekeeper situation. The association is further concerned, and the letter continues:

And what of the public? At a time when the price of beer to the public has increased by a Government impost of 12¢ a bottle and 6¢ a small bottle and can, Parliament is contemplating a scheme to further increase the cost of take-home beer.

The increase in the price of a bottle of beer was one of the hardest imposts in the recent Commonwealth Budget. There are those people who prefer to purchase liquor and take it home rather than spend time at the hotel, but the legislation discourages that. The Bill will force people to make their own soft drinks, and people now make their own home brew, so we can see why the industry has cause for alarm. However, we must consider the pollution problem. The Conservation Council of South Australia has written to all members this afternoon, and the letter states:

Last week we sent you a statement on the Beverage Container Bill. We are concerned that various sectional interests opposing the Bill have received a very great deal of publicity. The very active campaign of these interests has tended to cloud the basic issue; that is, that the Bill is a first step in legislating for resource conservation. South Australia has led Australia in many areas of much-needed legislation in the public interest. It is to be hoped this is maintained.

That is challengeable in regard to what we are leading into as against leading astray. The council's statements are interesting, and the council is concerned. Conservationists do not give me much support in my endeavours to try to protect the environment, but I hope that they will do so in future. One point made in a circular from the council dated September 22 is:

The deposit system for returnable glass bottles was introduced by the trade many years ago. A non-deposit system discriminates against this long-established and, from an energy and pollution point of view, most economical means of offering beverages for sale.

We must consider, in relation to the cost of making a bottle, the cost of returning the bottle to its supplier and the cleanliness of the bottle. We had a deposit of 5¢ on milk bottles some time ago, and that has been removed. We do not see milk bottles lying around now, but the bottles are still used. I know that milk is not regarded in the same context as soft drinks and alcohol, but neverthe-

less milk can be bought in bottles on which there is no deposit payable. The Conservation Council also states:

The South Australian Government has allocated \$8 000 in the 1975-76 Budget (an increase of \$3 000 over last year) to an organisation trying to educate the public not to throw away; if this is to be supported then so should a Jaw which gives incentives to return beverage containers (if kids know they can collect 10¢ on every can or bottle there won't be any need to tell them not to litter—how many of us as children made pocket money by collecting empties—a good training in initiative and self-help?).

Society has changed compared to those days. The education programme on collecting methods was not as good in my day as it is today, and people now are far more aware of the problems. The young people who are influencing the citizens of today are the first to remind people that they are littering and the first to pick up litter. I have much faith in the young people and in the fact that an education programme can be successfully sponsored, encouraged and continued. The Premier and the Government must have faith in that area when they allocate \$50 000 for a litter campaign. We certainly hope that the Premier will be promoting litter control, not simply projecting himself in the community.

A report was obtained recently by the industry. It is termed an alarm report, and the industry contributed about \$80 000 to it. That is not money thrown away by the industry in a last-ditch effort to protect itself: it has been done to prove that, provided a concentrated effort is maintained, the litter problem will be decreased. It is all very well for the Conservation Council to attack the industry, the people who are stated to be the vested interests opposing the Bill, saying they are receiving more than their fair share of the publicity, but apart from making statements about deposits on containers and the costs to ratepayers of collection, the council must submit suggestions and show that it really is concerned.

I hope that it joins other service clubs and community organisations in the constant drive against litter and that it will collect the litter and find out what problems exist. I hope it also realises the battles that some of us have taken up in trying to keep areas such as the Patawalonga free of litter. The assessment has stated that cans comprise only 10 per cent of litter, and doubtless this is a beginning. I consider that the Government will try this legislation and, if it works in relation to cans, there will be a stepping up of the Government's programme by applying a deposit to other types of container.

I maintain that we should try the education programme, that we should make more personal effort and do all that we can to ensure that people are conscious of the litter problem. I believe that they are, although we never may be satisfied. If we can prove that the people will not co-operate and that they are not interested in protecting the environment, we should then consider imposing a deposit on drink containers. A deposit of 10¢ on a container is a large deposit in ratio to the prices we are paying for the contents of what we purchase. For that reason, and that reason alone, we should not rush into this thing; we should reconsider the whole situation of litter and not tear into it just for the sake of popular politics.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I shall speak specifically to the effects of this legislation on industry and employment in this State. I challenge the Minister of Labour and Industry to stand up and answer some of the points I shall raise, because it is important to examine the effects of this Bill particularly on employment in this State. If the Minister is sincere in his concern about the present high level of unemployment in South Australia, he

should be able to assure this House that there will be no adverse effects on employment. Otherwise, we shall just have to assume that the Government, at least in relation to this matter, is in no way interested in the effect of this Bill on employment opportunities in the State.

Recently, there has been a tendency on the part of Governments in Australia to bury their heads in the sand and to introduce legislation without examining its direct effects. We have seen it on numerous occasions in legislation coming from the Labor Government in Canberra. Here, we have yet another classic example from our State Government, which is trying to produce a piece of legislation and, examining it in isolation, it has not examined it in its broadest context and in its effect on the industry.

Briefly, let me summarise what has been put forward as the likely effects of this legislation. I understand that the Premier's Department has prepared a report. The member for Mitcham asked a Question on Notice, to which the Premier replied today, that in fact the Director of the Development Division had prepared a report, which was presented on September 17, 1975, and which indicates that much of the information used in preparing the report came from the industry; but, unfortunately, the Premier was not prepared to make that report available to this House. This is a classic example of the Premier's own department preparing a report on the effects of this legislation, the report, apparently, containing information that suggests that this Bill will have a serious, adverse effect on employment opportunities; yet the Premier is not prepared to release that report to this Parliament or to indicate to the outside world what the Bill's effects are likely to be.

Clearly, that indicates that the Government is not prepared to be honest even with itself, let alone with the people of this State, on the likely effects of the legislation. I put forward information; I do not apologise for the fact that all my information has come from the industry itself, for they are the people who understand the industry and are employing the persons concerned; they are the people who can make the best assessment of the likely effects of the Bill on future employment opportunities. The largest canned drink manufacturer in this State is Coca-Cola Bottlers, Adelaide. I understand, Mr. Speaker (and this directly affects your district), that 50 people are likely to be retrenched at the Port Pirie plant if this Bill is passed. Other speakers on this side of the House have clearly indicated that this legislation will effectively ban the use of cans in this State or, if not ban them, will reduce to a small level the actual number of canned drinks manufactured in this State and sold. The Government has not refuted that evidence. Therefore, we can accept it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is nonsense, and you know it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister is now trying to refute the fact that this Bill will reduce the number of canned drinks manufactured in this State. This is interesting because, before the dinner adjournment, members interjecting were prepared to admit that it would have that effect. This shows there is disagreement even on the Government side. The Minister now claims that this Bill will have no effect on the sale of cans in this State, whereas his own back-benchers openly admit it will effectively ban the use of the can in this State. Coca-Cola has indicated that it will have to close its plant at Port

Pirie, which will mean the retrenchment of 50 production people.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You do not believe that, do you?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, I do.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Because the Government has not yet put forward one shred of argument to refute the case submitted by the industry on the effects of this Bill. Even the Premier's own department obviously has a report, which he is not prepared to release and which cannot destroy the case put forward by the industry. If the Government has such a case, why does it not submit it to this House? The only reason is that it does not have such a case to put against the industry. Therefore, the only argument put forward is that submitted by the industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will continue with the debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Speaker has called members to order, and the member for Elizabeth will have an opportunity to stand up in this House and put forward his own case, so he need not interject, even though he believes he is almost the Attorney-General. In addition, Coca-Cola has indicated that it may have to close its warehouses in a number of centres, but I will not go into the details. That, too, will have an adverse effect on employment opportunities. In addition, it has said it will have to retrench at least 20 people at its Thebarton plant. So that is 70 people in one company. That may be out by 10 per cent to 20 per cent but, even if it is, it is a considerable number of people to be unemployed or retrenched at this time. Then Gadsden Proprietary Limited, can manufacturers, situated at Albert Park, has also indicated the effect that this legislation will have on its plant. It has indicated it will have to close the plant; it makes no bones about it, no apology for it. If the Bill is passed, there will be no point in continuing the plant. That will directly affect the employment of between 70 and 90 employees.

I ask that the member for Albert Park stand up and justify to the people in his district who are likely to be retrenched the necessity to continue with this legislation. Again, I guarantee the Government will not be prepared to take up that challenge. Adding up those figures, we get a clear indication, on what I believe is a fairly conservative figure, that there would be about 150 additional persons unemployed in this State if the Bill passed. That is the direct effect on employment. We should look at that effect in the light of the current high level of unemployment. The Premier in this House today claimed that this State had the lowest unemployment figures for Australia. I have heard the Minister of Labour and Industry make the same statement. These people are not prepared to quote facts. South Australia at present does not have the lowest unemployment figure in Australia. South Australia has an unemployment percentage, on seasonally adjusted figures, for August, 1975, of 4.09 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Western Australia is the State with the lowest figure—3.58 per cent. So, for the Premier's information, I ask him to check his facts before making such outlandish claims, as he is continually doing in this Chamber. At this stage, irrespective of whether South Australia is the lowest or the highest, an unemployment level of 4 per cent is disastrous in the Australian

economy. For years we have maintained our unemployment level at about 1 per cent or 2 per cent. I am not concerned with whether or not our unemployment rate will continue to be reasonably low in comparison with other States: I am concerned about the people who will lose their jobs and find it most difficult to get alternative employment.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I remember you said this last year when we were talking about it, I don't think!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The second aspect directly affecting industry is the impact on industries already established in South Australia. I have asked the Premier on numerous occasions to list for me the level of new industries developing in South Australia on an annual basis. Unfortunately, he has said that that information is not available. South Australia is regarded at present as being one of the States with the lowest level of new investment in industry, and we have here a Bill likely to affect established industries. I shall quote briefly some of the industries that have already indicated the likely effect of this Bill on them. I have here a letter from Cooper and Sons Limited, brewers, situated in the heart of Davenport, a delightful district. These people indicate that it is likely that they will have to cease canning their products if the legislation is passed. I quote briefly from their letter, as follows:

If we ceased canning our products, it will make redundant a \$60 000 canning line, and it is most unlikely that we could find employment for all of the eight men who man the canning line. The alternative is to pay more for our cans from interstate and pour money into a large number of depots on the very doubtful assumption that people will still purchase cans under the restrictive conditions proposed by the Bill. We are not prepared to take this risk.

That is one company that will be affected by this legislation, indicating that eight more men may be retrenched. I have a letter from George McEwin and Son Proprietary Limited, a well-known canning company in South Australia. The letter states:

Should these events—
if the legislation is proceeded with and passed—
become factual we would have to give very serious consideration to our own continued production in South Australia.

That refers to the fact that, if the Gadsden organisation pulls out, if this legislation proceeds, the company would have to seriously consider the continuation of its production in South Australia. I have a letter from the South Australian Egg Board, not a canned soft drink manufacturer, but an organisation which requires to use metal containers from Gadsden's. The letter states:

Failure to have a supply of pulp tins may result in dumping of eggs because surplus eggs to local requirements can only be stored for long periods when such eggs are processed and pasteurised in pulp form. Your firm has supplied our requirements for many years in a satisfactory manner, and any failure on your part to continue with further supplies would create a position which could make it impossible for us to continue operations without an enormous escalation of costs.

I turn now to yet another food-processing establishment, Anchor Foods Proprietary Limited, an established company employing a large number of people in the Northfield area. The letter from that company, talking of the effect of the closing down of Gadsden's and referring to that organisation, states:

It has come to our attention that the Government proposes the introduction of a tax on beverage cans and, as we understand some 60 per cent of your production is

involved in the manufacture of this type can, we fear that from the economics viewpoint closure of your cannery would become inevitable.

That is yet another example. For none of the companies quoted have I given specific details of further increases in the numbers retrenched. A further letter comes from Clemens Products (SA) Proprietary Limited. Again, commenting on the likely effects of the legislation, the letter, referring again to Gadsden's, states:

It is our understanding that should your company decide to cease manufacturing of the 15oz. can in South Australia we would have to obtain this can from interstate at a greater cost which we could not of course absorb and would therefore be passed on to the consumer.

That is another reference to the likely demand for the products of the Gadsden company. Finally, I refer to another industry established in South Australia, one that carries our State's own emblem: the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited. The letter sent by that organisation referring to the likely effects of this legislation on Gadsden's, and subsequently on the co-operative, states:

As you know, our Port Lincoln cannery uses about 12 000 000 cans a year and if we did not have the facility to get these from you in Adelaide we would have to draw them from a canmaker in another area and this, as far as we can see, would mean from Melbourne. Obviously, therefore, the immediate effect would be to increase our costs by the huge freight cost (we estimate \$200 000 per annum) of freighting these empty cans across from Melbourne. Because of the extra distance involved and the consequent time-lag factor we believe that we would have to hold larger stocks of cans in Port Lincoln to guard against having to stop production because of transport strikes, transport breakdowns, and the like. This would again increase our costs and, even more serious, tie up unnecessarily large amounts of working capital.

There, from six well-known South Australian companies, we see the effects of the legislation on immediate production. The Government has failed to recognise or acknowledge those likely effects. I have briefly outlined the impact of this legislation on employment opportunities and on established industries, and it concerns me greatly that we have a State Government, bound to a motion passed at one of its annual conferences without any deep research having been done, without any examination of the effects of this legislation and, because of the results of rushing this legislation through, without seeing the subsequent effects. We therefore find the Labor Party in South Australia in a most embarrassing situation.

It is now forced, because of its constitution, to proceed with a measure that it really cannot support when it looks at the broader implications of the legislation. I make a plea to the Government to reassess once again its attitude to the Bill. If the Government is not willing to do that, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, as a responsible citizen of this State, to re-assess the possible impact of the legislation on the State, especially in your own district. I believe, too, that the Government has not looked at the logistics of operating this legislation. A 10¢ deposit on each container would mean that a South Australian manufacturer would have to put down about \$240 for each tonne of cans produced.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Are you speaking as a scientist now, or as a member of Parliament?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As someone who has simply obtained the facts, which is more than the Minister has ever done.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Are you going to give us a lesson in economics?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This would involve 2 400 cans which, filled with soft drink, would weigh about 1 tonne. As a deposit, the manufacturer would have to put down \$240. By comparison, the same tonne of soft drinks could be brought from other States at a freight cost of \$16 a can. I pose to the Minister, who claims to have thought this legislation through—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You said \$16 a can.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If I said that, I apologise and I shall correct it. I meant \$16 a tonne.

Mr. Mathwin: The Minister is nit-picking.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yes, I know that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Government members do that when they cannot support the case for the legislation. We would find that large retailers, such as Coles or Woolworths, could bring soft drinks in cans at \$16 a tonne into this State. Obviously, they would bring them from the interstate market, with the appropriate marks on the can, rather than buy them here. How will the deposit be returned to the consumer from those manufacturers interstate who have sent their cans to South Australian retailers? That is a logistic problem. I understand that the Premier will not answer it, nor will the Minister; nor has anyone in the Government, which claims to be a responsible Government, referred to that problem. I believe they have not sat down and thought about the logistics of passing that deposit on and collecting it from the manufacturer, particularly an interstate one. If cans were still made here, the large retailers would import the cans at \$16 a tonne freight costs from interstate.

Instead of the Minister sitting there like a little sparrow on the bench and being rather foolish, I ask him to consider this matter. However, he seems more concerned about whether I have made a slip in a technicality, which I have corrected, rather than looking at the effects of the legislation. I really think that that shows up how thin skinned the Government is about this legislation. It is so concerned about the effects of the legislation and so worried about it that its members need to nit-pick on the most minute points they can possibly find. Government members have not come to the arguments; they have simply gone to the minute details where a slip of the tongue was made. I wait patiently for the challenge to be taken up by the Minister of Community Welfare or the member for Albert Park, who, I am pleased to see, is back in the Chamber. However, I guarantee that neither of them is willing to take up the challenge I have thrown down this evening. If they do not take up the challenge, it shows clearly that the Government has an indefensible case. The legislation is concerned about trying to protect the environment. Opposition members have already put the case for the Liberal Party, namely, that we believe that the Government should look at the entire litter problem instead of at just one aspect of it. I support that case, as I have done previously in the Chamber. I wish that for a short time the Minister would stop chirping in a senseless manner.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I said earlier, every honourable member who wishes to have a say in this debate will have the opportunity. There is no need for this endless interjecting. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I agree with you wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker. I think it most unfortunate to see a Minister, who is supposed to be a responsible individual, making a senseless chirping noise across the Chamber like that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must get on with the debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In returning to the point I was making, I emphasise that the legislation directs its entire attention to one aspect of the litter problem, but it completely ignores the other 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the problem and the effectiveness of the legislation in trying to clean up the 10 per cent to 20 per cent of the litter problem. I still wait for the Government to put forward its case as to why it will not support the introduction of littering fines, as the Liberal Party has proposed. A piece of legislation for the introduction of littering fines was referred to in the House this afternoon by the Liberal Party, and I believe that it is the alternative form of legislation which would be more effective and which would not threaten the established industries on which we have become so dependent. Further, it would not cause further unemployment in this State. The Government cannot put forward any substantial case in defence of its legislation, nor can it put forward a case defending the increase in unemployment that is likely to occur. It has not even considered this in the speeches that have been made and in the arguments that have been put forward by the Minister and the Premier outside this Chamber.

The sole reason is that the Government does not have a case to put forward. I have already outlined the fact that the Minister concerned has not studied the logistics of implementing the legislation. I am concerned about the litter problem. I have raised it in the House previously and I have seen the disgraceful situation in this State and throughout Australia compared to overseas countries, and it shames me to be an Australian to see the total disregard for the cleanliness of our environment. We will not overcome that filthy habit of ours by simply putting a deposit on the part of the litter that is thrown out. We will solve the problem only by forcing people, through fines, to ensure that they no longer throw their litter around the countryside. I now, and always have, supported compulsory fines and, when a similar Bill was last debated, I expressed that view. I also support a comprehensive education programme.

I believe that Australians have already started to change their habits about throwing away litter. On this aspect, one need only go to the Royal Show to see the improvement there year by year. If rubbish containers are made available, Australians wake up and stop being as lazy as they used to be and make every effort to use the containers. I oppose the legislation but, at the same time, reiterate that I am concerned about the entire litter problem. It is for this reason that I look forward to Government members supporting the measure we proposed this afternoon for solving the entire litter problem, instead of the 10 per cent to 20 per cent part of it.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): It is indeed a disappointing and somewhat difficult exercise to have to get up and answer all the misleading innuendoes that have been made by so many Opposition members in the debate today. However, it is a task that does not daunt me, because I realise that Opposition members, in general, were speaking largely tongue in cheek; if not tongue in cheek, they were most certainly representing interests that are well outside the ambit of this Chamber, apart from those represented in the gallery. However, I will not refer to the gallery.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Elizabeth has just referred to members in the gallery and, as I understand it, Standing Orders provide that no honourable member is permitted to refer to people in the gallery.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. Mathwin: He should know better; he's a lawyer.

Mr. DUNCAN: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I point out that the language I used was, in effect, excluding those in the gallery, so I did not directly refer to them. However, I want to get back to the substance of the matter, because I have only a few short minutes this evening and because there are several matters I want to raise. I do not want to waste too much time on discussing the reasons for the appalling position the Opposition has taken in this matter. I refer, first, to Kesab, because I think there has been much misrepresentation of the attitude of Government members concerning Kesab. I do not think that there is a Government member who would claim that Kesab has done anything but a good job with the limited resources available to it from various sectors in trying to fight the litter problem in South Australia. That has not been the concern of Government members. We have not been worried about the general approach of Kesab, and I believe that I speak for most, if not all, Government members. We commend the work that Kesab has done.

I refer anyone interested in this matter to the Premier's policy speech, in which is set down the Government's policy for the next three years. It is a policy providing a comprehensive campaign against litter, seeking the support and co-operation of Kesab in this matter. Members opposite have carefully chosen to ignore the Premier's policy speech and the fact that the Government is pledged to this campaign. Members opposite have ignored the fact that we acted long before they ever suggested a broad attack. The Government had made the same suggestion in its policy speech. Members opposite cannot point in the policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition to any similar undertaking. Opposition members have come on to the scene as Johnnies-come-lately. They have come here this afternoon and tonight looking for any sort of argument to put up against this Bill. Members opposite are now belatedly claiming that this Bill deals only with a sectional part of the litter problem.

The Bill is part of the Government's total attack on the litter problem. Certainly, not all our remedies are contained in it, and everyone outside Parliament appreciates that. We are committed to a total approach against litter. I again refer to Kesab, because the points that Government members have made by way of interjection this afternoon have been wholly valid. When this Bill was previously before this House Kesab put out a report in which it opposed the legislation, but not in strong terms. However, it has now come out more strongly in opposition to the legislation. Although I do not wish to attack Kesab in general (as I said, most Government members agree that it has generally done a good job in educating the public against littering), in the case of this Bill Kesab has played an especially shoddy role. One does not need to look far to see why Kesab, which is an organisation pledged to the eradication of litter, has come out against this legislation, the aim of which is the eradication of litter.

I now refer to documents published by Kesab, showing that some interesting personalities support it. They are interesting, because of their interest in this legislation and the way that the legislation affects their interests. For example, I refer to the 1974 Kesab annual report. Page 3 of that report contains a list of the Kesab govern-

ing council. Although I do not intend to refer to all the people on that list, apart from my own name, I note that Mr. R. A. Cruickshanks is a member of the council. Surprise! Surprise! For all members opposite who have noted the interest that Kesab has taken in this legislation, Mr. Cruickshanks comes from J. Gadsden Proprietary Limited. Of course, that is not a matter of great surprise to Government members, but members opposite, who have been gullibly swallowing the propaganda published in South Australia by the media and the public relations campaign that has been funded by organisations such as J. Gadsden, will be interested to hear of this.

Then I notice that Mr. R. D. Davies is a member of the board. He represents Australian Consolidated Industries. Mr. E. E. Isaachsen represents the South Australian Brewing Company, an organisation that will not exactly benefit financially by the passing of this legislation. Another member of the Kesab board is Mr. B. Kirk-Williams, from C-C Bottlers. I now refer to the Kesab membership list.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How many people are on the governing council?

The SPEAKER: Order! As I said earlier, all members will have an opportunity in this debate if they wish to make any point. There is no need for this constant interjection of members on the floor. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: I now refer to the Kesab membership list. In the foundation voting members list we see such notable commercial organisations as Australian Glass Manufacturers and the South Australian Brewing Company. In the commercial voting members list we see such notable organisations, especially in the business of can, beverage and glass-bottle production, as Australian Consolidated Industries, Australian Hotels Association, Alcoa, Broken Hill Proprietary Limited, C-C Bottlers, Chrysler, Comalco, and Containers Limited. There is also our old friend J. Gadsden, the South Australian Associated Brewers, the South Australian Soft Drink Manufacturers Association, and Schutzenfest.

That list speaks for itself. It is clear from that list that Kesab in this context is a prisoner of the organisations which provide its financial support. There is not much doubt about this situation. Clearly and unfortunately, Kesab has not been able to play an independent role; it has not been able to play a community-minded role in South Australia because of the pressures that have been put on it. Having dealt with that matter and having made it patently obvious to members opposite, who have closed minds in this matter as to the bias that does exist, I want to refer to the speech of the member for Fisher. The member for Fisher stated (and he used the words "Not one") that not one comparison had been made regarding resource use in this area. Unfortunately, the honourable member is not present, but he will be interested to realise that he was way off beam. I refer to page 35 of Deposits on Beverage Containers, a report from the House of Representatives Standing Committee on the Environment and Conservation. Under the Heading "Energy and Resources" there is a clear statement and a comparison of five different delivery containers and their qualities. The chart shows that returnable glass containers on every account are far more beneficial to resource conservation than is any other type of container.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is that why he didn't mention that?

Mr. DUNCAN: I think that the honourable member often speaks in this House without preparing anything to say, opens his mouth, puts his brain out of gear, then proceeds to debate and puts his tongue into action. However, I do not want to dally on this matter, because there are other matters to which I want to refer. Following my comments on the honourable member's contribution to the debate, I want to refer to something which appears to have totally escaped the attention of honourable members opposite, that is, the fact that this Bill is undoubtedly a first step in legislating towards resource conservation. It is important to make this point in this debate this evening because resource conservation is a matter about which we will be hearing more and more as we move into the 1970's.

This is a matter which is euphemistic to capitalist organisations, which are interested only in making a profit. However, as time goes by and resources start to become scarce, we will find a different sort of economic structure in society. We have already had a taste of what to expect from the oil industry; we have already had an indication of the sort of havoc that can occur when one of the vital, fundamental components of our society becomes a scarce commodity. More and more we will see legislation that will encourage resource conservation. Not a member opposite has referred to that matter. Of course, resource conservation is an important part of this legislation. The two aims of the Bill are resource conservation and litter control. Litter control to some extent is the short-term benefit of this legislation; the long-term benefit is resource conservation.

If we are not careful we will face a situation even in a small State such as South Australia where 90 000 000 cans each year are distributed as litter and are not recycled. The situation will arise where all natural resources of the country are distributed across the land as litter. Although not so urgent in the case of iron ore for steel, it is certainly urgent in the case of aluminium, where the world's resources are limited and will be in scarce supply before too many years pass. This is an important aspect of the Bill, an aspect that Opposition members have paid no heed or attention to at all; they have all been concerned with the short-term, narrow interests that they represent in this place. They have not concerned themselves with rising above those issues or worrying about the medium or long-term future of society. It is disappointing that not a member opposite has shown any interest in the question of resource conservation.

Mr. Gunn: What about resource recovery?

Mr. DUNCAN: I listened to the debate this afternoon and not one member made any reference to resource conservation at all. South Australia has a reputation as a pace-setter for legislation. This legislation, of course, will certainly be a pace-setter when it becomes law, because South Australia will be leading Australia in this much-needed legislation of public interest. We will be showing the way to other States. From discussions I have had with people, including Liberal politicians from other States, they are interested in this legislation. I believe the reason we have seen this invasion of people interested in putting pressure on members of this House and members in another place to try to defeat this legislation is to defend the interests of commercial operators such as J. Gadsden Proprietary Limited, the brewing companies, etc.

I believe the reason we have seen this influx is that South Australia is only small fry in this field. If we pass this legislation companies such as Containers Limited, Gadsdens,

Broken Hill Proprietary Limited, Alcoa and Comalco Limited will not be much affected, but it will create a precedent and the conservation groups and people concerned about the future of society and not the short-term advantages to be had; people concerned about the future of society in other States will demand that their Governments take similar action. People who have come to South Australia to lobby members opposite and members in another place realise only too well—

Dr. Eastick: They would have spoken to your Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: True, but our Minister has not been susceptible to the sort of pressure members opposite have been susceptible to.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite have been only too pleased to criticise the fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: —that the Director of the Environment and Conservation Department went to North America to look at this type of legislation.

Mr. Arnold: But only at legislation operating in one State.

Mr. DUNCAN: That is not so; he visited several States in the United States of America and Provinces in Canada to look at this legislation in total.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: He did not go to America to look specifically at the Oregon Bill at all, but to look at the whole situation at the expense of the South Australian Government and South Australian taxpayers to make an independent assessment of the situation. The same cannot be said of the member for Fisher, who went to America on a trip paid for by a lobby group in the hope that he would return and present the views he has presented to the House, but has not presented those views in a particularly satisfactory manner; he has not presented them very well at all. Nevertheless he returned to do the job he was sent overseas to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: The incredible pressure that has been brought to bear on members of this House and members of the Legislative Council has been extraordinary. Seldom have we seen in South Australia such a concerted lobby, such an incredible pressure group develop from a sectional interest to try to defeat legislation in this Parliament. I am pleased to say that I have seen little result so far from that pressure. Members on this side of the House believe in and are committed to be successful and will be passed in the next week or so. It has been interesting to see the sort of incredible pressure that has been built up not only from people who live in South Australia but from people living in other States and possibly overseas. We have seen the interesting situation of the way the *News* has changed from a favourable approach to this legislation to a different approach. In the *News* of June 12, 1973, it was stated:

State Government is moving boldly against pollution

with its plan to make deposits on drink bottles and cans compulsory—

Mr. Arnold: Drink bottles—beer bottles.

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes, but the plan was the same as is contained in this legislation. That was the attitude of the *News* then. The Directors of the South Australian Brewing Company, C-C Bottlers (SA) and *News Limited* are of a similar ilk. In some cases they are the same people. *News Limited*, of course, owns 50 per cent of the *Sunday Mail*. Although this Bill had been available to the press for some time (the press has had copies of it and members opposite have had copies of it) we saw in the most recent *Sunday Mail* a continuation of this incredible campaign. The headline on page 3 of that paper stated:

Bottle beer up 10¢ fear.

Surely that is a scandalous attempt, in view of the legislation being available, to try to pressure South Australians into the fearful position of not standing up for the provisions of this measure, a measure that is in their best interests. It was clearly an attempt by the breweries through the Australian Hotels Association to tell blatant lies with the specific intention of trying to frighten people in South Australia. Members opposite have not had much to say about that headline, because it was a blatant lie. Nowhere does this legislation provide that bottled beer will increase by 10¢. Members opposite, especially the member for Mitcham, have made it well known that they are determined to force into this legislation a deposit system on all beer bottles. If the article I have quoted had been written correctly it would have sheeted home the blame or any threat of a 10¢ deposit on beer bottles to where it belongs—on the Liberal Movement and members of the Liberal Party who are acting as the mouth piece for the pressure groups that have tried to get the legislation defeated in this place.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't agree with that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg will have his opportunity.

Mr. Mathwin: My word, I will!

Mr. DUNCAN: Although I am running out of time, there are many other matters to which I should like to refer, including a report in the September 23 issue of the *News*, in which the following appears:

The Conservation Council of South Australia is urging all State politicians to support new drink-container legislation now before Parliament.

I refer only briefly to that in passing to refute the statement made by the member for Chaffey when he referred to the submission made by the council to the Select Committee appointed recently by another place. Of course, that is now outdated. The most up-to-date word from the Conservation Council is its statement of September 23 that it urges all members to pass this legislation. So, it is completely misleading for that member to quote to the House from documents that the Conservation Council previously presented to the Select Committee.

I made the point during the previous debate on this legislation that so many Opposition members had, strangely, changed their attitudes. I mused then that so many of them had found it convenient to change long-held and often expressed attitudes. It has been long enough since that debate for the House now to hear the sorts of attitude that used to be held by members opposite before lobbying on this Bill started and before the big money pressure was exerted. It is important that I should quote—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Becker: But you know—

Mr. DUNCAN: Of course, the member for Hanson is affected by this. If there is one thing that members

opposite do not like, it is having this sort of thing quoted back at them, because their private views were different from those they held after they were whipped into line by their masters in the Adelaide Club and in other places. I should like now to refer to what the member for Glenelg said. He was outspoken on October 18, 1972. A report headed, "Wants Ban on Bottles" in the *Guardian*, which, I understand, is the local newspaper circulating in the Glenelg area, stated:

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.

That is an interesting approach.

Mr. Mathwin: All bottles.

Mr. DUNCAN: The honourable member did not say "all bottles". I should like to refer to what the member for Frome has said regarding this matter, on which he had a strong attitude previously. An *Advertiser* report, headed "MP wants steel cans to be banned", stated:

An MP wants the State Government to prohibit steel food and soft drink cans being used in South Australia.

Mr. Gunn: Read it all.

Mr. DUNCAN: I intend to do so. Although the Government agreed to his request, he then voted against the Bill in the House. We just cannot win. This is an extraordinary situation. The report continues:

Mr. Allen (LCP Frome) said in the Assembly yesterday that aluminium cans used exclusively would help the pollution problem. In the country towns there was an absence of aluminium cans. However, there were steel cans lying around in their hundreds.

That is the point. The report continues:

He said this proved that people collected the aluminium cans and sold them for recycling.

Clearly, the honourable member has stated his view that steel cans ought to be banned. I should like to refer to the member for Hanson before my time expires, because his statement is possibly the strongest of all. On the last occasion I referred to this matter, the honourable member was embarrassed as, no doubt, he is tonight. That is why he is squirming in his seat.

Mr. Becker: This is your final smear.

Mr. DUNCAN: The honourable member is on record in the *Advertiser* as having supported deposits on beverage containers. The *Advertiser* report states:

Mr. Becker also advocates a 5¢ deposit on all cans. "I realise the deposits would mean more problems for store-keepers and manufacturers—

the honourable member had a stronger backbone then than he has now—

but I can see no other way to combat pollution," he said.

Mr. Becker: What did I say tonight?

Mr. DUNCAN: Can a person in public life have the sort of approach that the honourable member had then and yet vote against this legislation? This is an extraordinary situation. Indeed, it must be strange for those people outside this place who do not know the honourable member's twists and turns as we do when they find him expressing such a strong view and then caving in to this sort of pressure. I should like also to refer to the member for Light. On the previous occasion, he was inclined to leave the Chamber as I was about to refer to what he had said. I presume that he, as Leader, then was strongly opposed to the Bill. I was about to have reported in *Hansard* the fact that he had previously expressed strong views on this matter. An *Advertiser* report stated:

The Opposition Leader, Dr. Bruce Eastick—as he then was—

said that 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 representations from people, particularly local government authorities,” he said. “We welcome the general effect this will have on safety, particularly in recreational areas.” He warned that the deposit would have the desired effect only if it was meaningful.

Surely, we can hope tonight that the Leader will support this Bill. The few quotations to which I have referred show the entirely hypocritical attitude taken by members opposite. I have much more material, but no more time.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Recently—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you one of the leopards that has changed his spots?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: I certainly did not win a coat out of the football by taking a bet against my own team, as the Minister did.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call honourable members back to the debate. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Recently, I asked the Minister for the Environment a question about on-the-spot fines for littering, in reply to which he said he was not considering introducing them. In previous sessions of Parliament the Minister has always made the same reply: that he has no intention of having on-the-spot fines. Three years ago, it was reported in the Sunday press that they would be introduced. When I questioned the Minister about it, he said that at that stage he was not considering introducing on-the-spot fines. We see now some sort of attempt by the Government (I think it is a poor attempt) in this half-baked Bill to do something about pollution problems facing us in this State. I regard this as a blind Bill because, when one looks at it, one has to guess what is the Government's intention. Apparently, the Minister has no regard for broken glass. We have heard much play from the member for Elizabeth about bottles, but he has no regard for what a former Governor of this State, Sir Edric Bastyan, termed the Australian brown daisy. Sir Edric referred to the problems we were faced with on our beaches and everywhere else in the State.

We faced a dangerous situation, but obviously the Minister for the Environment, backed by his colleagues in his Party, is not concerned about the big problem in South Australia of broken bottles, particularly the Australian brown daisy, the large bottle on which the Government, according to the future Attorney-General, will not apply any refund. The Government will tackle the small stubbies and encase them in the regulations, but it does not want to touch the large bottle. It is bad to touch the Australian brown daisy! The situation really concerning the Government is that, on the one hand, it is trying to appease a section of the community and then, on the other, it is going cap in hand to the section it does not want to upset, the drinkers and the band that drink beer from the large beer bottles. The action being taken could be a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough, and the Government is afraid to tackle the situation. It dare not go as far as it ought to go.

Any member opposite who is honest with himself knows that my remarks are correct and that the Government will not solve the big problem of pollution or try to combat it properly. The Government is acting in a half-baked way by attacking a small section, while trying to put over

to us that this is part of an overall scheme that will come about this year, next year, or perhaps never. The Minister for the Environment has said that he is not interested in applying on-the-spot fines but, if he did apply those fines, that would be some action against pollution in this State.

I have termed the Bill a blind Bill, and I refer now to clause 6, the side heading of which is “Marking of refund amount on beverage containers”. The relevant provision includes two subclauses, but it does not state what the refund will be; we must wait for a regulation to state that. The Government knows that the penalty for an offence will be \$200, but it does not know, and the legislation does not provide how much the refund will be. I refer to the definition of “container”, which states:

“container” means a receptacle that is made or produced for the purpose of holding a beverage, being such a receptacle that is or was, at the time it held that beverage, closed but does not include an exempt container 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.

An exempt container is defined as follows:

“exempt container” means a container of a class or kind declared by proclamation to be a class or kind of container to which this Act does not apply.

We are relying entirely on regulations. A glass container is defined, in part, as follows:

“glass container” means . . . a container of a class or kind declared by proclamation not to be a glass container.

The Bill is supposed to enlighten us but, on all the definitions, the Government will think about the matter, make a proclamation, and bring it in by regulation. The definition of a refund amount states, in part:

“refund amount” . . . the amount prescribed as the refund amount in relation to containers of that class, kind or description.

That does not tell us a thing: we are entirely in the hands of the Government. The Government will not tell us how much the refund amount will be or what will be an exempt container. The same thing applies right through the definition, and the Bill tells us nothing. We must rely entirely on the proclamations and regulations. Will the regulations be brought in during the eight months for which the House is not sitting? I presume they will be. The Premier has promised that we will sit for a few weeks in February, but he can easily call that off. These regulations can be brought in in six or seven months time and be in operation when Parliament is not sitting and cannot do anything about them. This is part and parcel of the Government's system.

I am surprised that the Minister, in what may be his greatest Bill, in his semi-retirement from the front bench could not include definitions of what the amount will be, what is a glass container, or what is an exempt container. The Minister is either frightened to tell us or unable to tell us because his Caucus will not allow him to do so. In Part III, dealing with glass containers, we have a reference to the refund amount in the side heading, but no figure of the refund amount is stated. However, we have provision for a penalty of \$200, so the Government knows what will be the penalty if anyone is naughty. It knows how it will treat people if they are bad, but it does not know how much people will get if they take bottles back for a refund.

I hope that the Minister, when he pauses and thinks of this as his last great Bill to go through the House, will tell us what is in his mind regarding these amounts. I agree entirely with the provisions of Part V, by which the Government will ban the ring pull container type of

can. I agree that those containers are dangerous and that they have caused inconvenience and problems, particularly for children who use the beaches. I am sorry that the Minister was not in the Chamber when I was asking about that problem. It seems that he is not very concerned about the large beer bottle and that he, as a Minister in Her Majesty's Government of South Australia, is protecting that type of bottle with all his might. If we look at the Bill, we see in clause 17(1)(a):

prescribe an amount as being the refund amount applicable to a container of a class, kind or description and may so prescribe different amounts as being the refund amount applicable to containers of different classes, kinds or descriptions;

So here we have it in a nutshell. We go right through the Bill in search of what it will cost the consumers and the industry, and how much people will get as a refund; and, when we reach the final clause, clause 17, we see that the whole of this matter is to be dealt with by regulation. That is a two-faced matter as far as the Government is concerned: it will do this by regulation, as stated in clause 17, and regulations will, no doubt, come in when this House is in recess, and will be in operation for months before anyone can do anything about it. That, to me, is bad legislation. Surely, if the Government has the guts, as it professes to have, to bring in legislation of this nature (although it has not the guts to bring in on-the-spot litter fines, and it does not want to challenge the person who drinks from a big beer bottle) it should be able to say to us here, "This is what it will cost and these are the amounts and figures we have in mind". It should not be frightened about it.

Much has been said about Kesab. I reflect that this Government has been kind enough in the past few years to donate \$5 000 to Kesab. That appears to be a half-hearted donation—nothing compared with what private industry has given it. The member for Elizabeth attacked the industry, in his lecture from the left; his attack on Kesab in particular was disgraceful.

Mr. Evans: All the Government gave was equivalent to one-third the salary of a press secretary.

Mr. MATHWIN: If we look at the cost of the chief monitor, the Goebbels of the monitoring system, we see that his salary is far in excess of \$5 000; but I would not want to take that very far. Nevertheless, the Government's contribution has been half-hearted; it is scared to grasp the situation as it really is. Education is the big factor in this connection; it is most important.

Mrs. Byrne: It doesn't work.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not know whether the honourable member visits schools in her district; I am sure she does.

Mrs. Byrne: I am referring to cans on roadsides.

Mr. MATHWIN: She must have seen that the litter conditions in schools are much better now than they used to be. If it does not happen in her district, it happens in mine. Therefore, someone must be educating these children. The children have been told about pollution and are doing something about it.

Mr. Langley: If you are a naughty boy, you have to pick up little pieces of paper; you know that.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a fact that, if the Government had the foresight to impose on-the-spot fines, it would catch the people who were really naughty and threw papers around. If they were given a tap on the shoulder and told, "You can go to the police station and pay your \$5, and pick the paper up and put it in the basket," that would soon stop them.

Mr. Langley: You would do that, would you?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, I would. Litter education is a great factor in schools. A competition was explained at a convention that I was at recently, with the member for Hanson, where the Premier himself said they were thinking of running competitions for people who would help solve this pollution problem, particularly with the smaller type of litter. He was suggesting that people could be paid and, instead of walking, say three, four, or 14 km, they could pick up paper and be given so much money for charity for picking up so many pieces of paper (although I did not think the Government was interested in piece-work).

Another matter is the definition of "litter". With the many definitions in this Bill, it is a pity we have no definition of "litter". The Government did not go that far, although the Bill covers a wide area, dealing with bottles, cans, tins, paper, and bags of all sorts, sizes and makes. There are also ice-cream containers, plastic containers (which are a great problem), and thousands of old cars lying all over the State. The Government does not worry about those things, which do not affect it. It is not worried about all that rubbish. Indeed, it is willing to condone it for many years to come, because it will take a long time to solve the problem. So the Government says, "This is the area of local government; they are the people who look after it. Let them get on with the problem."

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What does your council think of this Bill?

Mr. MATHWIN: My council thinks it is a start, but not enough.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Is it supporting the Bill?

Mr. MATHWIN: It thinks it is not enough. The semi-retired Minister knows that he has not gone far enough; and he knows he dare not go any further.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Does your council support the Bill?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister dare not go any further. He is protecting one section of the community. If the Minister has children, he will know that the beer bottle is a great problem and that we should do something about it. If we touch the cans and the stubbies, why not touch the beer bottle? That is the situation. Let me remind the Minister (because I am sure he has read this) of the Jordan report, brought in by my Party's Government, not by the Party of the member for Elizabeth, who blurted out earlier that his Party was the only one that had ever done anything about pollution and that his Government was the only one that really knew anything about pollution. Yet his Party is supposed to have taken note, in a small way, of the Jordan report, which was put into operation by this Party when it was in Government. The member for Unley can listen to this, because he, too, will become more learned if he does.

Mr. Langley: No, I won't—not from you.

Mr. MATHWIN: On page 203 of the report, paragraph 27 states:

A more 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.

That is it in a nutshell. Those people who made this report are not silly; they are the people we should take note of and members opposite have taken note of them, when it suits them as a Government, when they are playing along with a different situation. We brought in this report in

time for members opposite to take note of it. That is what the Jordan report states. Then, on page 205 we see, at paragraph 51:

Education on environmental matters should be encouraged, (1) for the general public, through radio and television, adult education; (2) for children in schools so that they grow up more aware of environmental problems, ecology and conservation; (3) at tertiary level both as a general advanced course and to train specialists in environmental problems.

That is quite simple, and it is there for honourable members to read. It is, as the member for Fisher has said, a people problem. It can be stopped only by people, and we must educate the people about this problem. If they will not improve the situation, we must help them and enforce any provisions necessary. The Minister will know that this is done in other countries. He could ask the Premier, who gallivants around the world from time to time. Unfortunately, the Minister has not had an oversea trip on this matter. I believe that he should have had a trip instead of the Premier having had one, because then the Minister would not need to rely on hearsay. He would know how this matter is dealt with in other parts of the world, and he would know that on-the-spot fines are enforced and that they work.

This Government has proved on many occasions that it merely pays lip service to environmental problems. It knows that different aspects of the environment appeal to different people. It knows that something must be done about the environment, but it has put forward poor legislation in the matter. I regard this Bill as poor legislation indeed. I am worried about the possibility of unemployment. No matter how Government members try to sidestep the matter, unemployment remains an issue. In Port Pirie, Mr. Speaker, similar problems may be experienced. In Adelaide, as the Minister would know, some people would be in trouble. What about people living in the country? Let us talk briefly about Port Pirie. Those people who may lose their jobs will have houses in that city. They may own the houses, they may be buying them, or they may have rented houses. What will be their situation if they lose their employment? It may be a laughing matter to the member for Unley.

Mr. Langley: I'm sorry. I was laughing about this letter.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member should not be reading funny letters in this Chamber. We have enough problems with the Government, without the member for Unley reading and chuckling during the debate. I am concerned about unemployment, and the Government should be, too. The member for Elizabeth took all the kudos, saying that the Labor Party was the only Party that had ever thought of the environment and its problems. That is quite ridiculous, and he would know that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What is the Opposition policy on the environment?

Mr. MATHWIN: It has a policy on the environment, and the Minister should know it. The attack on Kesab by the member for Elizabeth was getting very low indeed, because he was attacking not Kesab but industry. That was behind the lecture to the left that he gave us earlier: his hatred of people who make a little profit, his hatred of industry generally, his hatred of private enterprise, of the dirty word "capitalist", and the filthy word "profit". He made no bones about it: that was the attack he made. It was all right for him to make an attack on members in this House, but his attack was on people in industry because, he claimed, industry was making donations and

helping Kesab. The Kesab organisation has done a colossal job on a meagre amount contributed by the Government, and it has had to go elsewhere to get money. Because the Government gave Kesab \$5 000, it was expected to be able to sweep the State clean, but when it got money from other people and from businesses it was declared black by the member for Elizabeth. He is willing to call the Kesab people lackeys because they take money from other organisations. I was surprised by his attitude to the trade union movement. His Party, of course, receives a large part of its income from the trade union movement in sustentation fees and political levies. He well knows who his bosses are and to whom he should bend the knee. While it may be common practice for the honourable member and his Party to do that sort of thing, no-one has lobbied me. I have spoken to no-one in the lobbies of this place on this Bill.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Or anywhere else?

Mr. MATHWIN: Or anywhere else. I have spoken to no-one who was lobbying on behalf of the container people, nor has anyone spoken to me. Any member may challenge me on that. I should like that to be well known on the Government side. The ability of members opposite to bend the knee to the big whip, to their masters in the Trades Hall, does not wash with me, because I have not been given the big lash by anyone. The statement about people being pressured from the Adelaide Club was ridiculous. It was mentioned that the Director went overseas to look at this matter, but he went over after the matter had been passed by the Government in Caucus, so his directions were quite clear. The Director is employed by the Government. When the Government picks the team on any matter it can get its own answers, and it can get its own answers from the Director.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill. It is in line with the policy of my Party, and in view of the challenge the Minister threw out to the member for Glenelg a moment ago I propose to quote the passages on packaging which are relevant in this regard. Under the heading "Packaging" they are as follows:

16. Recycling is necessary, but should be minimised by avoiding the use of excessive packaging, and by the use of more easily recycled packaging.

17. Fines and adequate finance should be used to reduce pollution, keep litter off streets and to assist local government in waste disposal.

18. Where appropriate, it be compulsory for deposits to be paid on packaging.

19. Where alternative methods of packaging are available which are lower in raw material and energy usage and are easily recycled, these should be encouraged by lower taxes or subsidy.

20. Avoidance of excessive packaging or any form of packaging where an environmentally less taxing alternative exists.

21. Support for the principle of standardised reusable containers, subject to safety provisions.

I do not pretend that that is an absolutely comprehensive policy on this matter, but it points the way in which the Liberal Movement goes in a matter of this kind. It means (and I now am able to put an end to some of the speculation that has been rife about the LM's attitude on this matter) that we support the principles of this Bill. I do not intend to argue the case for the Bill at any length; that has been done by members on both sides almost *ad nauseam*. I do intend, however, to refer briefly to the submission of the Nature Conservation Society to the Select Committee in another place, because that submission sums up, in my view, the arguments in favour of the Bill. Paragraph 5 of the submission states:

Fundamentally, we see this whole question of packaging, and in particular beverage containers, as a number of separate though interconnected issues. Firstly, the major issue of wise resource usage; secondly, the question of solid waste disposal; and thirdly, the problem of litter. The order of priority is as stated.

Although I do not agree with the tone of the speech made by the member for Elizabeth, nor with everything he said, I thought that the point he took about this being fundamentally a matter of resource use rather than litter was a good one, and I certainly accept that. On that point, the submission in paragraph 16 (which is the final paragraph under that heading) states:

Ultimately, the question of whether Australia can afford to perpetuate or, if the industry has its way, extend the convenience-throw-away ethic, with its concomitant wastage, is a matter of both morality and pragmatism. Figures from the United Nations indicate that the per capita consumption of steel, for all purposes, of the undeveloped world is only marginally greater than the Australian per capita discard of tin cans alone. In the spheres of world peace and trade, the degree of genuine effort displayed by the affluent to reduce unnecessary wastage is likely to be a significant factor in the future. We submit that the age when a few wealthy nations can justify waste in the name of convenience is fast coming to an end.

Those few paragraphs, I think, sum up my approach to the Bill. However, I do not conceal the fact that it has caused me, as it did on a previous occasion, a good deal of anxiety, because strong arguments have been put by those opposing it, and I do not believe that we can simply dismiss those arguments as being of no account whatever. Perhaps I can illustrate the dilemma in which I found myself during the past few weeks by quoting from a letter from an LM member who is a keen conservationist and with whom I have discussed this matter. She wrote to me, after one of these discussions (and I will not quote the entire letter), on September 14, as follows:

There are you and Steele Hall—

because I had been discussing it with my colleague in the Senate—

dithering around thinking up ways to keep a can factory operating and we are running out of energy. No-one would hurt, we'd probably be a lot healthier, if beer and soft drinks were cut out altogether.

I think she is perhaps a little extreme in saying that. The letter continues:

Do you realise that one-third of the world population uses about 80 per cent of available resources? For how long can that go on? I thought that you professed to be a Christian.

She had said to me a little earlier in another letter (and I quote it, because it is absolutely right) the following:

Fundamental principles are involved here even although, relative to other industries, the packaging industry is on a small scale. Each issue must be looked at from the point of view of total impact on the environment and not on how economically attractive it may happen to be or on how many jobs it may provide.

I quote that only to show that I have discussed this matter with others, and I have been in some dilemma about it. There are four arguments, in particular, in opposition to the Bill with which I want to deal, because some of them, I think, are valid and should be met in this legislation. First, we have heard much about Oregon. People have been there, paid by the Government and paid by the canning industry, and they have come to this and that conclusion about Oregon's legislation. I have not been to Oregon for over 20 years, and there was no deposit legislation in those days in Oregon.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You aren't aiming for a trip?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, because in my view a trip would be not only immoral but, to use the jargon of the day, utterly counter-productive.

Mr. Jennings: Too late!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be, but whomever I sided with I would be accused of a breach of faith or something like that, and that is not the way to tackle it. Since 1969, when I went to the United States of America, I have received every month a publication called *State Government News*, which is a round-up of legislation in the various State Legislatures and of the way in which it is going. I have had a search made through the various copies of this publication to see what has been said about Oregon's legislation and, although it has loomed large in its thinking, and some people have decided to take it as a standard, good or bad, it has not made a particularly strong impact in the USA judging by the references we have been able to find to it. One reference to it in the April, 1974, *State Government News* states:

Foes of Oregon's ban on non-returnable bottles and beverage cans may have reached the end of the line in fighting the law in the State courts. The Oregon Supreme Court refused to review a lower court ruling that upheld the 1971 law.

In the same issue, we find that South Dakota was doing precisely the same thing. Under the heading "Environment" the publication states:

Non-returnable beverage bottles and cans were prohibited after July, 1976. An anti-litter programme was adopted. Environmental impact statements were required for State projects. County land use plans were required by 1976.

That was amongst the work of the South Dakota State Legislature, which was in session earlier in 1974. So, apparently South Dakota was not impressed by the arguments against the Oregon law. The most significant reference I have found (and it is the latest one) is in the October, 1974, issue, which under the heading "Bottle Ban Cuts Litter" states:

Oregon's ban on non-returnable beverage containers has reduced litter, a study commissioned by the Legislature reveals. Beverage-related litter dropped by 66 per cent during the first 11 months after the law took effect October, 1972, the report says. A controversy has arisen over whether the bottle ban has also cut profits in the bottling, soft drink and beer industries, as the report contends. A special legislative subcommittee is deliberating whether or not to accept the report in the wake of a revelation that the consulting firm has ties with the bottling industry. An analysis of the report conducted at the request of Governor Tom McCall charged that "substantive errors" had been made in the sections on economic impact. The report contends that beer and soft drink industry profits each dropped approximately \$4 000 000 the first year of the bottle ban. Jobs were reported lost in bottle and can manufacturing. Offsetting the losses were better profit margins on returnable containers, standardisation of production machinery and protection for local and regional bottlers.

Whatever one likes to make about the connection between the firm making the survey and the bottling industry, there seems to me, from the absence of any other comment in the *State Government News* not to have been the catastrophic effects we have heard from some about the Oregon experiment; so I dismiss that argument. The next argument I come to is the South Australian argument on the question of employment. I am impressed by the arguments that have been put forward, and to me personally when I have gone to the Coca-Cola and Gadsden companies about employment. I believe that unemployment will be caused by the legislation, even though the Government has closed its eyes to it, and I have asked questions in the House about it. One answer was given

to me by the Premier on September 16. I thought it was superficial in the extreme. The answer was as follows:

The Government has considered the possibility of a reduction in employment as a result of the beverage container legislation, but in view of the uncertainty of the fall in actual numbers of can drink sales a full-scale study has not been undertaken. Any reduction in the can industry will be offset by increased employment in the glass manufacturing industry.

I believe that reply was prepared by the Environment and Conservation Department for the Premier. That reply was published in the paper. Within a day or so I had a ring from, I think, Mr. Christie, from Australian Consolidated Industries, to say that the bottle industry had excess capacity in South Australia and it could take up the slack even if there were no cans, and it would either have to employ no-one else to make up for the cans or, at most, it would have to employ an additional 10 or 12 workers. When I got that information I decided, in conjunction with the little other information I had, to try again, so I put a Question on Notice, which was answered today. This is what I asked:

1. Did the Government, during the week beginning Monday, September 15, receive a report from the Premier's Department on employment relating to the can-making industry and, if so—

- (a) when was the report requested and by whom;
- (b) on what day was it received;
- (c) what does the report show;
- (d) will the report be made public and, if so, when; and
- (e) if the report is not to be made public, why not?

2. If such a report has not been received, does the Government propose to obtain one from the Premier's Department and, if so, will it be made public when received and, if not, why not?

The answer was "Yes", that the Government did have a report, although there had been no mention of it in the earlier reply to my question. The reply further stated:

(a) The report referred to was prepared at the direction of the Director, Development Division, as a normal procedure associated with industrial activity within the State.

The Government received the report on September 17, which was the day before I got the first answer; that does not say much for either the Government's honesty or the co-ordination between Ministers. The next part of the answer is as follows:

(c) The report indicates that much of the information came from the industry and the Director, Development Division, concludes that it is not possible to predict accurately the effect of the legislation on can drink sales and meaningful statements on unemployment cannot be made.

The answer carefully avoids making any prediction at all, as to the effects either on the canned drink sales or on employment. I believe that the Government is concealing the information in that report because it will show that it is likely to lead to the unemployment that has been claimed by the industry itself, and it will not be made public, because the next answer states:

The report is an internal report of the department not designed for public release.

There we have it: the report is there. I believe that statement shows that there will be unemployment, and the Government will not say what is in the report. The Government will not make the report public. I believe that this will mean further unemployment. I believe that Gadsdens had a dirty trick played on it. It has increased the capacity of its plant at Albert Park, which is off the Port Road. That was done in 1973, with the blessing of the Government. Not a word was said then about the likelihood of such legislation.

Mr. Arnold: The ALP conference had not been held then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps not. Nothing was said about such legislation. If the legislation has the effect that the industry fears, that plant will be rendered redundant. I do not believe that that is a fair tactic and I would much like, if I could (but I cannot because it would involve money), to provide in this legislation for compensation for industries which are harmed by the Bill.

Mr. Harrison: Gadsden's has been located in Albert Park since there's been an Albert Park.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the member for Albert Park should know, the company greatly increased its capacity in 1973, and that is the point to which I refer. This is a matter on which the Government must take the responsibility. If the Government is hiding something it is on its own head, because it is finally a matter for the Government whether or not this Bill proceeds. All honourable members know that Bills are lost, not defeated; they are just forgotten about. We have an expression for this: "putting a Bill up in Annie's room". This is done frequently. If the Government does not want this Bill to go on because of any of its ill effects, it has the discretion to let it go to the bottom of the Notice Paper either here or in another place. I am worried about the matter of employment.

My third point is that I believe that it is unfair to single out one part of the packaging industry and use it as the vehicle for our experiments in anti-litter legislation. It seems to me that we are singling out the can industry at the expense of the other parts of the general packaging industry. I do not believe that we should do that, and I believe that the Bill should be widened. I have made no secret of that fact in the past few hours.

Mr. Venning: Are you going to move an amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I am going to move an amendment and I have copies here for the honourable member to chew over. I will distribute it in a moment. I do not believe that we should restrict this legislation to cans. I think we should make it absolutely explicit in the Bill that beer bottles, especially, are caught, as well as cans. Honourable members on this side have had something to say about beer bottles, and I think that they are absolutely right. I believe that we should have the same deposit on all drink containers and that, unless the Minister is satisfied that a deposit greater than the minimum standard deposit which he fixes is paid, this Bill should apply to all drink containers.

Mr. Rodda: If they don't go along with your amendment, will you support the Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I will not. I believe that such provision should be inserted in the Bill by amendment, because of the unfair bias at the moment. My fourth argument (and this argument has been advanced to me and to others strongly by the can industry) is that we are starting at the wrong end by tackling the litter and not the litterer. I believe that is correct, and I intend to move amendments to provide for what are, in effect, on-the-spot fines for littering. I believe that such a provision is overdue. In this Bill I will restrict the litter caught by it to beverage containers, because that is the subject of the Bill. However, I believe that we should make a two-pronged attack on the problem in this way.

In due course I intend to move amendments to widen the effect of the Bill, or make it absolutely clear that the Bill applies to beer bottles and other containers, as

well as cans. First, a minimum standard deposit should be applied to all sorts of containers. Secondly, I will move for on-the-spot fines for litterers. Those amendments have been prepared and, if the member for Goyder will help me, I will have those amendments distributed.

Mr. HARRISON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mitcham is out of order as he is referring to amendments that he will move.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The honourable member cannot speak about the amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course not, and I do not intend to say anything more about them. In fact, there is only one more matter that I desire to raise. That matter concerns some of the comments you, Sir, have made about this Bill and about the attitude of the Liberal Movement to it. A good friend of mine sent me a copy of the *Port Pirie Recorder* of Friday, September 19 (about 10 days ago), in which a report appears as follows:

The member for Pirie, Mr. Connelly, said in Adelaide yesterday that he might not have the deciding vote as Speaker in the House of Assembly for the Government's Beverage Container Bill. Mr. Connelly said if the Liberal Movement voted for the Bill the Government would have the numbers. He said the Liberal Movement had been quoted in *Hansard* in the past as saying they would support the legislation.

What you are reported to have said is absolutely correct. The Government will have the numbers if we support the Bill. However, with the utmost respect, I remind you, Sir, of the amendment to section 37(4) of the Constitution Act which now gives you the right to vote on this matter and gives you not only a casting vote, if it should be necessary, but also a deliberative vote. Subsection (4) provides:

Where a question arises in the House of Assembly with respect to the passing of the second or third reading of any Bill and in relation to that question the Speaker, or person aforesaid has not exercised his casting vote, the Speaker or person aforesaid may indicate his concurrence or non-concurrence in the passing of the second or third reading of that Bill.

So, Sir, you are in a position, should you wish to do so (and you may well wish to do so in view of the extreme importance of this matter to your district) to exercise a vote apart from a casting vote. I simply make that point and do so with the utmost respect. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Boundy, Broomhill (teller), and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Guan, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hopgood. No—Mr. Evans.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The confusion of the Opposition continues. One moment it is complaining that it has insufficient time to debate measures before the House and the next moment it is moving to restrict debate on

the Bill we have before us this evening. I feel we have been through all this before. When this measure was previously before the House I recall having said that the two best speeches I had listened to were those made by the member for Elizabeth and the member for Mitcham. I confess that the same has occurred this evening. If one could learn anything at all from listening to Opposition contributions one would learn members opposite are strongly in favour of conserving our resources, that they strongly support resource recycling and are vitally opposed to littering. Above all, members opposite are vitally opposed to do anything about it though! That is what this measure attempts to do.

This measure attempts to do something about two real problems that face us as a society. First, it attempts to solve the litter problem that each day is becoming greater and, secondly, it attempts to do something about resource management. During this debate the question has been asked frequently about why the Government is concentrating on cans, why it should select cans out of all the types of packaging for the purpose of imposing a deposit? The reason is that the beverage container is the most immediately reversible of the packaging problems. Until recently beverages were packaged exclusively in returnable containers, whereas now they are packaged in non-returnable containers. It would not be too great a problem to reverse that situation.

However, if we moved to control other areas of packaging the problems would be greater and would not be so easily overcome. Packaging throughout the world has become a problem. Anyone with a family the size of mine who goes to the supermarket knows of the real problems of packaging and the cost to the consumer. He knows of the enormous profits in packaging which, after all, is a futile method of production, particularly at a time when the world is facing an energy and resource crisis.

I do not intend unduly to take up the time of the House. I could, as other honourable members have done, quote *ad nauseam*, as the member for Mitcham said, all the information that has been provided by people who are for and against the Bill. There are, however, one or two matters to which I want to address myself. The member for Elizabeth has appropriately, I believe, drawn the attention of the House to the problem of resources. I do not wish to say anything more on that matter, although I compliment the honourable member on his contribution to the debate. For one of the few times in its life, the Opposition is now concerned about the employment problem.

Dr. Tonkin: Go on!

Mr. KENEALLY: It is strange to hear the Opposition this evening. It has over the last two years strongly supported cuts in the Public Service vote, which must involve retrenchments or putting off public servants. A reduction in public expenditure can result only in a reduction in public manpower and, if the Opposition cannot see that, it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: If the Opposition cannot see that, it cannot see anything. For the first time since I have been a member of this place, the Opposition has shown some concern about unemployment. This is a concern that the Government has had continually over the years. Of course, it is now concerned about the employment of people who may be affected by this Bill. This Bill is not something new which

has been introduced into this House and about which no-one has known anything. For two years, industry has known of the Government's intention to introduce such a Bill. South Australian industry has made absolutely no attempt to readjust itself to the proposal that the Government hopes to implement. Industry has merely waited until the last moment and tried to blackmail the Government by saying, "If you pass this Bill, a certain number of people will be retrenched and put out of a job." If industry was concerned about employment, it would have had ample time—

Mr. Venning: What—to retrench?

Mr. KENEALLY: No, to change its manufacturing methods in this State. All steel cans that are manufactured here are not directed solely towards the canning of beer, as seems continually to be pushed down our necks by members opposite. Other products, such as those about which the member for Murray and, indeed, South Australia generally would be concerned, are put in steel cans. The Government is concerned that resources are not diminished to such an extent that the supply of those products that are necessary for the people living in our society is not reduced dramatically because so many of our resources are going into the production of cans for beverages that are not so necessary.

I do not know whether industry has had discussions with the Government on this matter with a view to overcoming the problems that it will face. There are certain members on the Opposition front bench who believe that all cans manufactured by I. G. Gadsden Proprietary Limited are used for beer. However, the member for Davenport said that at least one user referred to an order of 11 000 000 cans with Gadsden's for preserves. That would not be unusual, as other customers of that firm would have had larger orders than that. There is no reason why that type of manufacture could not continue after this Bill passes. There is no reason why, as the Northern Territory will still be able to obtain its beer in cans, there could not be a readjustment in the Gadsden empire to enable it to provide cans for beer in one place as well as cans for tinned fruits (and other things that are more important to the people of South Australia and the State's economy) in another place.

We have been led to believe that the Government is suddenly trying to reverse a trend to which we in South Australia have become accustomed since the year dot. Of course, that is not the case. In my time (and I am not as old as some members opposite), I can recall when all beverages were packaged in returnable containers, and that is exactly the position to which this Bill will return us. The Government has not touched cartons, plastics, and so on, which are also great problems. However, there is no reason for anyone to say that the Government will not be tackling those aspects. I have said that we are tackling the most easily reversible container problem that we experience in South Australia.

We will have on the Statute Book legislation which is aimed to protect our environment and which can be built upon. However, the Opposition seems hell bent to stop any legislation going on the Statute Book in this State which will in any way protect the environment and which in any way shows concern for the resources not only of this country but also of the world. We have heard members opposite say, "Why should this Government be the trend-setter?" I say, "Why should it not be?" If something needs to be done, it should be done and, if other Governments are not willing to do it, this Govern-

ment is. It has the best interests of the people at heart, and is involved in resource management and control of litter, and I am sure you, Sir, have not been impressed at all by the sometimes subtle, and sometimes not so subtle, pressure that is being exerted by members opposite to get you to vote in a certain way. I believe that you will have good sense and know where the priorities lie.

I wonder what happens to the aerated waters industry in South Australia. My family consumes many soft drinks. We pay deposits on cool drink bottles, and then return the bottles to obtain the refund. Although I do not know what the current figures are, I do know that when I spoke in the debate on the Bill that was introduced previously a bottle of soft drink cost 14¢. As the deposit on the bottle was 5¢, the total cost to the purchaser was 19¢. Then, when he obtained his refund, the drink would have cost the purchaser only 14¢. A can of soft drink of the same size cost 22¢. Members opposite who believe they show concern for the community should be aware of the complete and absolute rip-off that takes place in relation to cans. If they were concerned about having this commodity available to the community at the least possible cost, those members would support returnable containers. There is no doubt that the community is charged much more for non-returnable containers than it is for returnable ones. Regarding the cost of returnable containers, I should like to refer to what Forrest Gist, the Comptroller of the Pepsi-Col a Bottling Company, in Portland, Oregon, was reported in the *Oregon Times*, of June, 1973, as having said:

We've always felt the returnable bottle was more profitable. We have bottles out there that are coming back 15 to 25 times, and they cost us 10¢ each. Conceding 5¢ refund to the consumer and, based on 15 trips, each bottle costs about one-third of 1¢ a trip, but non-returnables cost us 4¢ each, and that's lost every time.

The same is true about packages. This is the truth of the matter, but members opposite are not concerned about the welfare of the community, which is tied up with being able to obtain the best possible product at the best possible price. The Opposition's support for non-returnable packaging reacts completely against that. It is no good the member for Mallee shaking his head and suggesting there has not been a complete rip-off regarding non-returnable containers.

I intended, when speaking on employment, to say some things about Port Pirie. I am not speaking with the knowledge of the industry there that you would have, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me that the market at Port Pirie for cans depends completely on cans being transported to that city and marketed from it, that there is not any manufacturing of cans at Port Pirie. I also understand that syrup is taken to Port Pirie, used in the manufacture of aerated waters or cool drinks, bottled, and distributed throughout the North and to other markets. If there is a reduction in the number of cans taken to Port Pirie, and so an expansion in the amount of syrup used there and in the manufacture, transport and bottling of cool drinks, there will not be a reduction of the work force in that city.

There well could be a reduction if the industry used a type of blackmail, but in my view there is no need for this to occur. The employment that may be lost in the reduction of the number of cans could easily be taken up in that other side of the Pepsi-Cola industry or other industry in that area. Logic has no part in the Opposition's argument. As the member for Elizabeth has clearly pointed out, the Opposition may like to support this legislation but, unfortunately, for some reason or other it cannot. Even the Opposition members who in the past have stated that they

support having a deposit on non-returnable containers cannot support the Bill. I know that my speech is a little disjointed because members opposite have swayed me from the point, but I have a press extract on the Gadsden company's 1975 annual report. It states:

Big Gadsden's share sale nets family \$2 500 000: the Gadsden family has sold an 11.4 per cent stake in can and packaging maker J. Gadsden Australia in a \$2 500 000 deal.

One does not know whether the Gadsden family felt that this might be an appropriate time to get out and sell some of the shares, but it seems to me that this is a company of no small means. Here is a company, knowing two years ago that there was a move, not only in Australia but also elsewhere, back to returnable containers, that might have had enough gumption to do something about it. The industry has not tried to overcome what it sees as a problem facing it: it has tried to pressure people in Legislatures here and in another place to support its way of thinking. Unfortunately, the industry's way of thinking is not the way the world is moving, and the sooner that industry becomes aware of that the better.

Professor Hugh Falk, an American professor, has studied the effects of conversion of the beverage container system to returnables in Illinois, and he found that a return to the use of returnable containers would result in a net employment gain of 6 500 jobs. When we say that it is possible that there will be further possibilities for employment, we are not shooting off the top of our head. Research has been done on this matter in Canada and in the United States, and there is strong reason to believe that this will result in increased employment. Retrenchment in one industry can be taken up in another.

I get cross to hear Opposition members condemning themselves in relation to statements they have made previously in this House that people who are unemployed should move to another part of the country. Opposition members have asked why those people should sit at home and expect to receive unemployment benefits. We would say that those people should not be expected to move, because they have their houses, their social life, and their friends in the area in which they live. We tried to promote that as an honest effort, but the Opposition said that it was rubbish and that the people concerned should uproot their families and go away from their friends.

Now, when it suits the Opposition's argument, it says that the Government has no concern about people at the Gadsden company who may be retrenched, when not long ago the Opposition said that such people should go somewhere else. The Opposition also has tried to show that the Jordan report comes down strongly in favour of education (with which we agree) and the imposition of penalties on those found discarding bottles and cans, except in an acceptable way. We have heard much about that, but I cannot discuss it, because that would be out of order. However, I challenge members opposite to refer to the third and most important recommendation. That was:

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

Why are members opposite so dishonest as to promote two recommendations in the report but completely refuse to talk about the third recommendation? If they are to use two of the major Jordan report recommendations, they should also use the third. To use a term that the member for Torrens has used, this Bill is not a panacea for all our packaging or litter problems. It does not overcome the big problem that faces the country, but it is a first step in an effort by a Government that has a concern for

the welfare of the community. It is a first step to do something regarding the litter problem.

Any opposition to the Government's action can be seen only as opposition to doing anything to solve the problem. The resource management argument is important and it is one thing that has motivated the Government in taking action. However, I put that argument aside, because the Opposition has no concern for resource management and the way the world is hell-bent on depleting our resources. The Opposition has no concern for future generations: it is concerned only about a problem here and now.

In many cases, legislation that has the overall good at heart and reacts favourably on the majority will have a detrimental effect on the minority. I do not believe that the problem regarding employment in South Australia would be nearly as big if industry, when it was first warned that this legislation would be introduced, had taken the necessary action. This is good legislation. The Government supports it heartily, and it deserves the support of all people who claim to have an environmental conscience.

It is no use for members opposite to say they are concerned about resources but they will oppose anything the Government does to solve what everyone accepts as a grave problem. The legislation is good and worthy of support, and the Opposition should be ashamed of its attitude.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The kindest thing I can say about the speech of the member for Stuart is that it was not as bad as that of the member for Elizabeth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to keep within the terms of the Bill and not deal with other matters.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am certainly doing that. I am about to explain what I am saying. For one thing, the member for Stuart did not go on quite as long; and, secondly, he was not quite as vindictive. The member for Elizabeth was in full flight this evening; he was at his vindictive best (or worst) and he continued to impute the basest of motives to members of the Opposition and, indeed, to people who have been talking to members of the Opposition. He accused us of speaking with tongue in cheek, which he said was an appalling position. He agreed that Kesab had done a reasonably good job in South Australia, but then he said that it had played a disgraceful role in this matter. He then denigrated people involved in the industry who happened to be on the council of the Kesab organisation, and have been there since its inception.

I wonder what the young member for Elizabeth has any faith in, because he imputes the basest of motives not only to anyone on this side of the House but also to anyone who disagrees with his small-minded point of view. It seems to me that some of these people have interested themselves in this matter over the years, and I should have thought they were worthy of some sort of commendation for what they had done.

Mr. Keneally: He gave them commendation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member could not have been listening, because the member for Elizabeth denigrated those people simply because they were interested in litter control. How can these people win when they are dealing with someone of the mentality of the member for Elizabeth, despite rumours about his becoming the Attorney-General? Lord help us!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member back to the Bill. The election of a new Minister has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When we hear something from the member for Elizabeth of the calibre that we heard this evening, and when these rumours are noised abroad, one loses complete faith in the judgment of the Government. I am dealing with the matters that the member for Elizabeth raised. Having denigrated the Opposition and the members of the Kesab council, and Kesab having seen fit to oppose this matter, he got on to resource conservation. I wonder whether the Government and that member in particular have done anything about working out what use of resources will be involved in the beverage industry if the can goes out of existence, as one certainly believes it will under the terms of this Bill.

Take an instance that has been cited here this evening: what will happen in the case of the works at Port Pirie? A fair amount of beverage is exported from Port Pirie to the Northern Territory; it services Alice Springs and there is a sizeable market for that South Australian company in the Northern Territory. If the canners go out of business and the drink has to be carted to the Northern Territory in bottles (a far less convenient container) has the Government worked out what that will do to freight and to cooling? Has it worked out how much energy will be used in terms of freight and freezing convenience? What about the centres that will be established for picking up some of this material? Has the Government worked out how much of the earth's resources in terms of fuel will be used up in carting to and from some of these containers, particularly if they become glass containers? It has only half-thought this business through.

The member for Elizabeth criticised, not by implication but by direct statement, people who talk to the Opposition about legislation that affects them. What sort of hide does the member for Elizabeth have? We know perfectly well that members of the Labor Party cannot raise a finger on industrial matters without first getting the stamp of approval from the Trades Hall.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Look at the Premier, with his sweetheart agreement legislation: he has been backing off that ever since he made his public statement: "It will not be brought in without the approval of the Trades Hall."

The SPEAKER: Order! The matters the honourable member is now debating have nothing to do with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me say that one of the features of the speech of the member for Elizabeth was criticism of the Opposition for listening to people like canners and others, who are involved in the effects of and who will be grossly affected by this legislation. It ill behoves the member for Elizabeth to chide us when we know that the Labor Party is bound hand and foot when it comes to industrial matters in this State that affect the trade union movement, which movement controls the Labor Party's activities in the whole of this area. We would be falling down on our duty to the public if we did not listen to all sides of this argument. We know that the Labor Party is blinkered in its approach to much of this legislation. If we were not prepared to listen to people involved, if we were not able to assess the likely effects of this legislation, we would not be doing our job in the place. The sooner the member for Elizabeth can get into his untidy little mind the fact that we are not all impelled by base motives, the better it will be for him and his future in this

Parliament. We have had submissions from the conservationists; in fact, we had something that turned up today, which I read with interest. I have read the submissions from the canners, the companies using their products, and the conservationists. We are not subject to the control that the Labor Party is. We have weighed up the pros and cons—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Yet you'll all oppose the Bill; not one of you has a different frame of mind.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The demerits of the legislation are so obvious, and they should be so obvious to the Minister, that it should be abundantly apparent to him why we are opposing it. Then the member for Elizabeth turned his spleen on to the newspapers. Suddenly, some sinister plot emerged because someone on the board of Coca-Cola Bottlers had something to do with the newspapers, and this has led to some adverse publicity for the Government in the *Sunday Mail*. Everyone is ganging up against this legislation: the Opposition is crook, the bottlers and the papers are crook; the people on the Kesab board are crook—everyone is crook except the Government.

The member for Stuart did not have quite the nasty overtones in his speech that we heard from the member for Elizabeth. The kindest thing I can say about the member for Stuart is that at least he did not impute to us the basest of motives, as did the member for Elizabeth. I tried to take a few points from his speech. Again, we heard resources churned out. He talked about packaging and profits, and taking the family to the supermarket. That bears out our point that a whole range of packaging will not be affected by this legislation, which will deal with only about 10 per cent of the problem.

There is a far better way of tackling the problem than in terms of this legislation. The member for Stuart said that industry has had plenty of time to adjust. What does he mean by that? Was industry supposed to close down two years ago because of the possibility of this legislation being brought before us again? What sort of furore did we have when General Motors-Holden attempted to rationalise its operation by transferring some of it to Melbourne? GMH was prevented, in effect, from rationalising its operation. What move would the member for Stuart advocate for canners in view of this legislation? Should they have closed up two years ago? He said that this had been hanging over their heads for two or three years, and asked why they had not done something about it. Should they have gone into plastics, thus creating a far greater disposal problem? It is all very well to make such negative criticisms of industry, but I ask the member for Stuart just what these people should do. He went on about this trend-setting State, saying that we on this side are not interested in the welfare of South Australia.

Mr. Keneally: You don't appear to be.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are interested. The trend-setting activities of this Government have put South Australia way behind the eight-ball. Despite the brave front of the Premier in the matter, employment figures in this State are not nearly as rosy as he indicated this afternoon. If we take the seasonally adjusted figures, we are in a bad way. Look at what is happening to small businesses, and to business in general. We have had nothing to crow about in South Australia since this Government has been the trend-setter. Look at the workmen's compensation legislation and the leave loadings. If members opposite think this is advantageous to us in our competitive situation, they should think again. If they think this legislation will be advantageous, where do they think the cans will come from for the Northern Territory?

Mr. Venning: From other States.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course. Beverages will not be taken in glass from Port Pirie. Cans will be brought from other States.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: This doesn't affect the can sales of the Northern Territory.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It will knock the canner out of business.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What are you talking about?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps the Minister should look at the matter. I understand that the Government has been approached by the people who have approached us. I urge the Minister to look again at the submissions by the Gadsden organisation, for which company there is obviously so much hatred on the Government benches.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There's no hatred at all.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest quite sincerely that the Minister should go through that submission with a fine tooth comb and, if he has not got the wit to glean from that that the canning industry would be in serious difficulty as a result of this legislation, he is dumber than I think he is. Experience in other countries bears out what I am saying. The usage in Oregon State dropped to 1 per cent, but as a result of introducing the push-in container it is now about 5 per cent; it was 40 per cent originally. If the Minister is not going to learn from experience in other countries he is less bright than I think he is; that is putting the kindest possible construction on it.

This State will be seriously disadvantaged as a result of the legislation. It is useless for the Government to put its head in the clouds and say that this will be the pace-setting State, an Australian paradise. It will be so expensive that no-one will be able to live here, and there will be no jobs. Although employment is perhaps not a major consideration in this matter, I believe it is a consideration, and certainly not a minor one.

Mr. Keneally: Let us pollute the State, throw away everything, and give more jobs to people—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: How silly! That interjection is not worthy of a reply. I shall summarise the facts, because they have been exhaustively debated by members on this side. The legislation will tackle only about 10 per cent of the problem. It exempts some beverages in glass containers; when the previous Bill was introduced, because of the interstate trade in the wine industry the Government realised the disadvantage involved. If the Minister is not prepared to take cognisance of the submissions of people involved in the industry, he has closed his mind to this aspect of the matter before he has started. If the Government looks dispassionately and fairly at experience in other countries, it cannot support this legislation. The State of Oregon has been quoted in this debate *ad nauseam*, but the authorities there still spend \$1 000 000 a year in picking up litter. In Washington State, the authorities have come to grips with the problem far more effectively, far more efficiently, and far less expensively than has been done in the much vaunted State of Oregon.

I have read with some interest the submissions of the conservationists, who acknowledge that only 10 per cent of the problem is being solved. I refer now to today's submission from the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated. I do not criticise the council. Its members are well motivated, but we must balance up the opposing points of view. I have no hesitation

in deciding on which side I would come down in this matter. One of the statements in the submission from the council which I read with sympathy states:

Even if littering was prevented by education and heavy fines, the amount of garbage to be disposed of would not be altered and costs to ratepayers to collect and dump will continue to increase with the throw-away mentality being fostered by certain industries.

That is rather at variance with the statement by the member for Elizabeth that some people in these industries had interested themselves in the work of the Kesab campaign. I do not believe that the people in industry who will be affected by this legislation are fostering the throw-away mentality. If we are to come to grips in the long term with this problem an education campaign at all levels in the community will be the only solution. If we are to come to terms with the 90 per cent of the problem the Bill will not affect, obviously that will be central to any campaign to improve the situation. It is a question of education. I was overseas two years ago. One of the features attracting travellers to a country is its cleanliness. As a result of my visit to European countries, I believe that the results in those countries, such as Austria, were achieved not as a result of this kind of legislation but of long-term education from childhood to adulthood. We will achieve the result we desire in this State only if we embark on that type of programme. I have studied the report of the Kesab campaign (and I think quite dispassionately) and I think that this organisation has done a great job in a relatively short time in South Australia with little help from the Government. The introduction to its report states:

Our campaign has been severely hampered by limited resources and lack of the overall local support necessary to conduct a truly extensive attack on litter, based on our formula of education, equipment, enforcement and example. Even so, we have proven this programme in specific venues and mass audience events and we can rightly claim that public awareness has been dramatically increased.

I do not believe that that is an over-exaggeration. The introduction continues:

Awareness has brought an acceptance of our programme which has resulted in a general reduction in overall litter. This reduction in general littering has been achieved in the face of tremendous increases in the use of take-away foods, with the attendant disposable packaging, as well as increases in many other fields which cause or contribute to littering.

The points referred to in the introduction will obviously not be touched by the Bill. In total, without repeating and canvassing at length the arguments that have been advanced by the Opposition, I point out that I have approached the legislation with an open mind as, indeed, I approach all legislation that comes before the House. I say for the instruction of the member for Elizabeth that we are not in the thrall of any group in the community, in contradiction to the Labor Party, which is. The Minister may grin or smile and say what he likes, but that is a fact. No-one has ever pressured me to vote in a certain way and, if he did, he would probably lose the vote. We have open minds.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the conservation people?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They did not lobby me personally. I have read their submissions, including the one that arrived today at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Venning: They are cranky statements.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Cranky, you say?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know whether I agree with the interjection. This is a group in the community, and perhaps it is well motivated.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You don't think they're cranks, as your colleague says.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am unable to judge. I have read its submissions.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're not sure?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course not; I do not know them.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You don't know them?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, should I say that they are cranks or not if I do not know them? If the Minister, goes on like this, he is a crank if he expects me to make a statement along those lines. I have approached the legislation with an open mind and read with interest the submissions from those who the member for Elizabeth would suggest are our masters, which is nonsense. I have read the conservationists' submissions and I believe that every right-thinking person would realise that this legislation will not solve the problem.

Mr. Nankivell: It's not conserving anything.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but what it will do is to harm the State and to cost the State considerable money in the long term; it will affect employment, but will not solve the problem. For these reasons, I am certainly not willing to support the legislation. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I rise with much pleasure to support the Bill, because I think it will make three main contributions towards a cleaner and better State. First, It will make an effective contribution towards combating the litter problem; there is no doubt about that. The percentage of litter made up of non-returnable beverage containers can be argued, but I take exception to the 10 per cent that has been bandied about by the Opposition. I think it is higher than that, but even if it is only 10 per cent it will be a worthwhile contribution towards solving the problem. The second reason why I think the legislation is important is that it will help reduce the amount of solid waste that must be disposed of. That is a problem which is urgent and which will become even more so in the future. Finally (and this is probably the most important part of the legislation), it will help to conserve our resources of fuel and material, which are rapidly reaching exhaustion. I hope that I will have sufficient time to develop that argument, which has already been touched on by the members for Stuart and Elizabeth.

I will return to the problem of combating litter, because that is the aspect which has been dealt with by most members so far, particularly Opposition members. There are alternative methods of dealing with this problem. I think that the Opposition pays lip service to doing something about the problem, but all it says is, "That is not our solution," and that we should try other methods. The first method referred to was education, and I would be the last to deny the value of education in any area. However, frankly, I do not think that education will solve this problem. It may make a small contribution, but we will be smothered deeply in cans and non-returnable bottles long before education has had an effect. If they disagree, I suggest that Opposition members look at education campaigns against smoking, drinking, etc. The sad fact is that those who are most inclined to listen are the least inclined to litter, and vice versa. Therefore, I think that education will appeal to the people who are responsible and sensible, but it will have no appeal to those who do not possess those attributes.

I will comment on the evidence given before the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation by a man named Norman Lester Dobyns, a corporate Vice-President of the American Can Company. The Steel Can Group sent me an edited version of the evidence given by this man, so I thought it would be worth my looking at the whole of the evidence, and it is a most interesting document. Mr. Dobyns has certain qualifications. He was asked by the Chairman what his educational qualifications were, and I thought that they were amusing. The evidence states:

Chairman: I would like to ask you about your background. With regard to your academic training, in what field was your primary degree at Washington and Lee?

Mr. Dobyns: Journalism. I was never very good at mathematics in my early years so I tried to take courses that evaded that.

Chairman: Then you did graduate work and you hold a masters in communications.

Mr. Dobyns: My graduate work was at Houghton in economics, which as you know involves no mathematics.

Chairman: I do not know. It is a changing world. I think if you say economics has no mathematics, then you are back with the returnable bottle.

And he is right, there. The transcript continues:

Chairman: Regarding your masters in communications, in using the term "communications" are you referring to the media and public relations, or to actual systems of communication.

Mr. Dobyns: I would like to be able to say both. I returned to school at night for two reasons. Primarily, I perceived that the new satellite communication systems going into effect around the world were beyond my understanding . . . The second reason is that I like young girls and there was a considerable number of them in the night school.

That was fairly typical of the whole of Mr. Dobyns' evidence. His firm, the American Can Company, is one of the biggest companies in America, and, to combat the litter problem, it is joining in a study of human behaviour. The evidence continues:

I do not know why some of my countrymen are slob, but I can assure you that we have a very small percentage of our 212 000 000 souls who are clearly wretched, anti-social slob. They meander around our countryside depositing their foul fluid residues wherever they can and I wish to heaven they would stop; because of their anti-social behaviour, my industry is now threatened with possible extinction. You have to believe that we are concerned with litter because it threatens our livelihood and you never get a man more concerned than when you threaten his livelihood.

That has been well brought out in the campaign in this State. The evidence continues:

The reason we have not solved the litter problem is that we do not know how.

He is right there. So much for education. There is a small percentage, I suggest, of the 212 000 000 slob who are wretched and anti-social and beyond the reach of education. The second line of attack which was put forward was the punitive line.

Singapore has been referred to by one or two speakers. I have been to Singapore, which is a clean city, and I believe that formerly it was a filthy city. There is no doubt that the system of fines and of punishment applying there is effective, but members opposite who have referred to Singapore are being dishonest. I went to see the Singapore city engineer, who told me that there are 65 seats in the Singapore Parliament and all the 65 seats were held by the People's Action Party, which is led by Mr. Lee Kuan Yew. That gives him a head start in introducing repressive legislation that would not be accepted even by a Liberal Government.

The next point is that Mr. Lee Kuan Yew has booked courts for two days a week, so that if anyone drops anything such as a bus ticket, a can or a cigarette, there are 600 inspectors waiting to slap a notice on him. It is not an on-the-spot fine: the offenders are required to present themselves in court a couple of days later. The court is free all day to deal with these wretched people.

That system would not work in Australia. In Australia, if a litterer were apprehended and asked his name by the inspector, he would probably say that he was Joe Blow. In Singapore, residents are required to carry identity cards and to produce them, and there is no doubt that an offender will be brought before the courts. An offender can plead not guilty, but that would never apply, because he could not get away with it. The fines imposed in Singapore in relation to incomes there are extremely high, and similar enforcement in Australia is just not on. We can forget about the big stick in that sense.

I now refer to the method used in Finland, which has not yet been referred to. I refer to it only to frighten the Opposition. I was told by someone in the Environment Department in Helsinki that the way they deal with cans is to fix a minimum price appreciably above the price of bottles. That effectively cuts them out. Again, that is not a technique that would go over well in Australia. The next system available is the application of taxes applied and used for the cleaning up of litter. This is the system operating in Washington State in America. During my travels I made inquiries about this problem and observed it in Finland, Vermont, Washington State, Oregon, British Columbia, and Alberta. I have seen a fair amount of what is going on overseas.

I agree that Washington State is a clean State, and the system applying there works well, but there are serious objections to that system. First, when one pays a tax (and 13 groups of package are subject to a small tax) the funds collected are used to clean up the State. Some people at least take the view that, having paid their tax, they then have a licence to litter, because they have paid the Government to pick up the litter. They toss litter around, and they have no need to worry about doing otherwise. This system operates against the principle that the polluter should pay. Certainly, everyone who buys the package or container has to pay the tax, but conscientious and decent people will not throw their garbage around the country, although they are paying for the collection of garbage thrown around by people who are not responsible.

That system has definite weaknesses. It is unjust. The principle that the polluter should pay is the only principle we should encourage. Mr. Dobyns thinks that the solution is a technological one, and I suppose that is understandable for a tin-can manufacturer in a country like America. He states:

The technology exists to process solid waste. I am not talking about blue sky, I am not talking 1984, I am talking right now. The separators are there, the shredders are there, the magnetic separators are there, the air classifiers exist. We have the technology to do everything we need to do to solve the solid waste problem. We are prepared to do it. I have virtually brought my order book with me—
he sells these things—

The problem simply put, as it relates to the United States, is that our municipalities are strapped for funds, our Americology system for a 500-ton a day, one-shift unit—that serves a city of 250 000 people and we would need four of them—

sells for \$4 000 000 American. This is not a give-away item. It is an industrial plant that costs 4 000 000 American bucks. Our municipalities find it very difficult

to locate \$4 000 000. I am going to proceed on the assumption that the same would be true here.

We would have to find \$16 000 000 in American currency to deal with garbage that has been thrown around by people. If we say that alternative methods are not effective and have disadvantages, we are left with the method set out in the Bill, which is based on Oregon legislation. I make no apology for referring to what happened in Oregon, because we should be learning from what is going on over there. Not only South Australia, but other States also are following the lead given by Oregon in this respect. On hearing of similar legislation in Vermont, I had discussions with Mr. Donald W. Webster, Director of Environmental Protection in the Agency of Environmental Protection in the State of Vermont. He admitted to certain problems, and I believe that the problems experienced in Vermont are peculiar to that State, which is a small State with a population of less than 500 000 people. It is about 64 km wide at the southern end, and about 130 km wide at its widest end, being about 250 km long. Vermont is astride many major highways leading from east coast cities such as Boston to the interior lakes area. It adjoins New Hampshire, which is a larger state, and motorists purchasing beverages in containers in New Hampshire drive through Vermont and litter that State. There, the deposit legislation has no influence. This problem is further exacerbated by New Hampshire retailers, who use beverages as loss leaders. They deliberately sell such items in this manner to attract business, and in this way Vermont gets the garbage left by visitors. Mr. Dobyns referred to Vermont and said that the situation there represented a horrible failure. He stated:

In Vermont they have similarly adopted a deposit Bill and the effects predictably have been disastrous, but for a different reason. In Vermont you deal with a population located on the border of a border State. The retailers who have been marketing beer and soda in Vermont have now lost very nearly 70 per cent of their beer and soft drink business because the consumers of those products are hopping in their cars and driving across in to New Hampshire where there is no deposit system, no price increases, and buying their recreational fluids there. I can assure you that the retailers in Vermont are distraught. I can also tell you that a Bill which repeals the Vermont enactment is now being prepared and will be strongly promoted by those of us who have been gored and I am not necessarily pessimistic that we are going to turn that one around. You do not take away 70 per cent of the business of your State's retailers and not have some public discussion.

This was given in evidence on February 20, 1974. I was in Montpelier, the capital of Vermont, on June 3, 1974, and spoke to Mr. Webster, who was in charge in this area. I taped, with his permission, some of the discussion that we had. During that discussion he said:

... there has not been one single Vermont retail store that has been forced out of business, nor has there been one single Vermont distributor of beverages ... forced out of business. Now if I can, what we would recommend in Vermont and we'll try to do in our next legislative session is to convert from our present legislation to something akin to the Oregon style legislation; with certain exceptions, we favour the use of redemption centres such as the Canadian Provinces.

That is exactly what is incorporated in the South Australian Bill. He was pleased with the experience of their type of law, which had had its problems since it had much opposition from certain vested interests. The State was in a peculiar geographical situation that made it difficult for that sort of legislation to succeed, yet (as I hope will be seen from my report), according to Mr. Webster, the legislation had been well received and he was pleased with its general result. It had certainly done something towards combating litter.

It was worth while seeing what happened in Oregon. Whilst there I was afforded every facility and was even taken across the Columbia River to Vancouver, in the State of Washington, where I spoke to a brewer who sold beer not only in Washington but in the adjoining north-west Pacific States. I got information from him about prices, and also got information from the Oregon Liquor Control Commission, which controls this legislation, in Portland. I wish to refer to some of that information. In a document prepared by Don Waggoner, President of the Environmental Council on the Oregon bottle Bill, is a summary he has given of the objections to the Bill and his answers to those objections. Some of those objections and answers have been referred to in this debate. The first objection and reply is as follows:

Prices of beverages (to consumers) will rise to offset additional handling costs.

Answer: The reusable bottle (container) is a cheaper container because of its re-use and therefore permits lower-costs per ounce of beverage. A throw-away can costs 4¢ to 5¢ and a one-way bottle costs 3¢ to 4¢.

Returnable bottles cost a bit more than that, but they are used many more times, so the cost of packaging is much reduced. I was interested to ascertain what was the effect of legislation on prices in Oregon. For this purpose I was given a statement dated February 12, 1974, which stated:

The following is a recapitulation of comparative prices of malt beverages in Portland, Oregon, and Vancouver, Washington—

which is just across the river—

as surveyed by special investigators Frank K. Roemer and Chapman W. Thayer on February 6, 1974. The Vancouver prices include the 5 per cent Washington sales tax. The Portland prices do not include the 2¢ (11 oz. stubby) and 3¢ (32oz. quart) deposit on refundable certified containers. Several comparisons are then given. I will refer to the first comparison and then ask for leave to have the other comparisons inserted in *Hansard*. The first comparison is as follows:

Safeway Store 4011 Main Street Vancouver, Washington		v.	Safeway Store 3940 S.E. Powell Blvd. Portland, Oregon	
			6 pack	
			11 oz.	Stubby
			Vanc.	Ptld.
Blitz.....	1.34			1.18
Rainier.....	1.36			1.18
Lucky	1.34			1.18
Olympia.....	1.34			1.18
Heidelberg.....	1.34			1.18
Budweiser.....	1.46			1.38
Miller.....	.00			1.34

I seek leave to have the remaining comparisons inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

SCHEDULE OF COMPARISONS

Safeway Store 4011 Main Street Vancouver, Washington		v.	Safeway store 3940 S.E. Powell Blvd. Portland, Oregon	
			Loose Pack 24/11 oz. Stubby	Twist Top 32 oz. Quart
			Vanc. Ptld.	Vanc. Ptld.
Blitz.....	5.13		4.48	.00 .45
Rainier.....	.00		4.48	.00 .00
Lucky	5.13		.00	.00 .00
Olympia.....	5.13		4.48	.56 .45
Heidelberg.....	5.13		.00	.00 .45
Budweiser.....	.00		.00	.00 .00
Miller.....	.00		.00	.00 .00

Minit Market 400 N.E. 78th Vancouver, Washington		v.	Plaid Pantry Market No. 18 2950 S.E. Hawthorne Portland, Oregon	
			6 Pack 11 oz. Stubby	Twist Top 32 oz. Quart
			Vanc. Ptld.	Vanc. Ptld.
Blitz.....	1.42		1.35	.58 .49
Rainier.....	1.42		1.35	.58 .49
Lucky	1.42		1.35	.58 .49
Olympia	1.42		1.35	.58 .49
Heidelberg ..	1.42		1.35	.58 .49
Budweiser ...	1.56		1.47	.00 .59
Miller00		.00	.00 .00

Pay 'N Takit Market S.W. Washington Street Vancouver, Washington		v.	8-1 Store No. 1 2519 S.E. Belmont Portland, Oregon	
			Loose Pack 24/11 oz. Stubby	Twist Top 32 oz. Quart
			Vanc. Ptld.	Vanc. Ptld.
Blitz	1.38		1.27	.54 .45
Rainier	1.38		1.27	.54 .45
Lucky	1.38		1.27	.54 .45
Olympia	1.38		1.27	.54 .45
Heidelberg ..	1.38		1.27	.54 .45
Budweiser ..	1.48		1.35	.62 .00
Miller	1.48		1.35	.62 .00

Mr. SIMMONS: The brewer to whom I spoke was a fairly hard business man. He did not even offer me a drink while I was with him. He said he was doing fairly well out of returnable bottles: the economics favoured them, because he could get more use out of bottles. I believe, however, he was cheating a little and in some cases was reusing non-returnable bottles. Nevertheless, he gave me the figures and indicated that the returnable bottle was a cheaper packaging device for him than was the non-returnable bottle. That situation is not peculiar to Portland, Oregon.

The member for Stuart gave certain figures in this debate. I can bring those figures up to date. In Adelaide a can containing 370 millilitres of soft drink costs 26¢; a bottle containing 750 ml (twice the quantity) costs 33¢ plus 10¢ for the bottle, so for 33¢ one gets twice the volume one would get in a can costing 26¢. The situation is the same for beer: a 370 ml can costs 40¢ and a 750 ml bottle costs 65¢. There is no reason to believe that reducing the use of cans or non-returnable containers will increase the price of beverages. The second matter contained in Mr. Waggoner's statement is as follows:

This legislation is "picking on" one segment of the litter problem and is unfair and/or will accomplish very little.

Answer: This beverage-related segment of litter represents a large portion of the problem. It is true that other items do contribute significantly to litter. However, it is necessary to start somewhere, and so the largest single identifiable sector was chosen first.

I suggest that is a sound principle on which to attack the problem: it is unnecessary to deal with all litter at the same time. If we can clean up 10 per cent of litter (and I do not accept that figure) we will be getting somewhere. We on this side tried to get a member opposite (I think it was the member for Davenport) to say what that 10 per cent represented. The figure means nothing because he could have been talking in terms of individual items of litter and counting matches, cigarette packets (which will degrade eventually anyway), or counting by volume or weight. None of the evidence I have seen shows that the contribution of cans and drink bottles to total litter is as low as 10 per cent; in fact, there is much information contained in the report prepared for the Erie County in New York State about this matter. For example, on the New York State Thruway the percentage of litter made up of beverage containers was 45 per cent. In Ackland Falls it was 15 per cent to 17 per cent, in Como it was 50 per cent to 60 per cent, and so it continues. On Beaver Island it was 35 per cent to 40 per cent. I am sure that a realistic figure of the amount of litter that is caused by these containers is much more than 10 per cent. It is realistic to deal with something that is appreciably more than 10 per cent. If we could clean that up, we would be making a major contribution and dealing with one aspect of litter that is most difficult to get rid of, because it does not bio-degrade. The steel can takes a long while to rust, and an aluminium can will be there for donkey's years. A non-returnable bottle is also there for a long time. The next matter was, "Consumers demand the convenience of throw-away containers". The answer was that the use of these containers was initiated by bottlers and container manufacturers, because they were more profitable. This stands out a mile in the case of cans. It is more profitable for people to use cans.

Regarding bottles, the glass industry makes many more bottles if they are non-returnable than if they are returnable. Obviously, big business has a vested interest in promoting this convenience packaging. We have heard

some nonsense from members opposite about the energy used in transporting heavier beer bottles to distant country places. Why are they not honest? Why do they not accept that 80 per cent of beer is sold in the Adelaide metropolitan area and that these considerations just do not apply? The document continues, "Vermont tried a ban on non-returnable beer bottles, and it failed". I have already dealt with that. The next is, "The only solutions to littering are education and enforcement", and I have already dealt with that.

I should like now to refer to employment. The member for Davenport tried to make the point that, in introducing this Bill, the Government was unconcerned about its possible effects on unemployment. The spectacle of the Opposition shedding crocodile tears about unemployment is sickening. The only group in this Parliament that is genuinely concerned about the security of employment is the Parliamentary Labor Party. On the one hand, the Opposition says that the Government is embarrassed by the decision of its annual convention and is introducing the Bill solely because of that decision: it alleges that we are dominated by the trade unions. On the other hand, the Opposition says that we, as a Party, are unmindful of the effect of the Bill on employment. Presumably, the trade union representatives at that convention who supported the adoption of the policy were also unmindful of this fact. What a lot of codswallop!

There is no doubt that sales of beverages in cans and non-returnable bottles are likely to decrease, with a consequent fall in demand for their containers. Also, some people on the canning lines will possibly lose their employment. However, extra labour will be used on bottling lines, as more bottles will be filled. There will also be employment at collection depots. At Calgary, Alberta, I saw three of these depots, one of which was staffed by handicapped people, who were doing a worthwhile job sorting these containers. Another was staffed by college students who were raising funds for their tertiary institution and were, in fact, endowing a scholarship on environmental research out of the proceeds. Another one was done privately. They were all doing well, and all employed people. The other is local labour. We have heard much about Port Pirie, but the portability of throw-away cans and stubbies has helped the big metropolitan beverage manufacturers to spread to the country, to the detriment of local manufacturers. I am sure this has happened.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I cannot possibly support the Bill in its present form. To me, it is like signing a blank cheque, because there is so much that is just not explained in it. So much is left to regulation that one must do much guessing. The overall situation has been debated, so I shall restrict my remarks to the large country area that I represent. I suppose I travel not only on metropolitan roads but also on near and far country roads more than do most people in this State. I therefore consider that I am able to give a good judgment on the litter situation.

I have noticed that, since the last time this matter was debated in the House, there has been a considerable improvement in the litter situation on roadsides throughout South Australia. One reads continually these days of schoolchildren conducting litterthons. They are the fashion now, in place of walkathons. I can recall when the latter were first initiated: it was a novelty for people to sponsor walkers at so much a kilometre. Today, children are sponsored at so much a bag of cans, and there is much competition amongst children. The absence of litter on the roads at present is noticeable. This is not a hard

operation to perform. One notices when travelling on our roads that most litter is always within two or three miles of a town, roadhouse, or roadside cafe. As one travels farther on, one sees that the litter tapers off. It is no problem to hold litterthons and clean up most of the litter that is close to towns.

The advent of the can has been a godsend to people in outback areas not only of South Australia but also of Australia. My mind goes back to 1948, when I journeyed by train to Alice Springs and then by coach right through to Darwin. In those days of the steam trains, the carriages were not air-conditioned. It was possible for one to travel with the windows open. All bottles were thrown out of the train, there being a continual line of bottles from Hawker right through to Alice Springs. Now, with the advent of air-conditioned trains, it is impossible to throw litter out of the windows. The permanent way gangs on the railways have undoubtedly collected bottles and buried them, and the absence of litter along the railway lines now, compared to the position 25 years ago, is noticeable. It is also noticeable that there are few soft drink bottles in the North of the State. The can has taken over in the soft drink trade. This is partly because of freight costs and partly because of the initial cost of the bottle and the freight to be paid both ways on it.

Only a fortnight ago, I was speaking to a soft drink manufacturer, who said that it was at present costing him 22¢ a bottle for replacements. Earlier this evening the member for Stuart read a letter and, although I did not hear the first part of it, I understood him to say that the replacement cost was 10¢. I do not know what was the date of that letter, or whether it was a recent or an old one. However, if my information is correct, there is a big discrepancy between the price that I have been quoted by a soft drink manufacturer and the price to which the member for Stuart referred. It is interesting to analyse the freights paid on drinks that are taken to the North of the State. I refer, first, to the township of Oodnadatta: the freight on ale taken there is \$49 a tonne.

Mr. Nankivell: In bottles?

Mr. ALLEN: That is so. I have gone to the trouble of weighing an empty bottle. It takes 1 440 empty bottles to make up a tonne. In other words, we are paying 3.3¢ a bottle to take beer to Oodnadatta. I inquired whether there was any reduction on return freight on the empties, and I was told that there was very little. So, the return freight on those bottles could be at least 3c, the freight up and back therefore being 6c a bottle.

Mr. Venning: Do they return the bottles from up there?

Mr. ALLEN: Under these conditions, they would not be able to. That is why the can has taken over in the North of the State: because of the high freight rates on the return of bottles. If this Bill is passed, and the can is more or less banned, there will be a return to bottles on which, I understand, there is to be no deposit. Only in this morning's press the following report appeared:

The Minister for the Environment (Mr. Broomhill) said last night that beer bottles would not be subject to the 10¢ deposit proposed for containers because the present return rate of beer bottles was greater than bottles which carried deposits.

Even if there was a one cent deposit on the bottle and the hotel was compelled to take back bottles that it had sold, who would lug back 33 empty bottles to buy a schooner of beer or 70 empty bottles to buy a bottle of beer?

Mr. Venning: Members on the other side.

Mr. ALLEN: If they did, they would be working harder than they are now. We would have broken bottles on the roadside, as we had in 1948. The freight on ale taken to Marree is about \$35 a tonne, or about 2.4 cents a bottle. When I first went to Marree, which was in 1971, the whole township was surrounded with rubbish, such as old stoves, water tanks, and car bodies, that had accumulated over 80 years. I gave the Minister a colour photograph that I took, but he told me that he could not do anything about the matter.

I then referred it to the Commonwealth member for Wakefield (Hon. C. R. Kelly), who contacted the Commonwealth Railways, which bulldozed all the rubbish, including the car bodies. Naturally, in that country when much work is done with bulldozers, the dirt becomes powdered. That happened at Marree and I asked whether it would be wise to sow seed, but I was told that nature would take care of the position. There is no rubbish around Marree now, and the country has regenerated. The Commonwealth Railways started the trench system for disposing of rubbish, and now the town is free of litter. What has been done is a credit to those concerned.

When I approached the Minister about a similar position at Oodnadatta, I got a similar reply, but the Commonwealth Railways would not help there. The litter is still lying around that town and the people there do not take the pride that the people of Marree took. Members may have seen on television recently that the town was littered with cans and bottles. The weight of an empty beer bottle is equivalent to the weight of 30 empty aluminium cans, and that is why cans are preferred to bottles in the North.

If this legislation is passed, there will be an influx of cans from across the border. Doubtless, if the Bill is passed, a hotel at Birdsville, several kilometres across the border, will get supplies from Queensland and persons travelling south will buy a supply there and litter them down the Birdsville track. Alice Springs also will get supplies from Queensland and the Stuart Highway will be littered with cans. A similar position could apply in the District of Mallee. That is why I claim that the legislation does not go far enough.

I have always considered that, if the recycling value of cans was increased slightly, there would be few aluminium cans on the road. There are many more steel cans on the side of the road now than there are aluminium cans, because the aluminium cans have a recycling value, particularly in the southern parts of the State. Red Cross is active in collecting aluminium cans and recycling them, but I understand that that organisation is having difficulty at present because of high costs. Despite the fact that local organisations are collecting the cans and delivering them free of charge, the further costs involved result in Red Cross making little profit.

In Queensland at present only .2 per cent of steel cans are being recycled. This is without any deposit, but 17 per cent of aluminium cans are being recycled and, in Brisbane, as many as 28 per cent of aluminium cans are being recycled. Most country councils have adopted the trench system of disposing of litter. I think that anyone who has had experience of it will agree that it is very effective and that it is much better than disposing of it willy-nilly over the countryside.

One question that should be asked about this legislation is who will pay to set up the depot. Another is who will pay the freight from the depot to the factory or to the point of origin. At Oodnadatta, where the return on a

bottle would be 3.3¢ and that on aluminium cans would be quite high, there is first the labour involved in setting up the depot. Will the cans be crushed before they are railed back? Imagine how much the freight would be to send a load of empty cans by rail from Oodnadatta for crushing! It would be colossal. If the cans are crushed before return, who will pay for the crushing?

The member for Elizabeth has said that glass containers are much more economic than cans, but we are used to his not lifting his sights farther than the metropolitan area. He was in Leigh Creek recently trying to revive the local branch of the Australian Labor Party, and he would have realised that there was a far greater problem with cans and bottles in the Far North than in his district.

Mr. Venning: How did he get on up there?

Mr. ALLEN: He did not get on very well with the Secretary of the Trades and Labour Council. The Secretary told me that. That honourable member also said that members on this side had been lobbied, but no-one has lobbied me. The member for Stuart also said that, and I think he will regret saying it if he takes over (under the electoral redistribution Bill) some of the area that I have been speaking about. I am afraid the people in the North will take a dim view of his statement.

The member for Peake referred to the variations in the price of soft drink in cans and in bottles, and the member for Stuart also referred to that matter. That variation could apply in the metropolitan area, but in the country freight must be added to the bottles, and I think that in the North cans are a much better proposition than bottles. They also have the advantage of cooling more quickly. The member for Peake also said that 80 per cent of the beer was drunk in the metropolitan area. Once again, he more or less said that the country people did not matter, that they drank only 20 per cent of the beer, and that it did not matter if their costs were high because of this legislation. This is typical of the attitude taken by the Government. Once again, it is borne out by the member for Peake. The Government is preaching "one vote one value". If that is the case, the country people want to be regarded as citizens equal to those in the metropolitan area. I cannot support the Bill in its present form.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): If this legislation was to ban Cairns and not cans, I would support it. There is not much difference, because they are both fairly empty and they make a big noise when they are rolled around. Most aspects of this debate have been covered, but I first mention education. Despite what members opposite have said this evening, I think that education is having some effect on the littering of this State. I had an experience with my grandson only last week when I walked down our road to pick up the daily paper. He walked with me and said, "Grandpa, here has been a litterbug around here", and he proceeded to pick up the litter. He is a child in grade 1; I believe that, given time, education would have a great effect on handling the litter of this State. When we travel throughout the State, we realise that councils are becoming more aware of the need for receptacles. In country towns like Laura and Wilmington, bins are being provided not only about once a kilometre but also every 100 metres. If these facilities are provided, the people will do the right thing, or their conscience will do it for them. Also, the education of the younger people will have an effect.

If this Bill was passed, what effect would section 92 of the Constitution have on South Australia? I am concerned

that this legislation is quite narrow and that the Government's concern for aspects associated with it is practically nil. Meat industry legislation is soon to be dealt with. That is another indication of a narrow outlook. We talk about the effect of this legislation on labour. Although there has been a crossfire in the Chamber this evening about our attitude to unemployment, if a Liberal Government had been in power, there would not be the unemployment we have today; the situation would have been totally different. Private enterprise would have made progress in that area. Section 92 is, to me, the unknown quantity with respect to this Bill.

With deposits on cans, what will happen to the manufacturers in the other States and their commodities? It has been said this evening that businessmen came from other States to lobby. I am not sure of that, because I did not see any lobbying. Did those people come here to see what they would do as regards their industry in another State and what they would pour into South Australia? What will this Bill do to the industry in our State? I am concerned about the Government's narrow attitude not only to this Bill but to all legislation introduced in this Chamber. True, it talks about setting the pace. It has set the pace all right, from this State being a progressive State to being a State where unemployment is rampant, where the desire to work has gone and where, generally speaking, the pace set has not been good.

Members on this side of the Chamber have realised for some time that it is necessary to do something about the litter in this State, as is the case in all areas of Australia. We believe an on the spot fine is something to be looked at. It would be a much better way of attacking the situation than this unfair attitude to the banning of the can or deposits on cans, singling out one aspect of a container used in this State. As has been mentioned by the member for Frome, who represents a district a long way from the capital city, the can has meant much to the people in those areas. It concerns me that this Government is not concerned about people living in the interior. That is already in evidence in the Government's projected legislation about redistribution of the electoral boundaries. Its interests lie in the metropolitan area, where its votes are, and its concern for outside areas is almost negligible.

I now refer to an article that appeared in the *Stock Journal* this week. It does not deal with this legislation but I should like to mention the attitude of the Commonwealth Labor Government. It is reported by two of the women attending the "Women in Politics" conference in Canberra, when Mrs. Margaret Whitlam, the Prime Minister's wife, said:

According to Mrs. Heading the Prime Minister's wife, Mrs. Margaret Whitlam, typified the initial attitude of many city women at the conference. Asked her reaction to the peculiar problems of country women in isolated areas, she replied: "No, I am not interested. City women have many more problems."

And an adviser to Elizabeth Reid, the Prime Minister's adviser on women's affairs, replied to the catalogue—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see how the honourable member can relate this to the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: I am tying it up to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I cannot see it; the honourable member must get back to the discussion of the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: May I just tie it up with this last sentence:

No, I am not interested. City women have many more problems. And an adviser to Elizabeth Reid, the Prime Minister's adviser on women's affairs, replied to the

catalogue of disadvantages facing rural women. "Well, why don't you just leave the farm—our economy will soon allow us to import our food needs."

That is the attitude of the Labor Government, that it is not concerned with the welfare of the State. It will put forward its philosophy irrespective of the result, as long as it carries out the philosophy of a socialist Government. I oppose the Bill for the reasons mentioned. The situation has been debated this evening and many points have been raised by my colleagues on this side of the House. I hope this Bill in its present form will be defeated.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I was somewhat taken by the well-informed address of the member for Peake. However, one aspect of the debate which he promised to cover at some length, and which he said the member for Elizabeth and the member for Mitcham had already covered adequately, was in fact left untouched by all three of them. I refer to the question of resource conservation. The Conservation Council of South Australia, whose work I admire, has pointed out that one way in which containers take a great deal of energy is in the manufacture of glass or aluminium containers. By comparison, an aluminium container would take about 5.6 tonnes of oil to make one tonne of aluminium, while it takes about five tonnes of oil to make one tonne of glass. They then ignore the aluminium aspect, and talk about non-returnable glass bottles, which use about 4.4 times the amount of energy of returnable bottles.

Going back to the comparisons between aluminium and glass manufacture, the initial comparison is not really fair because one can, after all, make a substantially larger number of aluminium containers from one tonne of aluminium than one can make glass containers from one tonne of glass. We would have to manufacture a considerably larger amount of glass to keep up with the same amount of containers. There is also the matter of what the Government is trying to conserve. This was rather an obscure point. The conservation of natural resources must affect all of us. To make glass, one must have an immediate glass resource; that is, of course, sand. Sand is generally from coastal beaches, because most of our large cities are adjacent to the coast and the glass resources must be near the cities. We are thus denuding the delicate natural balance of coastal beach resources.

This aspect of conservation is being ignored in pressing for the manufacture of glass containers. In Australia we have relatively large quantities of bauxite; we have about 5 000 000 000 tonnes at Weipa. Therefore, there would seem to be relatively less of a problem since we have almost unlimited reserves of our own bauxite, but it must be transported a considerable distance. We must use energy in transport and in manufacture. We have an unlimited amount of steel in Australia, taking our own needs into consideration. We export vast amounts of most of our minerals, and we are left with holes in the ground, not really developing our own industries, and yet we now talk about limiting them still further. Steel is probably one of the most admirable materials because it is degradable; it will rust away and reduce back into the ground.

Mr. Millhouse: How long does that take?

Mr. ALLISON: It depends on the thickness of the can. One aspect which has not been considered is that tinplate is essential if steel containers are to be used effectively. Tin is the one commodity that is in extremely short supply in the world. In about eight years time the world food canning industry will be in more trouble than the early settlers, because there will not be enough tinplate

to coat the inside of the cans. If we are using steel containers for beverages we are being silly, although in the short term any conservation of tinplate will be an ephemeral thing. We will run out of tinplate far too quickly. There are other aspects of glass, plastic, and aluminium; they do not degrade, but remain permanently on the surface. If they are buried, they are likely to be turned up and can cause damage. Plastic, one of the most important alternatives, has been claimed to be carcinogenic (cancer forming), and therefore must be subject to a great deal of research before it is proved suitable for canning a whole host of things. It is a commodity in doubt for containerisation.

One thing which is patently obvious, and for which the solution has not been tackled, is that energy itself is the one thing that will run out before any of the other materials; whether we throw them away or recycle them, the energy consumed in manufacture will run out. It was estimated only 18 months ago that the earth's oil supplies would be gone by about the year 2000, within the lifetime of our children. However, we may be 30 or 40 years out, which will mean it will happen in the lives of our grandchildren. If the Government is sincere, perhaps this is one aspect of research and conservation that could be investigated in the various fields of atomic, solar and hydro energies. This should have been going on for many years, quite apart from the implications of this Bill. Dr. Paul Ehrlich two years ago, in one of the most interesting *Monday Conference* programmes ever recorded, said that it did not matter how optimistic or how pessimistic we were about the world's resources, but with 3 000 000 000 people on earth we could err over our estimates of 20, 30, or 40 years, but within 150 to 200 years everything would be depleted. While we may pay lip service to conservation, what we are trying to conserve and whether it is a short term or a long term is really beside the point. We have far more pressing things to consider.

So much for the natural resources. I find it rather difficult to believe that commercial organisations should have their representatives on Kesab actually belittled by a member of this Parliament. After all, they have interests in keeping South Australia beautiful similar to the interests of members on this side. We assume we are sincere in our motives. The Government obviously does. We do not question the Government's motives, including those of the Government Whip. However, these people have been belaboured (pardon the pun) by the member for Elizabeth, who complains that, although they are on the same board as he is, with the same motives, theirs must be questioned, but his must not. People should be praised and encouraged in taking private unpaid action to reduce littering. One does not get co-operation from people by attacking them in such a way. The Minister called into question one member on my side of the House for the opinion of his city council. My own city council over the past four or five years, since I have been a councillor, has sought Ministerial assistance in increased fines for littering. This has been done. We have also sought methods of disposing of car bodies, tyres, and general litter control. We have been relatively disappointed over the past three or four years, because we had hoped that legislation would have been introduced to control far more than this rather discriminatory Bill does. Although my own motives over the past four or five years have been strongly in favour of the intentions of this Bill, I find it is now introduced at a time when the employment situation is such that industry cannot afford the kind of

setback predicted by manufacturing industries in South Australia.

We supply cans and bottled products not only to this State, but in a wide distribution network to New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria, and the Northern Territory. South Australia is an exporter of cans, and if that industry is whittled down we must then become an importer of cans, and one more profit margin in South Australia will have disappeared. The Bill seems to be discriminatory, forgetting about paper products, plastics, and other forms of loose litter which, we are told in various documents, comprise about 80 per cent of litter outside cans and bottles. I consider this legislation is, in itself, punitive because it punishes people who handle goods of this type. I have no doubt that the Oregon situation will be found to be true in South Australia, because people will stop handling cans. The retailers will make this decision. They will not want to sell goods they themselves must get back in a dirty condition, and spend time and money on when it is non-profitable. The 5¢ and 10¢ are a mere balancing of the ledger. The reduction in Oregon from 40 per cent consumption down to 1 per cent or 2 per cent is still a significant amount, and it has increased to 5 per cent of the consumption with the introduction of the press-top can. I do not think that those statistics can be questioned.

Whatever the implications have been from both sides of the House, I do not think there is much question that unemployment must ensue from the legislation, because we cannot reduce consumption by that amount and not expect to stand some people off, even if only in the interim while other forms of packaging are found. In the present industrial economic climate, I do not think that this is the time to introduce the Bill. I know that my district will suffer somewhat. We already pay more on various bottled commodities from Adelaide because the freight is additional. This is important because cans are considerably lighter and occupy less space on a truck than bottles, which absorb more space, time, energy and fuel in delivery, and freight charges must be higher.

There does not seem to be any provision in the Bill for raising a general anti-litter tax, and I do not think that we should forget that motor vehicle bodies and tyres, which are an intolerable eyesore in many areas, could have a tax placed on them at the time of being sold, and they could be used in regard to recycling. Along the Coorong last week I noticed that for miles and miles paper and cardboard waste plastered the trees and shrubs; the waste had probably blown from the insecurely loaded truck taking paper to Apcel for recycling. Similar problems have occurred in Mount Gambier. Probably more attention to that kind of littering might have helped me to consider the Bill more favourably, but I do not think that the Bill goes far enough. I do not think that the Oregon legislation, which provides a levy of \$150 for each \$1 000 000 on turnover, would be sufficient here, because \$150 for a company turning over \$5 000 000 in South Australia would mean only a \$750 levy, and companies probably give more than that to Kesab, anyway.

An acceptable levy could be arrived at if we entered into discussion with companies and gave them a time limit for phasing out. The cost of setting up 20 collection depots is estimated at \$500 000, together with the necessary running costs, and it has not been ascertained who will pay this money. I assume that the companies, whose turnover will be reduced and whose sales will therefore be less certain, will be asked to spend that sum to establish collection depots. This would mean a further loss to the South Australian companies, which would probably consider going

to other States. An elaborate accounting system would probably be needed even to keep a check on the \$5 000 000 in deposits alone required simply for can returns. I do not know whether provision has been made for that management in the legislation. Much money would be floating around ready to be handed back.

Reading the legislation, I can make only one assumption, namely, that although the intention is ostensibly honourable, it seems to have the immediate result and aim of destroying the can and the non-returnable bottle industry in South Australia, but I do not think that the legislation is an honest way of doing it. If that is the Government's intention it should say so, and everyone would know where they stood and not be put to the expense of changing equipment. The member for Stuart earlier interjected regarding cool drink cans being a rip-off, and being twice as dear as the ordinary bottle. If it is the real object of the legislation to protect the public from itself and from the canners, the Government should say so. The Government should also examine all the other methods of litter control that have been referred to, many of which I would heartily agree with, before the legislation is passed. The Bill is discriminatory but, if it were more comprehensive and fairer to South Australia as regards the other States, I would support it. In the present economic climate, and with potential unemployment one of the ensuing factors, I am unable to support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I oppose the Bill for several reasons. I commend the member for Chaffey for the contribution he made and for clearly outlining the problems with which the industry and the people of South Australia will be confronted. We have seen an interesting exercise from the Government, because we have heard three of the members who obviously are vying for the position on the front bench, namely, the members for Elizabeth, Stuart and Peake. We have not yet heard the member for Playford, but it was obvious by the action of the member for Elizabeth that he is trying to set himself up as the Attorney-General. Because of the disgraceful exhibition in which he engaged this evening, I feel sorry for the people of South Australia if the Labor Party endorses him for that position. He took the opportunity to attack a voluntary organisation which has a proud record and which performs a good service for the State. The member for Elizabeth also attacked free enterprise. Was he trying to gain the left wing support of the Labor Party and of his extreme left wing friends, such as Mr. Scott and other imports, who are wrecking this country? Who was he trying to impress? It was a deplorable attack, under privilege, on people who cannot defend themselves.

Most members have received considerable literature on this subject, and earlier when this matter was being discussed most members no doubt received a submission sent to the Hon. Mr. Broomhill from the South Australian Beverage Packaging and Distributing Liaison Committee. The Minister has either not read the submission, has not understood it, or is not concerned with its contents. It is interesting to read page 4, which contains a quote from the Jordan committee. I remind the member for Elizabeth that it was a Liberal Government that appointed the Jordan committee whose recommendations this Government has used as a basis for its conservation and environment policy. However, in the Bill the Government has departed from the committee's recommendations, but it would be well advised if it were to follow the recommendations. Recommendation No. 1 of the committee's report states:

An extensive education and advertising programme designed to inform the public on the need to stop litter and on the need to recycle all resources.

That has been done only by a voluntary organisation, which the member for Elizabeth has attacked. What has the Government done to establish recycling facilities in South Australia? The Highways Department has taken a positive step by providing receptacles along country roads throughout the State; this should be encouraged, and more should be done in this field. The recommendations continue:

(2) The imposition of penalties on those found discarding bottles and cans except in an acceptable way.

During the last Parliamentary session I took the opportunity to introduce a Bill to provide on-the-spot litter fines, which would have attacked the problem in a positive manner. The Government refused to accept what I believed to have been a proper course of action. The final recommendation is as follows:

(3) The making of all glass and metal cans returnable with an imposition of a deposit.

The Government wants to put the cart before the horse. Of course, if it followed the recommendations of the Jordan committee's report, it would be in a much better position to control the litter problem, which should be of concern to all members. I believe that the Government is treating the problem in isolation. Oversea experience has proved beyond doubt that this measure will be beset with problems. It will cause inconvenience to the community, and unemployment, although the Labor Party is not concerned about unemployment.

We know that because more people are unemployed in Australia than has ever been the case before in the history of this nation. The Labor Party is not concerned about that, and we cannot ask it even to consider the position of unfortunate people who will lose their jobs and who might also lose their houses as a result of the effects of this legislation. Certainly, the member for Elizabeth is not concerned about that. If the Minister wants to take positive action, he should adopt the Washington proposals, as the member for Mount Gambier clearly explained. I oppose the Bill, and I hope that the House will defeat it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): It is a pleasure to most honourable members that this debate is being closed—

Mr. Millhouse: Make it short.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will make it short, and will make only a short reference to the contribution of the honourable member. This has been a dreadful debate to listen to, with the exception of some speeches of members on this side of the House and the member for Mitcham, whose words I agree with but whose motives I doubt on this issue. We have had a situation where members opposite have been completely lacking in any genuine opposition to this Bill. I know that many Opposition members have previously called on the Government to introduce legislation of this nature. They, like many members on this side of the House, have been subjected to the pressure of local government, which is primarily responsible in this field, to support such legislation.

I do not intend to name all of those honourable members, because one of the members on this side of the House has already done so, but the previous Leader of the Opposition (the member for Light), the member for Hanson, and the member for Frome, to name only a few, are members who have publicly in the past called for action such as that included in this legislation. However, when the opportunity

for them to support action is given, as it was 18 months ago and as it is now given this evening, we find that all sorts of problems prevent Opposition members from supporting the Bill. Previously, their main complaint was that the people who would be most affected by the legislation should be given the opportunity to put forward their views to a Select Committee, that Parliament did not know sufficient about their problems.

I claimed then that I believed that members opposite were not sincere at that time, and were trying to delay the matter. When the Bill was dealt with in the Legislative Council that was exactly the tactic adopted. It was not until the members of the Legislative Council were forced to vote on the Bill that they did so. I cannot really be angry with the Opposition: I believe that it has been placed in a position where it has been instructed to adopt the policy that it has adopted this evening. The Leader of the Opposition can smile, but the press reports that the Opposition had a meeting this afternoon at which an instruction went out to its members.

I feel sorry for members opposite, because I know that many of them really want to support this Bill. It was suggested that this would be the last measure that I would be dealing with in this Parliament as a Minister. That is probably a correct assumption, and I am proud to be associated with this Bill. I will be able to look my children, and later my grandchildren, in the eye with some pride in what I have been able to achieve in this Parliament and in the stand that I have taken on measures of this type. I wonder how many members opposite will be able to do the same thing. I should like members opposite to go home and speak to their children about this measure to see whether or not those children support what they are doing this evening in attempting to oppose this Bill, which is of such inestimable value to the community.

I believe that the member for Peake, especially, made a most valuable contribution to this debate. His speech was a classic illustration of the importance of members of Parliament visiting overseas countries. I congratulate him on the interest he has taken in the past in this matter, and the fact that he was willing to devote his time in other countries to looking at similar schemes to that proposed in the Bill. What the honourable member was able to tell us dispels the claims that have been made by opponents of the Bill, who have constantly referred to the Oregon situation as if that were the only other place in the world where similar controls have applied.

As the member for Peake said, this is not the case. In many of the areas throughout the world almost identical controls to those provided in this Bill have operated satisfactorily. There are only one or two matters that I want to touch on, because I know that Opposition members are committed on this matter. I regret this, but I know that that is the position and that I will not be able to convince them by logic. However, I want to correct a few errors. The constant claim which has been made by industry and which has been repeated, parrot fashion, by nearly all Opposition members is that we are dealing only with an isolated problem in looking at the can, and that the can represents only 10 per cent of litter. No member opposite has attempted to show where these figures come from or how accurate they are. I can tell members that the information that has been related to them is taken in specific places at specific times of the year. The surveys used rate a match box, a cigarette packet, a cigarette box, and the cigarette wrapper inside the box each with a value equal to that given to a can. However, in measuring litter by volume, cans represent more than 50

per cent of the total litter throughout South Australia. This false argument, which is so freely presented by members opposite, that we are dealing with only 10 per cent of the litter problem, is completely incorrect. Members opposite have also suggested that, rather than single out this problem, we should tackle all items. This idea sounds all right as an alternative suggestion, but I am certain that all members opposite know that this is not a practical solution to the problem.

First, the State has no power to impose a relevant tax. Secondly, even if the State did impose such a tax, it would be playing right into the hands of the people represented by members opposite, who would love such a situation. The manufacturers of products that could later be classed as litter would relish the opportunity to pay a tax of, say, 5¢ on a can, bottle, carton or whatever the product in the packaging field to the Government so it could be added to their costs to the consumer, so that when anyone criticised their product for being littered throughout the countryside they could wipe their hands of it and say, "It's not our problem; we're paying the Government a tax to pick up that mess." That is the sort of situation that members opposite are agitating for.

They might be interested to know that such a policy, promoted at a recent Environment Ministers conference by a Liberal Minister, was rejected by all other States and the Commonwealth. It therefore seems to me that the South Australian Liberal Party is acting in isolation and expressing views contrary to those being expressed by other Liberal Governments. It is worth repeating the history of this matter. When this legislation was introduced about 18 months ago the packaging industry lobbied all members of Parliament, as they have done on this occasion, too.

Mr. Mathwin: They didn't lobby me.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Perhaps they missed the member for Glenelg because they knew he would go along with whatever the rest of his Party members decided. What they pleaded 18 months ago was, "Give us the opportunity to show the Government what we can do; give us 12 months and we will make inroads into the litter problem so that you will not see a can anywhere in the State. We will undertake all sorts of public relations activities, and we will clean up the State. The can won't be a problem and you won't need this legislation." What has happened since—absolutely nothing. The industry, still speaking through the mouths of members opposite, is trying to suggest that, by some miraculous education programme will clean up the problem. Members opposite know that will not happen, yet they are willing to promote this sort of nonsense using an education programme in this area as if it was a serious means of combating the problem.

Dr. Tonkin: Your Leader thinks it is.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: My Leader believes that education from the viewpoint of the general litter problem will improve the situation. I certainly agree with that, but we need some control in order to clean up all the cans throughout the State. We all know that consumers buy drinks in cans because they are unwilling to buy a returnable bottle, carry it around, and get a refund. As the industry is quick to point out, the can is a convenient container; it is convenient because people can throw it away. I am surprised that all Opposition members oppose this measure. Many of them who have been associated with local government know full well that the Local Government Association and many councils have been calling on the Government to introduce such a measure.

The member for Hanson knows the problems created by cans on beaches in his district. Does he really believe that that problem will be solved simply by opposing this measure. The council in his district will have something to say to him when it learns that he is not willing to support this measure. Several members suggested, in response to the good case made out by the member for Elizabeth on the matter of the use of resources, that it was not an important issue. I do not intend to go into the matter at length but refer members to an article they should read which appeared in the *Environment* and which was written by Bruce Hannon, an Assistant Professor of General Engineering and a staff member of the Centre for Advanced Computation at the University of Illinois, Urbana, about the American situation. He states:

The purchase price of soft drinks in throw-away glass is 30 per cent more than when it is sold in returnable containers.

The member for Peake drew attention to an incredible increase in price the community is currently paying for products in cans, against products in bottles. Professor Hannon continues:

Added to this are litter pick-up, hauling, and land-fill costs paid by the consumer through monthly billings from trash haulers and state and municipal taxes. There are, in addition, the environmental costs of material and energy production paid in terms of health and aesthetic losses such as lung damage from power plant emissions and land strip-mined for coal. Were these costs tabulated and presented to the consumers at the time of purchase, the public would at least know the true cost of packaging convenience and might choose to buy less expensive returnable containers.

On the other hand the packaging people have wedged themselves into the economic web, causing a redistribution of labour. Now labour, as well as the packaging industry, is opposed to a reduction in the volume of throw-away containers. One wonders if a reduction in the use of the earth's capital supplies of fuels for the production of energy might actually mean an increase in the need for human energy and consequently fuller employment. Indeed, Professor Hugh Folk has studied the effects of a conversion of the beverage container system to returnables in Illinois and found a net increase of 6 500 jobs.

I will not pursue that matter in depth, except to say that, when we have given replies in this place about the likely loss of employment in the can manufacturing industry and the redistribution of those employees in other fields of bottle handling, those replies have been disputed by members opposite. Professor Hannon's article contains useful information on the energy situation. Claims have been made constantly during this debate about the Jordan report. Some members have suggested that the Government has acted contrary to that report by introducing this measure. I suggest that that is not the case. The Secretary of the Town and Country Planning Association (SA) Incorporated, Mr. John Coulter, wrote to me about this matter and stated (I will not refer to all the letter for the purpose of dealing with this matter):

In part answer to the report to you prepared by the SA Beverage Packaging and Distributing Liaison Committee, we would point out that:

1. The Jordan Committee report has been misrepresented. Section 6.2 draws particular attention to the casual relationship between expansion of the packaging industry and the increase in litter. This section is conveniently ignored. In the specific recommendations, recommendation 25 points out that "a guiding principle in all waste collection should be re-use of resources", and recommendation 26 specifically states that "action should be taken to prevent the packaging industry from wasting resources and adding to the refuse problem..."

2. The SABPDL has only considered the litter aspect of the problem and has ignored the resource use aspect to which repeated attention is drawn in the Jordan report.

3. Because of the need to husband and not waste resources, particularly energy, the phasing out of metal cans completely should be seen as the goal. If metal cans cannot compete economically when a deposit is placed on them, this should be seen as a good thing.

They are not my words, but words used by others in reply to criticism from members opposite when referring to the Jordan report. I suggest that that matter should be given some weight.

Mr. Mathwin: What does it say about beer bottles?

[Midnight]

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There is nothing about that matter in the report. I have received from the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated a letter that I believe should be referred to because the author of it was a member of the Jordan committee. It states:

Sectional groups are putting up strong resistance to the passage of the current Beverage Container Bill which aims to save scarce resources and reduce littering by imposing compulsory refundable deposits on drink containers. My council, 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 final paragraph of the letter states:

The logic of these arguments is so convincing, and the pros for this legislation so outweigh the cons, that we believe the passage of the Bill to be essential.

That summarises my arguments on what the Opposition has put in regard to the Jordan report setting down a standard that this Government is not following. I believe that we are quickly reaching the stage where, with the growth in the sale of the can, if we do not take action of this kind we will be in a similar position to that which exists in many States of America where, once the sales of the product in the can reach 50 per cent, the alternative, the returnable container, is withdrawn from the market and the community is left with no choice. The problems connected with that can be immense. I appeal to members to reconsider the arguments that they have put this evening when they are voting on this matter. In the light of the way that this legislation has proceeded, I move:

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

The SPEAKER: 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. Is it seconded?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye", against say "No". I hear no dissentient voice and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL moved:

That the Speaker do count the House and declare whether or not the questions for the second or third readings of this Bill be carried and, if so, whether or not by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question: "That this Bill be now read a second time". For the question say "Aye", against say "No". I hear no dissentient voice and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the second reading is agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: I declare the second reading of this Bill to have been passed by an absolute majority.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

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

The SPEAKER: 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. Is it seconded?

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Mitcham, and I point out to the honourable member that the debate that he is now engaged in is in a very narrow field and that he must give only the reasons why he is moving to suspend. Could I ask the gentlemen on my right to cease this loud personal chatter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I need a suspension of Standing Orders so that I can move an instruction on, I think, only one point, although the contingent notice I gave at the beginning of the sittings today concerned two. I think that I do not need an instruction on the question of the amount of the deposit but, because the Bill has reached this stage today, I cannot move my contingent notice without a suspension of Standing Orders. That is briefly the procedural reason why I desire the suspension.

I think I can canvass one matter in that limited narrow compass you, Sir, have emphasised again this evening. First, the matter for which I strictly need the suspension concerns the provision of what I can loosely call on-the-spot fines. I said in the second reading debate that I believed that one of the arguments of those opposed to the Bill that had substance was that we were attacking the problem at the wrong end by doing something about the litter rather than about the litterer. My amendments are designed to answer that argument and ensure that, at the same time as we do something about the litter, we do something about the litterer as well by providing for fines for litter when they consist of bottles or any containers, and for an expiation fee so the matter can be cleaned up on the spot. I think there should be no objection to that matter.

The other matter contained in the contingent notice concerns what I regard as a quite vital matter, that is, that one uniform deposit should be fixed for all sorts of container and all sorts of beverage. I have in mind, of course, most particularly beer bottles, although they are not the only ones that would be caught by this.

Mr. Jennings: Milk, too?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Milk, too. I say that, in my view and that of members of my Party, it is essential that these two matters should be included in the Bill if it is to pass this Parliament. I do not believe it will pass without these matters having been included. Therefore, it is up to the Government. If the Government really wants the Bill (and the Minister has made a speech about it this evening), it will accept my motion for suspension and accept these amendments. Then, I can tell the Minister, the Bill will pass as far as the Liberal Movement is concerned but, if he does not accept those things, he runs the grave risk of losing the Bill. It is up to him and his colleagues in the Government whether they want the Bill or do not want it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): The Government is not prepared to grant the honourable member the latitude he wishes. I do not intend at this time to canvass in any way the merits or demerits of the honourable member's proposed amendments, but I intend to point out this Government introduced identical legislation before the most recent State election.

That Bill passed in the form of the Bill we are now considering, and it was sent to another place.

Since then we have had a State election, and this measure was given much prominence in the policy speech and in the material that was freely made available to the community as the environmental policy of this Government. The introduction of this measure in the form now before us was the No. 1 issue on that platform. The Government intends that the legislation should be considered in this Chamber and voted strictly in accordance with the terms of that earlier measure and the one we are now considering for the purpose of proceeding to another place in an identical form and providing the Government with the opportunity of a double dissolution issue being involved in this matter. Accordingly, whatever the merits or demerits of this amendment or indeed an amendment moved by any other member, the Government is determined that this Bill shall leave the House in its present form. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER: The motion is that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the honourable member for Mitcham to move a motion for an instruction without notice. For the question say "Aye", against "No". There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill (teller), and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Nankivell. No—Mr. Hopgood.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. ARNOLD: I do not intend to proceed with the amendments standing in my name.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have more faith in my amendments, and I propose to go on with them because I think they are good. I move:

In the definition of "refund amount" to strike out "in relation to a container of a class, kind or description".

I mentioned the purport of these amendments when seeking an instruction, although I said then that technically I thought I did not need an instruction for them because they were amendments to a clause of the Bill, anyway. I will take this as a test amendment. The purport of the set of amendments is to ensure that the Minister may set, by regulation, a minimum deposit for all sorts of container. There will be no bar to a higher deposit being fixed by an industry, if it wants to, and it will then be outside the ambit of the Act; but there will be a uniform minimum deposit, which the Minister can make what he likes—2¢, 5¢, or 10¢—below which the deposit cannot fall. My purpose is to ensure that we catch beer bottles and beer cans in the same way as we catch Coca-Cola cans and soft drink bottles. There is to be one deposit for the lot.

Much was said, during the debate, about beer bottles. I think one member referred to the description of Sir Edric Bastyan, who I think called it "the great Australian daisy", or he may have said "brown", but we certainly all know of the numbers of beer bottles that are chucked out of cars, trains and whatever moves along the roadway, and are left on the roadways, beaches, and so on. It is absurd for the Government not to want to catch these in the same way as cans are caught. The Minister has said, both publicly and privately to me, that only a small proportion of beer bottles does not find its way back under the present system, and that therefore it is unnecessary to do this. The fallacy of that argument, as he well knows, is that the total number of beer bottles is so colossal that 10 per cent is a very large number in itself, and it is that large number, even if it is only 10 per cent of the total, which causes the litter. That argument falls to the ground.

I make the point very strongly that, if we destroy the can industry, as this Bill may well do (the industry claims it will and I am not at all convinced that it will not), we will immediately increase the number of bottles. The Minister has said so. We will get back to the position we can all remember from a few years ago when there was much more broken glass lying around, especially at the beaches. We will have the menace of injury from broken glass as well as a comparable litter problem and the comparable aesthetic problem that we have now from cans. If we cut down the usage of cans we will see an increase in the usage of glass containers, which will be left lying about where the cans are now lying about. They will be not only an eyesore but a danger, and we should discourage this as best we can. The best way is by ensuring that there is a significant deposit on beer bottles in the same way as the Minister intends to place a significant deposit on cans. The only way I can do that in this Bill is by ensuring that it is at least the same deposit on the whole lot. I quoted during the second reading debate from the submission of the Nature Conservation Society. The Minister has some regard for the views of the society, which he quoted on another matter. This is what the society says about the Bill:

Basically, we criticize the proposed South Australian legislation on the ground that the minimum deposit (5¢) for general beverage containers is inadequate.

I do not propose to interfere with his discretion to put on it whatever he likes, and I believe he is going to put 10¢ on it. That will meet this objection. The submission continues:

That this is true is clearly borne out by the Oregon situation where bottlers are in many cases charging 10¢ a bottle and, in some cases, 20¢ to ensure a satisfactory return rate.

This is the point I make now most strongly:

A 2¢ deposit on a beer bottle—

and I know that is what the Minister had in mind—and, we suggest, farcical. Should the proposed legislation be enacted, it is our belief that the canned beer market would revert to a bottler's market, with, bearing in mind the proposed next to meaningless (by 1974 standards) deposit, consequent increase in the problem of broken glass. In short, we argue for the highest deposits being placed on beer bottles, no matter how politically unpopular that may be.

That sums up my argument, and I use the Minister's technique: those are not my words but the words of a group for whom the Minister says he has a regard. I hope that, even if the Minister and the Government have dug in their toes tonight, they will have second thoughts later. As I said in seeking the instruction which was denied to me through the Minister's action, unless he is prepared to accept this, he risks very gravely losing the

whole Bill. I say this not for myself alone but for my Party. We are represented in both Houses and, while we may not have a decisive voice here, we have it in the other place. The Minister risks losing the Bill if he does not accept this amendment. I have given him good authority for it if he does not want to accept mine. Unless he is prepared to tackle the problem by expanding the measure to take in beer bottles, it is hardly worth doing this at all, and it is being grossly unfair to one section of the beverage packaging industry. I have given the Minister fair warning of the consequences that may follow if he will not accept this as well as the other amendment on which I have been defeated regarding on-the-spot fines.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) : I do not intend to reply to the points of debate other than to tell the honourable member that I do not intend to accept his amendment, for the reasons I gave when it became necessary for me to decline to give him an opportunity to suspend Standing Orders. I pointed out that I was not in a position to accept any amendment to the measure, irrespective of what it might be, and that I did not intend to canvass the merits (or the obvious demerits) of the amendment, which is not acceptable.

Mr. ARNOLD: I support the amendment largely because it sets out to achieve precisely what was in the amendments I withdrew earlier. There is little difference in the approach adopted by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. EVANS: I strongly support the amendment. If there is to be a deposit, it should be similar on all containers. I do not believe the community can support any other attitude. The Government is attempting to declare this a vital issue. The Minister has said he will not accept amendments because they will vary the Bill. There is to be no argument on the basis of right or wrong. How does the Minister get the Bill into such a category when the Premier said last night on radio that it was not in that category? There is no reason why the Minister will not debate it except that he wishes to corner the Speaker in the House when it comes to a final vote, to try to put a man in a situation which will attempt to stop him carrying out what he should do, quite clearly, on his own conscience. He bucked the Party once before, and I hope he has the courage to do it again. There is no justice in imposing a deposit on one type of container and not on another. The deposit is to be on the non-returnable bottle and the can, but not on the 750 ml beer bottle. Why should that be so? The member for Mitcham is right, and so is the Conservation Council. The beer can will go off the market and more glass containers will be around. Irresponsible people will throw away any container, without considering the deposit. If a can is thrown from a moving vehicle and hits the ground, it may still be in one piece, but the same would not happen to a beer bottle. There is no common sense in saying that the deposit should not apply to a beer bottle. As regards those people who will lose their jobs in the can industry, how can we justify saying to the other section of the industry that there will be no deposit on beer bottles? It is shameful of the Government to attempt to corner a certain person on a vote like this as a result of the Minister's action. The Minister will not even answer the arguments with regard to the amendment, but has said, "We don't want the Bill varied when it goes from here." He is concerned only with Party politics, and is unwilling to debate the issue.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The public has approved this measure.

Mr. EVANS: The public has not approved any issue in isolation, and the Minister knows that. No person or

group of people in the community would vote for any political Party's policy *in toto*, and the Minister cannot say that this issue has total majority public support. The average person in the street probably does not understand the implications of the measure, and I am amazed that the Minister is trying to make this a vital issue and is refusing to discuss the merits or demerits of the amendment. I support the amendment.

Mr. MATHWIN: I, too, support the amendment, because a deposit on beer bottles would be a good thing. The Minister would well recall the situation along our beaches with broken bottles, particularly the large beer bottle. If cans are almost completely cut out, people will take beer bottles to the beaches and, if they do not break them, the larrikin element or young children will break them, thus creating an even bigger problem on our beaches. In replying, the Minister skirted around the subject of the beer bottle and refused to answer by interjection what would happen to it. The Minister has no doubt been instructed by the Premier that this is a special Bill, one on which the Government will stand or fall. The Government's intention is no doubt to test how far it can take the Speaker, and the Government should be condemned for doing such a thing. Surely if the Minister is sincere, he must extend the deposit to all containers.

The Committee divided on the amendment;

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill (teller), and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Gunn. No—Mr. Hopgood.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes; there being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes. Therefore, the amendment passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 5—"Appointed day."

Mr. COUMBE: It is only fair that the Minister say when it is likely that the appointed day will be. This factor affects retailers, wholesalers and consumers.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member will recall that when this Bill was before Parliament on the last occasion we intended to allow 12 months for retailers and the industry to provide for the necessary changes. However, in the light of the situation in this present year and the period when the legislation was likely to be passed, if we left it for 12 months we would be making a change when the summer production of drinks was under way. Accordingly, to overcome this problem and to ensure that every opportunity is given for a proper and smooth changeover, it is contemplated that the operation date will be mid-1977.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 17) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTRY)

Returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.59 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 1, at 2 p.m.