

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 25, 1971

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH-EAST RENTALS

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I seek leave of the Council to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I thank the Council for giving me this opportunity of making this statement, because it is important—important enough to make it now. It is important in view of the motion about zone 5 rentals moved earlier this year in this Chamber.

Following extensive investigations and discussions with Commonwealth authorities and the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair), I placed proposals with which the Commonwealth is prepared to agree before representatives of these settlers. Messrs. C. V. Matthews and W. G. Snodgrass together with Sir Thomas Eastick, Chairman of the 1963 inquiry committee, were present at the conference. These proposals were drawn up to provide equitable treatment for all settlers in zone 5 and represented a reduction of between 35 per cent and 40 per cent in the rentals originally notified.

After discussion of the Commonwealth proposal and in consideration of certain views expressed by settlers' representatives, I indicated that the Government was prepared to go beyond the Commonwealth proposition to the extent that it would implement the recommendations, as to rents, submitted by the Eastick committee in 1963. I placed before the settlers two alternatives that would give effect to the Eastick committee's recommendations. The first alternative gives precise effect to the Eastick committee's recommendations, and the second provides for more equitable rentals as between all of the settlers in zone 5. The effect of the two proposals in total is similar but there are variations as between settlers in the second alternative.

I understand that the representatives will place these proposals before other members as soon as possible and that I will be advised of their views. Until such time as these views are available, no further action is contemplated. The proposals submitted will involve the Commonwealth and the State in a write-off of approximately \$1,300,000 and the cost to the State of proceeding beyond the point at which

the Commonwealth has indicated agreement would involve the State in additional expenditure of about \$106,000.

QUESTIONS**ABATTOIRS**

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain for me an estimate of the cost to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board of the increased annual leave and sick leave benefits of its employees? Also, will he ascertain whether the Government will assist financially to offset these increased expenses so that killing charges will not increase?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain that information for the honourable member and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

ATHELSTONE HEIGHTS SEWERAGE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Representations have been made to me on behalf of a group of residents in Athelstone Heights, where sewerage is at present being installed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It appears that six houses (four in Kirkvue Road, one in Lymn Avenue and one on the corner of Lymn Avenue and Gorge Road) are not included in the present plans to sewer this area. The owners of the houses on these allotments are concerned about this matter. Will the Minister therefore ascertain from his colleague whether these six houses are not going to be sewered in the present project and, if so, why, and whether it is too late for special consideration to be given to this matter so that sewerage might be connected to these six houses?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, and when a reply is received I will give it to the honourable member.

BICYCLES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 10 regarding bicycle riders?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Roads and Transport reports that, although detailed statistics on the use of the bicycle are not available, it would seem that increasing use is being made of this form of transport. The

Road Safety Council is conscious of the need to make the motoring public aware that a good deal of caution needs to be exercised when cyclists are using the road, and this is stressed by the council in its various campaigns. In addition, as part of the road safety syllabus for primary and secondary school students, special attention is drawn to the cyclist's responsibility on the road.

GLENELG ACCIDENTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On August 17 an accident occurred in Dunbar Terrace, East Glenelg, when a motor vehicle apparently went through barricades and finished up in the concrete-banked Sturt Creek. It was reported in the press that nearby residents had expressed concern about the dangerous situation that existed there, one of whom indicated that several near misses occur at this danger point each week. One resident was reported as saying, "This is a real death trap: somebody is going to be killed there one day. We average two or three near misses a week." Will the Minister ascertain whether any action has been taken, or whether any plans are proposed, in regard to making this particular point safer than it is at present and, if this action has been taken, will he supply me with details of such plans?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the question to my colleague and obtain a reply as soon as it is available.

TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Last year it was several months after the country zones telephone directories were available that they finally found their way to honourable members' rooms. The 1971 edition of the country zones directories has been available in country areas for some time, but honourable members still have the 1970 edition. Will you, Sir, try to have the current edition made available to honourable members?

The PRESIDENT: I will certainly look into the question and make these books available to honourable members when they are delivered, but first I will ascertain whether there has been any delay in delivery.

ATOMIC FALL-OUT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a complex question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My question refers to the atomic explosions that have occurred in the Pacific area. I believe that, two weeks after the first explosion in the French Pacific Ocean testing ground, the radio-active material contained in rain falling in the Adelaide area rose from one *pico curie* a litre to 583 *pico curies* a litre.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What's a *pico curie*?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is a form of measurement of radio-activity. As a matter of fact, one would have assumed that, as this matter directly concerns agriculture, the Minister would have known what it meant. However, as the upper limit set by international convention is 1,000 *pico curies* a litre, will the Minister of Health ascertain whether his department adopts any testing of water in the Adelaide reservoirs and, if it does not, will it do so? If it does, can he say what is the level of radio-active material in Adelaide's water supply at present?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Naturally, honourable members would hardly expect me to know immediately the full answer to that question. However, I do know that some tests on water are made by either the Public Health Department or the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I will refer this matter to the Director-General of Public Health, have inquiries made, and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

SOUTH-EAST WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained from the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about South-East water supplies?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague reports:

The salinity readings were taken upstream of a drop weir some 2½ miles from the drain outlet and would not have been influenced by tidal action. The readings referred to by the honourable member were obtained from electrical conductivity measurements which are converted to equivalent salinity level in terms of total salt content, but the technique does not distinguish the various chemical constituents. I have with me, however, a table which I will make available to the honourable member, with the results of full chemical analysis carried out on two samples taken from the drain in May, 1971. So far as the effect of the saline

water on health is concerned, the upper salinity levels for various classes of livestock are:

Class of Livestock	Upper Limit of total salt (p.p.m.)
Poultry.....	3,000
Pigs.....	3,000
Horses.....	7,000
Cattle—	
Dairy.....	7,000
Beef.....	10,000
Sheep—	
Adult, on dry feed . . .	13,000
Adult, on green grass . .	18,000

Source—"Quality Aspects of Farm Water Supplies"—Australian Water Resources Council.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Will the Minister now agree that South-East water has very little potential use for Adelaide, if the information given by him is correct?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not an expert in this field, which is a matter for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. If the honourable member directs a question along those lines, I shall be happy to obtain a reply for him.

SOUTH-EAST RENTALS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister of Lands say whether the proposed write-off of \$1,300,000 referred to in his Ministerial statement on zone 5 is on a ratio of three-fifths to two-fifths, Commonwealth to State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 860.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I oppose the Bill. I have been a member of this Council for a longer time than have most other honourable members, and the Leader's second reading explanation was possibly the shortest one I have ever heard here. Further, I regret to say that it was not entirely factual. In his explanation the Leader said:

One of the principles that this Council has always fought vigorously to maintain is the right of any person to decide for himself or herself whether to vote or not to vote at any election.

In making that statement, if the Leader had said "most honourable members" instead of "this Council", I would have agreed with him.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Perhaps I should have said "in the opinion of this Council".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Because the Leader said "this Council", he included Labor

Party members in his statement, but the principle he referred to is not one to which I subscribe. If I had made that kind of inexact statement 15 or 16 honourable members—not one—would have had a go at me. I think I know why this Bill was introduced, but I will not go into that. I know, too, that it was introduced in the knowledge that it has no hope of being passed in another place.

I believe in the system by which members in another House are elected, and I believe in the system by which the Commonwealth Parliament is elected, namely, compulsory voting. It is all very well to say that elections for the different Houses should be held on separate days, but it is only in recent years in the Commonwealth sphere that we have had Senate elections on one day and House of Representative elections on another. For many years both elections were held on the same day, and the people of Australia were happy about it. Any complaints I receive from the various people I discuss the matter with are that we have too many elections. If the Liberal and Country League members in this Council and in South Australia want to overcome this impossible position of the voluntary vote and the restricted franchise, a very real basis for negotiation is for the one roll and one election. If they want to insist on this Council's holding an election on a different day from the election for another place, provided the same roll was used there could be room for compromise. However, while those who have intend to hold what they have, we will never get over the impasse.

If members of this Council and members of the Party which believes in this are going to have restricted franchise, and if voting is to be on a voluntary basis, then the impasse will remain as long as this place remains unless there is a revolt by the people. I have said this before, and I have been accused of stirring public opinion. I sincerely believe that this place will have to change its attitude at some time in the future because of the weight of public opinion. If we should have a future election relating to the dissolution of both Houses, I believe the supporters of this Bill in the Council would lose, because I am fairly convinced that the majority of people in this State (and I talk to hundreds) want one roll with one vote, similar to the way in which members are elected to the Commonwealth Parliament.

I leave it at that. As I have said, I think I know why the Bill was introduced. It has no hope of surviving. I say no more except to

reiterate the principles for which I stand with-out equivocation, and I hope the Bill will be defeated.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I oppose the Bill, and I agree with the Chief Secretary that much has been left to the imagination as to why it was introduced. The Leader has given us no information in that regard. I agree, too, with the remarks of the Chief Secretary in so ably pointing out that this Council has not supported the principle that every person may decide for himself or herself whether to vote at any election. The honourable Leader, in presenting his second reading explanation (which the Chief Secretary says was one of the shortest on record), did not even give a reason why there should be voluntary voting for the House of Assembly. In fact, this Council has nothing to do with how elections are conducted for the other place. We have been told repeatedly that the Council would not interfere with something that was a matter for the House of Assembly. Time and time again the Leader has said, "If this is what the Assembly wants, it can have it as far as it affects only that House."

As this Bill affects only the House of Assembly, this Council should not be meddling with it at all. It is true that the Leader mentioned the word "Council" but he did not say anything about his Party's policy, because he does not know what it is in this regard (neither does anyone else) as a result of a conference that was held behind locked doors, where the matter of voting arose. Nobody knows what came out of that conference. We have had several different reports. If L.C.L. members were to open their conferences, as my Party does, to the press, perhaps the public would know what was going on and the locksmiths would not be kept so busy having to fix the locks so that people could not get out or so that the press could not get in to know what was going on at the conference.

There is much we have to guess at about why this Council should be so concerned about voluntary voting for the Assembly. There has been no move from that House to introduce voluntary voting. What is wrong with compulsory voting? I have always understood that a democratic Government is a Government elected of the people, by the people, for the people. What does "by the people" mean? Does it mean that only a handful of people should elect the Government, or does it mean that all the people should elect the Government? If the Government is to be elected by all the

people, then all the people should have a say in what their Government is going to be. It may be of interest to honourable members to know that Commonwealth elections were once held on a system of voluntary voting, but that was changed in 1922, when the last Commonwealth election was held on a voluntary voting basis. That election resulted in a 59 per cent poll. Since then, 49 years has elapsed, and the Commonwealth people are satisfied with compulsory voting, not only for the Lower House but also for the Senate.

Also, it is nearly 30 years since compulsory voting was introduced into this State. There has been no vigorous move by this Council over those years to alter the basis of voting. The Leader did not even tell us when the last attempt was made. As I say, the last Commonwealth election on the basis of voluntary voting was in 1922, and it resulted in only a 59 per cent poll. Since then, with the advent of compulsory voting, the percentage has risen to over a 90 per cent poll. It is Government of the people, by the people, for the people, when a 90 per cent poll is achieved. It is recorded that, at the time of the introduction of compulsory voting, its opponents said that it would lead to a much higher percentage of informal voting, as well as widespread corruption and irresponsibility. None of that has come about. We have had better government as a result of compulsory voting. Under voluntary voting, the percentage of informal voting has reached as high a figure as that under compulsory voting, and electoral corruption certainly has not decreased. Prosecutions for electoral offences of this type are very rare. We know that electoral corruption may be greater under voluntary voting than it is under compulsory voting because, for instance, if somebody knows that Billy Jones is in another State while an election is taking place, and if he wants to impersonate him at the polls, he can easily do so with very little chance of people finding out where Billy Jones was on the day in question. Billy Jones could delegate his powers to somebody to go along and vote for him. Surely that is not the sort of thing the Leader wants to happen throughout the State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That can still happen under compulsory voting.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It can, but it is not so possible that it will happen in those circumstances, and the Leader knows that that is so. He knows that, when a person is compelled to vote, he makes sure that his name is crossed off the roll; that happens in

nine cases out of 10. So a person goes along to vote. Under the other system of voting, it would not matter to the person visiting another State whether or not his name was crossed off the roll. The Leader could go up to him and say, "Let me exercise your vote." It would not matter whether or not he exercised that man's vote: that man would not be prosecuted for not having exercised his vote, but at least the Leader could have done something corrupt in the election.

The only people who claim that electoral irresponsibility has increased as a result of compulsory voting are those who have been defeated at the polls. The Leader knows this, for he has come up against this sort of thing under compulsory voting on occasions. He thinks that the people acted irresponsibly because they voted compulsorily and he did not receive the required number of votes to be elected. Of course, the person elected would claim that the electorate acted responsibly.

As I have said, compulsory voting was introduced for the Commonwealth elections and none of those predictions came true. What does the Leader want? Yesterday, the Chief Secretary gave us figures of the percentage voting in polls at by-elections as a result of voluntary voting for the Legislative Council. In 1961, in a by-election for Central District No. 1, there was a 7.32 per cent poll, yet an honourable member gets up in this Chamber and claims he is representing the people in his district; he claims that he was elected by the people for the district. In Midland District in 1962 there was a 43.38 per cent poll, yet the members for Midland have the audacity to tell us that they were elected by the people for the district. They had been elected by only less than 44 per cent of the people going to the poll. If they received 51 per cent of those votes, they were elected by only 22 per cent of the people, not within the district but on the roll, which in 1962 was only about 48 per cent of the people in the district, anyway. So that made it a fairly low percentage of the votes on which those members were elected to the Council in 1962.

The Hon. C. R. Story: But they have done a fairly good job.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The people were responsible on that occasion when they elected the members for Midland, just as they did a remarkable job in electing the members for Central No. 1, where only 7 per cent of 48 per cent of the people in the district voted.

Those people who voted showed excellent judgment.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What about the shopping hours referendum?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That has nothing to do with this Bill. The Hon. Mr. Cameron should be able to see that for himself. Perhaps he has not read the Bill or has no intention of sticking up for what he said when he was fighting to gain a seat for the Southern District. Let him get up and say that people misquoted him when he said he was going to do all sorts of things for a democratic Government. We have heard very little from the honourable member regarding his attitude on this matter.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: We've heard plenty from you, though.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course you have, and it is all good material, too. What I have said I have said only in this place: I have not run to the press and said what I was going to do to turn this place upside down. In the 1965 by-election for Central No. 2 District, 43.71 per cent of the 48 per cent of people on the roll voted. In Northern District, a by-election was held in 1966, when the Hon. Mr. Whyte was elected. Although one could not meet a nicer chap, he has no democratic instincts about wanting compulsory voting, because it suited him to be elected to this place on a poll of about 24 per cent of the people who were on the roll, which represented about only 55 per cent of those who would have been eligible to vote had there been only one roll.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: He's still a nice man.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, but he has no idea how a democratic Government should be elected. However, that does not detract from his nice personality. It would not have mattered had he not voted with the Labor Party members, as we would have got only six, anyway. There are two Hall "yes" men in this Council, and the others follow the Leader here. The Hon. Mr. Russack was elected in 1970 as the member representing the Midland District. He is another nice gentleman, who has blushed ever since he has been here. Indeed, he is still doing so because only 39 per cent of the people elected him to this Council on September 12 last year.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: What sort of a poll was it that elected you?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It was a short-horn poll that elected the honourable member; there is no doubt about that. I will

tell the honourable member what sort of a poll I got: I was elected in a poll at which 80 per cent of the people on the roll voted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And they thought so much of you that they gave you a two years' extension without your having to go back.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, after I was originally elected on an 80 per cent poll. However, the Hon. Mr. Cameron was elected by only a 32.14 per cent poll.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I got 66 per cent of those.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member got two-thirds of that, although the other candidate was associated with the Liberal and Country Party, anyway. He ran just to make the election look above board. However, even with the assistance of the other candidate, the honourable member was still elected with only a 32.14 per cent poll. I suppose he should be proud of that achievement. If the Country Party was able to get 33 per cent of the poll that was conducted on July 3, Lord help Mr. Cameron had the Labor Party put up a candidate: that honourable gentleman would not be here today had that happened. The Leader of the Opposition seems to think that the Government should be elected in accordance with weather conditions obtaining on poll days. He knows that, if there is hail and snow on election day, the people will not come out to vote unless cars are provided for them, and which Party has all the necessary finance to enable it to take the electors to the polls in motor vehicles? Everyone knows that the finance is on the Opposition benches.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Most of them have two cars, anyway.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and servants who would drive them and whom they could employ on election days to take people to the polls. The wealthy members (the graziers, landowners and doctors) opposite have the money tied up between them, and they will make their cars available to take people to the polls on election days, no matter what the weather is like. Is it any wonder that (as I am given to understand) these people have taken an option on taxis to be at the gates of the Adelaide Oval on grand final day to take to the polls the people they know will support them? They want voluntary voting, not because they want a democratic Government by the people and for the people but because they want to be elected to Government by between 7 per cent and 46 per cent of the people. They realize fully that people will be influenced

regarding whether they will vote not only by the weather but also by whether a football final or a cricket test is being played on the day in question.

What is the position regarding voluntary voting in local government polls? What sort of polls have been obtained in this respect, and are members opposite satisfied with those polls? On the polls held on July 3 last, the results of which were published in the *Advertiser* on July 5, the poll in the Brighton area ranged from 12 per cent to 17 per cent.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Is this local government?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and where there is voluntary voting, which is the sort of thing honourable members opposite want. They want a poll of from 7 per cent to 40 per cent to elect the Government, which must control every man, woman and child in this State. Members opposite would be happy with a poll of that magnitude. Is it reasonable for a Government to be elected as a result of the type of weather obtaining on a Saturday afternoon or on the whims of the people, who cannot decide whether they will come out to vote? Of course, that is not the way a Government should be elected, as members opposite well know. Why have they introduced this Bill: because they know that, the smaller poll they can get, the better it will be for them. If they get a 5 per cent, a 12 per cent or a 40 per cent poll, they know that they can make their cars available to get people to the polls. They know they can buy those votes. Of course, not only do they have a car available for these people but they also have a glass of beer and sandwiches for them, too. This is the sort of thing that the Leader of the Opposition wants. Talk about corruption at the poll! Of course, this must lead to corruption in the election of a Government. At the last Burnside council election there was a 16.9 per cent poll, and in Campbelltown there was a 9.9 per cent poll. Is there any reason why these figures would be any higher for a Government election? Of course there is not, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition wants to introduce a Bill to provide for voluntary voting.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Have you got the figures for when the Hon. Mr. Kneebone was elected?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have already quoted them. I have nothing to hide. He was elected on a 7 per cent poll.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And one of his best supporters was the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: All the nice men seem to be elected on the smallest vote.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not know about that, as I was elected on an 80 per cent poll, despite the honourable member's having told me time and time again what a nice person I am.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Where is local government mentioned in this Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Voluntary voting is mentioned in this Bill. We had a round-the-world trip by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris when speaking in another debate, when he did not mention a word about the Bill being debated. Under voluntary voting, there was a 45.7 per cent poll for the East Torrens council election. That is more like it, and more like the figures at Elizabeth where there was an 18.29 per cent poll. At Enfield there was a 5.4 per cent poll, and this is the sort of figure the Leader hopes to have in a general election under voluntary voting.

In another ward at Enfield it was a 10.6 per cent poll; at Henley and Grange it was 34.4 per cent; at Hindmarsh 21.2 per cent; at Marion it was 21.7 per cent in one ward, 10.14 per cent in another and 17.50 per cent in another; at Mitcham it was 8 per cent in one ward and 16 per cent in another; at Noarlunga it was 16.5 per cent in one ward and 19.1 per cent in another; at Payneham it was 34 per cent, 40 per cent, and 62 per cent in three wards; at Port Adelaide it ranged from 46.13 per cent to 29.65 per cent, and included 38.16 per cent, 33.03 per cent, and 41.07 per cent; at Prospect it was 24.6 per cent; at Salisbury it was 12.2 per cent; at Stirling it was 42.4 per cent and 26.3 per cent; at St. Peters it was 36.7 per cent and 40.7 per cent; at Tea Tree Gully it was 13.3 per cent and 6.1 per cent; at Unley it was 23.8 per cent, 22.7 per cent, 29.1 per cent, and 22.9 per cent; at Walkerville it was 47.5 per cent; at West Torrens it was 24.83 per cent; and at Woodville it was 20.3 per cent and 22.4 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Did any of these get over an inch?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member has put on plenty of inches since he has been a member here, because he knows that he does not have to go out and get people to vote at present. So he sits back and people vote for him. I believe in the 1968 election the honourable member

got a 95 per cent poll and, because of that, he has been able to put on an extra couple of inches. In these circumstances, apart from having to put his hand in his pocket to get cars to line up at the Adelaide Oval to take people to the elections, he may also have to shake their hands before they vote. I am not suggesting that he would not shake them by both hands if they assured him that they would vote for him.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It is against the law.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it is, but who would know if it were a voluntary vote? It is not against the law to go to a football match and meet a man and say, "I will give you a ride, but let us stop at the Town Hall on the way home." Perhaps the person could have a hip flask and on the way to the Town Hall could give the man a drink because he was thirsty after watching the football match. There is nothing illegal about that, but there would be a possibility that he would vote for that person after receiving a ride instead of having to use public transport. That is one reason why members opposite want this procedure introduced. This is clearly illustrated by the results of polls held on July 3, in which the percentage of the poll ranged from 3 per cent to 41 per cent and averaged 20 per cent. That is the sort of thing that members opposite would want at an election at which a Government was elected. They do not want people meddling with their elections: they do not want people to be interested in the sort of Government they will get, but would rather leave it to the type of weather we have on election days. They do not want people to go along and exercise their right to vote. In his second reading explanation the Leader gave no reason why voluntary voting should be used: he did not tell us about the policy of the Liberal and Country League, because that is usually considered at a conference that is held behind locked doors. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I strongly support the Bill, because I have always believed that a person should not be forced to exercise a right if he desires not to. The Hon. Mr. Banfield, in replying to an interjection from me, said that the referendum held in 1970 on shopping hours had nothing to do with this Bill, but then he proceeded to spend 70 per cent of his time speaking about council elections, which have nothing to do with the Bill, either. At the 1970 referendum, 50,181 people did not exercise their right to vote, yet

the Government still took away the right of certain people who had enjoyed the privilege (and not only the privilege but the right of the individual in the areas concerned) to have open shopping hours on Friday night.

At present there is little doubt that in this State we have voluntary voting. All we need to do is stop being hypocritical, alter the situation, and make it law. From the figures given to me by the Chief Secretary yesterday in a reply to a question, it is clear that no action is taken against most people for not voting. Anyway, very few are fined. In 1968, no prosecutions were instituted, in spite of the fact that 33,678 people did not vote. It must be clear that the provision in the Act of a fine for a person who does not exercise his right to vote is an empty threat. Yet we have the spectacle of people being frog-marched to the poll by the use of this provision. It is absurd in this country that such a situation should exist.

It is a good move to provide legislation that will remove the situation of confusion in which people are placed in not knowing whether or not they are compelled to vote. It is clear to me that people in a democratic society should have the right to exercise their vote if they wish to do so: if they do not, they should not be forced to come to the poll to register a vote that means nothing (that is, by throwing the paper away), or to vote one way or the other even though they are disinclined to vote for any Party represented at the election. A person must be free to vote if he wishes to do so. I have always supported adult franchise and believe people should have the right to vote at elections for members of this House, but I cannot see how the Chief Secretary could have tied this aspect to this Bill. I consider there is nothing in the Bill dealing with franchise: it is a matter of voluntary voting.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is all tied up with the one question, and no-one knows that better than you.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Not at all, because it is clear to me that these are separate items. A question has been asked why the Bill was introduced in this House: if it had not been members on this side would not have had the chance to express their views about it, because it would have been killed in the House of Assembly before it reached this Chamber.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why was it not introduced in the Lower House when you had control there?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I was not in politics then, so I cannot reply to that interjection.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You would have a good idea, though.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have always supported voluntary voting for House of Parliament elections, because I believe that that is the proper procedure.

The Hon. A. I. Shard: You didn't mind being elected by a compulsory vote, did you?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not understand that interjection.

The Hon. A. I. Shard: There was a compulsory vote for the Senate when you were elected, and you accepted it.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I would not object to voluntary voting for that House. In countries with voluntary voting the sort of thing promoted by the Hon. Mr. Banfield is not relevant in a general election. In Great Britain the average percentage of people voting at general elections since 1935 is 80 per cent. So, the situation promoted by the honourable member as existing in local government and in by-elections does not exist in a general election. The very atmosphere of such an election creates such an attitude of mind that people want to go out to vote. The amount of election advertising before a by-election is negligible; often, people are unaware that there is to be an election. So, I wholeheartedly support the Bill. I hope that the Council will pass it and that it will receive favourable treatment in another place.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I oppose the Bill. The Hon. Mr. Cameron said that he has always favoured voluntary voting. When the Chief Secretary interjected, the honourable member claimed that, even though he was elected by a compulsory vote in the Senate—

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: When did that happen?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member might not have been elected in that way but I believe that he would have been willing to be elected in that way at a later time. This Bill seeks to maintain this Council as an L.C.L.-controlled Chamber. Honourable members opposite have been elected to this Council on a restricted franchise and they know that anything other than this legislation will deprive them of the advantage they have enjoyed for so long. Compulsory voting applies to Commonwealth elections. I do not believe there has been any major outcry by any people, least of all by honourable members opposite, that

they do not favour compulsory voting in the Commonwealth elections.

Victoria and Western Australia have similar voting arrangements to those applying to our Lower House. In connection with the Upper Houses in those States, there is now the same roll, and elections are held on the same days as elections for the Lower House. Of course, this Council has always enjoyed much more power than have any of the other Upper Houses in the Commonwealth. Further, this Council has more power, basically, than the House of Assembly in this State. This has been proved conclusively over the years. The Government, which has been elected by the people, is subject to the whims of honourable members of this Council. I believe in compulsory voting because it gives everyone the opportunity to study the political scene, which greatly affects people's everyday lives. It is in the interests of people to pay attention to the political sphere. I know that some members opposite have claimed that Great Britain has always had voluntary voting. I do not deny that; if that is what the people there are used to, that is their business. However, no-one should try to come to a new country like Australia, whose Constitution provides for compulsory voting, and try to alter our system. We are satisfied with the Commonwealth Constitution.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: So am I.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Several years ago a Bill was introduced into another place which was called the "Casey Protection Act" by the Liberal Government of the day. It was given that title because two Assembly districts in the North were to be left as they were; there was to be no increase in the number of electors in those districts.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is not quite so.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes it is: I happened to be there. The two districts I have referred to were the districts of Frome and Eyre. The Liberal Party cottoned on to the catch-cry that the Bill was introduced as the "Casey Protection Act". That title was recently recalled by a member in another place. This is completely wrong. There was no move made to protect anyone in particular, because one of the seats was held by one political Party and the other was held by another political Party.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That Bill was introduced to protect the Liberal Party.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The point I want to make from my reference to that Bill

is that the Bill now before the Council could be called the "L.C.L. Protection Bill for the Upper House".

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: There is no mention of that in the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: There is no need to mention it in the Bill because it stands out. Members opposite always rely on the lack of information to the general public about the actual constitution of this Council. Very few people outside even know what the Legislative Council is. Of course, the Liberal Party has always controlled this Council and has always relied on the ignorance of the voters outside regarding exactly what this Council is and exactly what power it has. I defy any honourable member to dispute that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You should ask the Hon. Mr. Cameron about his attitude on this subject during the Millicent by-election.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I was in favour of voluntary voting.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member changes his mind at the drop of a hat. I oppose this Bill because it is not in the interests of the people of South Australia. I agree with the Chief Secretary that the time is drawing near when, if this Council does not live up to its responsibilities as a political House, the people will definitely do something about it. I have always believed in the bicameral system of Parliament. That is my personal feeling. I said this when I was in the Lower House, I have said it in this place, and I say it again now.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Be careful!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not need to be careful.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You have always said this; I agree that you have.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Quite so, and I say it again. The Upper House should be a House of Review, which members opposite and members of the L.C.L. claim it to be, but this is not so. This is a Party House, and they know it. Members opposite talk about voting in this Chamber, saying they are free to vote, but they make jolly sure that they vote in the way in which they want the voting to go. Several members may sometimes cross the floor and vote with the Opposition, but that is only a smokescreen.

If we had a true House of Review, the situation would be different. Members opposite should not have the power to forestall or interrupt the passage of a Bill received from the Lower House, which supplies the Government of the State. We should be able to

review legislation in this Chamber, to make recommendations, and perhaps to hold up legislation for a certain time. The House of Lords works in this way, and I think it works very well. If we wish to apply today the standards that applied in the 18th Century, then by all means leave the Council as it is—and that is exactly what members opposite are doing. It is high time that we did something about the situation, but members opposite do not want to do that. They want to remain in office in this Chamber to forestall any legislation introduced in another place, whether it be by a Labor Government or even by their own Party. I know they have forestalled their own Government at times, but it has been very seldom.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Why do you have to bring politics into this?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Because this is a wholly political Bill, designed to see that this Council remains as it is. I think it is a very sorry state to see such a retrograde step for South Australia at this time. The opposite should be the case. What will happen if members opposite receive a vote in the Lower House which will return an L.C.L. Government? Will they then introduce legislation for voluntary voting for both Houses? If they do that, of course, they will get the Bill through and this will then be the only State in the Commonwealth having voluntary voting for both Houses. If that is the sort of legislation members opposite want, then it is time they took up this matter on a Commonwealth basis with their counterparts in Canberra so that the Liberal Party could bring in voluntary voting in the Commonwealth sphere.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I don't think they would.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think they would, either. After reading the second reading explanation of the Leader, one wonders why the Bill was introduced. One simply has to imagine what the reason could have been. I cannot support this Bill in any way, because this is a political House, whether members opposite say so or whether they do not. I know they say it is not, but to me this is hypocritical—and I make no apology for saying that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What do you mean by "political"?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Members opposite belong to the L.C.L. and they vote accordingly. They claim this is a House of Review and that they are free to vote how they like, but this is ridiculous, because they are not. Members

opposite go into the electoral areas and tell the people the Upper House is a House of Review. To my way of thinking that is not correct. Secondly, they say they can please themselves how they vote, but they cannot do this at all.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member has not been here long enough to know, but he will learn. He will be told where to go, and if he does not do that he will lose his preselection before the next election. The honourable member may think he is a renegade, but he will be smartly pulled into line.

When one joins a political Party one becomes a part of that Party and honestly believes in the policies laid down by it—or at least I do, anyway. I believe in the policies the Labor Party sets out and I believe they should be implemented at the proper time. I am still entitled to my own point of view, but I will adhere to those policies because they are the policies of the majority in my Party. I do not want to take up the time of the Council any more. I honestly and sincerely oppose the motives behind this Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): One thing I can say: I am very pleased I gave a short second reading explanation of the Bill. I am quite certain that if I had gone into any lengthy explanation we would probably be still entertained by the Hon. Mr. Banfield and the Minister of Agriculture. True, the explanation was very short, and the Minister of Agriculture stated quite clearly that he opposed the motive of the Bill. The motive of the Bill, of course, is that we are asking the House of Assembly to consider a Bill for voluntary voting for that House. That is all that is contained in the Bill. We have heard many statements this afternoon to the effect that we are telling the House of Assembly what it must do regarding compulsory voting for that House, but that is not so. This is a private member's Bill introduced into this Council suggesting to the House of Assembly that it debate and decide the question of whether voting in that House should be voluntary or whether it should be compulsory. To take the matter any further is pure nonsense on the part of those who oppose the Bill so vigorously. A whole lot of motives have been inferred, but the only motive is that we are suggesting that the House of Assembly should debate and decide, which it has a right to do. We accepted that when in 1942 a Bill came to this Council from the House of Assembly

imposing a penalty on those who did not vote. This Council took the view that we are in charge of what happens here, but we would accept the unanimous view of the House of Assembly as far as that Chamber was concerned. To infer that this Bill has anything whatsoever to do with this Council as a House of Review or anything to do with franchise is quite nonsensical. The Hon. Mr. Banfield spoke at length on several matters that had very little to do with this Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I copied that from you the other day.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member referred to a number of matters to do with democracy. If one wants to define "democracy" as it is defined by almost every other country in the western world that follows the British Parliamentary system, it is interpreted as including the right of a person to vote or not to vote.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This Council does not follow the British Parliamentary system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It includes the right whether or not to vote at an election. That is an essential part of the British democratic system. We can take that still further and ask the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who is so keen on compulsory voting: why is there not compulsory voting in union ballots? Why are there not even secret ballots involved in union voting? If the principle is so important, one may well ask why it has not been followed more assiduously—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why don't you declare yourself on union voting?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —in other fields in which the Labor Party is inextricably involved. I think the Hon. Mr. Banfield has got himself rather confused—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No; you are the one who is confused.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —and perhaps I can prove it. We had a rather long tale about people not being able to go along to vote because of a snowstorm or a football final. Perhaps our seasons are changing. The House of Assembly elections happen to be in March.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: When was the last one held?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Should we consider the number of people prevented from voting by a snowstorm or a football final in March? I should be pleased to hear about

those unfortunate people who were prevented from voting for those reasons.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the last day of May in this year?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Does the honourable member really say that there could be a snowstorm or a football final on the last day of May to prevent people from voting?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is not compulsory for elections to be held in March.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I shall not go in detail into the material put forward this afternoon because most of it had nothing to do with this Bill. The Minister of Agriculture said that this Council had greater power than any Upper House in the world, or words to that effect.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Has the Minister ever heard of Tasmania?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Minister: what about the powers of the Upper House in, say, Victoria or of the Senate? As a matter of fact, if I heard him correctly, he said that this Council had powers "greater than the House of Assembly". He then went on to talk about the House of Lords, which no-one can compare with this Council because we are here dealing with a constitutional issue involving a written sovereign Constitution which touches on many subjects that do not concern the organization of Parliament in Great Britain. Let me now touch on one or two things involved. First, there are the deadlock provisions that are included in our Constitution, by which if this Council amends, rejects or defeats a Bill from the House of Assembly that House has the right to challenge the decision of this Council at the final court of appeal, namely, the people of South Australia. Yet, if this Bill goes to the House of Assembly and that place rejects it, we have no power whatsoever to challenge that decision. So all this talk about this Council having "greater powers than the House of Assembly" is complete nonsense.

Let us go back to the origin of the Constitution of this State. In 1856, by an Act of Westminster, our Constitution came to us structuring two Houses, each with equal powers; and it was found that that was not a practical solution in a two-House system. In 1857 there was a compact agreed on between the two Houses, which can be read about in many documents (I refer honourable members to Blackmore), and from that time to the present day the conference and deadlock system has worked so well that there has never in the history of South Australia been

a challenge in the final court of appeal under the deadlock provisions. Yet there is all this nonsense spoken about tying this Bill into the question of the powers of this Council and comparing them with those of the House of Assembly. How often have we heard the statement made that this Council is the most powerful Upper House in the world, that it possesses more power than the House of Assembly does? That is not so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is so.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the honourable member what greater powers this Council has than the Senate has.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There can be a double dissolution by the Lower House and there cannot be in this place until after an election; and the Upper House can send the Lower House to the people.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am interested in those comments, but once again I pose the question: what has this to do with the comparative powers of the two Houses? What the Hon. Mr. Banfield is dealing with is our particular deadlock provisions, which have nothing to do with the powers of either House. We have heard the Minister of Agriculture talk about the powers of the political Party and the domination of the political Party. However, I pass over that without further comment, except to say this: the Minister says that the Party machine governing in domination with a political philosophy has a right to govern and a right to implement its platform and principles. It will be interesting to see what happens to the Minister of Agriculture if, one day in the future, a Bill is introduced for the abolition of this Chamber. Where will he go, on that principle? Questions have been raised by Ministers and the Hon. Mr. Banfield about this Bill. I am surprised it has excited so much opposition and drawn so much comment on matters that have nothing to do with it. However, I thank honourable members for their attention to it.

The Council divided on the second reading:

Ayes (12)—The Hons. M. B. Cameron, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, H. K. Kemp, E. K. Russack, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

Noes (4)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.
Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Repeal of section 118a of the principal Act."

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said previously that snowstorms could occur on election day, but the Leader of the Opposition said this could not happen. Does the repeal of this section mean that elections will always have to be held in March, or can they be held in any other month when there may be a football final or some other important function? In the past, elections have been held in March, May, July, September, October and December.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture could have assisted in this respect, as he and I agree on the matter of the State's Constitution, and this matter is contained not in the Electoral Act but in the Constitution.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I must therefore oppose this clause, which removes the principle of compulsory voting in this State. I pointed out previously that if people were not required compulsorily to vote, it could result in polls of less than 5 per cent, as has happened on many other occasions. Apart from the apathy of people who are at present compelled to vote under section 118a of the Act, if elections are able to be held in months during which snow could be falling or football finals or cricket matches could be taking place, people that attend such functions would decide whether or not they would vote depending on whether their football team won or lost.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris:

(For wording of motion, see page 860.)

(Continued from August 18. Page 862.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): At least the members of the Liberal and Country Party are consistent in their views.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The Liberal and Country Party or the Liberal and Country League?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I said clearly "Liberal and Country Party".

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I thought it was the Liberal and Country League, not the Liberal and Country Party.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is referred to in the press, which is usually right, as the Liberal and Country Party.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You've changed your name, then.

The Hon. L. R. HART: No.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I just want to get it clear.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It might have been the Liberal and Country League when the Minister of Agriculture was a member of it. However, these days it is the Liberal and Country Party.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: So you have changed your name. When did you do that?

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is nothing in the motion about changing names.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is correct, Sir. There is no reference in the motion to changing names, so I must ignore the interjections.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must speak to the motion.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Members of this Party are consistent in their views: they believe in the freedom of the individual, which is true democracy. Much has been said in the last hour or so about the need for qualifications to exercise a certain right. Members of the Labor Party have said that this right should be available to every person. Let me compare that attitude with the situation obtaining in relation to this motion. To qualify for a builder's licence, one must have certain qualifications. On that basis, it is fair to suggest that for certain other functions (even the right to vote for members of this Council) the principle of requiring certain qualifications ought to be supported.

One may reasonably ask what is the real motive behind the introduction of these regulations. The champions of this legislation have said that it is necessary to protect the general public from the operations of unethical and incompetent builders. These are strong words, and one uses them only after closely studying the tone of the regulations, which the motion sets out to disallow. Many of the questions an applicant for a builder's licence is required to answer suggest that the Government believes there are many tradesmen operating in the building industry whose honesty is suspected, and further questions suggest that there are many practising tradesmen whose competency is questioned. If one studies speeches made

by Labor Party members during the passage of the Builders Licensing Act, or even the Building Act, one cannot help but gather the impression that many Labor Party members do not have a very high regard for those people whom one may regard as master builders.

A strong suspicion is circulating that the operation of these regulations will have a detrimental effect on the economic development of this State. I think it is fair to say that the present Labor Government is totally opposed to the principle of subcontracting and of contracting. So often we have seen during its term of office where it has abandoned the system of contracting and subcontracting in many Government departments, particularly in the Highways Department, and in its place the costly day-labour system has been reverted to. It would be an understatement to say that the builders licensing regulations have raised a storm of protest among builders in this State, and the restrictive nature of the regulations has caused great concern in the industry.

Costs in the industry are increasing, as they are in all other industries, but this industry in recent years has done much to absorb these costs. Past Governments have been active in keeping the cost of houses down, an aspect that this Government seems to have completely disregarded. As severe as the effects of this legislation will be in the short term, it is the long-term effects on the industry that concern many thinking people. As time passes it will become increasingly more difficult to obtain a restricted builder's licence in one of the many classifications, and more difficult still to obtain a general builder's licence. In this closed shop atmosphere those operators with a licence will be able to name their own price. In addition, there will be problems that will arise over lines of demarcation.

One can visualize the additional costs involved in building projects in country areas where a person with a general builder's licence is not available and several people licensed under the various classifications will have to be brought into the area to do the work. This is a situation to which country people have not been accustomed: they have been accustomed to a situation where a person in the district has been able to do general building work. In the short term there is the possibility that some of these people who have been doing this work in the past will be granted a general builder's licence, but in the long term I fear that this class of operator in the country will disappear, and this will cause considerable increases in

costs to the building industry, in country areas at least.

One could discuss this motion at great length, for there are many aspects of it that could be discussed in detail. One aspect that concerns me is the question of the length of experience a person must have in a building classification before he can obtain a licence. A bricklayer must have served a minimum of seven years in the trade, two years of which must be in an area of responsibility, before he is able to obtain a restricted builder's licence. Also, an electrician must have served a minimum of seven years in the trade, with two of those years in an area of responsibility, before he can obtain a licence.

One can easily understand that perhaps it would be essential for an electrician to have served this time before being entitled to a restricted builder's licence, but one does question whether the same length of time should be necessary before a bricklayer can obtain his licence. The periods of time these people must have served in the industry are longer than the periods an apprentice must serve in his apprenticeship. Today, the length of time an apprentice must serve tends to become shorter rather than longer.

I am not opposed to the principle of licensing builders, but I stress that this obviously is a Trades Hall inspired piece of legislation, designed to abolish the system of sub-contracting. We know that the Trades Hall people are opposed to the general principle of incentive payments and piece work, but it is these systems that have been responsible for many industries having the ability to keep their costs down. This applies particularly to the building industry.

This is a far-reaching piece of legislation. It is clumsy, and perhaps it is not necessary for it to go as far as it does. I cannot understand why it is necessary to licence every person in each of these classifications. If the builder himself was responsible, it should not be necessary to licence people who work under his control. Is it necessary for the subcontractor to be licensed if the builder is held responsible for the workmanship of the subcontractor?

What redress has a house owner against a builder in a situation in which there is a defect in the house, although the builder has complied with every provision of the Building Act, the foundations have been laid in excess of the requirements of the Act, and in every other aspect the builder has complied with the Act? I have known such situations as this.

What redress has the house owner then? I should like the Government to explain to me where the house owner stands in this situation. One could discuss this motion at length, but I shall not do so. I merely register my disapproval of these regulations and, in doing so, I support the motion.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in similar form to that introduced by the Leader of the Opposition last year, and which was defeated in the House of Assembly in May of last year. The Government has to report to the Council and the people of South Australia that its negotiations concerning the dams on the Murray River have failed. We are satisfied now that we cannot in the immediate future get amendments of substance to the River Murray Waters Agreement amendment, signed by the previous Government.

We have endeavoured to negotiate constantly. We have repeatedly put forward proposals for sensible compromise on the issue, retaining South Australia's special rights to the Chowilla dam and the special protections to the State provided by such a storage. However, the other States and the Commonwealth have relied upon the amended agreement, despite the fact that it was signed by an Executive in South Australia which acted in plain contravention of the instructions of this Parliament, and which knew its action would not be acceptable to Parliament. Nevertheless, the other States and the Commonwealth have said that they have an agreement from a Government in South Australia. They are not concerned in any way with the internal support or otherwise for that agreement. They are dealing with the Government of South Australia, and they have an amended agreement signed, which has been ratified by their Parliaments, and they do not propose to budge an inch from that position.

The amending agreement had removed, in effect, the special right which South Australia had to the protection of the Chowilla storage. Under the amending agreement, Chowilla will be looked at as a possible future storage, but will be judged on the basis not of the protections it can give to South Australia, but of its

yield and advantage to the total river system. In other words, if some other storage would yield more water to the up-river States, the special advantages of Chowilla to South Australia would be disregarded. Under the present Government, South Australia's endeavour has been to renegotiate that position so as to retain for this State the special rights and protections which the Chowilla storage would have given us—special rights and protections which are needed by this State far more than by any other.

The Government has found that the position is irretrievable. The other States and the Commonwealth will not concede that South Australia obtained rights under the existing River Murray Waters Agreement as a result of giving up water rights to the other States and the Commonwealth. They will not concede that we have some special right to protection from Chowilla, as people of this State believe we have and as we know we have. Further, the other States will not concede that they should negotiate the nature of further water rights arising, if other storages, including Chowilla, are built. In addition, while the Commonwealth would concede (and indeed it was prepared to make this concession) that the costs of expenditure at Lake Victoria, which will be flooded by the building of Chowilla, would not be taken into account against the building of Chowilla, New South Wales and Victoria would concede no such position. The result is that we have been unable to make any sort of dent in the front which the other States have put up.

South Australia has received support in its stand by a great many people. I am very grateful to the settlers on the Murray River who have made it their personal campaign to go to other States and talk to their fellow Murray River irrigators and point out that there was no difference in interest between them. The settlers pointed out that it was to all riverlanders' interests to accept South Australia's perfectly reasonable position upon this matter. The result of their campaign has been a change in attitude by interstate irrigators and the support for the South Australian position now publicly expressed by the Murray Valley Development League.

However, the unfortunate political realities of the position are that the Victorian Government does not depend for its majority in Parliament upon settlers in the Murray River area. These are Country Party seats, and the Victorian Government is not subject to the same pressures as would be Gov-

ernments in other parts of Australia for the needs of settlers in these areas. As I have said, we have now reached an impasse in the negotiations. The Victorian Government has alternative water resources which it could develop to satisfy the needs of people, other than those directly irrigating from the Murray, and it seems quite content to see a decline in irrigation activity since markets for riverland products are falling, or will fall, particularly with the prospect of Britain's entry to the European Common Market.

While eventually all States will be forced to develop storages on the Murray River, it would appear that, in the short term, and if we continued present negotiations, a real danger would occur that Victoria would withdraw entirely from the provision of additional storages on the Murray River, and this could endanger the use of additional Murray River water by South Australia in the foreseeable future. The matter could then only be resolved in the long term, and in the meantime considerable harm could result to South Australia.

It will be many years before Dartmouth is declared effective for the purposes of the River Murray Waters Agreement. We will not under any circumstances get instant water from the Dartmouth dam. It will take years to build and more years to store water. Nevertheless, the sooner additional storage is agreed on, the safer South Australia will be. And, on balance, the risks of further delay by continuing negotiations are markedly higher than the risks to the State from losing the Chowilla project altogether. The Government has done all it can. In the circumstances it can only report the failure of its efforts, and recommend the ratification of the amending agreement.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Government should resign.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It has been suggested by members opposite that the Government would try to negotiate for some change in wording which might be a face-saver but which would in fact mean nothing of substance to the State. The Government is not prepared to do any such thing, and has never had any intention of doing so. Unless we can obtain amendments of substance which will protect South Australia's position in relation to the Chowilla dam and the quality of the water in the Murray River, there is no point in negotiating. At this stage of proceedings we see no such chance in the immediate future, or indeed in the foreseeable future. We can only, therefore, proceed with the position which

obtained upon the signing of the amending agreement by the previous Government.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill which, of course, should have been passed and brought into effect a considerable time ago. We heard, if I may say so, a very interesting second reading explanation, because the scene has shifted from the Commonwealth Government to the State of Victoria. Ever since this Government has been in office we have heard that the thing inhibiting its progress is the Commonwealth Government. This one cannot be pinned on the Commonwealth Government, so we have had to find another whipping boy, and the Government has chosen to select Sir Henry Bolte, as the villain of the piece, and the State of Victoria.

I cannot understand and match up the words in the second reading explanation that the Government thanks the irrigators of the riverlands of South Australia for going into Victoria and convincing a great number of people that South Australia's claims to Chowilla are not only legitimate, which I am sure they are, but very desirable. I remind the Government that it was the settlers of Mildura and Sunraysia who were directly responsible for the original curtailing of the Chowilla dam project, because they realized that from Swan Hill to Mildura they would have at times a completely stagnant river. The river would be flowing at 500 cusecs. It was they who started the agitation which the Victorian Government, through its commissioner, brought to the notice of the River Murray Commission. He did that in the manner in which any engineer should do it in the interests of the State he represents on the commission.

Had it been allowed to remain outside of politics, the River Murray Commission would have got on with the job of building Chowilla early in the piece. At that time it was within the financial reach of the States and the Commonwealth, but there was a tremendous amount of prevarication and very little was done for 18 months after the Playford Government went out of office. There was not the push and the urge that there could have been, and as a consequence the Mildura people got the ear of the Victorian Government.

The New South Wales Government was never enthusiastic at any stage, because the history of water conservation in New South Wales has been an absolute tragedy. The Blowering dam was the last of the dams in the Snowy Mountains Scheme and was the direct responsi-

bility of the Government of New South Wales, which got great benefit as a result of the Snowy Mountains Scheme. It went ahead with large-scale irrigation which has proved in many cases not only unthrifty, but quite disastrous. The most recent thing I have noticed is that the development of Coleambally, which was of 700-odd blocks of land, has now been altered completely after only 100 or so blocks have been brought into operation. That is one of the disasters of the New South Wales efforts at water conservation. It has been a very expensive business. The Commonwealth Government had to come to the party and assist the Government of New South Wales in the completion of the Blowering dam.

An example of what happens without proper planning is seen at the Menindee Lakes. The best that can be said for them is that they have provided a magnificent playground for the aquatic sports lovers of Broken Hill, but they have provided very little water.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Broken Hill itself has gained some water from the lakes, hasn't it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. The whole history of the Menindee Lakes was the dream of a very honourable former Minister of the New South Wales Government. He represented half of the city of Broken Hill and he visualized (and there was pressure from other people, too) a big dairying scheme to supply fresh milk for Broken Hill and to provide a settlement on the Darling near the town of Menindee. The things that were never really investigated were the market situation and the future of dairying at that time, and also the suitability of the area for dairying and the distance from markets. It was obvious that enough water was stored in the Menindee Lakes to supply just about the whole of Australia if it were all used for dairying, but it does provide a magnificent aquatic sports area for the people of Broken Hill.

The great problem, however, is that the lakes are very shallow and in drought years are subject to a large draw from evaporation and as a result they are prone to salinity. The other interesting thing was that they were constructed by day labour. We were told at the time that the Snowy Mountains Authority and Chowilla, when it was to be built, should be built by day labour, and certain people in another place, one of whom later became Minister of Agriculture, spoke at length on day labour *versus* the contract system. The net result was that they had just got the dam

finished at Menindee, even with day labour, when the wall blew out and they lost the whole of the first year's catchment, which was pretty disastrous.

When we ratify this agreement for the Dartmouth dam we will gain 37 per cent more water than we are getting under our present entitlement, and in my opinion this is our very last chance to get a readjustment of our water allocation. I do not think there is any possibility in the future of getting any more water at all. I think we did extremely well and we should be thankful that the Hall Government was able to negotiate a Bill providing for 37 per cent more water for the State in future.

It is wrong to say the Government has renegotiated or tried to renegotiate the agreement. There have been discussions, but the Premier of this State knew as well as I knew that he had no show in the world of renegotiating this piece of legislation, because when the L.C.L. Government came into office we had three things on our plate. We had the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, of which the previous Government knew the contents; we had the Chowilla situation, about which the Government of the day knew completely. In fact, it had instructed our commissioner on the River Murray Commission (the Director of the Engineering and Water Supply Department) how he was to vote. That was before the election, before we took office. The Labor Government was completely in the picture on this matter. The Premier is a Queen's Counsel, and so is the Attorney-General. Those two gentlemen knew very well what our rights were in regard to any legal action that could be taken. Yet Mr. Dunstan, in the full knowledge of all this, while campaigning during the election that brought him back to power, said that he would use South Australia's legal rights—and South Australia, as he well knew, had no particular rights.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You said in 1968 you would build it yourself.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not think that was so; we never said we would build it ourselves. We never departed from the Playford Government's policy on this matter. As far as we knew, the Government of the day kept the true situation secret and away from the people; and there was nothing in the report that was detrimental to the dam being proceeded with in the way that the Playford Government had envisaged. There were no reports available and the previous Labor Gov-

ernment had made nothing available to the public. In fact, it had led the public to believe that the Chowilla dam would be continued with, in the full knowledge of what Mr. Beaney had reported when he came back from the final meeting of the commission a few weeks before the election was held. The Government let us go on saying that we would press for Chowilla. Nobody said, "Chowilla is not a goer." The moment we got back into office, the dockets proved that the Government knew what the situation was then.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It was deferred at the time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was not deferred at all. Mr. Beaney was invited by the Premier to get the best deal possible for South Australia. He had been away and had got the best deal. When he returned and the Labor Party gained office, he said, "In my opinion, that is the best I can get. We shall have to do more investigation. It looks as though Dartmouth is all right and the other States will go for it." It was then that a tremendous lot of convincing was necessary for people like me, who were dedicated to a better water supply for South Australia and to the original proposition that Chowilla was the best place for the dam. It was not easy for either Mr. Beaney or my own Government to convince me there was no alternative but to accept the commission's report, but in the process we did see to it that we got 37 per cent more water guaranteed for South Australia under the agreement.

Every minute that I speak now, the inflationary spiral in this country is rising. One of the provisions of this measure is that, if the estimated cost rises by more than 10 per cent, the whole matter has to go back into the melting pot. When the abortive Bill passed through this Council a few months ago, I said then that I believed the 10 per cent had been reached. I am not sure, but I think it probably has been. The longer we delay this Bill and the longer we talk about it, the less chance we have of getting a satisfactory water supply for South Australia. It may be said, as has been already stated, that it will be some time before we get the benefit of this water, but we must remember that at least this is our last chance of getting something.

If Lake Victoria is developed and its inlets and outlets are opened and widened, and we have under this agreement access to the Menindie Lakes water for an additional period of time (I do not see how New South Wales will use its water in any other way, because

it is not in a position to use it at present) I think we can struggle through. The major point about all this is that 37 per cent additional water will be gained under this agreement. If we do not get this and if there is any breakdown in this whole matter, it will not be Sir Henry Bolte's fault or the fault of the Commonwealth Government: it will be the fault of the ditherers, the Dunstons and the Stotts in the game who have put us where we are.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise briefly to support this Bill, which should have been passed 16 months ago but which for political ends was not, because of what I would call a stupid amendment being moved by the then Speaker, supported by the present Labor Government, to build two dams simultaneously. If the Bill had passed, we would have had this agreement 16 months ago. In the meantime, there has been some escalation of costs. Whether that will put this agreement into jeopardy now is still something we shall not know for perhaps a few days or a little while longer. The Legislative Council has always supported vital measures of this nature and passed them as quickly as possible. We did not get the opportunity, of course, some 16 months ago to see this Bill in this Chamber; we saw only copies of it as they came from another place, where, unfortunately, it was defeated.

I, like the Hon. Mr. Story, who has just spoken, was a Chowilla supporter. I considered the matter some 10 years ago when it was in its early stages and I was a strong supporter; so was the Hall Government, until it found that it was not a goer, and it found also that by strenuous negotiations it could get 37 per cent more water for South Australia. That was an achievement that has never been acknowledged by members of the present Government. If we finally get this dam and the extra water, it will be something for which the people of South Australia will be able to thank the members of the Hall Government.

As the Hon. Mr. Story has just said, we may be able to struggle through, until we get this dam, by using Menindie Lakes water and water from other sources. By the time we get the dam, we shall not only get the use of 37 per cent more water but we shall also get the situation where in times of restriction we shall receive one-third of the available water instead of three-thirteenths, as at present. That in itself is a great achievement and a marked improvement on the previous situation. Great play has been made in the last 12 or

16 months or more of the fact that Chowilla was lost to South Australia; we were told that repeatedly. People irresponsibly supported an amendment providing for the simultaneous construction of the two dams. However, all members know perfectly well that that is not attainable because South Australia, growing as it is, is not able to support more than one major project at a time, especially when one considers the services and the like that must be maintained while this is going on. All members realize that this was an impossible sort of amendment for which Mr. Stott will not be remembered with kindness in the future.

The attitude was taken that Chowilla was lost forever. However, in the agreement Chowilla has not been lost forever: it has been deferred. It may well have to be built in the future and, if that happens, it will ensure not only that we get our 37 per cent more water but also that we will get better quality water. However, it will not derive one acre foot more than Mr. Hall was able to obtain for this State in negotiations in which he took part when Premier of this State. I do not wish to say "I told you so"; nor do I have any recriminations against the Government. I support the Bill, which must be passed as quickly as possible. Indeed, it should have been put through both Chambers at least 16 months ago.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I wish to speak only briefly on this matter. For goodness sake, let us stop playing politics and get on with the job of providing water, which is the lifeblood of South Australia. Everything that has been said this afternoon has had political tinges, and this applies to both Parties. What some honourable members have said on this subject is intolerable, in view of the importance to this State of this matter. I make no apology for putting it as plainly as I can: water should not be a matter of politics. However, it has been made a political football, and both Parties are to blame for this. We cannot get Chowilla now, but there may be some possibility of salvaging the agreement pursuant to which South Australia will get 37 per cent more water which, through the disastrous misfortune that has overtaken agriculture, should be available to us from the surplus that cannot be used at Coleambally and other up-river developments.

South Australia is possibly lucky, because of the delay that has occurred in getting surplus water, that supplies further upstream are not being fully used. People must realize that, although we have at present a full river (a

river which is letting much water waste out to sea, and it will do so up until November or later), this State could be desperately short of water within 18 months or two years. About that, there is no doubt. Although our reservoirs are full and there have been heavy snowfalls in the mountains in the Eastern States, within a bare two years the present situation in which we have surplus water could change to one in which there is a dire shortage of water in this State.

Until we have sufficient storages to level out the cycle between disastrous shortage and flood conditions, which can happen so quickly in the whole river system, we in this State face danger. We have planned, and half constructed, the huge main from Murray Bridge. This is 6ft. in diameter, and it will be surging with water within two years. This main could well be functioning at the time when South Australia runs out of water as a result of our not having either of these dams. If we had carried on with their construction when they were first envisaged, we would have all that water now. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Every member appreciates the need for this Bill to be passed with the utmost urgency. Most of the other speakers have dealt with the main points, and there is little I can add. I do not think anyone is more qualified to speak on this matter than the Hon. Mr. Story, who has always kept this Council fully informed on all matters concerning the Murray River and the need for an increased allocation of water for South Australia. As has been pointed out by previous speakers, this agreement will increase South Australia's usable water supply by 37 per cent. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Kemp, who said that this whole matter has been involved with policies that will give some political gain, rather than Parliament examining the matter from the point of view of South Australia's future.

Everyone who has been associated with this matter knew from the beginning what the final outcome would be and that the only agreement that could be reached on this matter would be that to build the Dartmouth dam. The only thing in doubt now is whether this can be achieved. Any time that is lost in pressing on with the construction of the Dartmouth dam could lead to a situation in which Dartmouth might not be achievable at all. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): Representing a district that contains some irrigation settlements, I, too, support the Bill. It is essential that it be passed as quickly as possible, and I commend members of this Council for acting so promptly this afternoon. I believe that many people in this State have become rather complacent in the last two years regarding South Australia's water supply, as we have had a marvellous finish over much of the State to last year's season, and again this year we have had plentiful rains that have soaked the soil and led to good catchments in our reservoirs. However, the Murray River does not concern only irrigation carried out along its banks: it has also become this State's main reservoir. South Australia has mains stretching as far away as Woomera; the river is connected with reservoirs in the Northern part of the State, and it certainly sends water down to Yorke Peninsula as well as to lands as far south as Keith and the metropolitan area.

We are witnessing a change in the trend of agriculture throughout the State; the number of sheep is declining, and in many cases cattle (which, as most honourable members would realize, need more water) are being stocked instead of sheep. The population forecasts for parts of metropolitan Adelaide are quite startling, in that within a few years the population in the north and south of the metropolitan area will double, so there will be a continuing demand for more water. It is an unfortunate fact that many people do not worry about the source of their water supply: they worry only when the tap runs dry. A responsible Government cannot afford to face this risk, because the loss to this State would be enormous if we should have a series of bad seasons and the water that would otherwise have been available to us from the river was lost because we had not acted quickly enough in building more storages on the river. Without discussing the details of the second reading explanation and the political implications that have led to the present situation, I agree with the Hon. Mr. Kemp that the first consideration should be to get on with the job. The fact that this matter became a political issue is most unfortunate, and I refer to the past and not to what has been said today. However, I heartily support the immediate ratification of this agreement.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I did not intend to speak to this Bill, which I wholeheartedly support, but I believe that the

Hon. Mr. Kemp and other honourable members have implied that there is an impression in some members' minds that both sides on this issue have played politics. I make the point abundantly clear that the Liberal and Country League has never played politics on this issue. In striking contrast to the Liberal and Country League policy, when the Dartmouth question arose, has been the Labor Party's policy in playing politics on the issue. When it was in office the Hall Government put the State's interest above all else in this matter and did not play politics at all, an opposite view to that taken by the Labor Government, which, when it knew in its real heart that it could never achieve Chowilla, was doing nothing else but playing politics. From this point of view it has been a shameful business from the start. Now the Labor Party has come to Parliament and admitted that it was wrong.

My point (and I cannot stress it too strongly) is that one political Party in this State has played politics on this issue but the other Party (the Party I am proud to support) put the State's interest first and put its own Government's life on the line, because it thought that the State's interest was paramount and more important. Admittedly, we suffered, but we accepted the decision of the people. The Labor Government won because it put politics over. It has now admitted that it was wrong. I agree that the sooner we get on with the job the better, but I hope that it will not be too late. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I agree that the sooner the Bill is passed (the decision having been made that the agreement is to be ratified) the better. My purpose in rising was to thank Opposition members for their co-operation for the speedy manner they have dealt with the Bill. I am sure that this is something that we all wanted to see happen, now that the decision has been made, and I thank members for the way in which they treated this Bill.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from August 24. Page 979.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the Bill, which is similar to Bills that have come before this Parliament for many years. In saying that I support the Bill, I do not mean that I approve of everything contained in it, because I (and I think members of

my group) have some differences in our appreciation of priorities compared to the thinking of the Hon. Mr. Shard. I am sure that he will acknowledge that, although we agree some of the time, we do not agree all the time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is nothing wrong with our priorities.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is the Chief Secretary's opinion. I do not intend to deal with this document at great length, but I wish to refer to some aspects of it. Some of its contents are to be commended, but some matters should have been emphasized more and some, which have been omitted, should have been included in this year's Loan Estimates. First, I refer to the situation with regard to harbour accommodation. I have spoken before of the difficulties we have because of the number of small and shallow ports in this State. We badly need another new deep sea port. We are awaiting with great interest the report on that project; it cannot come soon enough, because it is urgent that work be begun on a further port to handle the type of shipping now coming to this State. Last year \$5,300,000 was paid in connection with harbours, but this year the sum provided is \$1,600,000 less than that. I am not necessarily criticizing the Government on this score; some of the work being done is most necessary.

The sum of \$500,000 has been provided for widening and deepening the navigation channel between the Outer and Inner Harbours at Port Adelaide. That work is most necessary, because many primary producers in my district and other districts use the port, particularly the installations of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The work is necessary, too, so that large ships can enter Port Adelaide, where I believe the turning space is much deeper than the actual channel itself.

I am pleased that a further \$450,000 is provided for continuing the construction of the new passenger terminal at Outer Harbour. When I returned from a visit to Western Australia about six or seven years ago I referred to the splendid facilities at Fremantle and the need to replace the primitive facilities at Outer Harbour. I am pleased that improvements are to be made to the harbours at Port Lincoln and Thevenard; although I do not represent those places, I have visited them, and I believe that honourable members should pay attention to provisions for Loan works throughout the State.

Of the provision of \$8,313,000 for country waterworks, \$859,000 is provided to continue

the construction of the Kimba main. I realize that I am dealing with a project in the Northern District, but I have appreciated the difficulties of Kimba residents over the years, and I am pleased to see the provision. I note that a submission has been made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance under the national water resources development programme. In this connection I wish to refer to a matter which, although not mentioned in the Loan Estimates, should have been included in them. Some money should be provided from Loan funds for a scheme at Virginia, or the money should be secured under the national water resources development programme.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: How do you get anything out of that fund?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I would refer my colleague to the Chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, because I understand that that gentleman said money could be provided under that programme for a scheme such as that proposed for Virginia; I hope he was correct. I should like to see the Government pursue the matter further. The Minister of Agriculture is well aware of the extremely urgent situation at Virginia. We have been told that soil tests must be conducted, but they will take a considerable time, during which the underground water supplies will be drastically restricted to such an extent that some holdings will no longer be viable. As a layman, I question whether the soil tests are really necessary, because this area has been irrigated with underground water for some time with, in most cases, no noticeable deterioration of the soil. If a large vegetable-growing industry is to be maintained near Adelaide, it will be necessary to use reclaimed water. It may be necessary to install a drainage scheme, as was done in the Murray irrigation areas.

The scheme necessary for reticulating reclaimed water at Virginia and the drainage scheme that would possibly be necessary later would be very small compared with the schemes implemented in the Upper Murray. I believe that the total cost of reticulating reclaimed water to people now using underground water (possibly the reclaimed water could be mixed on a 50-50 basis with underground water) and the later provision of a drainage scheme would cost relatively little compared with the cost of the alternative, which is moving the industry holus bolus to, say, the Murray areas. In connection with the need to find Loan funds or funds from the national water resources development programme for this enterprise, I

received the following letter from the Munno Para District Council:

At the meeting of the council held on the 13th of July, 1971, it considered a letter from the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, Minister of Works, in reply to a letter from this council requesting the provision of a reticulated domestic water supply to the township of Virginia and immediate surrounding areas. The Minister, in his letter, was not prepared to relax the present policy at this stage, as he states that it would be an embarrassment to the department maintaining what is considered to be necessary policy in this area.

The effect of this policy is having a detrimental effect in the area, as many people wishing to cut off small allotments from some of the larger holdings, purely for residential purposes, cannot do so, with the consequent effect that little or no development is occurring in the area. In the matter of the market gardening industry, the effect of restrictions on underground water usage is having a most penalizing effect, in that the production has decreased on the one hand and, on the other hand, necessary costs appurtenant to the industry have increased considerably. Further, the policy of the department with relation to the usage of Bolivar reclaimed water—in that no decision has yet been made to make the reclaimed water readily available—is further restricting the gardening industry.

From all accounts it appears that necessary departmental policy is slowly strangling the area, in particular the market gardener. My council has on numerous occasions written to the Minister of Works requesting some relaxation of his policy so that at least a supply of reservoir water can be provided for domestic purposes, however, with little avail, and yet a new industry (motor racing) has been permitted an indirect supply of mains water. It appears as though this new industry has been granted water at the expense of established market gardens. This appears to be a gross injustice to longer-term residents and land-owners in the area.

The letter continues:

For your information, I have appended copies of letters between council, Minister of Works and other departments. At the latest meeting, my council gave further consideration to this grave situation and as a result of deliberations it resolved that you be requested to support this matter wherever possible.

This letter was signed by Mr. Lance M. Hatcher, District Clerk, and it enclosed a petition from 38 residents of the area regarding the supply of domestic water. The letter concluded in the following terms:

During the discussion, at least two members referred to recent suggestions that water supply for the general northern metropolitan area is in excess of requirements due to a slower rate of development than previously estimated. Your assistance in confirming or otherwise this point would also be appreciated. If it is correct, then it seems the population

of the north-western portion of the metropolitan area should no longer be denied a service which is an accepted way of life in almost all other parts of the same area.

I submit to the Government that some scheme should be brought forward as soon as possible. It should not be necessary to go into a lengthy and detailed examination of soil types in the area, because irrigation has been used successfully for so many years. I notice in discussing this matter an appropriation of \$180,000 for final payments for the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, estimated to cost a total of \$25,330,000. The statement is made that these works are in full operation and provide complete sewage treatment for a contributing population of 600,000 persons from the Adelaide and Elizabeth drainage areas. I emphasize the words "complete sewage treatment". It is said by some people to be the most modern sewerage works in the world. In many other areas serviced by apparently less effective works reclaimed water is used, and I believe time is running out when we can afford to let this water run out to sea when we have an industry languishing and in dire distress.

The Government is providing for country sewerage extensions in a number of places, particularly in the town of Gawler, where \$400,000 is provided. The total cost of the scheme is \$3,670,000, less than a year has been spent already and it will take some considerable time yet. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris mentioned the hospitals and I have no desire but to endorse what he said regarding that area of Government spending and services.

The Government has provided \$19,300,000 for school buildings, and I believe that probably any Government over the past few years is to be commended for the provision of school buildings. Some people expect the set-up regarding school buildings to be as though we are in heaven, forgetting we are still on earth. The improvements made over the years since you, Sir, were a Minister of the Crown and during the years in which you were a Minister have been quite remarkable. The services and many of the schools provided today are excellent indeed. That is not to say we are blind to the need for replacement of numerous other schools. I am pleased to note the recent announcement that there will be provision for a new high school at Nuriootpa, and I notice also the provision of a new primary school for the same town. This may seem a bit unfair to other areas, but those who know the situation and realize that Nuriootpa services not merely

the township but the whole of the Barossa Valley area, particularly for secondary education, will know that these schools are very much needed. I am very pleased that the Government is doing something in this regard. It is, of course, subject to finance being available, and I hope the Government is sufficiently seized with the urgency of the matter to see that finance is available for these two projects.

The Nuriootpa High School is in an excellent area, on an excellent piece of ground, and a new site is not necessary. The building of a permanent school on that site will provide the Barossa Valley with an extremely good secondary school. The primary school is surrounded by narrow streets, it is hemmed in, and it is necessary to have a new site. This the Government has had for some years and I am pleased to know that a new school appears to be on the way.

Another town with an equally urgent need for a replacement of a school is Yorketown, in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, where the primary school has had a few prefabricated buildings added to it. My colleagues and I have inspected it, and it is very inadequate to service the district as an area school. I have received a letter from Mr. C. T. Moody, the Manager of the Bank of Adelaide at Yorketown, in which he makes the following comment:

During the past few weeks my wife has made a thorough investigation as to the present schooling facilities and from the attached list you will find these facilities sadly lacking.

He has attached a long list of the shortcomings of the Yorketown school. He goes on to say:

Basically what Yorketown urgently wants is extra classrooms and facilities for the secondary and primary sections of the school. At present the primary section is crowded out by the secondary section.

He asks that I should take up this matter with the proper authorities in association with Mr. Ferguson, the member for Goyder in another place. Mr. Moody concludes by saying:

The latest information from the Minister of Education is that a high school will be ready for use in Yorketown at the beginning of 1974. But what do we do in the meantime with the present appalling conditions?

Mr. Moody is a bank manager and not given to making extravagant statements, but I emphasize the concluding words of his letter:

What do we do in the meantime with the present appalling conditions?

There is some validity in that last sentence and that description would not be far from

the truth. I trust the Minister will be able to see that something is done about it soon and that something is put on the Loan Estimates next year at least, not necessarily for a new primary school, but certainly for a considerable rebuilding programme. This school, which is so inadequate and so poorly serviced today, will have to continue as a primary school when the high school is built. If not a new primary school then certainly a major reconstruction programme is necessary at Yorketown, and I bring that to the notice of the Government for further consideration.

I notice with pleasure that there will be further extensions at Roseworthy College and that the Commonwealth Government is meeting half the cost. This is an important work bringing further facilities to an agricultural college of an already high standard, one we feel is the best in the Commonwealth. I wonder (and probably the Chief Secretary will be able to provide me with the answer) what will happen about the proposed Agriculture Department buildings. Perhaps I have not read the Loan Estimates sufficiently well but I have not been able to see anything about money for those buildings which are so urgently needed.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I think that \$50,000 is provided for them.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I suppose that would be a start. We are all aware of the situation in which the Agriculture Department works at present and the pressing need for facilities at Northfield.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you happen to know whether the Government intends to put the Fisheries Department together with the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is something I do not know. I should like the Chief Secretary to provide us with some information about that in due course. Probably he knows a little more than I do about another item, the Government Printing Office, in respect of which \$400,000 is provided to commence construction at Netley. All honourable members have been pressing for these facilities, the total cost of which will eventually be over \$5,000,000, which means the work will take some time to complete. Will the Chief Secretary let us know in due course when he hopes it will be completed? The old building at the back of Parliament House must go eventually from the point of view of inefficiency and lack of safety and because the space is needed for other things.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Could the honourable member also ask the Chief Secretary what has happened about the Rural Youth centre to be built at Northfield?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am glad the honourable member has mentioned that, because I have been as interested as he has been in the Rural Youth Movement. I was under the impression that something would be done for Rural Youth. I hope the Government has not lost sight of this matter and that, when it provides the new buildings at Northfield, it will think about providing facilities for Rural Youth. I am sure the Chief Secretary will agree that the Rural Youth Movement, which extends into the cities as well as in the country areas, is most valuable. It has provided further education and additional facilities and opportunities for young people. I am sure the Hon. Mr. Hart will agree with that. That movement should be given every encouragement in the future.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Probably they will use the cultural centre for that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is a point I was coming to. There are some things I was going to mention which, no doubt, will be dealt with adequately by other honourable members. I am pleased that further construction is to take place on the Torrens Island power station, but I am concerned about the line about the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, in view of the present trouble in that area, but no doubt that will be dealt with by some of my colleagues.

I want now to say something about a matter that is usually reserved for city members, something that the Hon. Mr. Hill mentioned yesterday—the festival theatre, as it is now called. I note that an extra \$800,000 is now to be appropriated for a cultural complex. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Hill referred continually to the “festival hall”. I commend him for that because that is what it should be; there is no need for a festival theatre, which would cost much more and which would never be a completely satisfactory solution to the needs of the theatre and the needs of the concert hall. I have never seen a hall that is completely suitable as both a concert hall and a theatre or vice versa. Even if this happens (and I will believe it when I see it) there will still be some argument about who will use the festival theatre at the time of the Festival of Arts. I foresee the possibility of some big concerts being shoved down to Centennial Hall, which is most unsuitable for that purpose. I regret to see the expenditure of another \$800,000

at the present time. I endorse what the Hon. Mr. Hill said yesterday, that we already have theatres available.

I have in mind two that could be fairly readily made available. One is a moderate size theatre now known as the Warner Theatre. That has dressing-room facilities and a stage, and it was a live theatre. It could be adapted in the same way as Her Majesty's was adapted. There are also smaller theatres in the universities, the teachers colleges and other places. There is no need for a theatre to be as large as a concert hall, because theatrical productions are presented many times over while concerts are presented only once or twice. Therefore, there is a need for a large hall for concerts. I do not believe the present expenditure of money is necessary when there are so many other things needed at present.

The last thing I refer to is that the Government is proceeding with the expenditure of nearly \$400,000 for the replacement of and the provision of additional school buses. I well remember that this facility was instituted by Sir Thomas Playford. It has been of tremendous assistance in educating the young children of this State. I read a letter from one such person only this afternoon, who got a secondary education and could not have got as far as he did without the help of school buses. I am glad the Government is taking the right step in continuing the maintenance and replacement of school buses, because it will mean a good education for some young people who will get the opportunity they need. If they get such an opportunity, it is then up to them whether or not they are able to take advantage of it. With the qualifications I have mentioned, I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support these Loan Estimates. I have virtually one subject only that I wish to debate, a subject which by a strange twist of fate the Hon. Mr. Dawkins started to discuss just now—harbours accommodation, for which \$3,700,000 is allocated. In April of this year, the Director of Marine and Harbors returned from a trip overseas and had this to say in the *Advertiser*:

South Australia's lack of a container terminal meant that Melbourne was getting the trade, according to the Director of Marine and Harbors (Mr. I. R. Sainsbury). Mr. Sainsbury returned on Tuesday after an eight-week tour of major world ports. He had been sent by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Corcoran) to report to the Government on latest port developments. Mr. Sainsbury said that South Australia was the only mainland port without a container terminal. Melbourne was handling container traffic from South Australia and Tasmania as

well as its own, which led to delays in sorting. "My view is that we need container handling here to attract ships", Mr. Sainsbury said.

In Parliamentary Paper No. 11A we see:

Expenditure of \$500,000 is proposed to commence work on a roll-on-roll-off berth at Port Adelaide to improve facilities for the interstate steel traffic. The work comprises a new wharf, dredging of the berth and its approaches, heavy duty paving of the wharf apron, an approach roadway, and essential services. The estimated total cost is \$1,507,000.

The containerization trade is a most fascinating exercise in speed, especially when compared with the old method of loading and unloading cargoes from ships. According to the Marine and Harbors Department, the conventional method of unloading a hold of a ship with a full gang enables between 50 tons and 100 tons an hour to be shifted and, if there are four holds with a gang in each, 300 tons to 400 tons of cargo can be shifted in an hour. With the roll-on-roll-off or containerization type of ship, 1,200 tons an hour can be shifted. One can therefore imagine what a difference this would make to shipping costs, as well as to import and export costs.

The fact that the Government has agreed to construct a steel roll-on-roll-off facility for use by B.H.P. Company ships and those of a similar nature does not mean that it will be readily available to other forms of shipping. It is envisaged that that company will be bringing in a ship every five days, and it has asked the Government to give it priority in the use of these facilities, to which request the responsible Minister has agreed. Indeed, it has been stated that the preferential treatment that the company wants in relation to the use of these new terminal facilities will just about preclude any other ship from using them. The roll-on-roll-off facilities at Port Adelaide's No. 3 dock are also being used by another overseas shipping company called PAL, which trades more on the old route between America and Australia.

As Mr. Sainsbury has been reported in the *Advertiser* as saying, it appears that the shipping lines from Europe can call at Fremantle in Western Australia, or Melbourne or Sydney, but not Adelaide, because there are no facilities here for handling this type of cargo. This scheme started off with a great blaze of glory, with everyone saying that it was real progress. However, a container ship coming from the United Kingdom could contain goods for merchants in Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart and Adelaide, and when the ship gets to the port in Melbourne it takes a considerable time for it

to be unloaded and for the goods to be consigned to the various consignees in the other States, which means another delay just about as bad as those caused in the bad old days when ships had to be unloaded laboriously by hand and when a ship was in port for anything up to 20 days.

I make a plea that the Government, in its future planning, seriously consider building containerization facilities at Port Adelaide so that the overseas ships coming to Australia will be able to unload at Port Adelaide; this will benefit not only the people of this State but also its industries, and it will also improve South Australia's export potential. It appears, from the evidence that has been presented in the 18 months to two years that container shipping has been operating in Melbourne, that it has not proved economic or efficient for the South Australian trade. One company to which I went for advice told me that it had given Melbourne away and was trying to unload at Fremantle, trucking its goods across by railway from Western Australia to Adelaide. However, up to date it has not been able to say whether it is quicker to use Victoria's eastern seaboard. South Australia must keep up with the times. In 1965-66, the container shipping companies said that, to get the speed of turn-round of ships that they needed, they would work through only three ports (in Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales) and that everything would proceed with great gusto. However, as the evidence has shown, that gusto does not exist.

The other point with which I wish to deal, and in relation to which I hope I am not impinging on the Hon. Mr. Whyte's comments, relates to country waterworks. A submission has been made to the Commonwealth Government seeking financial assistance in this respect under the national water resources development programme. To my knowledge, for more than two years this State has gone to the Commonwealth Government, either through the Prime Minister or through his responsible Ministers, with evidence requesting help to reticulate water to certain country areas in the Northern District, particularly on Eyre Peninsula. At present, more than an atom blast is needed to move Canberra into making a decision on this matter. If one looks through the Loan Estimates, one will find therein the same statement that an approach has been made to the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Half-hearted promises have been made, but we haven't received a cent.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It's about time we changed the Government over there.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Let us stick to this matter at present.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It's a crook Government in Canberra.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If the honourable member wishes to point the finger, he should remember that no Government is always right.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You quoted it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am not quoting; I am merely trying to point out that there is a definite need for the Government to be made to understand that South Australia is a dry State, and that we mean what we say when we request assistance for water reticulation. Such requests are not designed merely as gimmicks. The Hon. Mr. Story pointed to the shocking waste of money that has occurred in the provision of water in New South Wales. This State must have water, and it cannot be expected out of its own slender resources to finance the whole project all at once. I make a plea to the Commonwealth Government to give greater consideration to this State. If it will not, let it say so, instead of procrastinating as it has done for the last two years. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): In supporting the Loan Estimates I wish to make certain observations about matters that affect my constituents. It is pleasing to see that consideration has been given to schools and hospitals in my district: some Samcon schools are to be erected in the outback areas and allocations have been made for hospital buildings at Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Port Lincoln. I am pleased that these matters have not been overlooked. However, certain aspects of the Estimates concern me. The allocation under the Loans to Producers Act has been reduced by \$264,000. That Act performs a useful purpose in assisting wineries, distilleries, and fruit canning and packing houses, and I am concerned that less money has been allocated under this line.

There has been great encouragement given to overseas investors to set up enterprises in this type of industry, but it has always concerned me that we should promote overseas interests and spend money to support such moves but, at the same time, allow our local industries to suffer as a result. Nothing I can say now is likely to alter that situation, but I refer the point to the notice of the Government. Spending on national reserves

is also reduced and I suppose that is fair enough, because the Government cannot continue spending money as it has been in order to acquire land for national reserves. If it did, it would finish up with half the State acquired for reserves but with no-one to look at them. Mount Clarence station, Which embodies the mining operation at Coober Pedy, could be profitably acquired by the Government as a national reserve. It already is a tourist attraction, but it has many other attractions. If the Government wants land for reserves I believe that this site would be most suitable and would serve a double purpose.

It is pleasing to note the allocation (it is not nearly enough, although I suppose it is what the Government can provide) for harbour facilities at Port Lincoln and Thevenard. I turn now to a pet topic of mine, having been interested in it for almost 30 years without achieving much, and that is the supply of water to Kimba. The sum of \$859,000 has been provided this year and that is not nearly enough. True, the scheme is proceeding on schedule, but it will not be completed until 1973. About half the total cost of \$2,800,000 has been spent up to now and the main has reached the half-way point, so that I cannot complain that the work is behind schedule.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I told you that you would get all the credit for that.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not know whether much credit is due, but people are concerned and perhaps the Chief Secretary may not be aware of the seriousness of the present position. At present, about 2,000,000 gall. of water is held in reserve in the Kimba district, and this is the lowest quantity ever held in reserve at this time of the year. The Government spends tens of thousands of dollars each year (it amounted to \$250,000 in one year) to provide water for Kimba. It seems so ridiculous and ludicrous that a scheme that is estimated to cost \$2,800,000 could not be hastened. I am sure that everyone would agree that that is not much money to spend. For many years I have been a member of deputations to various Premiers and Ministers of Works of this State, and I have written to the Prime Minister and the Minister for National Development in the Commonwealth Government.

During the reign of John Gorton as Prime Minister I learned that this State had never applied to the Commonwealth Government for assistance for this scheme. This situation astounded me, because we had been led to

believe by two Governments that an application had been made but that it had been downgraded because of the priority for the Keith to Tailem Bend main. However, at that time no application had ever been lodged. Not only does the Government spend tens of thousands of dollars each year but the cost to primary producers in that area is more than they can bear at present. The situation of having a truck waiting to get water from a train, paying a driver, and paying road maintenance taxation to use unmade roads, cannot further be endured by these people. I am most concerned about this matter, because I believe it is not proper that we should sit back and say we will expedite this scheme when the Commonwealth Government gives us finance.

If the Commonwealth Government is at fault (and I say it is at fault for not making funds available), so then is the State Government. Apparently, this Government can find money for a performing arts complex at a time when people are in dire distress, as they are on the route of this main from Poldia to Kimba. People have proved that the land on which they live, in normal conditions and not considering the present depressed rural situation, can provide much revenue for the State. These people have established in this area, but the performing arts centre could be only a dream. I hope that it is not and that it pays off: the Premier said that it could pay off one-thousand fold, but even if it does it will take a long time to succeed. With the water situation in South Australia as it is, if the Premier fiddles with the situation as he did over previous negotiations with other States, people will be carting water from Victoria for the use of tourists that the Premier hopes the performing arts centre will attract to this State. Sir Henry Bolte would do very well out of that. However, it is not a matter that we can make fun of. Every honourable member should be concerned, including Government members; I hope they will take to the Premier my sincere plea for a speeding up of work on this main. I support the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEAT BELTS)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 26, at 2.15 p.m.