

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 10, 1967

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Highways Act Amendment,
Land Settlement Act Amendment,
Morphett Street Bridge Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

OIL

Mr. HALL: My question concerns the offshore areas (the rights to which are being disputed) near the border between Victoria and South Australia. I understand that the exploration licences issued in Victoria and South Australia show the offshore boundary to be an extension in a straight line of the border between the two States. Although this is not a conclusive point in settling the dispute, it would seem to support the claim that the offshore boundary should be an extension of the land border. In view of this, will the Premier assure the House that not even one square inch of the offshore area (in which South Australia has a rightful interest) will be ceded to Victoria?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, exploration licences have been granted with the meridian line as the border. However, as the Leader rightly says, this establishes nothing, legally. Inevitably we have to come to some conclusion as to what is the offshore boundary. The Leader requests that I cede nothing that South Australia has a rightful interest in. Yes: I will cede nothing that South Australia has a rightful interest in. However, what is "cession"? One cannot be charged with giving away something that one has not got. In fact neither Victoria nor South Australia has any means, legally, of determining what is the offshore boundary between the interests of the two States in territorial waters and certainly neither has any means of determining that, as far as the continental shelf beyond territorial waters is concerned. Even within territorial waters the rights of the States are extremely doubtful. However, full information concerning this matter will be placed before the House.

Mr. Millhouse: When?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member can bide his time; he will get it in due course.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what proposals this Government has submitted to the Commonwealth Government regarding drought relief? Also, can he indicate the recent activities of the Drought Relief Committee and say whether it has forwarded questionnaires to obtain information from farmers about the type of relief they require?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. As he said here last Tuesday, the Premier has forwarded a detailed submission to the Prime Minister. The committee has been active and, as the honourable member suggests, it has sent questionnaires to farmers in the two areas that are suffering most from the drought: the Loxton area, which is represented by the honourable member, and the Murray Plains area, which is represented by the member for Stirling and me. Questionnaires have also been sent to Murray Plains councils, which are co-operating well in the collation of the information. I think the same applies to the Upper Murray area, where a committee was appointed at a well attended meeting at Wunkar. With the co-operation of the member for Ridley, the Drought Relief Committee gained much useful information at a meeting held at the South Terrace office of the United Farmers and Graziers. It is hoped that action will be taken soon, and further information will be given then.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about fodder for cattle herds in the Balaklava area and its availability from other States?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Leader, referring to some of his constituents who were carting stock to another State and backloading fodder from the Murray River irrigation areas of New South Wales, asked whether, when stock was no longer carted, assistance could be given for the backloading of hay. The matter has been referred to the Drought Relief Committee at his request, and I have the following report by the Chairman of the committee:

Of greatest significance in respect to feeding of hay to stock in drought-stricken areas is the overall supply. Stocks of hay are now at a very low level in all districts in this State and, so far as we can ascertain, in other States as well. Grain is available in the form of wheat and barley in sufficient quantities to handle the situation so far as the maintenance of basic sheep breeding flocks are concerned. Where insufficient hay has been conserved for cattle the position is more difficult.

Fortunately, the improvement in seasonal conditions in the State generally over the past month would indicate that hay will be cut in some districts in the coming season.

When fodder is brought from other States, there is a danger that noxious weeds will be introduced. A recent proclamation prohibits the introduction of lucerne from parts of Victoria because of the existence of bacterial wilt in those parts which could become a problem if it were brought into South Australia. This matter has been carefully examined, and the situation will be kept constantly in mind. As the position has improved somewhat in parts of the State (although further rains are needed), it is hoped that sufficient hay will be cut for the next season.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about whether the Railways Department would be prepared to forgo its charge of 85c a ton for removing grain from silos where it is proved that the grain is to be used to feed starving stock?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture is awaiting a report from the Drought Relief Committee on this topic.

SEACOMBE ROAD

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of August 3 regarding the condition of Seacombe Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the maintenance period under the contract for the construction of Drain 10 expires on August 25, 1967. After this date, orders will be issued to the two councils concerned (Brighton and Marion) to reinstate Seacombe Road to its condition prior to commencing any drainage works. The cost of reinstatement is chargeable to the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. There are no immediate Highways Department plans for the reconstruction or resurfacing of Seacombe Road as this is a road entirely under the care, control and management of the two councils concerned.

HILLS LAND

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last Tuesday about the possible acquisition as a fauna and flora reserve of land adjacent to Loftia Park?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A report has been received from the National Parks Commission on an area of land east of Loftia Park National Pleasure Resort. However, although the urgency of the matter is appreciated, further examination by officers of my

department is necessary. At present negotiations have not advanced sufficiently to enable me to advise the honourable member further.

SWIMMING TRUNKS

Mr. BROOMHILL: There has been criticism of the outdated swimming trunks that the Leader of the Opposition was wearing as shown in the photograph in last night's *News* of the Leader exercising on Grange Beach. I commend the Leader for having selected that beach from all metropolitan beaches. However, it has been claimed that his swimming trunks were as outdated as his policies. In fact, the compere of *Adelaide Tonight* last evening drew attention to this matter and, by way of comparison, pointed out that the Premier, with his more modern ideas, would wear more streamlined bathing trunks. Is the Premier prepared to lend his trunks to the Leader if the Leader again visits a beach in my district?

The SPEAKER: The Premier will not reply.

CONTAINERIZATION

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the queries I raised during the Loan Estimates debate about facilities for containerized shipping at the port of Adelaide?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In reply to the honourable member's remarks, I have obtained the following report from the Director of Marine and Harbors:

A comprehensive view of the requirements of Port Adelaide in regard to container traffic and the steps being taken to meet such requirements is contained in a brochure.

I am prepared to make a copy of the brochure available to the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will the Minister table it so that all members may look at it?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The document is a public one. It was tendered as evidence to the Senate Select Committee. The report continues:

So far as is known at present, the only 100 per cent container ship that will call at Port Adelaide will be the *Kooringa*, which will operate a weekly feeder service to Melbourne, and No. 6 berth, in No. 1 dock, has been allocated for this vessel. No other wharfside facilities are required as the containers will be taken directly to and from a container depot being built on reclaimed land in the Gillman area. Many containers and unit loads will, of course, be carried by the new composite or unit load ships currently being constructed by Continental, Japanese and United States owners. These vessels will call regularly at

Port Adelaide in the same manner as the present vessels of the same owners and berths Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 have been allocated for their use. Certain preparatory dredging works consisting of widening berths Nos. 18, 19 and 20 from 80ft. to 100ft. and providing a 1,000ft. diameter swinging basin at the mouth of the No. 3 dock are required, however. The former will be carried out this year and the latter next year. In the meantime the berths at the Outer Harbour can be used where adequate areas have been levelled and surfaced at the rear of sheds Nos. 1 and 4 for the storage of containers.

The need can also be seen for an interstate roll-on-roll-off service which is already enjoyed by New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania with active planning in hand for such a service to Queensland and about which there has been much publicity in the press. To this end plans are being drawn for a roll-on-roll-off berth in No. 3 dock, and it is hoped to present such a proposal to the Government shortly for investigation by the Public Works Committee. Such a service would ferry overseas and interstate containers, unit loads, strapped pallets, etc., to and from the Eastern States.

In case a shipping consortium should select Adelaide as the terminal port for fully containerized overseas vessels, 170 acres of land is being reclaimed near the Outer Harbour at Pelican Point which could be used for providing facilities for such vessels. This is, of course, long-term planning, as 20,000 D.W.T. overseas container ships running a 10-day service at 75 per cent loading in both directions would require about 1,000,000 tons of containerable cargo to and from one particular locality, that is, North-Western Europe, America, or Japan, whereas the total containerable cargo passing through Port Adelaide both in and out for all localities is little over 500,000 tons, that is, 300,000 tons in respect of North-Western Europe, and 200,000 tons split between Japan, the U.S.A. and the rest of the world.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It seems to me that there will be a problem concerning an extended delay in forwarding commodities from this State to overseas markets and, similarly, in receiving commodities from overseas markets into this State. I understood the Minister to say that a 10-day delay would occur between shipments, and I believe that this will adversely affect South Australian industry, which is competing with industry in Sydney, Melbourne or Perth, where shipments will be direct. If my impression that there will be a 10-day delay between shipments is not correct, will the Minister indicate the expected service to be given Port Adelaide by these ships and the frequency of the service?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: From discussions I have had with the parties concerned,

I believe that the service will be frequent and will connect with the service in Melbourne. No extra cost will be involved and practically no delay will occur, because commodities will be delivered so much more quickly that weeks of loading will be reduced to hours. If the honourable member desires another copy of the report that I gave to the Deputy Leader, I shall be prepared to let him have one.

GAS

Mr. McKEE: Can the Premier say whether, if natural gas were conveyed to a consumer at Port Pirie, the price for gas would be the same as that for gas supplied to the metropolitan area of Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is certainly the aim of the Government to see that when industries establish in the country using natural gas they will not have a worse price than that available in Adelaide, and discussions are being undertaken with the authority and the producers to this end.

HORTICULTURAL ADVISER

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: During the Address in Reply debate in June I urged the appointment of a horticultural adviser to be stationed at Nuriootpa to fill the vacancy caused by the transfer of Mr. Spurling. Has the Minister of Agriculture any further reply for me on this subject?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have had advice from the Public Service Commissioner that this vacancy was advertised again on July 22 and that the closing date for applications is today, August 10. As soon as I hear further about this I shall advise the honourable member again.

STATE'S ECONOMY

Mr. LANGLEY: Early in this session I referred to a biased editorial in the *Advertiser* concerning this State's Ministry. This editorial was far from the truth, as the people of South Australia know. In today's *Advertiser* a similar editorial appears, headed "Island of Stagnation". A statement made by a Commonwealth Minister (Dr. Forbes), whom one would think to be a true representative and out to help this State, was published. This seems very political in character. As this statement seems to give the impression that South Australia is not progressing under the Labor Government, it is not helpful in any way to the people of this State or to business coming here. Does the Premier consider this statement to be far from representing the present and future situation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the Commonwealth Minister for Health is trying to play politics at the expense of this State and, like several other public figures in this State, is knocking the State's employment and industrial situation as hard as he can, regardless of the effects on business confidence or on people wanting to come here. The Minister is a member of a Ministry that has said that the economy of Australia is finely balanced and needs no stimulus, a statement bitterly disagreed with by the Liberal Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland. Queensland, which forms part of the market for the products of this State, has a considerably worse employment situation than that of this State. To the people who are unemployed in the community because of the lack of stimulus in certain markets within Australia (and it is in the hands of the Commonwealth Government only to stimulate them), the statement that the economy is finely balanced and that no stimulus is needed to provide them with employment must be a bitter blow, indeed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had the pleasure of listening to Dr. Forbes give his address at the annual meeting of the Liberal and Country League. His main thesis was that South Australia is part of the Australian economy but this is the only State in which the depressed conditions of which he complains exist. Can the Premier say what are the factors that are so different in South Australia as to mark out this State as being the only depressed State in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member has never heard of Queensland and it seems that Dr. Forbes has never been there. In fact, if we look at the state of the Queensland economy, we see that it has had to have special subventions from the Commonwealth Government to assist what Queensland itself has called, and what the Commonwealth Government (of the Ministry of which Dr. Fobes is a member) has called, the depressed state of the Queensland economy. Queensland has a higher level of unemployment than this State has. The honourable member has said that this is the only State in which depressed conditions exist—

Mr. Millhouse: Let us not hear about that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: — and, when I give him the lie direct, he says, "Let us not hear about that."

Mr. Millhouse: That is right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One significant fact in the down-turn of the South Aus-

tralian economy is the depressed state of the markets for our pressed metal products in the Eastern States of Australia. This arises from two factors: the effects of the drought on the Eastern States and the effects of Japanese competition on the Australian car market, which has produced—

Mr. Millhouse: That's a fine excuse!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is what the car manufacturers themselves tell me. The honourable member obviously knows more than they do about it.

Mr. Clark: He knows more than anybody about anything.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The simple way in which this industry can be stimulated (and it can be stimulated) is by reducing marginally the sales tax on motor cars.

Mr. Millhouse: By how much?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Commonwealth reduced it by 2½ per cent, that in itself would give sufficient stimulus to the market (where there has already been some upswing) to have a marked effect on the South Australian economy.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Whose opinion is that?

The SPEAKER: Order! Members know that answers to questions cannot be debated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the opinion of the economic advisers to this Government. A submission of this kind was made at the Premiers' Conference; it was supported; and the Commonwealth Treasurer has said that it will be considered in the coming Budget. However, if we are to believe Dr. Forbes, no notice is to be taken of the necessity to stimulate markets for this State's products.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Who would take notice of him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If this is the kind of deal Liberal Governments give to the State, the people in South Australia, who are part of Australia and who ought to be able to demand of a Commonwealth Government that it does its job in regard to every sector of the Australian economy, will know how to vote.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the course of his address Dr. Forbes pointed out that the Commonwealth money supplied under the Aged Persons Homes Act was responsible for no less than 10 per cent of the total expenditure on dwelling construction in South Australia in the June quarter of this year. He gave that estimate among a number of others set out in this morning's paper. In the light of the figures I have just quoted and in the light of those tha

appeared in this morning's paper, will the Premier agree that at least half of the troubles of South Australia economically have been due to the rise in the level of costs in this State since March, 1965, which has significantly reduced our ability to compete on markets in other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The rise in costs in South Australia has been entirely marginal. South Australia remains competitive cost-wise with the other States and it has a much more satisfied work force than previously. Compared with Liberal-governed States, it has a far lower level of time lost through labour disputes.

Mr. Millhouse: That applied before you came to office.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It applies much more so now.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Less!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary.

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members persist in debating replies to questions, I shall have to take some action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact is that South Australia is not uncompetitive with the other States cost-wise. However, I find it an interesting commentary on the policy of members opposite that their express remedy for the situation in South Australia about which they complain is to cut benefits away from the workers in this State. If this is what they propose in order, as they say, to make industry more competitive than it is now, then let them have the fortitude to come out and say that they are going to remove from the workers in South Australia the benefits they have received under this Government.

Mr. McANANEY: The Premier said that the workers were better off under the Labor Government. However, during the last two years, the average wage earned in South Australia has dropped to \$2.30 below the Australian average. How does this fit in with the Premier's statement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under the present Government workers now have a number of benefits available to them which were certainly not available to them under the Playford Government and about which members opposite have complained as being the means of loading industry with extra costs. One example often referred to is the general improvement in workmen's compensation in South Australia; another is long service leave; another is service pay; another is improved conditions for public servants and teachers;

and another is equal pay for teachers and other people in the Public Service. Members opposite say that these have increased costs in South Australia, even though some are not direct costs to industry at all. These things are very real benefits to workers in South Australia for which they are very grateful to this Government, and the honourable member will find this out if he likes to talk to workers for once in his life.

Mr. HEASLIP: Can the Premier say why South Australia's unemployment figure has increased to such an extent that it is now equal to that of any other State, and why South Australia's economic position has deteriorated to a very low level? The unemployment figures of New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia are much lower and their economic positions are much better. I point out also that the sales tax on motor vehicles has not altered over the past six years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of the honourable member's statements are incorrect, and he must know this. South Australia has not the highest unemployment rate in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Heaslip: I said "equal".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not even equal to Queensland. The honourable member must know this; from statements he has made previously in the House, I realize that he knows it. On a number of occasions in this House I have given the reasons for a down-turn in the South Australian economy, and I have stated them publicly. If the honourable member is unable to understand them or to listen to what other people say, then I cannot help him further. It is evident that there are certain people in the political life of this State who desperately do not want to see a recovery in the South Australian economy.

NATIONAL ROUTE No. 32

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question of July 21 about signposting National Route No. 32, a suggestion inspired by the Riverton Chamber of Commerce?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that arrangements will be made to ensure that the appropriate route markers are installed at strategic positions on National Route No. 32. New signs are currently being designed for the northern end of the Gawler by-pass, as well as at Giles Corner.

CARRIBIE BASIN

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the water supply in the Carribie basin?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has advised that a report late last year of the Mines Department concluded that the likely safe off-draw from the basin was small in view of the little difference between piezometric surface and sea-water level. At that time it was intended that further studies should be made to determine the annual intake that reached the aquifer. These studies are progressing and the Mines Department advises that the help of the Bureau of Meteorology has been sought in regard to the installation of a pluviograph in the area. Present impressions of the basin are such that there seems to be little hope of developing a widespread scheme from this source, and certainly this cannot be done until a complete study has been made. It is also pointed out that suitable underground stock water is available to landowners at shallow depth and at relatively little expense.

EVAPORATION BASINS

Mr. CURREN: At present, considerable quantities of drainage water discharge into the evaporation basins near each of the river district irrigation settlements. As I understand that during the main irrigation season from November to March each year the salinity level of this water reaches reasonably low levels, will the Minister of Irrigation have tests conducted at the point of discharge into the evaporation basins in order to establish the suitability of this water for possible re-use in the production of fodder crops?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to have tests conducted concerning the suitability of this water. The question of its re-use in connection with the production of fodder crops may, however, present some difficulties; but I shall be happy to have the matter investigated and bring down a report.

COUNCIL FUNDS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of August 1 about the late allocation of funds to councils for expenditure on certain projects?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports:

Allocations of extra grant funds are sometimes made during a particular financial year, because (a) programmed works could not be

commenced owing to factors outside the control of the Highways Department; (b) such works have been delayed for a variety of reasons; and (c) estimated revenue is more buoyant than anticipated at the commencement of the financial year. Such factors cannot be anticipated when the initial grant programme is approved for the ensuing financial year. It is not clear in what manner such extra grants cause unprofitable working without having more specific information. Establishing trust funds under the present annual budget procedure, adopted by most Governments, would present problems. There would be no advantage in performing ordinary grant works, which are small in character, under debit order.

ANGASTON CROSSING

The Hon. B. H. TUESNER: I have received a letter from the District Council of Angaston asking me to support its move for the installation of flashing warning lights at a very hazardous crossing, known as Plush's Corner railroad crossing, at Light Pass. The Angaston to Stockwell road is intersected here by another road from Light Pass. The Nuriootpa to Truro railway line crosses here, and a spur line begins here and leads to the Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand Limited quarries at Penrice. The council's letter states:

The main danger at this corner is to loaded motor vehicles approaching the crossing from Stockwell. To the drivers of these motor vehicles particularly, it is well-nigh impossible for them to obtain a clear view of the rail line as it comes from Truro (Stockwell). If these vehicles are forced to stop at the crossing to enable the driver to ascertain if the line is all clear, by the time he gets his heavy vehicle in motion again he could be in bother with an approaching train.

Because of the close proximity of the quarries, a considerable volume of heavy motor truck traffic uses this crossing. The letter continues:

We feel that this particular crossing may almost be unique and, in being so, has dangers which do not exist at any other crossing, outside of the metropolitan area. You will no doubt be aware of the heavy traffic (including interstate vehicles) which use this road in travelling to and from either the wineries and/or the South Australian Portland Cement Co. Ltd. works, etc. It is this type of traffic particularly that we are concerned about.

Earlier this year the district council made representations to the Railways Commissioner on this matter, but the representations were unsuccessful. Will the Minister of Lands refer this matter to the Minister of Transport to ascertain whether it could be reviewed again with a view to having flashing warning lights, as suggested by the council, installed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

ROAD TAX

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question seeking further information about road maintenance tax allocations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that all moneys received under the provisions of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act are paid to the credit of the road maintenance account and used solely for maintenance of public roads. Specific allocations to district councils have never been made directly from these receipts, which are taken into consideration when determining the overall allocation of funds for road purposes. Although the total amount collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act in the year ended June 30, 1967, amounted to \$1,903,177, the amount spent on maintenance of roads and bridges during the same year was as follows: Highways Department, \$3,729,834; grants to district councils, \$1,644,930; the total amount spent on maintenance being \$5,374,764.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister said that the amounts received from the road maintenance tax had never been paid directly to councils. I recollect that, when the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act was introduced, the amount collected in the first year was disbursed by special grants to councils. Although the letter sent to the councils about the grant did not state that the money had been collected through road maintenance tax, the total tax collected was disbursed to councils. Will the Minister obtain from the department a report, not about whether the report was technically correct but about the true facts of the matter, because I believe he will find that the information the department has supplied is not in accord with fact?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Wasn't the money specially earmarked for that purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What the honourable member says is correct. However, as the question of the member for Ridley dealt with a specific year, it would be technically correct to say that no grants were made direct to councils during that year.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It is the total amount.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I can remember when the tax was first applied; I remember distinctly that, in the first year, the system was as described by the member for

Gumeracha, but it was changed in the following year. However, I shall be happy to obtain a report.

COFFIN BAY JETTY

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the possibility of a new jetty at Coffin Bay?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The establishment of a permanent jetty has been examined by both the Marine and Harbors and Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Departments. The Director of Marine and Harbors drew up three schemes that were submitted to the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, who has requested that one particular proposal should be re-examined and that an estimate for the scheme should be prepared.

GILES POINT

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited announced that it had let a tender for the construction of a 1,500,000-bushel terminal silo at Giles Point. An amount to provide for the construction of bulk-loading facilities at this port has been included in the Loan Estimates. Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Government intends to call tenders for the construction of these facilities? If it does not, can he say what arrangements will be made to construct them?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Tenders will not be called; the work will be done by day-labour employees of the Marine and Harbors Department.

FISHING

Mr. HALL: As intimated yesterday, I was talking last weekend to a large group of fishermen in the South-East, and I was asked what rights cray fishermen had in waters near the oil-drilling rig *Ocean Digger*. Of course, this rig is welcomed both locally and on a State-wide basis because of its value to oil exploration. Representations were made to me by fishermen from Port MacDonnell and other ports, and a fisherman from Robe asked me this question. It is a fact-finding question and I realize there could be some difficulty in the matter because the rig will be operating beyond the jurisdiction of both the State Government and the Commonwealth Government. It must be remembered that the rig is large and there must be movement to and from it. There may have to be a gentlemen's agreement, but it will have to be decided how close to it pots may be set. Will

the Minister of Agriculture use his good offices to ascertain how close to the rig pots may be set and what safeguards will be necessary?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, I shall use my good offices to assist the fishermen. I assure the Leader and this House that it has always been my policy to do all I can to assist fishermen.

SEEPAGE

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to my question of last Thursday concerning the problem of salinity in Lake Bonney?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: About 12 months ago a deputation was informed that the question of diverting No. 2 Main Drain would again be thoroughly investigated when staff could be spared from other more urgent work and funds were available. The opportunity to release staff for this task has not yet occurred, and in fact there has been increased commitment on other matters relating to river salinity and disposal of drainage water, including investigation into deep bore disposal generally and emergency measures to prevent the overflow of extremely saline water from the Berri evaporation basin.

During 1965 it was noticeable that groups of box trees were looking sick. This was at a time when the salinity of the lake water had improved from 2,600 p.p.m. in 1964 to 2,000 p.p.m. A recent inspection has revealed that these groups of box trees are still unhealthy and that foliage appears to be distorted as though some disease or parasite is causing damage. Other gum trees in the immediate vicinity appear to be healthy. The Apex Club at Barmera has recently performed some creditable work on a picnic ground on the foreshore. They have watered some trees with lake water through a sprinkler system. These trees seem to be more vigorous and healthy as a result, notwithstanding some leaf burn where water has been sprayed on to leaves.

A small group of box trees on a little sandy knoll right alongside the outfall for No. 2

Main Drain at the lake shore are as healthy and vigorous as any others on the lake. These trees have had their roots in contact with the saline water passing in the adjacent earth ditch since 1938, but the bulk of their root system is above the constant water level in the lake. Trees on the shores of the lake and along the banks of creeks and the river, which before the locks were installed were above the usual water level but are now "standing in water", have been dead for many years. These and other observations encourage the view departmentally that the prime reason for trees dying at Lake Bonney has been water-logging, not salinity.

On the question of the effect of No. 2 Main Drain on the salinity in Lake Bonney, there can be no doubt that the discharge of the drainage water into the lake contributes to some extent to the build-up of salinity. However, there is room to doubt whether the effect of the drain in this regard is as significant as the seepage of saline water from the adjacent irrigation area via the southern and western foreshore or the salt concentration through evaporation from the lake surface. In support of this contention, the following salinity readings over the years are submitted:

No. 2 Main Drain—average of monthly readings:

	p.p.m.
1938	35,000
1950	5,700
1955	5,300
1959	4,000
1966—	
First six months	3,800
Full year	3,400
*1967—First six months	3,500

* over the range 2,800-4,400.

The range of salinity of water discharged by the drain compared with salinity at two sites on the lake (opposite the kindergarten and in the swimming pool) over the two years ended June 30, 1967, was as follows:

Main Drain No. 2 p.p.m.	Kindergarten p.p.m.	Swimming Pool p.p.m.
2,300-4,440	2,660-3,060	2,640-3,000

Comparisons this year are as follows:

Time	Main Drain No. 2 p.p.m.	Kindergarten p.p.m.	Swimming Pool p.p.m.
End of March	2,800	2,860	2,840
End of April	3,000	3,000	2,900
End of May	4,400	2,950	2,900
End of June	4,000	2,980	2,900

The kindergarten is about 20 chains west of the main drain outfall and the swimming pool a further 10 chains or so west. Notwithstanding variation in the salinity of the main drain discharge of up to 1,600 p.p.m., or nearly 40 per cent, the salinity at the other two sites varied over a range up to 160 p.p.m., or 5 per cent.

The foregoing salinity figures indicate that the discharge of No. 2 Main Drain is not only far from the only or major cause of salinity increase in Lake Bonney but decreasing in significance because of a considerable reduction over the years in the salinity of drainage water.

I think I can say that the problem of salinity in Lake Bonney could be solved if there were sufficient funds to meet the enormous expenditure entailed in diverting drainage and seepage water away from it and fresh water from the river into it, but, so long as this State's water resources and commitments remain as they are, it is most unlikely that the diversion of fresh water to Lake Bonney can be contemplated.

EGGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been approached by an elderly widow of Belair, in my district, who is an egg producer. She has, I understand, a producer's exemption that allows her to sell eggs from door to door. She has received (and this has caused her much perturbation) a circular from the Egg Board to the effect that from August 28 she must pack her eggs in certain cartons, and the cost of these cartons on the basis of each one dozen eggs will be 2.8c. The circular contains this sentence:

The cost of the cartons, plus any freight charges, are to be passed on to the purchaser of the producer's eggs.

This will merely raise the level of costs in South Australia a little more. Apart from that aspect, the woman tells me that it will be extremely difficult for her to get the cartons from, as the circular says, the Egg Board's premises at Railway Terrace, Mile End. She says that, in any case, as she—

Mr. Jennings: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —sells from door to door (I take it immediately after the eggs are produced), packing in cartons is unnecessary. Will the Minister of Agriculture make representations to the board either for this lady's benefit or generally to have the circular and the directions therein withdrawn or at least modified?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I suggest that the honourable member put his request in writing and let me know the full particulars. If he does that, I shall take the matter up with the board.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told that, although there is a Department of Physical Medicine at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, no such department has been established at the Royal Adelaide Hospital as yet. The Department of Physical Medicine, of course, deals with the physical rehabilitation of such people as those who have been injured in motor car accidents or who have suffered a stroke. I apologize for not having asked the question last night during the Loan Estimates debate and I hope that the Premier will forgive me for that. Can he say whether provision will be made in the plans for the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital for a Department of Physical Medicine?

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1967. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

At page 30 of the report of the Royal Commission into the law relating to the sale, supply and consumption of intoxicating liquors and other matters, the Royal Commissioner made certain recommendations, which may be summarized as follows:

- (a) that there should be a new statutory offence for "Any person who drives a motor vehicle while the percentage of alcohol in his blood expressed in grams per hundred millilitres of blood is .08 grams or more";
- (b) that there should be provisions for making regulations for approval of types of breathalysers;
- (c) that there should be provisions enabling a member of the Police Force to require a person whom that member "believes" on reasonable grounds (i) within two hours to have driven a motor vehicle, and (ii) to have consumed alcohol so as to have impaired his ability to drive, to accompany that

member to the nearest available police station and there to submit to a breathalyser test; and

- (d) that the reading shown by a police breathalyser be *prima facie* evidence that the person tested had a blood alcohol concentration equal to that reading at the time of the test and for two hours prior thereto.

In addition, the Royal Commissioner further recommended a review of these proposals in not less than 12 nor more than 18 months hence with particular reference to:

(e) the desirability of lowering the prescribed blood alcohol concentration; and

(f) the introduction of random roadside tests,

but these further recommendations are not germane to the present Bill. This Bill, then, amongst other things, gives effect to recommendations of the Royal Commissioner which I have summarized above. There is not the slightest doubt that there is a demonstrable co-relation between consumption of alcohol by drivers and levels of road accidents, and in so far as this measure will assist in the reduction of these accidents it may be regarded as a contribution to road safety.

Numerous scientific studies have shown that as the concentration of alcohol in a person's blood stream rises so does that person's ability to drive decline. At the lowest concentrations the impairment is imperceptible, but at the higher concentrations the impairment is obvious. It is now accepted that a concentration of .08 grams per hundred millilitres of blood is a critical concentration in that above this concentration impairment will generally exist to a marked degree. Some experts, incidentally, suggest that this critical concentration is as low as .05 grams. It is also established that a driver's ability may be impaired before the driver demonstrates the obvious physical symptoms of being affected by liquor. The effect of this Bill then will be to arm the courts with the power to deal with the driver who, while not necessarily exhibiting marked signs of intoxication, is by reason of his consumption of alcohol a potential danger to himself no less than to other road users.

I shall now deal with the Bill in detail. Clauses 1 to 3 are quite formal. Clause 4 inserts in the principal Act a statutory definition of a breath analysing instrument. Clause 5 strikes out from the principal Act subsections (5) and (6). These subsections are re-inserted in the principal Act by this Bill at a more appropriate place. Clause 6 pro-

poses a number of new sections in the principal Act, and since these proposed new sections represent the substance of the amendment they will be considered in order.

Proposed new section 47a: provides for a definition of "prescribed concentration of alcohol", for although the method of expressing this concentration as a percentage is acceptable to scientists, and in fact it is expressed as such a percentage in the legislation of other States, it has been felt desirable to put the matter beyond doubt by indicating clearly what is involved in the question of comparative concentration.

Proposed new section 47b: creates by subsection (1) the statutory offence of driving, etc., while there is present in the blood the prescribed concentration of alcohol, and it will be noted that the act of "attempting to put a motor vehicle in motion" has also been included since this act is in itself bound up with actually driving the motor vehicle. The penalties for this offence are severe, but nevertheless somewhat less than for "driving under the influence", and in common with that offence for a second, third or subsequent offence, minimum penalties are provided. Subsection (2) provides that evidence of a given concentration within two hours of the commission of the offence will be *prima facie* evidence of that concentration being present at the time of the commission of the offence; this presumption, of course, may be rebutted by other evidence. Subsection (3) provides that only offences committed within the preceding five years shall be taken into account when determining whether or not an offence is a second, third or subsequent offence.

Proposed new section 47c: provides, in effect, that a conviction for the statutory offence under subsection (1) of new section 47b will not of itself be regarded as a conviction for being under the influence of intoxicating liquor, etc., within the meaning of a policy of insurance.

Proposed new section 47d: provides for a convicted defendant to be required to bear certain costs, etc., associated with his apprehension. This is not a new provision, being merely a repositioning of subsection (5) of section 47 of the principal Act which was removed from that section by clause 5 of this Bill. It now applies both to driving under the influence and the "statutory offence".

Proposed new section 47e: provides for a compulsory breathalyser test in the circumstances set out in subsection (1), provided

that the test can be taken within two hours either on the spot or at least at the nearest police station at which facilities exist. In relation to the circumstances set out in subsection (1), it is not necessary that the police officer requiring the test need be satisfied that the impairment resulted from the consumption of alcohol, as proposed in recommendation (c) of the recommendations summarized. Since a purpose of the Bill is to deal with the case of the driver whose ability is impaired but who is not necessarily exhibiting overt signs of intoxication, it would be illogical to limit the first step in a possible prosecution to drivers who, in effect, manifested observable signs of intoxication. The actual offence and penalties are set out in subsection (3), and in this regard attention is directed to the very broad range of penalties there set out; no minimum penalty is provided, but the maximum penalty approximates that for a third or subsequent conviction for the statutory offence. If these penalties were appreciably less than those proposed, no person who had been convicted more than once of the statutory offence would comply with a compulsory requirement, since the penalty that the refusal would attract would be markedly less than the penalty for a second or third conviction of the statutory offence. Subsection (4) provides a defence for a refusal to take the test; a defence which showed that there were no reasonable grounds for the defendant being required to take the test would succeed here, as would a defence that the defendant had a "reason of a substantial character" within the meaning of that subsection.

Proposed new section 47f: provides that a person required to submit to the breathalyser may request a sample of blood to be taken by a medical practitioner of his choice. Under subsection (2), the appropriate member of the Police Force is required to facilitate the taking of the sample. Subsection (3) provides for the first steps in the identification of the sample to be taken, so as to make the sample useful as evidence. A request under this section does not absolve the person from submitting to the breathalyser test.

Proposed new section 47g: deals generally with matters of evidence. Subsection (1) provides that the results of analysis by breathalysers may be admitted and that the results will be evidence of the concentration of alcohol two hours before the sample was taken. This admission of evidence is subject to the

admission of rebutting evidence referred to in relation to subsection (2) of new section 47b. Subsection (1) also provides for persons to be authorized to operate breathalysers. Subsection (2) restricts the admissibility of breathalyser evidence unless the operator gives to the person whose breath is analysed written notice of: (a) the concentration of alcohol indicated; and (b) the date and time of the analysis. Subsection (3) allows for *prima facie* evidence of certain matters to be given by certificate. It is emphasized that this evidence can be rebutted by contrary evidence. Subsection (4) is merely a redraft and a repositioning of subsection (6) of section 47 which was omitted by clause 5 of this Bill. It deals with certificate of analysis by the Government Analyst or his officers and is subject to subsection (6). Subsection (5) provides for the giving of a certificate by an authorized person operating a breathalyser. Subsection (6) provides that the certificate referred to in subsection (4) or (5) will not be admissible unless the party against whom it is proposed to use the certificate is given notice of the fact at least seven days before the trial and has not at any time before the trial notified the complainant that he desires the person signing the certificate to be present. In short, whether or not the certificates are admitted is a matter entirely up to the defendant.

Proposed new section 47h: provides for the notification of the approval of an apparatus as a breathalyser. Clauses 7, 8 and 9 amend the principal Act to bring the "lighting up times" into line with those suggested in the National Road Traffic Code. Under the principal Act as it stands at present, vehicles are required to display the appropriate lights between half an hour after sunset and half an hour before sunrise. The proposed amendment extends this period by half an hour each way, that is, to provide for the display of appropriate lights from sunset to sunrise. Clause 10 amends section 176 of the principal Act, the regulation-making section, by setting out the power to make regulations relating to the breath analysing instruments. Clause 11 is a general decimal currency amendment to change old amounts still expressed in pounds, shillings and pence to the equivalent of those amounts in decimal currency.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It appropriates the moneys required for the purposes detailed in the Loan Estimates which the Committee has considered. Clause 3 defines the Loan Fund. Clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of \$71,820,000. This is the amount of South Australia's allocation for works and purposes arranged at the June, 1967, meeting of the Loan Council.

Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of \$82,560,000 on the undertakings set out in the First Schedule to the Bill. This clause is in the same form as has been adopted for many years and provides in subclause (3) that the Treasurer may authorize variations as deemed necessary between the several lines in the First Schedule but so that the total amount authorized to be issued under the Act shall not be exceeded. The necessity for such a provision for variation must be obvious to all members, as no Treasurer can early in the year accurately forecast the final necessary expenditures line by line. It has been suggested by the honourable member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) that in 1966-67 a provision entirely comparable with this was improperly used as the total amount of Loan expenditures actually exceeded the amount of \$77,459,000 which was the total authorized to be issued under the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1966.

I point out that the limitation applies in subclause (3) of clause 5 to "amounts issued under this Act", and I stress the last three words "under this Act". The honourable member for Gumeracha, better than anyone in this House, is well aware that there is provision under the Public Finance Act, in section 32b, for the securing of authority for further Loan expenditure to meet either of two contingencies:

- (a) where expenditure is required for an authorized Loan work for which appropriation is not provided in a Public Purposes Loan Act or otherwise; or
- (b) where there is appropriation in a Public Purposes Loan Act or otherwise for an authorized Loan work but that appropriation is insufficient.

These special provisions were inserted in the Public Finance Act by amendment in 1949 when the honourable member for Gumeracha

was Treasurer, and during his term of office he found a number of occasions when it was deemed necessary to use them. It is obvious that from time to time occasions will arise when such provisions are necessary to facilitate the proper and expeditious conduct of the financial affairs of government. Any use of section 32b of the Public Finance Act in authorizing additional Loan expenditure by Governor's Warrant must, in accordance with the requirements of that section, be subsequently authorized by a provision in the first Public Purposes Loan Bill introduced thereafter.

Accordingly clause 6 authorizes certain advances made during 1966-67 under the provisions of section 32b of the Public Finance Act and set out in the Second Schedule. Of the two items in that schedule, the first relates to excess expenditure upon public buildings for which there was insufficient appropriation in total in the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1966. The second relates to advances to the Lotteries Commission authorized by the State Lotteries Act, 1966, but for which no appropriation was made in the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1966, because the State Lotteries Act was a subsequent enactment. As expenditure on these two lines aggregating \$1,733,285 was authorized by Governor's Warrant under section 32b of the Public Finance Act, the expenditures authorized by the Public Purposes Loan Act, including variations in accordance with section 5 (3) of that Act, were \$76,075,348, or significantly less than the maximum amount set out in that section.

It has not been the practice to lay before the House the specific formal variations made by the Treasurer under section 5 (3) of the Public Purposes Loan Act, but I list those made in 1966-67 for the information of members. Increases formally authorized, not all of which were actually fully spent, were:

	\$
South-western suburbs drainage	100,000
Lands Department—buildings, plant, etc.	20,000
Non-government hospital buildings	2,725,000
Expenses and discounts of floating conversion and public loans	125,000
	2,970,000

The lines of authority not required in full that were formally decreased in order to cover the increases enumerated were:

	\$
Loans to producers	200,000
Student hostels	150,000
Metropolitan area drainage	250,000
Irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands	20,000
Railway accommodation	700,000
Waterworks and sewers	1,500,000
River Murray weirs, dams, locks, etc.	150,000
	2,970,000

Clause 7 provides for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts, charges, and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 8 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 9 authorizes the borrowing and the issue of \$30,000,000 for the purpose of financing Loan undertakings in the early part of next financial year until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1968 becomes effective.

Clause 10 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury Bills or by bank overdraft. The Treasurer possesses and may exercise this authority under other legislation, but it is desirable to make the authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill, as is done with other borrowing authority. Clause 11 deals with the duration of certain clauses to the Bill. Clause 12 directs that all moneys received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. Clause 13 provides for this Bill to operate as from July 1, 1967.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): As far as I have been able to ascertain, the wording of the Bill is the same as that used in previous years, and it validates moves that have been widely discussed during the Loan Estimates debate. Members will realize the importance of the changes in Government financial policy that have occurred in the last two years. We now see the full effects of the Treasurer's recent decision to transfer to the Loan Account subsidies for non-government buildings. Also, the table details the reduction in the capacity of the Loan Account, a reduction that has resulted in a less effective

programme this year than the programme introduced by the Hon. Frank Walsh in 1965-66.

The effect of the postponed debt from last year, as applied to the Loan Estimates, also reduces the capacity of the programme as outlined in the Bill. I draw the attention of the House to the table and the Treasurer's explanation, both of which outline the cuts in expenditure to cover certain increases. The additional moneys required for non-government hospital buildings has reduced expenditures on many important and developmental items, as a result of the change in Government financial policy. These matters have been canvassed in the House, and to facilitate the passage of the Bill, which has to be sent to another place, I support it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I thank the Treasurer for explaining the authorities that he used to support the alterations made in the programme that was approved by Parliament last year, but which differed from the programme the Government ultimately put into effect. In last year's Loan Estimates the Government changed the previous policy of the State concerning grants to non-government hospitals. Grants for four hospitals that had been charged to the Budget previously were transferred to Loan Account. This undesirable change in policy aroused strong criticism. However, the Estimates were finally passed and the four hospitals for which grants were being made were stated, in the Public Purposes Loan Bill, to be "hospitals, non-government", and the amount was set out in that Bill. But at the end of the year there was a change in control at the Treasury, the Hon. Frank Walsh handing over to the present Treasurer. A few days before the end of the financial year, although up until then we had been told by the Ministers that there would be a substantial deficit, we were told by the Treasurer that (by some remarkable financial achievement) there would be not a deficit but a balanced Budget: overnight, we were to finish up with a balanced Budget instead of an ominous deficit.

Naturally, the House was interested in this new method of finance. But what do we find? We find that the Treasurer had taken some other hospitals, which had been selected in the Budget for grants and had received payment under a warrant granted by His Excellency the Governor, from the Budget and put them into the Loan Account. From memory, I

think those were substantial items, amounting to \$2,600,000. So that overnight, by the doubtful expediency of manipulating Government accounts, the Treasurer announced that he had a surplus. What had actually happened was that money voted for other public works in the State that had not been proceeded with had been used: the Government had not paid all the accounts it expected it would have to pay, and some items (grants to non-government hospitals) had been transferred to the Loan Account from the Budget Account. For me, it raised one technical question: how a Governor's Warrant that has been paid can be cancelled. I leave the Treasurer and the Auditor-General to determine that, but the fact remains that the Governor's Warrants that had been used and under which the Budget items had been properly paid must have been cancelled, and this remarkable improvement in the Government finances was achieved overnight.

When we on this side asked under what authority these transfers were made, we were informed by the Treasurer, both in answer to a question and again when he made his statement on the Loan Estimates, that these provisions were made under section 5 (3) of the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1966. The Treasurer was good enough to say that I was responsible for that provision, so I am well aware of its contents. It says that:

If the amount mentioned in any line of the First Schedule as the proposed expenditure for the work or purpose mentioned in that line is insufficient for that work or purpose, the Treasurer may issue additional money from the Loan Fund for that work or purpose but so that the total amount issued under this Act from the Loan Fund for the financial year ending the 30th day of June 1968 for works and purposes mentioned in that schedule shall not exceed \$82,560,000.

Actually, the figure mentioned in the Public Purposes Loan Bill last year was \$77,459,000. However, what do we find when the Treasury papers are submitted to the Committee? Notwithstanding the expressed prohibition in that Act, stating that the amount shall be limited to \$77,459,000, we see that the amount actually expended under the First Schedule was \$77,808,000. The Treasurer, to try to overcome that difficulty, now brings along the new explanation that that subsection (3) applied only to that Act; but, of course, it applied to that appropriation, and the Treasurer cannot get out of it by his new idea of using another provision, in the Public Finance Act, 1949, section 32b (2) of which states:

Where (a) there is no Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work; or (b) there is an Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work, but the amount appropriated is insufficient for the complete carrying out of the work, the Governor may by warrant authorize the Treasurer to advance any public money not exceeding the amount stated in the warrant for the purpose of the carrying out or continued carrying out of that authorized Loan work.

So that, for the provision that the Treasurer is now trying to rely upon to be used, the amount voted had to be "insufficient". I ask the Treasurer to look at the Bill before the House today in respect of which he is using section 32b. The new sums voted under section 32b relate only to two items. The use of the section in respect of one of those items is entirely proper, namely, the item of \$40,000 concerning the Lotteries Commission. However, its use for the second item, dealing with Government buildings, land and services (\$1,693,285) is obviously entirely improper. I remind the Treasurer that for the latter item \$7,280,000 was voted last year but that only \$6,571,643 was spent. In other words, the line on which the Treasurer is relying as being insufficient and for which he is asking the House, under the Second Schedule, to approve an additional payment of about \$1,693,000 is not insufficient at all. Actually, it was underspent by about \$708,000.

In trying to get out of one accounting problem, the Treasurer has blundered into another one. How can the Treasurer claim that it was necessary to issue a Governor's Warrant under section 32b which provides that, where there is an Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work but the amount appropriated is insufficient for the complete carrying out of that work, the Governor may by warrant authorize the Treasurer to advance the money? How can he claim that there is insufficient money for that purpose? The money for that work was not expended. Of course, the Treasurer, having encountered difficulties with section 5 (3) of the Public Purposes Loan Act, tried to bring the total down below the upper limit imposed under the Act. Although I have not had an opportunity to study the second reading explanation (obviously, it is impossible at present to understand its details) I point out that, on the documents presented, the Second Schedule is an improper schedule in regard to one item. When the Treasurer replies to what I am saying I hope he will take us fully into his confidence and explain this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): First, I wish to reply shortly to what the Leader of the Opposition said, because the statements he made referring to expenditures are incorrect. The basis of the figures before the House have been explained previously. The Leader has set out to give the impression that the lines of authority, which were not required in full last year and which were formally decreased, meant a direct decrease in Government expenditure in this area by direction of the Government, in order to allow for an expansion in expenditure in other areas. That is not so. It is quite constantly the case that a number of matters programmed for a particular year do not, in fact, come to debit in the particular year. These lines were not deliberately decreased in order to provide for an expansion in other areas. In numbers of these cases the amounts originally budgeted did not come to debit.

I instance the line for student hostels: we provided a much larger sum than we spent on student hostels. We did not spend more because those seeking subsidy under the particular Act that allows us to subsidize student hostels did not complete their works and the sums did not come to debit. That was the case with a number of items. I have explained why we did not fulfil our programme in regard to railway accommodation: we were held up on certain contracts as to supplies. I explained previously the matter relating to waterworks and sewers; as there were difficulties about contracts, certain accounts did not come to debit in the year. If I had taken no action about this it would have left me with a surplus on Loan Account with which to go to the Loan Council.

It is not that these works will not be done: they will be done during this financial year instead of last year. They are continuing works; they are not things to be completed for the most part in one year. We were able then to finance certain other works out of Loan funds that previously we had not intended to finance from those funds. As a result, the total amount available to the Government from all sources was, in fact, not in excess of the amount that we paid out, and the Budget was closely balanced on all scores, both in Revenue and Loan.

The member for Gumeracha has waxed eloquent concerning an item in the Second Schedule that he says is completely unauthorized by the provisions of section 32b of the Public Finance Act, under which the authority has been issued for the expenditure of these

moneys. He is quite wrong in his statement that this is improper or unauthorized. The amount in the schedule last year was \$22,310,000 and the expenditure was \$1,693,285 more than that. This was properly provided by warrant under section 32b. I draw the honourable member's attention to the Loan Estimates schedule in front of him. The total provided for estimated payments for Government buildings, land and services was \$22,310,000, not \$7,280,000. The words "Government buildings, land and services" refer to all those items, not only to hospital buildings. The total provided was \$22,310,000 and the actual payments were \$24,003,285. What happened was that we spent \$1,693,285 more for Government buildings, land and services than was estimated in the Loan Estimates originally. In consequence, a Governor's Warrant for the appropriate amount, pursuant to section 32b of the Act, was issued. That was perfectly proper, because the appropriation was insufficient to meet the payments.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Issue and application of money from Loan Fund."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I accept the Treasurer's statement regarding the Second Schedule, which deals with the total of the line, but I was dealing with the applicable sub-total. I cannot accept—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member is referring to the second reading debate, he is out of order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am referring not to the second reading debate but to the fact that clause 5 (3) does not allow the total set out in its concluding lines to be exceeded in any circumstances if an exchange is to be made. Any statement to the contrary is obviously incorrect. I cannot accept any claim that might be made that that authorized the Treasurer last year (or authorizes the Treasurer in any year) to exceed the amount expressly fixed by the Bill as the upper limit. The figures in last year's schedule show that the amount approved in the First Schedule (and set out in the Public Purposes Loan Bill) was \$77,400,000, but the amount expended in the First Schedule that year was \$77,800,000, notwithstanding that there was an express prohibition against using a transfer to exceed the total amount.

It is not permissible to use part of a section to allow a transfer and then to escape the

second part, which limits the transfer. The Treasurer has stated in the documents before us that he has used this section to authorize his exchange programme. Having used the section, he then disowned it and said that it no longer applied. I am sure that the Treasurer, with his vastly superior legal knowledge, would agree that, if a section is used to provide a transfer, such transfer is subject to the conditions of the section. I suggest to the Treasurer that, if he will not accept my word for this matter, he should refer it to the Crown Solicitor. If the Crown Solicitor says the Treasurer can do what he has done, I shall withdraw my remarks. I consider that the appropriation is not a lawful appropriation, and that this matter should be rectified by an amendment, which the Treasurer could easily effect.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I see no necessity for referring this matter to the Crown Solicitor. The honourable member has, or some honourable members have, referred to the Auditor-General, who is the appropriate officer in these matters and who is perfectly satisfied that what has been done by the Government is in accordance with law. If I have in any way erred in this (and I do not admit that I have), I have been following solid precedent in doing so. In 1961, as Treasurer of the State, the honourable member used section 32b to the extent of \$1,151,000 to make a total Loan expenditure significantly in excess of the provision of the 1960 Public Purposes Loan Act.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I did not rely on the clause in question to do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not relying on this particular clause to make any excess payments at all. I rely on this clause only to allow me to transfer payments from one line to another, but the total expenditure under this clause was decidedly less than the total expenditure provided by the Public Purposes Loan Act last year. Therefore, the honourable member is quite incorrect. The procedures that have been followed by the Treasury are perfectly proper and in accordance with the advice tendered by the appropriate officers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer now says that the amounts spent last year were significantly less than the appropriation provided. I point out that the payments made, as set out in the Loan Estimates, were \$400,000 more than the limit set.

These documents deal with the position as at June 30, as the Treasurer knows. The sum in the Second Schedule, upon which he is now relying, was only an advance; it becomes a payment when this Bill has been passed. If the Treasurer and the Auditor-General are so satisfied about the matter, what is the objection to satisfying me by getting the Crown Solicitor's opinion on it?

The Treasurer knows that there is extreme doubt about it. He also knows that he changed the policy after the amounts had been approved by Governor's Warrant. I cannot find an authority for that anywhere; that is why he does not want the opinion of the Crown Solicitor. When a matter of law, in cases such as this, is in dispute, the Auditor-General's job is to get an opinion from the Crown Solicitor. The Audit Act provides that if he gets such an opinion he shall print it in his report. As a disputed appropriation is dealt with in the Audit Act, I ask the Treasurer to obtain the Crown Solicitor's opinion. If the Crown Solicitor is satisfied, I will unreservedly withdraw my objection, but until his opinion is provided I will not withdraw.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows full well that it is not the Treasurer's duty to get an opinion from the Crown Solicitor in these circumstances. If the Auditor-General thinks that an opinion of the Crown Solicitor is needed by him, then it is his statutory right to obtain one. The Treasurer does not direct the Auditor-General in this matter: it is in the hands of the Auditor-General. The Crown Solicitor has statutory duties apart from his duties to his Minister. Regarding advice to the Government, the legal opinion given to the Government is not that of the Crown Solicitor but that of the Attorney-General, and I assure the honourable member that the Attorney-General has given the Treasurer good and sound advice on this matter. On this score, I draw the honourable member's attention to a previous ruling of a Speaker of this House to the effect that honourable members are not entitled to ask that a legal opinion be obtained by the Government in these circumstances. If the honourable member wants a legal opinion he may obtain one. If the Auditor-General considers it necessary in the course of his duty to exercise his statutory right, he will undoubtedly carry out his duty to the public and to Parliament as he always has done.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the member for Gumeracha in this matter. I do not presume to understand precisely the reasoning that has been given by the Treasurer in reply to the member for Gumeracha. As I understand him, the only reply the Treasurer has given so far is that the previous Government did this.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We didn't do it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you look at the second reading explanation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Treasurer gave us more time to digest these matters (instead of bringing in a complicated financial measure and expecting us to debate it straight away), we would do that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Your Government never put these things through on the same day!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would be the last one (and surely my record over the past few years shows this) to say that any Government was always right all the time. It has been noticeable that, every time we press the Government on something or other, the only answer that is given is that our Government always did it anyway. This is as though to say that our Government was always right or, if it was wrong, that that justifies the present Government's being wrong too. Except as an idle retort, this line of defence or argument never holds water and is completely childish. One expects schoolchildren to go on like this but one does not expect such behaviour from people in responsible positions. On the face of it, something appears to be wrong in this case. Section 5 (3) of the Public Purposes Loan Act of last year makes this perfectly clear provision:

... that the total amount issued under this Act from the Loan Fund during the financial year ending . . . for works and purposes mentioned in the First Schedule shall not exceed \$77,459,000.

Of course, it did exceed that. Surely those words must mean something. I am not suggesting that, because this provision has been breached, there is anything necessarily wrong or improper, and it may be that this has been done for years. However, on the face of that particular provision, it does look as though the Government is not doing quite the right thing. If that is so (and the Treasurer's only retort was that it had been done in the past: he has not defended this particular provision in any way), why will he not get an opinion on the matter? Why is he hedging?

Why does he use the superficially clever argument that he is the Attorney-General and he advises the Treasurer? This is exactly what he said with that smug self-satisfied look that we know only too well. He said, "I am the judge and the jury, too." Why won't he have this examined? It would not inconvenience him. Why should it not be examined? I believe that it should be. On the face of it, if we look at the provision and interpret it as it should be interpreted (and that is literally) the wrong thing has been done; this should be cleared up. After all, we are dealing here with many tens of thousands of dollars of public money, and we should be as scrupulous with a large amount like this as we are with any other amount.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has obviously not been following the wiles of the honourable gentleman sitting next to him. The member for Gumeracha protested this afternoon about my explanation on how I had found moneys in total in excess of the lines, because of the provisions of the Public Finance Act, and he then said, "I will admit that the \$40,000, which was of that excess, was quite proper." The honourable member will remember this.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member said, "However, I am protesting about the \$1,693,285", which I believe he had overlooked as being proper because he had not appreciated the full amount of the line. So, at that stage the honourable member was admitting that I could spend in excess of the total by means of the Public Finance Act, provided, of course, that the original line had been insufficient to meet the amount.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: No; I did not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh, yes the honourable member did. Then, when I had pointed out to him that both lines were insufficient and that I had obtained a warrant under the Public Finance Act to exceed the allowance, he then said, "That is no good, because the amount you spend under this cannot be greater than the total specified in section 5 of the Public Finance Act in any circumstances, and all that the Public Finance Act does is provide you with a means of advance." However, that was not the view he took when he was Treasurer.

Mr. Millhouse: Now, you are getting back to the same jolly argument.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The jolly argument, if I may jolly well explain it to the jolly old member, is this: clause 5 (3) states:

If the amount mentioned in any line of the First Schedule as the proposed expenditure for the work or purpose mentioned in that line is insufficient for that work or purpose, the Treasurer may issue additional money from the Loan Fund for that work or purpose but so that the total amount issued under this Act from the Loan Fund for the financial year ending the 30th day of June, 1968 for works and purposes mentioned in that schedule shall not exceed \$82,560,000.

Now, the moneys issued under this Act were less than the total provided last year. The extra moneys were issued under the Public Finance Act.

Mr. Millhouse: What was the total issued under this Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The total issued under the Public Purposes Loan Act was \$76,075,348.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that in the second reading speech?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I went on to explain how the amounts were made up by means of the Governor's Warrant under the Public Finance Act. The extra expenditures were authorized under that Act entirely in accordance with standard procedure in South Australia, which was previously followed by the member for Gumeracha when he was Treasurer.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am grateful to the Treasurer for his explanation of my objections to the House. It was kind of him to go to all that trouble, but he has made a slight mistake in his explanation. I do not know whether I do not explain myself very well or whether he does not explain me very well.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I read you very well indeed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer knows that during the debate I raised this question and when replying to the debate he did not even trouble to answer it. He replied at length politically on other matters but he did not touch the item I had mentioned. This was one of the objections I raised this afternoon. The second objection was in connection with the Second Schedule, and I accept the Treasurer's explanation of this without qualification. However, I do not withdraw my first objection, which was not tied up in any way with my second objection.

The Treasurer said that in his second reading explanation he said that the details of pay-

ments that he had given to us in the official documents showed that \$77,809,000 was issued. He now says it is a different amount. I do not know how he makes up this different amount. In the second reading explanation he does not show where the fallacy of the printed document is, but we suddenly hear now that, instead of the \$77,809,000 being spent last year, it is some other amount. I do not know how he arrives at the other amount and how this document is correct. This document is in accordance with his monthly statement; I have checked this. I can find one item that was not in the First Schedule last year—Lotteries Commission, \$40,000. This is a new item, but apart from this I cannot find any difference in the items. I do not know how the Treasurer gets an entirely different conclusion now. Either he has submitted wrong documents to us previously or his present statement contains some complication, which I would like explained.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am prepared to accept the honourable gentleman's explanation, because I follow it and understand it. However, I think the member for Gumeracha is justified in asking how the lower figure of about \$76,000,000 is reached. If this figure is properly arrived at, I accept the explanation of what has happened, but I think it is proper for the Treasurer to make some attempt to explain to the Committee how this figure is reached. When we are dealing with a large amount of money such as this, we as members ought to do our best to discharge our obligations. I ask the Treasurer to explain, if he can, how the figure of about \$76,000,000 is calculated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall refer to part of my second reading explanation. Subclause (3) of clause 5 has a limitation to amounts issued under the Act. The member for Gumeracha, when he was Treasurer, used the provisions of section 32b of the Public Finance Act for securing authority for further Loan expenditure to meet either of two contingencies. One was where expenditure was required for an authorized Loan work for which appropriation was not provided in a Public Purposes Loan Act or otherwise and the other was where there was appropriation in a Public Purposes Loan Act or otherwise for an authorized Loan work but that appropriation was insufficient. The special provisions were inserted in the Act in 1949. From time to time it is necessary to use these provisions.

Any use of section 32b for authorizing additional Loan expenditure by Governor's Warrant must, in accordance with a subsection in the Act, be subsequently authorized. The reason for authorizing it afterwards is that this is a special amount. I said in my explanation:

Accordingly, clause 6 of this Bill authorizes certain advances made during 1966-67 under the provisions of section 32b of the Public Finance Act and set out in the Second Schedule.

The honourable member has had the explanation of the items in the two sections. As expenditure on these two lines, aggregating \$1,733,285, was authorized by Governor's Warrant under section 32b of the Public Finance Act, the expenditures authorized by the Public Purposes Loan Act itself, including variations in accordance with section 5 (3) of that Act, were \$76,075,348, or significantly less than the maximum amount set out in that section. I set out in the statement on which the Leader has commented the increases that were formally authorized, not all of which were actually fully spent, amounting to \$2,970,000. Certain lines were formally decreased, amounting to \$2,970,000. Therefore, the difference in expenditure that the honourable member will notice where we are a little short on the amount provided last year amounts to underspending in certain lines on which we authorized an increase but did not go to the full expenditure. The amounts aggregating this are set forth in the Estimates, showing where some lines were overspent and some were underspent.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: With due respect, I still disagree with the Treasurer. The position about amounts in the Second Schedule is that they were not Loan expenditures authorized at the time the transfer was made. They become Loan expenditures at some future time. It is an advance and what will happen about it is set out clearly. That

is why it is before us and becomes a part of this Loan programme. The Treasurer will realize that a private member has not the facility to check all relevant documents. Last year a payment was made of, I think, \$408,000 more than the amount set at the upper limit by the Public Purposes Loan Act. True, this year we are voting an additional amount in respect of several items that were overspent last year and in respect of which an advance was made. However, that does not alter the fact that the amounts paid last year were in excess of the amounts authorized by the section. Section 32b (3) of the Public Finance Act provides:

When money has been advanced under this section the first Public Purposes Loan Bill introduced after the advance is made shall contain a provision authorizing the borrowing of the amount of money so advanced, and its application to the Loan work for which it was advanced.

That has application to the Bill this year. These transfers were made last year, when the limitation imposed by subsection (3) still applied and was not affected by the fact that the Treasurer had, by warrant, got an advance.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer say where I can find the calculations that give the figure of about \$76,000,000?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One gets this only by making a number of calculations from the Loan Estimates, totalling them and finding where certain transferred lines have been underspent. I have not available a document containing that information, but that is how the figure can be arrived at.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 13), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 15, at 2 p.m.