

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

ELIZABETH INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL: My question refers to the employment situation at Elizabeth, which has been in the news recently and about which I ascertained information at first hand when I visited that centre a short time ago. I understand that South Australia is still trying to attract migrants from overseas, that broadcasts are being made to Western Europe, and that activities are continuing in the United Kingdom to achieve this. Recently the Premier said in the House:

It is precisely the bringing of people here without an assurance of employment in certain areas of employment in South Australia about which people at Elizabeth are complaining.

I understand that the Premier, having made that statement, has now said publicly that he is trying to attract migrants to come to South Australia and live in the Elizabeth area. A contradiction is apparent between the Premier's statement that it is dangerous to bring migrants here without employment and his latest announcement about filling vacancies in engineering works at Elizabeth. In view of the contradictory implications in the statements, can the Premier say what type of industry is involved at Elizabeth and what categories of vacancy are to be filled by migrants from the United Kingdom?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the Leader is talking about in saying that there are contradictions in my statements. Under the State migration programme, no migrants coming to South Australia under the provisions made by our Immigration Department have lacked a job for more than a fortnight, either under the administration of my predecessor or under the administration of the present Minister of Immigration.

Mr. Millhouse: And under the previous Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but I understood that the Leader and the member for Mitcham had been delivering tirades about unemployment in South Australia under this Government, and that that was what they were referring to. If that is not so, I am sorry. The trades for which we will seek migrants in the United Kingdom are those for which we have

applications from industry for tradesmen. We have vacancies for numbers of tradesmen in South Australia. I draw the Leader's attention to the fact that, although at one stage carpenters found difficulty in obtaining employment in South Australia, there are not enough to go round at present.

Mr. Hall: That is not the story we hear.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader knows of carpenters in Elizabeth who are having difficulty in obtaining employment I wish he would tell the Government, because it is prepared to see that these people are provided with employment. The General Manager of the Housing Trust, whilst in England, gave details to the Agent-General concerning the kind of trade for which we have vacancies in employment in this State, and where we could have people under the State migration scheme coming to Elizabeth provided with accommodation and with employment. That is the basis on which migrants will be brought to Elizabeth. The Leader does not seem to have read the press report accurately concerning the broadcasts to West Germany. The broadcasts made by my wife and me were concerned with attracting industry to South Australia in order to provide employment. They were concerned with the advantages that South Australia could give industry by providing cheap land, and with factories built by public funds and either sold or leased to those prepared to come here, in addition to industrial estates of housing that would be provided immediately to entrepreneurs wishing to establish in this State.

Mr. Heaslip: Have any of them come here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, not yet. The honourable member seems to think that in four weeks an industrialist is prepared, without further inquiry, to make final offers to South Australia, but some interested inquiries have been received from West Germany already.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: These conditions have applied for many years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite so, but I hope that the honourable member does not suggest, as the Leader does, that there are strange contradictions in the remarks I made when trying to sell South Australia to investors in West Germany. I had always understood that members opposite believed in the necessity to attract to South Australia investment that would bring us technological advance, and it has been to that end that the broadcasts to West Germany have been made. There has been no contradiction in my remarks. We are able in numbers of areas to provide employment in South Australia. In only three areas

are we in difficulty about employment: one has been in the motor industry, the second has been in the household appliance industry, and the third has been in the building industry as a secondary result of the first two. In other areas of employment consistent expansion has occurred in the last two years, namely, in regard to shipbuilding, agricultural implements, and in numbers of other areas of secondary production. Indeed, it is difficult at the moment for the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to get sufficient workers at Whyalla.

Mr. McKee: That applies also to carpenters at Port Pirie.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In numbers of areas in South Australia we are in some difficulty about providing sufficient workers because of problems concerning mobility of labour, and to this end the Government has made approaches to the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service in order to tie in with that department the promotion of mobility of labour in South Australia and, on another score, to provide sufficient employment for carpenters. I personally intervened at the request of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures in a dispute that had arisen concerning the erection of the base at Alice Springs and the provision of carpenters from South Australia to do that work. As a result of my intervention, I was able to get agreement between all parties to enable employment to go ahead there, so that South Australian carpenters have been able to go from Elizabeth to Alice Springs on reasonable contracts, providing considerable money for themselves and their families as a result. We are able to provide employment for those whom we bring here under the State migration scheme. The Leader has no need to fear concerning Government administration in this area. Those people who are asked through the South Australian Agent-General's office to come to South Australia will be provided with employment but I hope, in view of the Leader's remarks, that he will use his good offices with his Party colleagues in Canberra so that we shall receive some basic co-operation from the Commonwealth Immigration Department concerning immigration to this State, and so that the Commonwealth department's programme is at least tied in with this Government's proposals, because we have been unable to obtain that co-operation previously.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, when the Premier gave information to the House in answer to a series of questions on notice about

housing at Elizabeth, he mentioned the many promises (I think that was the phrase he used) of the Commonwealth Government to build an ordnance factory on land nearby. Can he now give more precise details of the promises made by the Commonwealth Government? What is entailed in this project and, in particular, how many people is the factory, when completed, expected to employ?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't got it now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am sorry I have not the precise details here in the file. The reply that I gave yesterday was supplied to me by the General Manager of the Housing Trust, and I will get from him details of the matter about which the honourable member has raised queries.

Mr. CLARK: Although, because of illness, I did not attend the sitting of the House yesterday, I read with much interest a reply that the Premier gave to a question concerning my district that was asked by a member who has suddenly, for reasons best known to himself, shown an unusual interest in my district. As I was particularly interested in the Premier's reference (with which I entirely agree) to the proposed ordnance depot at Smithfield, will the Premier make further representations to the Prime Minister, pointing out that it would greatly help housing and employment in the area if the Commonwealth Government were to erect an ordnance depot and workshop in the Elizabeth-Smithfield area? Will he also urge that such work be undertaken as soon as possible?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. This was one of the works which at the Premier's Conference I listed as being works which it was urgently desirable the Commonwealth Government should undertake to remedy the effects of its policies on employment in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: And yet today you can't remember the details of the project.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier and Ministers generally not to reply to interjections in Question Time. Questions are asked for the purpose of seeking information, and I am obliged to administer Standing Orders. I have referred to this on two or three days successively: Ministerial replies are not debatable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I will not reply to the member for Mitcham. I raised the matter, to which the member for Gawler has referred, together

with a number of other works which the Commonwealth Government could conceivably undertake in South Australia, which on my information were ripe for development in this State, and which the Commonwealth should have been expected to undertake, given the fact that the effect of its policies on South Australia had been a reduction in employment in certain areas here. I put it to the Commonwealth that it had had this land for 12 years; that this was something on which we had made commitments in South Australia, understanding that the Commonwealth was going ahead; that it was claiming an expansion in defence expenditure; that during the last war South Australia had had a considerable advantage from the Commonwealth Labor Government's putting in this State a number of munition factories which it was obviously advantageous to the Commonwealth to put here for strategic purposes; that it had presumably provided for this ordnance depot in the same way; and that this could be a governmental policy of the Commonwealth that would give a stimulus to certain areas of employment in South Australia which needed that stimulus because of the Commonwealth's policies. I subsequently received a letter from the Prime Minister saying that he had not overlooked my representations and that the matter was being considered in order to see that some assistance be given to this area of employment in Commonwealth works. But the Commonwealth Budget did not produce anything of great moment for South Australia. My representations in other areas as to employment in South Australia were not heeded in the Commonwealth Budget; the sales tax on motor cars was not altered, although I gathered that there was a reduction of sales tax on children's Christmas candles! So far, I have received nothing concrete from the Commonwealth on the representations I made to it about specific works such as this one. I will undertake to the honourable member to write again to the Prime Minister on this matter and to ask that something be done urgently.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about accommodation to be provided temporarily next year for students attending the new Glengowrie High School in my district?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased to give an answer in some detail, because this is an important matter about which the parents

and students concerned wish to know the details. The report states:

It is intended that students of the new Glengowrie High School will be housed in the grounds and rooms of the former Sturt Primary School for not longer than the 1968 school year and it is hoped that the period will be less. The school will not use the building and grounds of the former school residence, which is included in the total site. The facilities to be occupied are at present being used as an annexe of the Bedford Park Teachers College. The rooms and grounds are generally in good order. The expected enrolment of 250 students will have ample accommodation in the present buildings which give the equivalent of 10 classrooms with generous shelter provision. Toilet facilities are satisfactory and the school yard is large enough for assemblies and recess recreation. Some alterations will be needed before the school occupies the buildings in February, 1968. In particular, it will be necessary to convert two suitable rooms to a science laboratory and an art room respectively. This will be done.

There are no craft facilities at this school but the Education Department will arrange free special bus transport to take students to their craft lessons in the specialist rooms of other metropolitan schools. Because the site of the former Sturt Primary School has an area of only one acre there are no extensive playing fields. However, no difficulty is expected in making arrangements for the school to use other nearby playing fields at appropriate times. Bus services to the temporary accommodation in Sturt Road are satisfactory from all parts of the Glengowrie High School zone. Past experience in the opening up of new high schools has shown that there are worthwhile advantages both for the students and the school in establishing a new high school a year earlier by making use of suitable temporary accommodation. Where this has been done in the past it has always been successful. It is expected that when planned alterations are made the accommodation at the former Sturt Primary School will make possible a similar successful start for the Glengowrie High School.

COURT PENALTIES

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier seen a statement by the New South Wales Attorney-General regarding penalties in courts in which statement it was suggested that fines, in addition to bonds, should be able to be imposed as penalties in criminal cases where the judges have the right to impose a prison term or a bond? Does the Premier, as Attorney-General, intend to introduce such a system in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was interested to read the remarks of my friend, Mr. McCaw, on the subject of this being pioneering legislation in New South Wales. In fact, under the Offenders Probation Act of South Australia, judges of the Supreme Court are enabled in indictable cases to impose a

bond in addition to any other penalty (either imprisonment or a fine) and have been able to do so for many years. Therefore, New South Wales is just catching up with South Australia.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: That was introduced by the Playford Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I pay a tribute to the foresight of the previous Government in including this provision under the Offenders Probation Act; it was very proper, and where credit is due I believe credit should be given.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you intend to broaden the provision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I believe the same provision should be made available to magistrates. It is clear from Mr. McCaw's statement that he does not intend that magistrates be given the same provision so that they can impose a bond in addition to other penalties. In South Australia, for years magistrates have drawn attention to the fact that they are inhibited, by the present terms of the Offenders Probation Act, from imposing penalties of a kind that they think are appropriate to the particular circumstances. I believe they should have greater flexibility in this regard by having the same right as the judges to order a bond as well as some other penalty. The Government intends to introduce amendments to the Offenders Probation Act. These have been held up because of interstate proposals for uniform measures on this legislation. Therefore, a measure amending the Offenders Probation Act has been delayed pending the finalizing of other matters concerned with the Act.

AIRDALE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a letter I wrote to him recently about playground improvements at the Airdale Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have a report which deals with the establishment of the school oval. The area was inspected by an officer of the Public Buildings Department on July 12, 1967. The report and recommendation are being considered and an estimate of cost is being prepared by the Public Buildings Department for submission to the Education Department. I have requested that the docket be forwarded as soon as possible. We will get on with the job as soon as we can.

EAST GAMBIER PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week

regarding the repaving of the yard at the East Gambier Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that the repaving of this schoolyard is to be incorporated in a group paving scheme for similar work at other schools in the area. Documents for this group scheme are complete and tenders will be called next week.

TOURISM

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I read this week in a newspaper from another State that during the last year more than 260,000 tourists had come to Australia from overseas, and that the tourist trade was our ninth largest earner of foreign exchange. The report stated that the last Commonwealth Budget provided for a grant of \$1,550,000 to the Australian Tourist Commission to enable it to "sell" Australia to tourists during the current financial year. I understand that this sum is \$1,000,000 more than the sum provided last year by the Commonwealth Government for tourism. The Commonwealth Minister-in-charge of Tourist Activities (Mr. Chipp) said that the commission would actively seek package deals with private enterprise to attract more overseas tourists to Australia. Can the Minister of Immigration and Tourism say whether there is any spill-over to State tourist bureaux of the moneys made available by the Commonwealth Government to the commission? Alternatively, is there a liaison between the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau and the Australian Tourist Commission that will ensure South Australian participation in any increase in the tourist trade resulting from the increase in the amount made available by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The details the honourable member has given to the House in regard to the allocation of moneys by the Commonwealth Government to the Australian Tourist Commission are correct. The honourable member will realize that the commission has only recently been established. In fact, I think it was appointed only about two months ago by the Commonwealth Government. The formation of the commission arose from suggestions by the Australian National Travel Association that such a commission should be established to attract tourists from overseas. In the past the Government of South Australia has contributed towards the cost of running A.N.T.A., but the Australian Tourist Commission is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. A conference of Tourist

Ministers will be held in Adelaide on Friday next and, if necessary, it will continue on Saturday. The Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Chipp) will attend, and this will be the first time the Commonwealth Minister has attended such a conference. The State Ministers are pleased that the Commonwealth Government will be represented. When the Commonwealth Minister has explained to the conference what the commission's function will be, I shall be better able to reply to the honourable member's queries about the benefits that we shall gain and I shall be pleased to give this information to the honourable member as soon as I can. As recently as this morning I conferred with the newly-appointed Chairman of the Australian Tourist Commission (Mr. John Bates), who is in Adelaide to attend the conference. He is pleased about the sum that has been allocated by the Commonwealth Government. This is the first time that such an allocation has been made and, although I think we can say fairly that more is required, the allocation is nevertheless encouraging. I am sure that much benefit will accrue to Australia, and we hope that South Australia will get its share of the benefit resulting from the activities of the commission. I do not think that there will be a spill-over in regard to the money made available by the Commonwealth: I consider that the money will be fully used by the commission.

MODBURY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: On July 11, in reply to a question I asked about having made safer the intersection of the Main North-East Road, Montague Road and Golden Grove Road at Modbury, I was told that the Highways Department was currently investigating a proposal to re-align the Main North-East Road along Smart Road, as shown on the development plan of the Town Planner. That statement caused concern in the district and, as a result, I have been served with two petitions opposing this proposal, one petition being from business people living on the Main North-East Road and the other from residents of Smart Road. Therefore, will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads the result of the investigation by the Highways Department, if such investigation has been completed, and indicate the proposed deviation route?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

BASCOMB ROCK DAM

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the Bascomb Rock dam?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have inquired this morning and understand from reports I have received that there is a dam adjacent to the original dam. The cloudburst filled both dams and I regret that the upper levels are not holding. However, the department is taking all proper precautions and is pumping water as quickly as possible into the adjacent tanks and carting water to two tanks nearby so that water may be conserved for use on Eyre Peninsula.

MURRAY RIVER WATERS

Mr. CURREN: As there seems to be confusion about South Australia's share of Murray River water, can the Minister of Works say what is the true position of South Australia in terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement and whether there is any likelihood of the restriction of the use of water from the Murray River during the coming summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The 1963 agreement still specifies, in time of declared restriction, that this State receive water in the following proportions:

New South Wales	1,000,000
Victoria	1,000,000
South Australia	603,000

This is the intended distribution until Chowilla is declared effective, when equal sharing will be applied. The River Murray Commission, at its meeting on August 11, discussed this year's water resources and tentatively agreed that restrictive action seemed likely for this coming summer. This will be again discussed by commissioners next week and a declaration is likely to be made. The July assessment indicated a distribution availability to South Australia of 318,000 acre feet for the period September-April, in addition to 376,000 acre feet below dilution water. This is an allocation about 278,000 acre feet below the full allocation for these months. With equal sharing our allocation may have been some 450,000 acre feet, an improvement of 122,000 acre feet on the present situation. The 318,000 acre feet that comes strictly in accord with the agreement will just meet our diversion needs. The problem will be quality, and any saline water coming into South Australia will create an intolerable situation in our irrigation areas.

THEVENARD CHANNEL

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: My question refers to the deepening of the Thevenard channel. The Minister of Marine will realize that it is essential that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited have earlier advice about allocations of finance in future years so

that it can proceed with proposed installations at the harbour, subject to favourable reports being made by the Public Works Committee. When does the Minister intend to refer the Thevenard channel project to the committee so that the committee can proceed with its inquiry and so that the co-operative can go ahead with its part of the work after the committee's report has been received?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Some months ago I visited Thevenard with the honourable member, together with representatives of the co-operative, and we discussed the deepening of the Thevenard channel. The matter has been considered, and the Director of Marine and Harbors expects to be able to submit his report on the proposed deepening of the channel to the Government within the next six weeks so that the reference to the Public Works Committee may be considered.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. CLARK: I understand that a correspondence course has been prepared to assist justices of the peace to carry out their duties. Can the Attorney-General say when this course is likely to be ready for circulation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The course is ready for circulation now. This morning I received from Mr. Marshall, S.M., who is in charge of the course and who prepared the justices' handbook upon which it is based, a copy of the material that will be made available to justices of the peace who undertake this course in conjunction with their study of the handbook, and I hope that justices interested in the course will enrol as soon as possible so that it may proceed. Also, I understand that there has been a steady sale of the handbook prepared by Mr. Marshall and printed by the Government Printer, so it seems that the proposals we have made for training justices in their court duties are well under way.

SCHOOL HOURS

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the evening press of August 21 appeared a report of recommendations made by two subcommittees of the South Australian Institute of Teachers concerning significant changes in the hours of high and primary schools. It was recommended that high schools start at 8.15 a.m. and conclude at 2.45 p.m., and that primary schools start at 8.45 a.m. and conclude at 3.15 p.m. The subcommittees have advanced what seem to be cogent reasons for these recommendations, which cover not only these matters but also other ancillary matters. How-

ever, these recommendations immediately bring to mind problems concerning country areas where students have to travel some distance and, indeed, some parts of the metropolitan area where it is not uncommon for students to travel some distance by bus and train to reach school. Has the Minister of Education studied the proposals, and, if he has, has he made recommendations to Cabinet? Also, will he comment on these proposals?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Naturally, I have seen the reports and have considered them in some respects. I understand that the institute will further discuss these matters in its branches before referring the submissions to me. Until those submissions are received and have been studied by my officers and me, I should rather not comment one way or the other on them. Undoubtedly, they may have some merit, but one or two aspects need to be seriously considered. For example, some students attending Parndana school travel 50 miles, and they would have to rise early in the morning in order to arrive at school by 8.15 a.m. Also, the department would not favour having to put on extra buses to cater for different arrival times at primary and secondary schools, as it would mean a greater expense and cause dislocation of present services, which have been arranged on the most economical run to collect children for both schools. We have to consider that many children, if released from school early in the afternoon, would return to their homes when the parents were absent, and they would be at homes at which parents would not arrive until much later if both parents were working. Beyond mentioning these points I have no comment at present.

GOODWOOD SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about painting and repairs at the Goodwood Primary School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that all repairs at the Goodwood Primary School have been completed, and painting will be finished this week.

CAPE TULIP

Mr. HEASLIP: It is now three or four years since I drew to the attention of Parliament the dangerous spread of cape tulip in the Wirrabara Forest area. In that time officers of the department have carried out an active

and worthwhile campaign to eradicate this weed and adjoining landholders have done the same. I believe that, as a result of this campaign, the weed is becoming controlled. However, this year, because of the dry weather, cape tulip has not grown as it would normally grow. As the best time to attack this weed is at the flowering stage, will the Minister of Agriculture bring to the attention of his officers that now is the time to attack this weed? Also, will he compliment them on their past efforts to control and eventually to eradicate this noxious weed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is gratifying to hear words of praise, and I shall certainly convey them to the officers concerned. Also, I will convey to them the comments made by the honourable member about the time at which this weed should be attacked, although I am sure that they would be aware of it. The officers will be pleased to hear his comments. Frequently, I have been informed of the work being done to control this weed, and I agree with what the honourable member said about the efforts of landholders adjoining Wirrabara Forest. It is by the co-operation of all sections of the community that we can do something to eradicate this weed.

EQUAL PAY

Mr. McANANEY: Until recently there seemed to be discrepancies concerning the principle of equal pay in the Public Service. Can the Premier say whether all members of the Public Service now operate under the principle of equal pay, and whether the Government intends to introduce a Bill this session to provide for equal pay in private industry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government gave the same undertaking to the Public Service concerning equal pay as it gave to teachers: that the principle of equal pay would be introduced over five years. That is being done.

Mr. McAnaney: In all departments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Some difficulties of administration exist concerning how the principles of equal pay shall proceed. It must be equal pay for work of equal value, and an assessment has to be made. However, in order to give full effect to these principles an amendment to the Public Service Act, incorporating this matter as well as other matters, will be placed before Parliament this session. Concerning general conditions of employment in South Australia, an amendment to the Industrial Code to be introduced this

session will make possible the introduction of equal pay by tribunals in South Australia, because at present they are prevented by provisions of the Industrial Code from introducing the principle.

ELECTRICITY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Works said yesterday, in reply to a question about the extent of the damage caused at the Torrens Island power station that, as an inquiry was at present being conducted, he would not make any further statements about the matter. However, I point out that, even though an exact cause may not yet have been determined, members are at least entitled to receive an explanation as to how much damage occurred. Therefore, can the Minister give any further information about the inquiry being conducted, how long it is likely to take, the extent of the damage, and the reduction in output that has resulted?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The inquiry is in progress and is expected to be completed within the next few days. Until a report is available, I cannot give any details.

CLELAND PARK

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of last week whether consideration could be given to providing an area for children, similar to that which exists at the Adelaide Zoo, at the Cleland National Park?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When I replied to the honourable member's question last week I said that I should be happy to discuss the matter with the National Park Commissioners. In a letter I have received from him, the Director of National Parks states:

The main enclosure in the native fauna reserve is intended eventually to be the area in which the public can see most of the animals and birds on display. It is intended to retain as far as possible the feeling of space and, to give this idea, it is necessary for the free-running animals and birds to have large areas in which to roam. Unlike the Adelaide Zoo the animals in the native fauna reserve are all to be natives of Australia and, although docile enough, they cannot stand up to the handling that such animals as sheep, goats, calves and other domestic animals can stand up to. It is intended, as funds are available, to provide more seating and this will help to overcome the problem. However, the suggestion will be borne in mind and, should it be found possible to implement the proposal, the commission will certainly consider it.

EGGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the beginning of next week has been fixed as the time for introduction of non-returnable egg cartons at a cost of 3c a dozen which, no doubt, will be borne by consumers. Recently, I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question on behalf of a producer in my district who is anxious not to have to use these cartons when her customers come to her for eggs or when she delivers to the door. As I understand the Minister now has a reply to that specific question, I ask him whether he will give it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: An officer of the Egg Board has consulted the person to whom the honourable member referred, and whose name I do not think we need mention. Following that, I asked the Egg Board for a full report on the situation. As a result, I have received the following report from the General Manager:

The policy of the board is to prepack in one dozen non-returnable cartons all eggs intended for sale in retail outlets. Eggs for catering purposes will be packed in non-returnable Keyes fillers, and will be known as "loose pack". There will not be any increase in the cost of eggs to the consumers when the non-returnable cartons are introduced. The board will determine the price structure at its meeting on Thursday, August 24. This is in accordance with normal practice. The board will embark on a promotion campaign to coincide with the new pack. In keeping with the promotion it is desirable that an improvement should be made in the presentation of the product. A firming of the quality standards will be instituted as follows:

- (1) Tightening of the air cell, which will have the effect of improving the quality.
- (2) The board will require that eggs be held under temperature control from the time of lay through the various phases of handling to the dispatch to the retailers.
- (3) Packing materials will also be held under temperature control.

The packing of eggs under these conditions and in closed cartons will ensure that eggs are delivered in good condition, and are not subject to atmospheric influence. The pre-packed one dozen cartons will be packed in a non-returnable fibreboard outer carton, which is a good insulating material. The eggs will be packed in distinctive printed cartons, which will be descriptive of the grade: red for large 24oz. grade; blue for standard 21oz. grade; green for small 18 oz. grade.

The packing of eggs in printed cartons will assure the housewife that she is buying a quality product in the grade she desires at the correct price. For a number of years many retail stores have required eggs to be packed in cartons. Because cartons have been in short supply it was necessary to re-use car-

tons, a charge being made for the carton at the point of sale, and a refund made on return. This has developed into a shocking state of affairs as far as cleanliness is concerned. To my knowledge cartons have been used to place feed in for domestic animals, and later returned for re-use. It is not uncommon for cockroaches to be found in cartons. Retailers have complained bitterly because of the dirty condition of cases and packing material, and the introduction of vermin into the stores. Materials returned from catering establishments, such as hotels, cafes and institutions, have frequently been returned with fat and food scraps covering them.

Fillers are very often forced back into cases and destroyed in the process. The cost on sorting and the waste of materials is considerable, and has been met by the producer agent or grading agent of the board. Every other State packs eggs in non-returnable cartons and makes a charge for the service. Western Australia charges 3.5c cartoning and a sales margin of 3c. Tasmania charges 3c a dozen for cartoning; Victoria, 4c for cartoning; New South Wales, 6c for cartoned eggs, and 5.5c for loose pack; and Queensland, 3c cartoned and 1c loose. The cost in South Australia will be 3c for cartoned and loose pack, and 2c selling margin.

Egg marketing in South Australia has been below the standards observed in other States as well as overseas, and it is the policy of the board to lift the presentation of our products on the local market, keeping in mind our responsibility through the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities to lift and maintain Australian standards generally. Modern merchandizing requires eggs to be prepacked. The carton gives protection to the eggs in transit, and the papier mache carton will contain and absorb the liquid. The board recognizes that there could be many anomalies, and these will be dealt with at administrative level. Experience will determine future board policy. Many producers have been packing eggs in non-returnable cartons, because of pride in the quality of their eggs, and the presentation of their product. All eggs packed for export are packed in new cases and materials.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister said in his reply that an officer from the board had been out to see Mrs. Powell, my constituent, who is an egg producer. However, he did not say what arrangements were made or what conversation took place between them. Can he therefore say what arrangements have been made and whether Mrs. Powell must use these containers? Secondly, in view of his general answer, can the Minister say which section of the community (the producer, consumer, or the Egg Board) he expects to bear the cost of these cartons which, I understand, is about 3c each?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thought it would be best to send somebody from the

board to see the person to whom the honourable member referred. An officer had a useful discussion with her and explained the position. The same conditions will apply to Mrs. Powell as to any other producer. I have said that future policy will be reviewed from time to time, as this is something relatively new in South Australia, although it has been in practice in every other State for some time. I was told this morning that a deputation was to discuss with the board matters similar to those raised by the honourable member, but any results would be determined by the board according to its thoughts on the matter after listening to the deputation. The cost of the carton is expected to be absorbed following a reduction in the price of eggs that has taken place generally throughout Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Won't the cost be borne by the consumer?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. The Minister should not reply.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will not answer the interjection, Mr. Speaker. This position applies with regard to all products that are cartoned, tinned, bottled, or put in any other sort of container: someone must pay for the container.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Producers who have a licence and are supplying direct to the consumers have complained to me that they are to be compelled not only to pay a certain levy for the privilege of supplying direct but to provide a special container that will raise the cost of the eggs by 3c a dozen. Can the Minister say why a producer who deals direct with the consumer (and where there has been no criticism of the quality of the product or its freshness) must have a special type of container that will add substantially to the cost of the service?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I, too, have received complaints on this matter. Similar suggestions having been made to me, these have been submitted to the Egg Board. As soon as I receive a reply regarding its reasons, I will inform the honourable member.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, obtain for me figures for South Australia and the Commonwealth showing the number of hospital beds (in both private and public hospitals) that have been available over the last four years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education as yet assessed the number of students that are expected to be trained at the Bedford Park Teachers Training College next year? In view of the progress being made in the construction of the college, can he say what arrangements are now being made to accommodate the students concerned, having regard to the fact that earlier arrangements had been made for some of the students to be accommodated at other schools? In the coming year, will all the students be able to be accommodated at the new college or will the facilities at the university be used to accommodate some students?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is expected that the buildings at the Bedford Park Teachers College, which will be available next year, will be sufficient to handle all students at the college, and it will not be necessary to use any of the university's accommodation. I stand to be corrected on the details in this regard, but I will take up the matter for the honourable member and inform him as soon as I have the information.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: A few days ago I asked whether a grant had been obtained from the Commonwealth Government, without there being a matching grant by the State Government, for the purpose of providing buildings for agricultural colleges, and I referred particularly to a college at Loxton. Has the Minister of Education a reply to that question?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have called for a report with a view to ascertaining the precise position, and I will bring it down when it is available.

PARAFIELD GARDENS STATION

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent inquiry regarding the construction of a railway station at Parafield Gardens?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Work on the construction of the new railway station is expected to start within the next three months.

X-RAY FEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand the Premier now has an answer to the question I asked recently regarding the extra income the Government will get from the imposition of X-ray fees on patients in public hospitals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since records have not previously been required in a form that would enable an accurate figure to be obtained, no accurate figure can be given.

However, an informed estimate of additional revenue is said to be about \$200,000 a year, although the honourable member will realize that most of this will come not from patients but from the funds with which they are insured.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION:
FISHING HAVENS

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: I desire to explain more fully the figures I used yesterday when asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture concerning fishing havens. I commenced yesterday by saying:

As in the last eight years of the Playford Administration an average of \$105,000 was spent annually on fishing havens and amenities . . .

I developed my question around that figure. In his reply, the Minister said that my question was full of inaccuracies and added that the average over the nine years "was therefore not \$100,000 as suggested by the Leader but \$54,818". I did not refer to nine years; in fact, the Minister gave individual figures for eight years and then, without further explanation, gave a nine-year average. The \$54,818 is actually the average over the period from 1955-56 to 1963-64 (nine years) of Loan expenditure only. The Minister then added the \$271,758 spent from Consolidated Revenue Account, and gave the average for the same nine years as \$61,670 when, actually, the average was \$85,014. The Minister claimed that the average for the three years under the present Government was \$52,376; actually, this figure represents the average over four years (1964-65 to 1967-68), 1964-65 being the last year of the Playford Administration, and 1967-68 involving an estimate only at this stage. The figure that I used showed that over the last eight years of the Playford Administration the average sum spent on fishing havens and amenities was \$105,838. Over the last 10 years the average was \$84,974; over the last five years it was \$101,944; and over the last three years it was \$129,120. During the first two years of the Labor Government the average sum spent has been \$33,418. I hope those figures will clear up any misconceptions honourable members may have, arising from the inaccurate and misleading figures given yesterday by the Minister.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

LeFevre Peninsula Primary and Infants School Improvements,

Surrey Downs Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes of proposed new clauses to be moved by the Minister of Lands.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 9. Page 1181.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the second reading. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in a lengthy debate on this matter, as most members are agreed as to the general principles contained in it. However, I shall want certain amendments made during the Committee stages before I shall feel able to support the third reading. The matters that I desire changed relate to the composition of the committee as suggested by the member for Albert. He has provided for a committee comprising members of both the House of Assembly and of our local House of Lords, the Legislative Council.

In my opinion, that is inappropriate for a public accounts committee. Such a committee is traditionally a committee of the Lower House, or the popular House of Parliament, and is part of the tradition of financial control of the public purse. It is part of the tradition whereby, when financial matters are being considered in this House, you, Mr. Speaker, leave the Chamber and the symbol of your authority is taken from its place on the table. This tradition has been handed down to us from the English Parliamentary system.

In England, in the struggle for Parliamentary supremacy, the Lower House achieved the right to control the public purse and, later, to have a committee inquire into and report on the way in which money had been spent and accounts kept. As the member for Gawler reminds me, this right was not achieved easily. An extremely long struggle took place in England and people lost their heads in the process, including one or two Speakers. However, Mr. Speaker, the risk involved in your office is nowhere near as great as was the

case in the past. I am grateful for that and am sure that all members agree that you are a valued member of the House.

We in Australia were not directly a part of this tradition: it has been handed down to us. Nevertheless, that tradition has real meaning, in that the whole history of Parliamentary democracy has been built on the control by the popularly-elected House over the expenditures of the Executive and over the process of inquiry about how those expenditures have been made. Although this tradition has been handed down to us, I still regard it as valuable because we in South Australia have not a popularly-elected House other than the House of Assembly.

It is a feature of the system that the Party that gains the majority in this House forms the Government, regardless of that Party's representation in another place and regardless of the Constitution of another place. That Government has the basic financial responsibility, and that is also a carry-over from the British tradition that gives rise to popular control, or the basic ingredient of Parliamentary democracy. If we are to establish a public accounts committee, we must adhere to the tradition established in the United Kingdom and followed, as has been pointed out by the member for Albert, in other Australian States. However, the Bill departs from that tradition.

I consider this a matter of importance at present because of the restricted Legislative Council franchise. We in this House are elected by a vote of all the people, whereas only certain people are entitled to vote for the election of members of the Legislative Council. We in this House determine who shall be the Government, having the basic responsibility in relation to financial matters. Because of that and because of the tradition handed down to us from the mother of Parliaments, the House of Commons, it is essential that a public accounts committee be confined so that it is a committee of this House, which has the ultimate financial control.

With that exception, I am pleased to support the Bill. However, if we are to have a worthwhile public accounts committee, the committee must be properly established in the way that other committees of the House are established, and this entails the making of financial provision. I am aware that the member for Albert, a private member, was not able to introduce such a provision. In the same way, I am not able to do so. Never-

theless, I think that most members will join me in wanting to have proper financial provision made. Any amendments for this purpose can be moved by a responsible Minister.

The member for Albert has established the necessity for the formation of a committee to inquire and report on the public accounts, to examine matters raised in the Auditor-General's Report and to deal with matters that may be referred to it by this House or, I understand, the Governor. It is possible for the Executive to spend in excess of amounts authorized by this Parliament. This could happen in relation to the Budget and the Loan Estimates, and Parliament otherwise would not have a proper check on what was being done. I consider that, as a matter of practice, what has been done by this and previous Governments has, in the main, been satisfactory. Nevertheless, it will not hurt to have a proper check by a public accounts committee so that Parliament's job can be performed more adequately. As members are aware, in terms of our current mode of operation, matters raised by the Auditor-General can be debated. Questions are asked, as a result of which corrective measures may be taken by the Government. However, in a modern Parliament, where there is so much substantive legislation considered, this is a hit-and-miss procedure. No systematic inquiry is undertaken by members of Parliament into matters raised by the Auditor-General, but such an inquiry could be made by a public accounts committee. It is in the interests of the community that a proper investigation of these matters should be undertaken. This has been the experience elsewhere, and public accounts committees are common in other States, in the Commonwealth Parliament, in England, and in other countries. I hope that this Bill will pass in an acceptable form and that soon a public accounts committee will be established to work efficiently in the interests of the House of Assembly and, therefore, in the interests of the people who elect the members of that House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Government is not sincere in this at all, but is using the Bill in an effort to drive a wedge between this House and another place.

Mr. Broomhill: We have been consistent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member should check his facts. In 1959, before the honourable member was a member of this

House, the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) introduced a motion on this matter. There was no suggestion in that motion that the committee should be answerable only to this House or to be made up of members of this House. In that debate the present Premier supported the motion, yet the member for West Torrens, in his ignorance, interjects to say that the Government has been absolutely consistent. The motion introduced by the then Leader of the Opposition on October 14, 1959, stated:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a public accounts committee be established to—

- (a) examine the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the State and each statement and report transmitted to the Houses of Parliament by the Auditor-General pursuant to the Audit Act, 1921-1957;
- (b) report to both Houses of Parliament, with such comments as it thinks fit, any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them, to which the committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Parliament should be directed—

not this House, but to Parliament—

- (c) report to both Houses of Parliament any alteration which the committee thinks desirable in the form of the public accounts or in the method of keeping them, or in the mode of receipt, control, issue or payment of public moneys; and
- (d) inquire into any question in connection with the public accounts which is referred to it by either House of Parliament, and to report to that House upon that question.

Yet the member for West Torrens says that the Government has been consistent in this matter.

Mr. Broomhill: This Government has been consistent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first sentence uttered in the debate on that motion by the present Leader of this Government was, "I support the motion. In view of what the member for Light has just said . . ." He did not say that he thought it was wrong to confine it to one House. The present Government has dreamed up something to make sure that we do not get a public accounts committee. When in Opposition, members of the present Government were the staunchest advocates for such a committee and I said then that I had much sympathy for them and did not agree with the opposition of the then Government to appointing a public accounts committee. However, this reform Government that is go-

ing to put so much reform on the Statute Book of South Australia that it will make the Playford Government look like a cocked hat or something—

Mr. Broomhill: It is, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The things that they rammged for when in Opposition are now forgotten, and this is one of them. In 1965, the first year we were out of office, the member for Albert introduced a motion on this matter. What happened in 1966?

Mr. Nankivell: I moved another motion, but the Government brought in a Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. Both were stillborn, but we have gone on with it again this year. We know that the Government is out to make trouble between this House and the Legislative Council, because it will be a good election point if they can manufacture a hostile atmosphere between the two Houses. Now, when a Bill is introduced (and the only kind that can be, because the member for Albert is not a responsible Minister of the Crown yet), the Government has emasculated it by cutting out reference to the other House. Yet the member for West Torrens says that it is being consistent. The whole object is to manufacture a clash between this House and the other place, because the Government knows that the other House will not accept a Bill that cuts it out of a public accounts committee. Under the Constitution, the Upper House has a great responsibility (almost equal to our responsibility) in financial matters. It is too silly to suggest that the Upper House should not be represented on a public accounts committee, and the Government, when in Opposition, acknowledged that fact.

Mr. O'Halloran said nothing about that point: he took it for granted. The member for Whyalla did not mention the point in a long and no doubt well-reasoned speech. Why does the Government do it now? The Government knows that it can control the Bill in this House, because we cannot introduce anything appropriating money, but when it is introduced in other place it will not be accepted. This will be an issue on which it can say that the Upper House deliberately obstructed the will of the people, or some such tosh as that. This is obviously an attempt to create a hostile atmosphere between the Houses. Surely, members on both sides agree, by and large, that the appointment of a public accounts committee is desirable, as it has been found desirable in nearly every other Parliament. Our honoured Clerk, when he made his report after his trip abroad,

referred to this, and I fully supported the reference in his report. Yet, although the Government believes this, although it has said this from time to time, and although we considered a motion in 1959, members of the Government are now resiling from that position again as surely as if they opposed this Bill outright. This is humbug and hypocrisy. I hope that, in view of what has been said by Government members (as well as by members on this side) in favour of the principle of the committee, this Bill will be passed, and that it will be passed in a form acceptable to another place so that we may, in fact, have a public accounts committee in South Australia.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I am grateful to members on both sides who have contributed to this debate. True, this is the third attempt I have made during this Parliament to have such a committee formed by the Houses constituting this Parliament. Most of the speakers in this debate have supported the principle of setting up a Parliamentary public accounts committee. The only one who raised any objections was the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) who spoke, as do most members of an Executive, in support first of the poor public servants who might be called before such a committee and who might have to answer for the sins of the people for whom they work. The honourable member said, in effect, that with a House of this size it was impossible to form such a committee unless some members were on two committees. He suggested that members were overworked now and that, as insufficient numbers existed to constitute these committees, we should not proceed to form a public accounts committee. I accept what the member for Mitcham has said, namely, that the member for Alexandra is consistent in this matter: every time it has been raised in the House he has used the same argument in opposing the formation of such a committee.

Mr. Quirke: I let you off by not speaking at all.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Burra has also been consistent previously in his arguments against establishing such a committee. However, no-one has been able to refute the fact that public accounts committees function effectively not only in other Australian Parliaments but also in the mother Parliament, the House of Commons. I refer members to the front page of *The Times* of August 2 which contains an article headed "Shocks in costs of State schemes: nearly 30 projects criticized". That article, following the annual report of

the House of Commons Parliamentary Committee on Public Accounts, criticizes public expenditure and particularly draws attention to an aircraft known as the "Buccaneer", pointing out that its cost may be too high.

The statement is made as the result of the committee's inquiries into that particular project. The leading article on page 7 of *The Times* states, in effect, that it is extraordinary that the people responsible for budgeting can so often and so consistently make errors. That, indeed, is one of the reasons for establishing such a committee. Having recently dealt with the Loan Estimates, we shall soon be considering the Revenue Estimates, containing lines for which we vote moneys. As I pointed out when introducing the Bill, provisions exist by which more money than has been voted may be spent on certain lines and by which (namely, under the Public Finance Act) money may be spent on projects for which nothing has been voted (subject to the Supplementary Estimates being introduced). Only when Supplementary Estimates are being considered does Parliament have an opportunity to criticize irregular expenditure. In general, individual members of Parliament have no ways and means of ascertaining how this money has been spent.

It is suggested that the Auditor-General is our watchdog: so he is, so he has been, and so, I hope, he always will be. However, the many things to which he draws attention in his reports are never followed up. Those of us who wish to criticize ask questions, and we know full well that no Minister is compelled to answer a question. We cannot always obtain the information that we as members of this House are supposedly able to obtain by way of questioning responsible Ministers—responsible, it is said, to Parliament for their respective departments. A public accounts committee provides a way in which members of Parliament can fulfil their proper function of ensuring that money is spent according to the wishes of the House and according to the way in which it is voted. I cannot understand the Government's objections to having a joint Parliamentary standing committee on public accounts. If the Government is concerned about another place having any say in the expenditure of moneys, why has it not tried to alter the constitution of the Public Works Committee which, after all, is involved in making recommendations to Parliament concerning the expenditure of moneys; indeed, projects involving sums in excess of \$200,000 or more must be referred to that committee.

Has the Government tried to change the constitution of the committee? Has it tried to make it purely a committee of this House because this is the place that votes the money? Quite the contrary! I can only support what the member for Mitcham has said, namely, that it seems that it is intended that this Bill will be used for other purposes. As we know, the other place, under the Constitution, has power to consider money matters and also to suggest amendments. Although it certainly does not deal with money matters in the same way as we deal with them, that place, nevertheless, is responsible to the people of the State; if anything irregular occurs, it has a perfect and proper right to draw attention to that irregularity, just as anyone in this House has that right. I can see no reason why an objection should be raised to forming a joint committee, particularly as my original proposals were based on those of a former Labor Leader of the Opposition (the late Mr. M. R. O'Halloran). The motions I moved previously were basically framed from motions that that gentleman had moved in this place. A number of amendments are to be considered; true, as the member for Glenelg has said, there are certain aspects of the Bill that I am not able to frame.

I hoped to introduce a Bill that provided for an honorary committee, and I am not unmindful of the fact that an instruction has been given by the House in order to permit a provision to be inserted dealing with the normal remunerations that apply to a Parliamentary standing committee. All the other committees of this Parliament are joint committees; none of them has any less or more responsibility than this committee would have. The same argument may be used in either case, namely, that the other committees should comprise members of one House and not of both Houses. I cannot subscribe to the statement that the committee should be reduced to one comprising members of only one House. Again, I thank those members who have contributed to the debate. I am anxious to see in just what form the Bill comes through the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to financial provisions for the committee.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Constitution and appointment of committee."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "two members of the Legislative Council and".

This is the first of a series of amendments to restore the composition of the public accounts committee to membership purely of members of the House of Assembly. I refer to the tradition established on the matter in the House of Commons. Despite the provisions in the Constitution of South Australia, I do not think the Legislative Council is financially responsible or acts in a financially responsible manner. I point out to the member for Mitcham that, in 1959, Mr. O'Halloran did not specifically say that the committee should comprise members of both Houses.

Mr. Millhouse: Did he say anything to the contrary?

Mr. HUDSON: No, I admit he did not. He said that the committee should report to both Houses, but the question of membership of the committee did not arise. The member for Mitcham said that members on this side were hypocritical and had changed their minds on this matter. However, I point out that a Bill to establish a public accounts committee, introduced by Sir Richard Butler in 1933, provided for membership on the committee of only members of the House of Assembly. Therefore, the Opposition has changed its mind on the matter and must also be hypocritical. The Bill introduced in 1933 provided for a committee of three members of the House of Assembly. Ultimately it passed the House of Assembly; it was amended by the Legislative Council; the amendments were not acceptable to the House of Assembly; and the Bill finally lapsed in the Legislative Council.

However, this is not a matter of hypocrisy: it is a straight issue as to who is financially responsible. The Opposition wants to argue that the Legislative Council is a fully responsible House, but I do not think that can be demonstrated. The Legislative Council has shown that it is not prepared to admit the responsibility this Government has in raising revenue necessary to govern. The Legislative Council is prepared to use its constitutional privilege (which should never have existed in the first place but which unfortunately does exist) to emasculate financial legislation that has originated in this Chamber, which contains the responsible Government of the day. There is nothing in the record of the Legislative Council to suggest that it would approach a public

accounts committee other than in a Party-political manner. I should have no confidence in a public accounts committee containing representatives of another place. The Legislative Council is elected by a restricted franchise and is not responsible to the people. If it had a proper franchise, we would not have the present ridiculous situation where a Government that obtained a clear majority, with over 56 per cent of the people voting for it, has only four members out of 20 in the Legislative Council.

Why should we expect the Legislative Council, which is elected on the basis of a restricted and undemocratic franchise and which has shown during the lifetime of this Government that it is irresponsible, to show responsibility on a public accounts committee? We believe in creating a public accounts committee, which is responsible to this place. The House of Assembly is elected by the majority of the people and forms the Government, which has the financial responsibility. We believe that we should follow the tradition established originally at Westminster, where the House of Lords does not have membership on the Public Accounts Committee. Members opposite say that we should allow the local "House of Lords" to have membership on the committee, but I could not support such an argument under any circumstances. The basic point at issue is whether we should constitute a public accounts committee responsible to this House which, by tradition, has the financial control, or whether we should give representation to the Legislative Council, the members of which have shown financial irresponsibility. Should we support the tradition of Parliamentary democracy established in Britain? I believe that we should and that we should carry these amendments which would enable a public accounts committee to be constituted in line with the ideas of the House of Commons, of Sir Richard Butler, and of those members of the House of Assembly who supported him in 1933.

Mr. COURCE: I cannot support the amendment. The member for Glenelg suggests that members of a joint committee, particularly those from another place, would look at this matter not in the detached way that is necessary but from a political point of view. Although I have not been greatly surprised at what the honourable member has said, I think he has reached the ultimate in suggesting that; it is sheer nonsense. There are four major joint committees in the House: the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which has

three members from each House; the Industries Development Committee, which has three members from this Chamber; the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement with six members from this Chamber and one from another place; and the Public Works Committee with five members from here and two from the Legislative Council. The Public Works Committee is charged with investigating, and reporting to both Houses on, expenditure in excess of \$200,000 on any capital project. Its reports come before this House and, if approved, go on to Cabinet which settles priorities. The Government cannot proceed with those works unless they are approved by the committee.

One of the strengths of this institution is the way in which joint committees are able to function to the benefit of this Parliament and the State; the matters referred to them are examined from the State's point of view. All the committees function in an excellent way, and I am entirely opposed to the honourable member's suggestion that members should be drawn only from this House. When a public accounts committee was first mooted about two years ago I was not so keen about it but, having considered it further, I believe the idea has merit. It will function only if it is representative of both Houses and representative of all members of the Parliament.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The legislation will be completely ruined by an amendment of this nature, and I strongly support the view that it is moved to wreck the Bill and for no other reason. It was cogently pointed out that a few years ago no-one queried whether members of the Legislative Council should be involved.

Mr. Hudson: What about Sir Richard Butler?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member for Glenelg has to go right back to 1930 for what is an obvious political manoeuvre. Some members of this Committee were parties to the motion moved by the Labor Leader of the Opposition in 1959, but they had nothing to say about the membership from another place. How silly is this? What will happen if this amendment is carried? In addition to the Ministers, there is a Speaker of the House, and a Chairman of Committees, both of which are full-time jobs. There are also two Party Whips, and five members on the Public Works Committee and six members on the Land Settlement Committee from this House. Then there are the members of other Parliamentary committees, including the Industries Development Committee and the Subordinate Legislation Committee. In

all there are 27 members of this place who are members of important committees, excluding the number of members of smaller committees that do not take up much time. If that total is extended to 32 by the appointment of five members to a public accounts committee, 82 per cent of the membership of the House will be serving on committees. In addition, members of Select Committees have to travel around the State to take evidence. I do not consider that in any part of the world a public accounts committee could fully carry out its duties, and I think the Bill ought to be dropped by Government members. Government members are setting out to wreck the Bill by adopting a cynical attitude because they do not want a public accounts committee while they are in office.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I oppose the amendment but for different reasons from those advanced by the member for Alexandra, who submitted a good argument for the appointment of a committee when he said that members were too busy to look after the State's finances. I have learnt the lesson of about 34 years ago, as I think the late Mr. O'Halloran learned it. We must accept that the other place considers that it is a responsible House of this Parliament and that it will want representation on the committee. That place could throw this Bill up in Annie's room as easily as it could do that to any other Bill that came before it. Perhaps the Government does not want this committee appointed: the member for Mitcham may have been right when he said that there were ulterior motives in the amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE: I suggest that there be no members of the House of Assembly on this committee but that all members come from the other place, which is the House of Review and which would be fulfilling its functions by carrying out the work of a public accounts committee. I consider the whole idea of a public accounts committee to be ridiculous and absurd.

Mr. McANANEY: I oppose the amendment. I consider that a public accounts committee should not delve into every account. Even the Auditor-General would take only a cross section and deal with special matters. This committee would deal with specific complaints, and because it existed it would act as a deterrent and have a restraining influence. The present Upper House has rejected as many Bills in the life of this Parliament as it rejected

when the Liberal Party had a majority in this Chamber, and it should be considered a responsible Chamber.

Mr. HUDSON: In 1959, the member for Burra said that there was nothing wrong with a public accounts committee and that he hoped that some day South Australia would have one. He did not oppose the principle behind the motion that had been moved.

Mr. Quirke: I have grown up and you have not.

Mr. HUDSON: It is easy to quote changes in points of view. The basic issue is that this committee has an unusual job and is distinct from the Public Works Committee, the Land Settlement Committee, the Industries Development Committee, and the Subordinate Legislation Committee, because it will deal with matters that it can take up as a result of the Auditor-General's Report, in addition to matters that can be referred to it by a motion of either House of Parliament. There is a distinction between Parliament and the Executive. I do not object to a full representative membership from this Chamber: the Opposition should have a minimum representation on it. However, no member can claim that the Legislative Council has a responsible record in financial matters since the Labor Party assumed office with a majority in this Chamber. It has a most irresponsible record. As the legislation stands at present, this committee, if appointed, would be required to report to the other place on a matter referred to it by that Chamber. Obviously when a Labor Government is in power in this Chamber the Liberal-controlled Legislative Council will use the committee to play politics. I do not think it would be so used if the Party seemingly in permanent control in another place was of the same political colour as the Party in power in this Chamber.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member for Glenelg has got some of his facts right and some of them half right, as is not uncommon with him. He does not know, for instance, that the Public Works Committee has the right to initiate of its own volition an investigation into any project. Parliamentary committees work without any consideration of Party allegiance. In the whole of my experience on the Public Works Committee, I have never once heard the word "Party" mentioned, and I think that must apply to every other committee. Concerning the analogy between the House of Commons and this Parliament, I draw the attention of the member

for Glenelg to the fact that at not inconsiderable expense and time his Government has been pursuing an exercise to ensure that everybody who may be entitled to be enrolled to vote for the Upper House is, in fact, enrolled. I know that fundamentally the honourable member is opposed to the bi-cameral system, although I do not know whether he is prepared to say so publicly.

Mr. Hudson: Would you favour the adoption of a common roll?

Mr. SHANNON: No. Has the honourable member ever suggested that he favoured the abolition of the Upper House?

Mr. Hudson: Yes, I have.

Mr. SHANNON: The whole difference between the House of Commons and the House of Lords is that one is elected and one is not.

Mr. Hudson: The electoral books here have been cooked up for years and years.

Mr. SHANNON: There is no possible proof of that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I realize that the clause and the amendment, dealing with whether two Houses should be represented on the committee, may broaden the debate, namely, as to the responsibility or otherwise of either House, but I cannot see how the abolition of the Legislative Council comes within the terms of the clause or the amendment. I ask honourable members to confine their remarks to indicating whether or not both Houses should be represented on the committee.

Mr. SHANNON: I think that you are probably correct, Mr. Chairman. I do not think for a moment that this type of legislation will meet with a favourable response in another place.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am disappointed to hear the member for Glenelg say that the Legislative Council would use this committee as a means of making itself a political nuisance. I refer him to the following remarks of the late Mr. O'Halloran (at page 1059 of 1959 *Hansard*):

What would a public accounts committee aim to do? As its name implies it would look into accounts of public departments. It would have nothing to do with current policy of the Government. I emphasize that because it has been suggested, in debates on similar proposals, that a public accounts committee would unduly impede the Government of the day in giving effect to its policy. It would have nothing to do with the moulding of Government policy, but would ensure that if a Government decided that money should be spent upon a certain item the money was spent as wisely and judiciously as possible. It would look back into financial aspects of policy performed. That is to say,

it would look back into what was done with public money, not forward into what the Government plans to do.

I think that refutes the argument of the member for Glenelg, and I still oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, and McKee.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell (teller), and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Ryan and Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Rodda.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "their respective Houses" and insert "the House of Assembly and two of whom shall belong to the group led by the Leader of the Opposition in that House".

This is a consequential amendment in part, and in part it provides that, of the five members of the committee elected by the House of Assembly, two shall come from the group led by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I imagine that the second part of the honourable member's amendment is not normally included in legislation to set up committees such as this. If there were many Independent members in this place, this provision would have to be amended because those Independent members would not favour the official Opposition having these members on the committee. Perhaps it would be better to make up the membership of the committee according to custom. As 27 offices of this Parliament have already been filled, the requirement that two members should come from the Opposition seems of doubtful value. I do not think the legislation will be improved much by this provision, and it could cause difficulties.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I point out that other Parties other than the Party led by the Leader of the Opposition could be represented in this Chamber. In the event of the Labor Party's being in Opposition, we could perhaps find the Democratic Labor Party also represented, the members of which would not, I am sure, agree to be represented by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe the Communist Party has

members in the House of Commons, and they would not accept being led by the official Leader of the Opposition. I am sure the member for Glenelg did not realize the scope of his amendment, which I hope he will reconsider and withdraw. The Leader of the Opposition cannot necessarily be accepted as being the nominal leader of all the members making up an Opposition.

Mr. SHANNON: This is the first time since I have been a member of Parliament that I have seen Party politics acknowledged in a provision establishing a Parliamentary committee. As I do not think this is a wise course, I hope members of the Committee will reject the amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I draw the attention of the member for Glenelg to the position obtaining in this House after the 1938 election when the House comprised 15 Liberal and Country League members, 15 Independents, and nine members of the Labor Party. The member for Onkaparinga was the Government Whip in that Parliament and was able to manage the Independents so that the Government could continue to operate, but one day they would support one side and the next day the other. Apart from the impracticability of applying the honourable member's amendment to the situation, no provision is made for any group except the two he mentions. It is unfair that any number of people who are unaffiliated should be excluded from representation on such a committee. Because I think the amendment involves many problems and is not advisable, I oppose it.

Mr. HUDSON: I am happy to accept the points raised by members of the Opposition; the amendment was drafted in this way out of consideration to them. If they would be happy with the position that would apply if all words after "House of Assembly" were omitted, I would ask permission to withdraw my amendment so that I might move in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member desire to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. HUDSON: Only if my suggestion is acceptable to members of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: No, it is not.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Alexandra is not satisfied with the wording of the Public Works Standing Committee Act under which five members of the committee shall be members of the House of Assembly. He talks about custom but, if he is not satisfied with the way the customs of this House provide a

pattern of membership on the committee, I cannot see what he now objects to. In view of the honourable member's statement, I will leave my amendment as it stands.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, and McKee.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell (teller), and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Ryan and Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Rodda.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

In subclause (4) to strike out "Parliament" and insert "House of Assembly elected".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Term of office."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

To strike out "a" second occurring and insert "the"; to strike out "Parliament" and insert "Assembly"; and after "House" second occurring to insert "of Assembly".

These are consequential amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Casual vacancies."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out paragraph (b); in paragraph (c) to strike out "being a member of the House of Assembly"; in paragraph (g) to strike out "Parliament of which he is a member" and insert "Assembly"; in subclause (2) to strike out "either House of Parliament" and insert "the House of Assembly", and to strike out "in its membership".

These are consequential amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Chairman and temporary Chairman."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Following the actions of Mr. Wilson (now Prime Minister of Great Britain) when Deputy Leader of the Opposition and Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in the House of Commons, in exposing many scandals with his ruthless interrogation and investigation, I should have thought that an amendment would be moved to ensure that the Leader of the Opposition was nominated as chairman of the committee. I

understand that the member for Glenelg wishes the Bill to be modelled on the British Bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—"Quorum and voting."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "Subject to subsection (2) of this section four" and insert "Three".

This is not altogether a consequential amendment. The member for Albert originally envisaged a committee comprising seven members, four of whom would ordinarily constitute a quorum. He then provided under subclause (2) that a quorum should consist of not fewer than five members. If the membership of the committee is reduced to five, a quorum of three would normally be sufficient.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

To strike out subclause (2).

Amendment carried: clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Duties of committee."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (a) to strike out "1957 as amended" and insert "1966".

This is purely a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (b) after "to" first occurring to insert "inquire into and".

In setting out the functions of the committee, I think it is wise to spell them out as much as possible.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (b) to strike out "both Houses of Parliament" and insert "the House of Assembly".

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

In paragraph (b) to strike out "Parliament" and insert "House".

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (c) after "to" first occurring to insert "inquire into and".

Again, this is purely a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (c) to strike out "both Houses of Parliament" and insert "the House of Assembly".

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (c) after "control" to insert "expenditure".

From discussions I had, it was not altogether clear to me whether the words "issue or payment of public moneys" covered the ambit that the word "expenditure" covered, and I think it is wise to include that word.

Amendment carried.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I move:

After paragraph (c) to strike out "and".

My object is to insert a further paragraph.

Mr. HUDSON: I oppose the amendment.

The additional paragraph to which the honourable member refers is as follows:

(e) to inquire into and report upon any matter relating to the public accounts which in the opinion of the Auditor-General requires immediate investigation and is referred by him in writing to the committee.

The Auditor-General already has certain responsibilities under the Audit Act; he is required to report to Parliament and, of course, the public accounts committee can investigate matters on which the Auditor-General reports. Further, the Auditor-General is required under the Audit Act to report to the Treasurer on any matter which, in his opinion, requires immediate action to be taken by the Government of the day. I should think that the Auditor-General's powers of investigating a matter would be such that the report he made in these circumstances would be likely to be to the Government of the day for immediate action to be taken. I would also argue that while Parliament was not in session, in so far as a situation might arise, requiring an immediate investigation by the public accounts committee, it would be covered by an amendment to be moved in a moment.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What is the amendment?

Mr. HUDSON: To strike out the words "either House of Parliament" and to insert "resolution of the House of Assembly or by the Governor". If the Auditor-General reports to the Treasurer that further action should be taken and an investigation by the public accounts committee is required, a matter can be so investigated on the signature of the Governor in Council. In other words, it would be possible for action to be taken while Parliament was out of session.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not happy about the amendment. It seems to me that Parliament is handing over to the Auditor-General complete discretion as to whether or

not the committee shall be required to investigate a matter. I do not think it is necessary to include an amendment which will provide that the committee may inquire into and report on matters which, in the opinion of the Auditor-General, require immediate investigation. I do not think it would be proper to include a provision whereby the committee could be instructed by the Auditor-General to conduct an inquiry.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (d) to strike out "the public" and insert "any".

I have a further amendment to insert the words "laid before Parliament". I am a little doubtful about what is meant exactly by "the public accounts" and about whether these would include accounts which are laid before Parliament but which are not subject to audit by the Auditor-General. It seems to me that this Parliament, in its wisdom, has passed legislation which gives certain organizations a right to an independent audit. I am thinking in particular of the University of Adelaide, the Flinders University, and the Totalizator Agency Board which were all established as relatively independent institutions of this Parliament, and which have the right to appoint their own auditors. Their accounts are still laid before Parliament, which might wish, through its public accounts committee, to institute an inquiry into those accounts. I think this would have to be done by the House of Assembly and not by the committee on its own initiative. If the phrase "the public accounts" is left in the clause, it is conceivable that that could be interpreted in such a way as to include only those accounts relating directly to the activities of the Government.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

In paragraph (d) after "accounts" to insert "laid before Parliament".

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (d) to strike out "either House of Parliament" and insert "resolution of the House of Assembly or by the Governor".

The Bill that was presented to Parliament on this matter in 1965 included additional words in this provision that would have permitted the public accounts committee to look into these matters on its own initiative, and also under an instruction or request of any Minister of the Crown acting, presumably, independently of the Governor in Council. It seemed to me that, in relation to accounts which Parliament

had decided to allow to have an independent audit in order to allow institutions such as the University of Adelaide and Flinders University as much independence as possible, the committee should not have an automatic right to investigate such matters but that it could do so by resolution of the House of Assembly. This would protect the independence originally granted to the statutory-type bodies. At the same time, it also seemed to me that a situation could arise where an immediate investigation of certain accounts was necessary when Parliament was not in session and the resolution of the House of Assembly could not be obtained in order to initiate the investigation. It ought to be possible by the resolution of the Governor in Council for such an investigation by the public accounts committee to be initiated. However, I do not believe that the wording of the 1965 Bill, which permitted the initiation by a Minister of the Crown, is advisable.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (d) to strike out "that" first occurring and insert "the".

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I move:

To insert the following new paragraph:

(e) to inquire into and report upon any matter relating to the public accounts which in the opinion of the Auditor-General requires immediate investigation and is referred by him in writing to the committee.

Although my previous amendment was defeated, I should still like to proceed with this amendment. Regarding the amendment of the member for Glenelg, if an inquiry is initiated by resolution of the House it means that the Government must support it. If an inquiry is initiated by the Governor in Council, this will also be as a result of Government direction. A matter may be put forward at the initiative of the committee, but the committee is completely at the direction of Government members. In other words, some important inquiries could be prevented from coming before the committee. I have heard indirectly that the Auditor-General does not want the responsibility which my amendment would place on him. However, as the "watch dog" of the finances of the State, I believe he should be able to institute an inquiry on his own initiative. It could well be that he believes that he should report only to Parliament and that he is an officer of the Parliament. However, at the same time, he is an officer of the

State and if there are any irregularities that can be prevented from being ventilated in this House because the Government does not want to proceed with them, then surely there can be nothing wrong in the Auditor-General's having the right to request the committee to inquire into such matters. I ask the Committee to accept my amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: I oppose the amendment. The Auditor-General is not limited in what he can say and report to Parliament. In paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) the committee is given power to report to Parliament as a result of any examination of the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the State and each statement and report transmitted to the Houses of Parliament by the Auditor-General. The member for Albert is saying, with this amendment, that a situation might arise where the process of the Auditor-General reporting to Parliament is too slow and that immediate action is too slow, but the provisions of the Audit Act already cover that situation. Section 12 (2) of that Act provides:

The Auditor-General shall transmit to the Treasurer the name of any person failing to comply with any of the provisions of this Act, and thereupon and until such failure has been made good to the satisfaction of the Treasurer all salary and moneys that may be or become due or payable to such person may be withheld.

Where immediate action is required to correct some fraud or fraudulent purpose that has been made evident, the Auditor-General has an immediate remedy, which is already specified. I do not think we need a public accounts committee of this Parliament to investigate the kind of individual fraudulent action that may take place. That can be handled in the normal way by the Auditor-General and by the Government, acting on his advice. It seems to me the functions of the public accounts committee are directed more towards examining the principles of accounting that apply in various Government departments, examining the general questions that arise in relation to the receipt of public moneys and their expenditure, and reporting on these questions in a general way.

I can think of few cases where it would be completely appropriate for the kind of thing that would be covered by the amendment that are not already covered by earlier provisions of clause 9, other than the need to catch individual wrong-doers, and they are already covered by the Audit Act. As the honourable member pointed out, the Auditor-General regards himself as an officer of Parliament

who is required, on certain matters, to report directly to Parliament (not to by-pass it) and report on other matters directly to the Treasurer, and to see that action is taken to prevent what is going on. If the honourable member thinks about this, he will see that the interests of Parliament are fully protected. A public accounts committee could examine under paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) anything it liked: it would not have to be directed by anyone under those heads.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move to amend the amendment as follows:

After "(e)" to insert "if it thinks fit".

My objection is that, as the amendment now stands, the Auditor-General has the complete initiative as to what the committee does in this respect. Provided that the committee still has the option to take notice or not, then there is nothing wrong with the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the amendment moved by the member for Albert. The committee should be able to make up its own mind on what it is to inquire into. It would honour its obligation by inquiring into and reporting on a matter. This other amendment, however, authorizes the committee to inquire into and report on any matter that the Auditor-General considers requires immediate investigation. If the Auditor-General considers something needs immediate investigation, he can ask the committee to investigate, and the committee can make up its own mind as to what extent it carries out its inquiry.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman's amendment negated.

Mr. Nankivell's amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Power to sit during sittings."

Mr. HUDSON moved:

To strike out "neither House of Parliament is" and insert "the House of Assembly is not"; to strike out "that" and insert "the"; and to strike out "either" and insert "the".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 12 passed.

New clause 13—"Salaries and allowances."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): I move to insert the following new clause:

13. (1) The salary of the Chairman of the committee shall be at the rate of six hundred dollars per annum, and the salary of each member of the committee shall be at the rate of five hundred dollars per annum.

(2) In addition to such salary each member of the committee shall, in respect of the performance of his duties as such member, be

entitled to such expenses and allowances as are prescribed.

(3) The amounts payable to a member of the committee pursuant to this section shall be in addition to any payment received by such member pursuant to any Act in respect of his services in the discharge of his Parliamentary duties.

Members have emphasized the importance of this committee and the work involved in its investigations. As positions on the committee would not be sought without some remuneration, and having regard to the responsibilities of members of the committee, it is fair and reasonable that salaries and allowances should be paid to them. The member for Albert was unable to include this provision in the Bill, because it must be moved by a Minister of the Crown.

New clause inserted.

New clause 14—"Certificate for payment."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

14. The amounts to which a member of the committee is entitled pursuant to this Act shall be certified in writing signed by the Chairman and the Secretary of the committee, whose certificate shall be sufficient authority for the payment of all amounts so certified.

This is normal procedure.

New clause inserted.

New clause 15—"Office not an office of profit under Crown."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

15. Within the meaning and for the purposes of any provision of any Act—

(a) the office of the Chairman or a member of the committee shall be deemed not to be an office of profit under the Crown;

(b) the Chairman or a member of the committee shall not by reason of holding office or accepting any salary, fees, allowances or other emoluments as such be deemed to accept or to have accepted any office of profit under the Crown.

This is self-explanatory.

New clause inserted.

New clause 16—"Financial provision."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved to insert the following new clause:

16. Any moneys required for the purposes of this Act shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for those purposes.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

GAS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

(For wording of motion, see page 844.)

(Continued from August 16. Page 1370.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): It seems that this is an appropriate time to speak to this motion, because the Premier has indicated the final phase of the construction of the pipeline from Gidgealpa-Moomba to Adelaide.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not started yet.

Mr. CASEY: The good news for me and the member for Burra is that the pipeline will traverse the eastern route through Peterborough and Clare, to Adelaide.

Mr. Quirke: I knew that six months ago.

Mr. CASEY: Unfortunately, the question of natural gas has become a political football, particularly in northern gulf towns. I have had representations from people at Broken Hill asking for a spur line to be built to that town.

Mr. Heaslip: Will you get a spur line into Peterborough?

Mr. CASEY: As far as I am aware the pipeline will go close to that town, because investigations have indicated that gas can and will be used there.

Mr. Heaslip: Will there be enough used to warrant a pipeline?

Mr. CASEY: I wonder whether the honourable member has any idea of the length of this spur line.

Mr. Heaslip: If it runs through Peterborough, will that town have natural gas?

Mr. CASEY: Of course, because it is on its doorstep. I hope that an increasing quantity of natural gas will be used at Peterborough. That town has always been recognized as a main railway junction and, if it were in an eastern European country it would be considered a town of major importance. I am sure that progress will be made in this town with the advent of the pipeline. The significance of the eastern route is that it will not in any way prejudice the supply of gas to gulf towns. If the member for Rocky River were here at present, he would agree with me that the economics of a proposal were of the utmost importance. An industry cannot be established anywhere unless the economics are sound; capital cannot be outweighed or left lying idle; it must bear interest payments, and be put to some use.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This is a rather unusual argument from the Government when decentralization has been discussed at such length.

Mr. CASEY: Does the honourable member think that such places as Peterborough and Clare are not entitled to participate in decentralization? He cannot have it both ways: someone must miss out.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: For many years we have listened to debates in this House concerning the decentralization of industry that did not take into account the economics of an industry at a particular place. You're telling us another story now.

Mr. CASEY: I am pleased that the member for Flinders agrees with what I am saying.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I have always agreed on that point.

Mr. Quirke: If you give me an industry for Peterborough I'll struggle to give you one for Clare!

Mr. CASEY: The eastern route was chosen because of the economics involved. While I do not object to a matter of this nature being referred to the Public Works Committee, I do not think that is necessary, because there are experts in this field whose advice is much more valuable than that of members of Parliament. Referring this matter to the Public Works Committee would be a complete waste of time, because the Bechtel Pacific Corporation has undertaken a complete survey. That organization consists of experts; it undertakes surveys throughout the world, and is considered to be one of the foremost consultants in this field. I am sure that if it were intended to lay a gas main in the metropolitan area, the matter would not be referred to the Public Works Committee: the gas company would be consulted, because that organization undertakes this type of work all the time.

Mr. Coumbe: The pipeline that went under the gulf was referred to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. CASEY: True, but I see no reason for referring this matter to the committee when so much expert advice is already available to us. The former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) previously gave the member for Gumeracha much information about the comparison between the eastern and western routes. In addition, the Minister of Mines has published statements about the respective costs. In fairness to the former Premier, the present Premier, and the Minister of Mines, I point out that all the criticism that has been levelled at them by members opposite has not been in the best interests of the State generally.

Mr. Quirke: It would not have had the slightest influence on where the pipeline was to go.

Mr. CASEY: That may be so. Gas must be supplied at a price that can compete with that of fuel oil. The Premier recently said that the price agreed on between the Electricity Trust and the producers was about 26c a thousand cubic feet, reducing to about 25½c. Naturally, if the western route were to be adopted the costs would increase, the price would rise a further 2c and that might place the price out of the trust's reach. Where would we be then? If the price to the Gas Company had been increased by an extra 2c, would it have been able to enter into a contract?

Mr. Quirke: What is the price?

Mr. CASEY: I do not know; I do not think it has been published. However, what I have said may also be applied to the price to be paid at Angaston. I am not concerned with who was responsible for finding gas in South Australia, whether it was the Liberal and Country League Party or the Labor Party, for I do not think that politics should enter into the matter. Gas was discovered by the Delhi-Santos group, which has spent much money on oil exploration in this State. After all, that organization was searching for oil, and gas was merely secondary. I estimate that the Delhi-Santos group has spent more than \$30,000,000 on oil exploration in South Australia.

Mr. Quirke: Whose money was that?

Mr. CASEY: I think the organization received from the Commonwealth Government a subsidy amounting to between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000. Therefore, it has spent about \$25,000,000 of its own money on oil exploration in the Great Artesian Basin. It has done this in the past and I dare say it will do it in the future. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) asked last week whether the cost of transportation would have been taken into account in the consideration by the Commonwealth Government of the moneys to be made available by subsidy for oil exploration. A substantial sum has been invested by the Delhi-Santos group in exploration in the Great Artesian Basin.

The member for Onkaparinga also wondered whether gas would compete with nuclear power. A couple of years ago I brought back from the United States of America an analysis of a nuclear power station being constructed at Oyster Bay. I handed that analysis to representatives of the Electricity Trust but found that they already knew about this power station and had at their fingertips all the information I had brought back. No doubt they are fully aware of the potential of nuclear power in

South Australia. Several years ago nuclear power was a matter for lively discussion in this place. Of course, in those days, although plans were under way to have work carried out, we did not have the exploration going on in the North of the State that was to take place later. If we did not have natural gas, nuclear power would be the alternative source of power for the State. I believe that in less than 20 years there will be a demand for nuclear power, not so much for the power itself, but for its use in desalting water. At present American desalting plants are being combined with nuclear power stations. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RATING)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1966. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments to the Local Government Act proposed by this Bill are mainly consequential on the provisions of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill which was introduced into this House earlier in this session. These amendments have become necessary for a variety of reasons. Under the definition of "ratable property" in section 5 of the principal Act as it now stands, it would, in a great majority of cases, mean that the common property comprised within a deposited strata plan would be ratable property. This should not be so, as the common property cannot be held except as incidental to the ownership of the units defined on that plan and, therefore, should not be separately ratable or capable of being separately sold for non-payment of rates.

Clause 3 of the Bill accordingly amends that definition to exclude common property from the meaning of ratable property. The amendment, however, goes on to provide that every unit together with the equitable estate of the owner of that unit in the common property shall be ratable. Clause 4 makes an amendment to subsection (1) of section 301 of the principal Act that is consequential on the enactment of the Planning and Development Act and on the

proposed new section 223nn of the Real Property Act as amended by the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill.

Clause 5 amends subsection (2) of section 319 of the principal Act which deals with the liability of owners of ratable property abutting on public roads to contribute towards the cost of constructing certain works in relation to those roads. The clause provides that, where land that abuts on a public road is common property comprised within a deposited strata plan:

(a) the units defined on that plan shall be deemed to be ratable property abutting on that road;

and

(b) the council may recover from the owners of the units the cost of the work ratably according to the frontage of the common property abutting on the road and in accordance with the unit entitlements of the units.

Clause 6 amends subsection (2) of section 328 of the principal Act which deals with the liability of owners of ratable property abutting on a newly constructed footway to contribute towards the cost of its construction. This amendment is on the same lines as the amendment made by clause 5 to subsection (2) of section 319 of the principal Act.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936-1966. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Can the Bill be placed on the file so that we can see what it is about?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will, I am sure, from the explanations that will be given, realize that the two Bills I am now introducing are consequent upon the passing of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It would be nice for the House to have the Bill in its possession.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will certainly have an opportunity to consider it before he is called on to debate the matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We have to debate it tomorrow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members experience difficulty they will have further time. However, I would have thought, from what the honourable member did on certain occasions as Premier, that this was by no means unusual. I can cite numbers of occasions on which this happened. I did not anticipate that the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill would pass quite as easily as it did, and I was pleasantly surprised. The amendments to the Land Tax Act contained in this Bill are consequential on the provisions of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Bill which was introduced into this House earlier in this session. These amendments have become necessary because of the definition of "unimproved value" in section 4 of that Act.

Under that definition, "unimproved value" means the capital amount for which the fee simple of the land in question might be expected to sell if free from encumbrances, assuming the actual improvements (if any) thereon had not been made. It is impossible to assess the unimproved value of land in strata as strata ownership depends on the existence of a building (or an improvement) on the land and it is not possible to assess the unimproved value of a part of a building.

It therefore becomes necessary to make a special case of units defined on a deposited strata plan and this Bill accordingly amends the definition of "unimproved value" in the Land Tax Act by providing that, where the land is a unit defined on a deposited strata plan, its unimproved value is that proportion of the unimproved value of the parcel, of which the unit is a part, which bears to the total unimproved value of the parcel the same proportion as the unit entitlement of the unit bears to the aggregate unit entitlement of all the units defined on the plan. This is the fairest and most equitable means of arriving at the unimproved value of a unit.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Oil Refinery (Hundred of Noarlunga) Indenture Act, 1958-65. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to correct an anomaly in the principal Act that occurred when it was amended in 1965. In 1963, a new section 9 was enacted in the principal Act providing for the exemption from the charge of outward wharfage at Port Adelaide of petroleum products at the refinery, transported by pipeline to Port Adelaide, and therefrom shipped and subsequently unloaded at any wharf in South Australia, such products incurring full inward wharfage charges wherever discharged.

It has recently been brought to the attention of the Government that a petroleum product, such as furnace oil, which cannot be transported by pipeline and must therefore be transported in road tank waggons to Port Adelaide for outward transmission to ports in South Australia, is charged both outward wharfage at Port Adelaide and inward wharfage at the port of delivery. Clause 3 corrects this position by adding after "by pipeline" the words "or by any other means of land transport", thus extending the application of section 9 of the principal Act to all petroleum products transported to Port Adelaide by pipeline or by land. As this is a hybrid Bill, it will require reference to a Select Committee in accordance with Joint Standing Orders.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): This is a logical change in the Act to provide for circumstances that were not apparent when the original Act was passed. The verbiage of the Act is now inadequate, for it does not permit a relaxing of the wharfage charge on materials conveyed by road transport to Port Adelaide. As this is a logical progression I do not object to it, and I support the Bill so that it can be referred to a Select Committee.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): In these circumstances, I, too, support the Bill, because a Select Committee must be appointed to consider the whole matter. It seems a perfectly logical and most desirable Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. C. D. Hutchens and D. N. Brookman, Messrs. Hudson and Hurst, and the Hon. B. H. Teusner; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on September 12.

MOTION TO SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to introduce a Bill and move the second reading forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there being present an absolute majority of the Whole, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Those in favour say "Aye"; those against say "No".

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): No. I have not had the courtesy of being told.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday (teller), McKee, and Stott.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: Since the motion has to be carried by a constitutional majority, I declare it lost.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (LEASES)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1967, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As honourable members will be aware, the last large areas of undeveloped Crown lands situated in an area of assured rainfall are those in the Upper South-East area in the counties of Buckingham and Chandos and adjoining areas. Until comparatively recent years it was generally agreed that this area was not capable of safe economic development. With the advances that have taken place in development and management techniques, however, interest in these lands has increased. Following extensive investigations of the area by departmental officers, it was considered that it could be reasonable to open the area for settle-

ment provided that adequate control could be retained both in initial development and subsequent management.

Following this investigation, the question of the development of this area was referred to the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, which made its report on August 26, 1963, and recommended, *inter alia*, that a limited development of the area be undertaken and that this should be encouraged inwards from the fringe area. The committee also drew attention to certain other requirements and suggested that action should be taken to ensure that sufficient control could be kept over the development of lands of this type.

Since 1963 further departmental investigations, including a soil survey of the area, have been carried out, and my department has watched with interest the progress of private development in the vicinity. As a consequence, I consider that action should be taken to commence development. The scope and form of this legislation has been considered by the Land Board and by officers of the Lands Department. The primary purpose of this Bill is to provide the legislative framework to meet requirements for development and to provide the control considered desirable by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement and departmental officers.

Although it was the problem of these lands that gave rise to this legislation, it is recognized that there are other lands in the State which, for not necessarily the same reasons, also require special care in their development, and accordingly this proposed Bill is designed to ensure that appropriate measures can be adopted in relation to those lands also in cases where such action is considered necessary. In the Upper South-East it is a problem of "unstable" lands, that is, lands which except under most carefully controlled conditions would tend to deteriorate and could also represent a hazard to surrounding areas. Control over their development then should pay regard to, amongst others, the following factors:

- (a) holdings should be sufficiently large to be economic without any need for overstocking or over-cultivation to the point of land exhaustion and, as a consequence, subdivision of holdings should not normally be permitted;
- (b) holdings should be by way of perpetual lease rather than as freehold to ensure that appropriate control can be exercised over development and management;

- (c) steps should be taken to ensure that persons granted leases have the financial and other resources necessary to enable them to successfully bear the substantial costs of development; and
- (d) there must be power to stop occupation and development when it is clear that continued occupation and development is causing deterioration in the land.

At the same time, opportunity has been taken to make some amendments of somewhat lesser importance to certain sections of the principal Act. These amendments provide for the simplification of administrative procedures and the correction of minor clerical errors which have been noted in the principal Act. Generally, no matters of principle are involved in these amendments. Amendments of this nature have been made to sections 14, 44, 47, 206, 225 and 232 (h) and to the Eleventh Schedule.

I come now to a consideration of the Bill in some detail. Clauses 1 and 2 are quite formal. Clauses 3 and 4 make consequential amendments to the principal Act arising from the insertion of a new Part dealing with special development lands. Clause 5 deals with the meaning of "adjacent land" and replaces a reference to this meaning which occurs at sections 66a and 66b of the principal Act and which is also used in the Part proposed to be inserted in the principal Act. Clause 6 corrects a clerical error in section 14 of the principal Act.

Clause 7 amends section 44 of the principal Act, which deals with agreements for the purchase of the freehold of Crown lands. The amendments proposed to be effected provide that in addition to the conditions, covenants and provisions set out in the Fifth Schedule to the Act the agreement may be made subject to such other conditions, covenants and provisions as the Governor thinks fit or such other provisions as the Governor thinks fit together with a right of re-entry. In the past it has been frequently necessary and desirable to impose conditions other than those contained in the Fifth Schedule in relation to agreements, and this has necessitated the drawing of a separate contract between the parties to the agreement. The effect of this amendment, therefore, will enable all the conditions of the agreement to be contained in the one document as is at present the case of perpetual leases under section 35.

Clause 8 repeals and re-enacts portion of section 47 of the principal Act which provides for minimum payments in respect to rents and

periodical payments under agreements to purchase lands and is necessary for two reasons:

- (a) some doubt has arisen as to the general effect of an amendment to section 47 made by section 13 of the Crown Lands Act Amendment Act, 1965, which came into force on November 25, 1965; and
- (b) in any case it is felt that the amendment did not make it quite clear that the only rents or payments affected were those in respect of leases granted or agreements entered into after that date.

The proposed amendment is intended to clarify the situation and is accordingly expressed to have effect from the date of the commencement of the 1965 amendment. It has not been thought necessary to re-enact section 47 (2), since this section was of consequence only where the number of payments under an agreement was fixed at 60. It was there to ensure that the increase in the minimum of each payment did not result in an increase in the total amount to be paid by providing that, where this increase of the total amount would otherwise occur, the number of payments would be reduced accordingly. Since, following an amendment in 1965, the number of payments is no longer fixed, there is now no need for this provision. The provision relating to the completion of payments before the expiration of the first six years of the agreement has been omitted, since this matter is covered specifically in the form of the agreement itself.

Clauses 9 and 10 repeal provisions in sections 66a and 66b of the principal Act relating to the definition of adjacent land; this provision has now been inserted by clause 5. Clause 11 inserts a new Part, and since this represents the substance of the Bill the proposed new sections will be dealt with in order. New section 66c inserts a definition, for the purposes of the Part, of "lease"; this is merely a matter of convenience. New section 66d provides for the declaration of land as "special development lands". New section 66e restricts the granting of special development lands to the grant on perpetual (special development) leases. New section 66f provides for the delineation of "excluded areas", that is, those areas within special development lands which should not be used at all. The insertion of new section 66g is to ensure, so far as is practicable, that no person shall acquire a lease under this Part unless he has satisfied the board in all respects as to his capacity

to develop the land. It also provides that no person shall hold more than one lease under this Part unless the dual holding is for the purpose of amalgamation of the two leases held.

New section 66h specifically excludes the operation of certain portions of the principal Act to or in relation to special development lands or leases under this Part; the excluded sections are as follows:

- (a) section 31, which limits the allotment to a person of lands exceeding the values set out in that section; this exclusion is necessary, as other holdings of Crown lands may represent part of the resources needed to develop leases under this Part;
- (b) section 35, which provides for the form and effect of "normal" perpetual leases; the form and effect of leases under this Part are provided for in new section 66e;
- (c) section 57, which provides for subletting for up to three years with the approval of the Minister given without reference to the Land Board; it is not proposed that leases under this Part will be sublet except with the recommendation of the Land Board made in accordance with this Part, the only exception to this rule being the case of sublease for certain easements;
- (d) section 61; because of the special conditions of leases under this Part it is not envisaged that they could be offered for sale in the manner set out in that section;
- (e) section 210, which would permit the surrender of a lease under this Part for an ordinary perpetual lease, is quite inappropriate in relation to a lease under this Part and, in fact, could defeat the object of this Bill;
- (f) section 212, which provides for the purchase of the fee simple; again, this provision would be inappropriate in relation to leases under this Part;
- (g) section 220; this section can have no application since leases under this Part cannot be surrendered for other leases or agreements;
- (h) subsections (2), (2a), (2aa), (3), (4) and (4a) of section 225 relate to the size of individual holdings and hence should properly not apply in relation to transfers of leases under this Part;

this again relates to the need for substantial resources to develop the leases under this Part.

Clause 12 amends section 206 of the principal Act which relates to the surrender of a lease or part thereof for the grant of a new lease either to the lessee surrendering or to a nominated person. Subsection (2) of that section provides that the new lease would be on the same terms and conditions as the lease or portion of a lease surrendered. This provision is unobjectionable when the purpose of the new lease is the same as the purpose of the old lease, but where the new lease is not for the same purpose it appears reasonable that the terms and conditions of the proposed new lease should be examined in the light of the new purpose. For example, specified rent or improved conditions which would be quite appropriate to a lease for agricultural purposes would be inappropriate in the case of a lease for the erection of a dwellinghouse. In addition, the minimum rent provisions provided for in section 47 have been specifically applied to new leases under this section.

Clause 13 amends section 225 of the principal Act which, amongst other things, provides for advertisement, consideration by the board and the consent of the Minister to dealings in Crown lands. At the moment much seemingly unnecessary work and expense result from the application of this section in relation to the creation of easements in favour of the Crown and its instrumentalities, these easements being created by way of sublease. The effect of this amendment will be to obviate the need for advertisement and consideration by the Land Board with regard to subleases for the purposes of these easements. The provisions relating to the consideration of objections to the grant of the sublease are retained, as is the provision requiring the consent of the Minister.

Mr. Quirke: Does that apply only to new leases?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, it applies generally, for example, to easements of the Electricity Trust. Clauses 14 and 15 correct clerical errors in section 232h and the Eleventh Schedule respectively. Clause 16 enacts new Twelfth and Thirteenth Schedules to the principal Act as provided for in proposed new section 66e (3). In form and substance these schedules follow the analogous provisions in the Crown Lands Act relating to ordinary perpetual leases with the following significant exceptions:

- (a) an additional obligation to fence any excluded area is included;

- (b) an additional obligation to comply with any directions of the Minister as to the number of stock which may be carried on the land;
- (c) an additional liability to forfeiture if—
- (1) any excluded area is cultivated, etc; or
 - (2) the Minister is satisfied that the stability or productivity of the land is deteriorating so as to be detrimental to the land or to any adjacent land.

I assure honourable members that the Government is fully aware of the need for care in the allotment and development of this land. Appropriate action will be taken to ensure that holdings are of sufficient size for successful development. Roads will be surveyed before the land is allotted, and development will follow the routes of surveyed roads. In the initial stages, the number of blocks available for allotment will be limited, probably in the vicinity of presently established roads, and the results will be observed in order that any changes that may be found necessary may be made as allotment, which can be expected to be spread over a number of years, proceeds.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICAL ARTICLES AND MATERIALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 22. Page 1493.)

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Prohibition sale hire or use of unsafe or dangerous articles or materials."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

In new section 12a (1) after "in" third occurring to insert "case of emergency and in".

I think this amendment meets the requirements of the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), who spoke on behalf of the Opposition in the second reading debate. While the Electricity Trust authorities were not convinced of the necessity for it, they raised no objection.

Mr. COUMBE: When I made the suggestion the Minister, with his usual courtesy, took it up, and I thank him. The amendment meets the point that I raised and I am glad that the trust has accepted it. I drew attention to the need for the amendment because of this statement in the Minister's second reading explanation:

The trust believes that there should be an emergency power to prohibit the distribution or use of electrical goods in circumstances such as these and that the trust should not have to rely on the willingness of dealers or others in order to withdraw goods from distribution or use.

The legislation administered by the Victorian State Electricity Commission contains the word "emergency", but our Bill did not include it. The amendment does what the Committee desires without opening too widely the powers of the trust.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Does this provision cover auctions sales of electrical equipment?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I understand the clause, it will not interfere with the sale of electrical goods other than those declared.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 1474.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Bills such as this are dealt with periodically and the Premier has explained that no adjustment has been made to the statutory salaries, except in the case of judges, since July, 1965. He gave a comparison between the increases granted to senior public servants and those granted to the group of officers whose salaries are fixed by Statute. I think he said that the highest increase being granted was 11 per cent. In this connection, I find that increases in the basic wage over the same period have amounted to about 10 per cent, so the percentage increase is about the same, although one may think of the significance of the increases granted to those on lower wage scales compared with the actual increases granted to senior public servants.

However, the State is indebted to these officers for their service. We, as members of Parliament, know how well they serve the State Administration, and they should not receive lower salaries than they would receive if they were employed in the private sector.

I have pleasure in supporting the increases that will bring into line the salaries of these officers.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill and consider this an appropriate time to mention the Agent-General in London. As members know, I was in London earlier this year and was impressed by the work of the Agent-General and his staff. He is making a good impression. When I was there the alterations to South Australia House were being carried out. I understand that they have now been completed. The Agent-General was extremely helpful to me. I am sure he is to all South Australians who visit London and I thought it proper to say those few words in commendation of the work he is doing.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): It is usual at such a time as this to hear criticism of such increases. However, I shall not indulge in that. These salary increases are not extraordinary; they are commensurate with those granted in private enterprise. The quality and calibre of the people getting the increases are such that we in this Chamber well know that they merit such increases for the work they have done and are doing for the benefit of this State. When we read of these salary increases, we are apt to think they are extravagant, but they are nothing of the sort. In my opinion, the salaries of these public servants are comparable with those of people in industry doing much the same type of work. Indeed, people in outside industry often earn greater salaries than these. I support the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Salary of Commissioner of Police."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to the salary and status provided for the Commissioner of Police, because I am of opinion that for some time we have greatly underrated the importance of his position. He deserves a higher classification, for he is important to the community. A good Commissioner of Police makes for a good Police Force, and the converse equally applies. The days when the Police Force comprised a few people have long since passed: it is now a substantial force, greatly praised. It has achieved a high standard of efficiency and controls a vast quantity of equipment. Therefore, I suggest to the Premier that at some suitable time the

status of the Commissioner of Police be re-examined.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendment:

Page 3, line 6 (clause 7)—After "Act" insert "not exceeding in the aggregate the amount of interest referred to in subsection (2) of this section".

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I move to amend the suggested amendment as follows:

To strike out "the amount of interest referred to in subsection (2) of this section" and insert "twenty-five thousand dollars in any financial year".

When this matter was debated in this Chamber, only the Minister of Lands (who represented me on that occasion) and the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) spoke on the Bill; they supported it. It then went to the other place, where it was debated at some length. Fears were expressed by honourable members there that the Government would dip into the fund for the purpose of financing additional work intended to be done by the department by way of inspections and so forth. At the time an assurance was given that that would not be the case, that the principal in that fund would not be touched. In discussions with one honourable member in another place, I offered to have the Bill amended in this Chamber to the effect that the amount of money to be available would not exceed the profit from the fund plus the interest. At first, this was accepted, with the proviso that it be reviewed in two years' time. Subsequently the Hon. Mr. Whyte came to me again and said that he believed it was rather cumbersome and that he would be satisfied if I agreed that it should not be in excess of \$25,000 in any one year. I agreed to this proposal, but apparently the honourable gentleman had another change of mind and moved in another place the suggested amendment now contained in the Bill. However, I am sticking to my agreement with the honourable member, and the amendment I have placed before this Committee is in accordance with this agreement. I believe that this is fair and it should remove any doubts felt by producers' organizations that anyone is dipping into the fund, which has built up considerably over the years.

It now bears interest, but this was not so until 14 months ago; over this period \$14,000 in interest has accrued.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: At what rate of interest?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is the normal Treasury bank rate, and this will continue whilst I have anything to do with it. I shall now refer to the fund itself in order to show how it has accumulated in the last 12 months. The balance at July 1, 1966, was \$275,000; receipts during 1966-67 included stamp duties \$34,299 and interest \$10,608, making a total of \$44,907.

Payments during 1966-67 (including \$741 for administration charges) amounted to \$14,842. So, the balance at June 30, 1967, was \$305,000. Consequently, it can be seen that there has been a build-up of \$30,000 during the year.

Regarding tuberculin testing proposals, the provision from Revenue in the last Budget was \$9,500, and the estimated cost of the expanded programme, including inclusions of new areas (Yorke Peninsula) and adjustment of fees, is \$16,750. The department desires to expand the testing because of a certain knowledge that major meat-importing countries (especially the United States of America) will in the very near future require a level of certification of freedom from tuberculosis not possible under the present programme. This is discussed at every meeting of the Agricultural Council. The present programme has achieved its maximum degree of eradication without extension of testing to marginal and selected pastoral areas. Fees paid for testing have had only minor adjustments since its inception in 1952. It will be difficult to continue the existing programme at present fees.

It is proposed to commence a survey of the incidence of tuberculosis in herds in the pastoral areas in 1967-68. This is designed to identify specific sources of re-infection so that testing may be directed at these points. An approach has been made to the Commonwealth for funds for this purpose. The proposed extension of the purposes for which the fund can be used to include testing is not incompatible with the original purposes of the fund—"to provide that compensation may be paid to owners who suffer loss by reason of the destruction of cattle or carcasses which are infected or suspected of being infected with a prescribed disease."

The major aim of these proposals is to prevent loss to the industry through inability to meet the requirements of importing countries in

respect of the certification of meat and dairy products with regard to these prescribed diseases. The more complete the testing programme the less will be claims for compensation against the fund. Therefore, increased testing provides increased protection to producers against losses from tuberculosis. The pastoral cattle industry subscribes the largest portion of the fund and at present does not benefit from any testing programme. The proposed amendments will enable pastoralists to share more directly in the benefits of the compensation fund.

There are no prospects of any major outbreak of any of the diseases listed under the Act, with the possible remote exception of pleuro-pneumonia, and this risk is receding annually. The fund was designed to protect against such a contingency. As 1966-67 was a year of decreased sales of cattle, and therefore decreased intake of stamp duty, it is expected that the new decimal rates of stamp duty will, in a normal year, result in a sharp increase in the annual intake to the fund.

There are no circumstances within sight that would indicate that a testing programme could be staged that would exceed \$25,000 a year (including the expanded programme already designed plus any testing in pastoral areas that might be necessary following the survey of incidence). With the progressive reduction in claims for compensation that will arise following an expansion of testing, it is confidently estimated that the present rate of stamp duty can be reduced in the near future after providing for all the proposed testing programmes and normal compensation claims.

Last year the Act was amended to reduce the stamp duty payable by cattle owners into this fund, and I intend to introduce a Bill again next year for a further reduction, because of the fund's buoyancy. The expanding programme and the extra precautions will have a lessening effect on pay-outs; this seems logical and it should be possible to reduce further the stamp duty. So, any fears held by members or by people outside this Parliament that this will be a retrograde step are groundless.

Only last week I was informed by the Stockowners' Association that it had resolved that the amount should not exceed \$30,000 in one year, whereas I am suggesting it should be \$25,000. If the Bill had been passed in another place in its original form, it was not expected that more than \$25,000 would have been spent, anyway. In fact, it is doubtful whether this amount will be reached; however, to provide a little latitude and to ensure that we are not curtailed in any way in this effort,

I am suggesting \$25,000 because this was suggested to me by the honourable member from another place. Therefore, I ask the Committee to accept my amendment to the suggested amendment.

I understand that the United Farmers and Graziers Association is quite happy with my amendment, although probably some wrong information was given to it earlier which perhaps caused doubts in the minds of its members. Because of inspections, veterinary surgeons have been guaranteed an income, and the industry was supervised. All organizations with which I have spoken are satisfied with my amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Because some cattlemen feared that the fund would be depleted, after the Bill had passed this Chamber representations were made to members of another place asking them to scrutinize the Bill and to take any necessary action, and this was done. The fund has built up substantially, but it is feared that it may be necessary to provide for a serious outbreak of an exotic bovine disease that may occur in the future.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Money would be taken from revenue to meet this expense, if necessary.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister has given assurances that the grant for herd testing will not be decreased, and that the fund will continue to earn interest at the normal Treasury bank rate. Also, it seems that the cost of stamp duty may be reduced from time to time, but the fund must be maintained in a healthy position. In view of the Minister's assurances, his amendment is acceptable to me.

Mr. CASEY: The Minister said there were only two speakers when the Bill was before this Chamber previously. However, I spoke, too. The original Bill was introduced in 1939 to compensate people for cattle that had to be destroyed. At present there is a large export of beef from South Australia and Australia, and this has caused cattle people to ask for the protection of a fund to which they are contributing. At one time they were paid because their stock was slaughtered. Now they are asking for assistance in preventing this disease, and they are getting it by way of herd testing and other things. This affects not only the beef cattle men but also the dairymen. We have a big export of cheese and butter, and it is most essential that these herds be tested to ensure that they are free from disease.

I think members in another place who made statements about this Bill were very short-

sighted. They were trying to form some sort of a cloak of protection around the dairyman, whereas the beef cattle men have contributed more to this fund than have the dairymen. We must make sure that our cattle are free of disease because America and parts of Western Europe will have more severe regulations in the future to ensure that meat leaving our shores is free of disease. Probably many members in this Chamber have, through the sale of cattle, contributed towards this fund. I have done that on several occasions. I know of people who have been compensated through this fund because their cattle had to be destroyed. I support the Minister's amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I, too, support the amendment. A very important principle involved in this Act is that cattle people who because of disease are forced to slaughter their cattle should be compensated from the fund, particularly when they contribute to it. Because of the need to build up our export market for beef we should take every step possible through herd testing and other methods to prevent the outbreak of these diseases. An Act such as this is important to us in building up our balance of payments, particularly with countries we are dealing with at present.

On the dairying side, disease can be communicated to milk and consequently to cheese. We are building up a tremendous trade in these commodities with Japan, which naturally wants to be assured that the products it buys are completely free from disease. While that assurance can be given, we will build up our trade. However, immediately Japan and the other importing countries become aware that we are not taking proper steps to eradicate these diseases or to prevent their outbreak, we will lose our trade with those people. As this is a most important matter to South Australia, legislation of this character is very important.

The fund has now built up to about \$305,000. Last year it increased by about \$30,000, even though about \$15,000 was paid out. When this Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council some members there were seriously concerned that this fund may be depleted. The Stockowners Association made representations to some members, and certain amendments were moved. My organization was informed that some of the principal in the fund might be taken for other purposes, so it resolved that it would not agree to the taking away of money from the fund and allocating it to another fund. We still stand by that principle. However, following further debate

on the matter and a conference with the Minister we found that our earlier fears were not entirely justified. We are satisfied that the fund will still bear interest at the usual Treasury rates for this type of fund. Therefore, some of our objections have now been removed and we are not so alarmed as we were after we had received certain information on the matter, particularly from another place.

This has brought about the Legislative Council's amendment that money should be taken only from the accumulated interest. The Minister's amendment ensures that \$25,000 will not be exceeded in any financial year. I was assured this afternoon by the principal officer, Mr. Irving, that the amount of compensation to be paid out in the coming year is not likely to exceed \$16,000. Incidentally, Mr. Irving is doing a really remarkable job and deserves commendation for his work in this field.

When this Act was first introduced a considerable amount of compensation was paid. However, the number of cattle affected by disease, and consequently the draw on the fund, has become less and less. The incentive of the cattle owners to keep their herds free of disease and the interest shown by the department and its officers in herd testing have resulted in a most effective administration of the Act. The Agriculture Department is to be commended for the work it has undertaken in this regard. Nobody can forecast when an epidemic is likely to occur and, of course, if one did occur the \$300,000 might not go far in compensating those affected. Although it may be unlikely, the Government might well have to come to the rescue of cattle owners in combating an epidemic and replenishing the fund. The departmental officer concerned (Mr. Irving) has satisfied me that the amendment is sound; I do not object to it; and I trust that the departmental officers will continue in their excellent work. The \$9,000 represents an excellent contribution, especially to veterinary surgeons in remote country districts, who must be guaranteed a certain income. I should like to see more veterinary surgeons encouraged to undertake work in remote areas, where at present they are difficult to obtain. Special permits should be given by the Minister in respect of a man who has gained knowledge and experience—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member is getting away from the amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Your job—

The CHAIRMAN: I order the honourable member to take his seat. I am telling him that I believe he is out of order. If he cannot convince me otherwise I will rule him out of order.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: With great respect, I was agreeing with what you were saying.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! While I am in the Chair there will not be two members talking at the same time while I am one of them. I could not hear what the honourable member was saying while I was speaking.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The \$9,000 in the fund will encourage veterinary surgeons in herd testing and, indeed, that is what the fund is for. I support the Minister's amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I, too, support the amendment, which I think is an example of the good influence of another place. Actually, as the Bill stood—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much conversation, and I cannot hear the honourable member.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The safeguard provided by the amendment is well worth while and, having received the Minister's assurance, I have no objection to his amendment. The Hon. Mr. Whyte (who takes an interest in the pastoral industry), when speaking to the debate in another place, may well have been speaking on behalf of pastoralists in the more remote districts. I think he was justified in expressing fears about the use of the fund. The pastoral industry has less access to veterinary surgeons than has any other industry and, with a high cattle population involved and bearing in mind the importance to this State of beef production, I think it is only right and proper that a member who is familiar with the pastoral industry should have raised this matter. In doing so, I think he showed vigilance on his part and that he is doing an excellent job. Obviously, it is in the interests of everybody connected with the cattle industry to eradicate cattle diseases, particularly tuberculosis, as soon as possible.

Mr. HEASLIP: When the original legislation was enacted in 1939 its purpose was purely to provide for compensation to owners of cattle which had had to be slaughtered because of disease. I do not agree with the suggestion that we are now departing from that general principle. The money involved is actually the producers' money and it is to be used in a way that will protect their industry. That

is highly desirable. The United States market is most important to South Australia but, unless we can assure the U.S. authorities that our cattle is free from disease, they will not accept this export. Money should be spent on eradicating disease as well as on paying compensation to those whose stocks have been slaughtered. Although the member for Flinders said he hoped the fund would grow, I do not think that is the desire of the cattle people: I think they desire the money to be used in such a way that it will specifically benefit their industry. The \$25,000 proposed by the Minister will provide a safeguard in the way of compensation, and I believe that the remainder will be used in eradicating diseases and in protecting the industry generally. I support the amendment.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank honourable members for the attention they have paid to the amendment. I apologize to the member for Frome for omitting him previously. That was not intended. Regarding the earlier discussions about the amendment moved in another place, I point out that, if the matter of the \$25,000 had been raised in this House or agreed to in another place, I should not have raised it tonight. However, the matter I raise is that, apparently, my word was not good enough, because on the previous occasion I said exactly what I am saying tonight. I thought the position would have been as has been related tonight.

Today it was claimed that we had not approached the United Graziers and Farmers Association on this and that that was probably why the matter had been raised in another place. However, I would have thought there would be an opportunity for that organization to approach me at that stage if first-hand knowledge was desired. If such an approach had been made, I would have said exactly what I have said tonight. When I was reading the report of the debate in another place I traced what seemed to be a suggestion that the Government was trying to use up the industry's funds. I resent that suggestion.

If the Government desired to do that, it would not have had to pay to the fund interest that has given the fund at least \$14,000 during the last 14 months. If the Government wanted to dip in, all it needed to do was not apply the interest in the first instance.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You will agree that this is the place for you to say that?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is true, but the whole position about the \$25,000 would have been explained in the other place if the amendment originally put on file there had been proceeded with. The honourable member concerned had the amendment on the file but he changed his mind about proceeding with it. The Minister of Mines, who represents me in that place, was empowered to give the explanation. When it was suggested that we were dipping into the industry's funds, I felt inclined to say, "All right, we will not go on with this at all." However, the Stockowners Association asked me to go on, and suggested an amount of \$30,000. I accept and appreciate what has been said by honourable members.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Hon. Mr. Whyte had the job of convincing another place, and he did not have the advantage of knowing what you have been saying this evening.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, but I have said that there was an opportunity for the assurance to be given by the Minister of Mines. The honourable member would have had this assurance given him if he had not persisted with the other amendment. However, I have no objection now and, as this place has accepted the amendment, I think it would be incumbent on the other place to accept it, too.

Amendment carried; suggested amendment as amended agreed to.

The following reason for amending the Legislative Council's suggested amendment was adopted:

Because this amendment best meets the needs of the industry.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 24, at 2 p.m.