

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 8, 1974

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive honourable members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. today. I ask the mover and seconder, and such other members as desire to do so, to accompany me to Government House.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.18 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on August 7 and 8, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the third session of the Forty-first Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon all your deliberations.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Police Offences Act Amendment,
- Road Traffic Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

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

CALLAGHAN REPORT

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (July 30).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has adopted the Callaghan report, in principle. Sir Allan Callaghan has proposed a new organizational framework for the Agriculture Department, to provide for maximum regionalization of departmental services and to strengthen certain functions: for example, economics, marketing and farm management; policy formulation and development; and public relations. He has not spelled out detailed procedures and structures to give effect to the principles he recommends. The Minister of Agriculture is in the course of establishing a working party representative of the Agriculture Department and the Public Service Board to formulate detailed proposals for the implementation of the Callaghan recommendation.

SWAN REACH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (August 1).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I confirm the advice given to the honourable member in my preliminary reply to this question, that it will not be possible in the immediate future to construct a craft centre at Swan Reach. I am advised that, if such facilities were provided for both boys and girls, it is likely that they would be used for only two days a week by secondary students, and possibly one night by adults. This would be a most uneconomical proposition when there are very well-equipped craft buildings at Cam-

brai Area School which may be made available indefinitely to Swan Reach students, without using them for more than four days a week. If craft accommodation were available at both schools, it would be necessary to share the specialist staff, who would then be required to travel between the schools. The loss of time and some difficulties arising from the present arrangements are appreciated, but the more urgent needs of other schools make it impossible to include craft rooms for Swan Reach in a building-design programme at present.

STATE FINANCES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what new initiatives, directed at overcoming this State's perilous financial position, he will be promoting to the Prime Minister and to the Premiers' Conference next week? There is no argument but that we are in a perilous financial situation and the announcements (or lack of them) by the Minister of Local Government about local government finance have highlighted this. It goes without saying that the State needs positive action devoid of political gimmickry. On this basis, I ask the Premier to give a clear and concise reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have outlined to the House, submissions have been made already to the Commonwealth Government in relation to assistance from that Government for several major State projects. I do not expect that the Premiers' Conference will deal in any detail with further financial assistance by the Commonwealth Government to the States in this financial year. This has not been the purpose of the Premiers' Conference. The Premiers' Conference is to discuss measures to be concerted between the Commonwealth and the States in relation to the control of inflation; that was the basis of the submission made by all Liberal and Country Party Premiers as well as by the Labor Premiers. That is what the Premiers' Conference is about. I have pointed out to the Leader previously in the House that several submissions have been made for further Commonwealth subventions to the Budgets of this State, involving special grants, and I hope to discuss these in detail at the weekend and next week with the Prime Minister and the Treasurer. We are unable to go further than that in respect of this financial year. If we obtain the sums for which submissions have been made, the position of this State, which budgetarily is better than any other State except Queensland, will be even better. But under the Liberal Governments of Victoria and New South Wales people are facing by far a much more difficult budgetary situation.

Dr. Eastick: Obviously there was a need to question the gimmickry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is talking about a perilous financial position in this State, but the financial position of this State is not perilous.

Mr. Gunn: What about the hospitals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My Government is spending to record levels on hospitals, as the honourable member will find out if he listens to my explanation of the Loan Estimates later this afternoon.

KANGAROO ISLAND SHEARERS

Mr. WRIGHT: I address my question to the member for Alexandra. Will the honourable member say whether it is a fact that, during the 1971 shearing season, in his capacity as a shearing contractor he told organizer Maczkowiack, of the Australian Workers Union, where

other private shearing was in operation on Kangaroo Island, namely, on the properties owned by graziers Wilson, Woolley and Smith, and gave as his reason to the organizer for informing on these owners that they preferred engaging their own shearers to engaging him on a contract system, and that this was his way of getting even? The honourable member yesterday took the opportunity in the House of calling the Secretary of my union an arrogant animal.

Mr. Gunn: It's an apt description.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have certainly taken strong exception to this, as all other decent human beings would take exception to it. After discussions held this morning, it was decided at the union office not to proceed to punch the member for Alexandra on the nose but rather to embarrass him with the truth. I have in my possession a statutory declaration stating that the contents of the question were prepared and signed by organizer Maczkowiack in the presence of a justice of the peace. I should be pleased to have the honourable member's reply.

The SPEAKER: I point out that the honourable member for Alexandra may prefer to reply to the question, but as it is not one directly connected with his Parliamentary duties he does not have to answer it if he does not wish to. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Adelaide, when directing his question to me, covered a fairly wide range of accusations. He made one comment, to which I desire to reply directly. I assure the honourable member that I will provide him with a reply to the remainder of his comments after I have carefully perused his remarks in *Hansard*. However, he claimed, among other things, that my accusations or allegations against the Secretary of the Australian Workers Union could not be upheld, nor would they be supported by other people. My brief reply to that comment is that I can produce evidence to support such accusations against the gentleman mentioned. I can also produce evidence to show that many other people hold the same view, including union representatives and financial members—

Mr. Keneally: And the member for Eyre?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: —of 14 separate unions in this State.

Mr. Wells: Did you blow the whistle on—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have here the original petition signed by the union members. The petition states:

We are financial members of various worker unions. We express a vote of no confidence in the senior executive members of the Australian Workers Union, in particular, the General Secretary, Mr. J. E. Dunford, for his irresponsible and unreasonable stand in refusing to accept the judgments handed down in the Woolley case. Also in the senior executive officers of the Trades and Labor Council for their recent—

Mr. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is not replying to the question I asked. I asked him whether he blew the whistle on the Kangaroo Island farmers, not whether he could provide proof against Jim Dunford.

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage I will not uphold the point of order. A question was asked, and I allowed the question to be asked on the condition that the honourable member did not have to reply if he did not desire to do so. However, the honourable member saw fit to reply to the question and a certain amount of latitude is always allowed in reply to the question rather than the honourable member's having to confine his reply to "Yes" or "No".

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The ban to which I referred was that which was placed on the transport of farmers' goods to and from Kangaroo Island following a dispute in which the Secretary of the Australian Workers Union featured. As I said earlier, various allegations were made by the member for Adelaide when asking his questions, and I will answer each of them. Indeed, if given the opportunity, I will do so in this place or in any other place to clarify my position. I will also substantiate the allegations that I made recently and explain why I made them.

COUNCIL FUNDS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Transport supply further information in relation to road grants to councils in South Australia? Yesterday, when I asked the Minister a question about this matter, he replied that \$31 000 000 would be made available to South Australia for this purpose. That is the same as the sum provided last year under the agreement. As this sum makes no provision for additional or expanded works in this State (and it certainly does not allow for inflation and the increases in costs just referred to by the Premier), is the Minister satisfied with it? Moreover, can he say why South Australia will not receive any increase in grants? If he is not satisfied with the allocation, will he take action (or has he taken action) to have increased grants made available to South Australia from Commonwealth Government sources?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to the several questions asked by the honourable member, let me first repeat what I said yesterday: at this stage I do not know whether South Australia will receive the \$31 000 000 that is included as our share in the legislation which, as far as I know, is currently before the Commonwealth Parliament. I do not know whether that Parliament is meeting today. I understand that yesterday it completed the joint sitting brought about by the failure of the Senate to pass legislation. That ultimately led to the recent Commonwealth election, but that is all history now. Of course, we must never lose sight of the fact that, had it not been for the actions of the Opposition Parties in the Commonwealth Parliament (and the member for Torrens is a member of the South Australian Branch of one of those Parties), the legislation to which I am referring would well and truly have passed the Commonwealth Parliament long before this. Until that Parliament passes the legislation, it is not possible to give the information requested. In fact, newspaper reports state (and I have no means of knowing whether this is correct) that the Commonwealth Opposition intends to amend the legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Gunn: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If newspaper reports are correct, the Australian Minister for Transport has stated that he will not accept amendments. Until these matters are dealt with in Canberra, neither I nor anyone else can give information about the allocation to be available to this State.

Mr. Coumbe: The House of Representatives was satisfied with the \$31 000 000.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member knows better than I do that legislation passed by the House of Representatives does not become law until it is passed by the Senate.

Mr. Coumbe: Yes, but the \$31 000 000 was approved.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The sum of \$31 000 000 is referred to in the legislation. If that legislation is passed by the Senate, \$31 000 000 will be available to South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's not enough.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If it was \$131 000 000 it would not be enough. What the Australian Government is saying—

Dr. Eastick: It has walked out on its promises.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —is that policies that have been adopted by previous Liberal Governments in providing funds for transport will not be adopted by the present Government. For the first time, we are receiving from the Australian Government funds for public transport. That Government is saying that we should not spend all our money on roads: we should spend some on roads and some on public transport. I know that, because members opposite do not agree with that policy, they criticize the present legislation, but the plain facts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know what they are entitled to do and say during Question Time. One of the things they are not entitled to do is continually interject. An honourable member has asked a question, and the honourable Minister will reply to it, but he will not reply to continual interjections that are made by honourable members who did not ask the original question. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The attitude in Canberra has changed and, although we should have liked much more for roads (indeed, we have stated a strong case for more money for roads), we wholeheartedly endorse the policy of the Australian Government of providing Commonwealth funds for public transport. It is the first Australian Government to do this. The South Australian allocation of \$31 000 000 will make our roads programme extremely tight, and the other States will have similar difficulties because their allocations have been reduced. Although \$31 000 000 is provided for in the legislation, I hope that, as a result of correspondence I have had with the Australian Minister, we shall be able to receive more money.

Mr. Coumbe: You are not happy with it at the moment?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have gone on record publicly expressing the view that I believe we should be receiving more for roads, and every other State Minister has done likewise; but I have also applauded the Australian Government for its allocation for public transport.

READER'S DIGEST

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General investigate Reader's Digest Services Proprietary Limited in relation to the sending out of documents purporting to be unpaid accounts, to see whether the law has been breached? I have received complaints from constituents that this company has been sending documents that represent unpaid accounts, because they look like demands for payment. I have been given a copy of an "account" which includes the words "Bill—You pay only \$3.98 Amount Due". Also included in the document is a complimentary savings cheque for \$2.02. One of my constituents received three unsolicited copies of the *Reader's Digest* through the mail and, though he has received no more copies, he has now received this "demand for payment". I have received a similar complaint from another person. In each case no contract was entered into and the delivery of the *Reader's Digest* was not solicited at any time. Although I believe the people to whom I have referred will not

send money to the company, I fear many people, having received three free copies, may believe they are obliged to pay this "account".

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter investigated.

RUBBISH CONTAINERS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation investigate the possibility of constructing rubbish destructors throughout the State? The provision of rubbish containers along our highways has helped materially in the collection of rubbish from the travelling public and this collection has improved the appearance of the countryside by removing garbage discarded by members of the public travelling on our roads. Has the Minister plans for completing the good work he has started?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member would be aware that the rubbish bins or the new type of disposable units placed on roadsides for the collection of garbage are provided by the Highways Department. At this stage I cannot say what are the procedures for collecting the containers and disposing of the rubbish, but I should think that some arrangement would have been made with the councils in the various areas. However, I will take the matter up with the Minister of Local Government to find out what the procedures are and whether they need to be improved.

STUDENT TEACHER ALLOWANCES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say on what basis he has asserted that the majority of student teachers will receive an increase in allowance of more than 30 per cent? On July 25, when I asked him a question on this matter, the Minister, in the course of his reply, said:

I make clear that the honourable member's suggestion that most students will receive only a 7 per cent increase is false . . . In any family where the only person earning was the breadwinner, the average situation would imply an increase of over 30 per cent. I admit that that position is modified by the fact that, in some cases, both mother and father are earning an income, but nevertheless I suggest to the honourable member that, for the 1973-74 financial year, over 50 per cent of the parents of student teachers are likely to have an income below \$7 000, and in those circumstances over 50 per cent of the student teachers will get an allowance increase of 30 per cent or more. The position is not as the honourable member has stated.

Apparently, the students at Adelaide College of Advanced Education conducted a survey that indicated that the information I had given the House was a correct statement of the position. Although it seems to me that the Minister would have no firm basis for his conclusion until applications had been made on the prescribed form, I nevertheless ask him whether he has any firmer basis than the speculative one he used to justify the assertion that the information I had given the House was false.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Any sampling undertaken at Adelaide College of Advanced Education to get an idea of average parental incomes is no more reliable than my estimate of the likely position: it is no more than an educated guess. The position may well be different from what I expect, and the sample taken by the students may turn out to be extremely biased in so far as it is supposed to be representative of the whole student population. Having discussed this matter with the students several times, I have said that it can be reviewed as soon as all the applications are received at the end of this month. If it turned out that our estimate was correct, a further adjustment could be made to ensure that the sum spent on increased student teacher allowances was in line with what we expected it to be.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's an assurance, is it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have given that assurance to the student teachers, whom, I may say, I respect much more than I respect the member for Davenport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The basis for suggesting that over 50 per cent of the parents of student teachers would have a salary less than \$7 000 is that for the financial year 1973-74 average annual earnings were not much more than \$5 000. I admit that we must make allowance for the fact that in several families more persons than the breadwinner are working. Nevertheless, that was the basis, and it provides a fair margin, even if the distribution of income amongst parents of student teachers is extremely biased towards the higher end of the scale compared to the whole population. If, in fact, the distribution of income amongst parents of student teachers is such that over 50 per cent receive more than \$7 000, it is also a commentary on the overall selection procedures that have operated and on the extent to which there is equality within our overall education system. There may be serious lessons for the future in the kind of information we are given. I certainly shall be interested in it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But you said my figures were false a fortnight ago.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I expect them to be false. That is a fair expectation when one is dealing with the member for Kavel.

Dr. Eastick: Get out of the gutter and try again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will cease interjecting during a reply by a Minister. Otherwise I shall have no hesitation in doing what is required of me to keep order in the House by warning the individuals concerned.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I apologize for the behaviour of the honourable Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister of Education is so thin-skinned that he must apologize for himself by trying to take a rise out of someone else, I consider that it is high time he handed in his commission.

There being a disturbance in the Strangers Gallery:

The SPEAKER: If persons in the gallery do not conform to the requirements of this House, I shall not hesitate to order that the gallery be cleared.

I cannot uphold the point of order. It was not really a point of order and does not call for upholding.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I expect that the distribution of income amongst the parents of student teachers will not be as shown in the sample taken at the Adelaide College of Advanced Education, and I should think that any survey taken at only that college may well be biased in comparison with the total student teacher population and that the average income of parents of student teachers at other colleges could well be significantly different from that of the parents of student teachers at the Adelaide college. That was another reason for suggesting that the statement from the student teachers at the Adelaide college (that 50 per cent or more of the parents would be earning over \$7 000 and therefore the students would be getting less than a 30 per cent increase) was false.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister reconsider adopting a system of arbitration for the fixing of student teacher allowances, or has he completely rejected the principle of arbitration in this regard?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have indicated several times that, regarding scholarship payments (whether for student teacher allowances or for any other allowances), I do not consider that a system of arbitration is appropriate. As I do not intend to adopt it, I therefore will not be reconsidering this matter.

FOOTBALL TELECAST

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Premier investigate the possibility of having this year's South Australian National Football League grand final telecast live? I understand that the Victorian Football League will allow a live telecast of the grand final in Victoria this year if all the tickets to the grand final are sold. Apparently, a similar proposal was put to the S.A.N.F.L. but was refused. Surely, if all tickets to the match in South Australia are sold, there is nothing to prevent a telecast here. I also understand that the S.A.N.F.L. has barred television channels in South Australia from telecasting direct the V.F.L. grand final, which is being held on the same day as our grand final. Will the Premier also investigate the possibility of allowing this telecast to go ahead if the S.A.N.F.L. will not allow a direct telecast of South Australia's major sporting event?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think that I have any authority or jurisdiction in this matter.

Mr. Evans: Do it from the Premier's Department!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that there have been no facilities of that kind installed in the Premier's Department. I suggest to the honourable member that he listen to what is said and stop being so silly. The position is that the decisions concerning the telecast of league matches are in the hands of the league and of the television authorities, which come under the Broadcasting Control Board.

Mr. Dean Brown: I can't hear you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member try to listen. I do my best. I have the instruments of the Chamber on and, if the honourable member cannot hear, I suggest that he get an ear trumpet. This matter is the responsibility of the league and the board, and I have no jurisdiction over either body. However, I will put to the Chairman of the league the honourable member's remarks and see whether I can get an answer.

MEAT

Mr. CHAPMAN: I address my question to the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture. In line with an assurance given by the Minister of Agriculture, will he tell the grazier organizations in South Australia when they may be consulted and given the opportunity of perusing the proposed meat industry legislation which is expected to come before Parliament this session? On September 12, 1973, the Secretary of the leading grower organization in the State (the Stockowners Association) directed correspondence to the Minister in which he expressed concern about the meat industry generally and referred to an earlier announcement that the meat industry legislation was in the course of being drafted this session. The Minister replied:

I expect to be in a position to introduce legislation to Parliament early in 1974, after organizations involved in the meat industry have had the opportunity to peruse and comment on the proposed Bill.

The organization has submitted that it is now beyond the early stages of 1974. We are in the current session referred to, and those organizations, on behalf of their growers, have expressed concern that as yet they have not had the opportunity of perusing the draft legislation, and they wish to do this at the earliest opportunity.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with my colleague and obtain a report.

DOMICILIARY CARE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to obtain a report on the operations of the domiciliary care service in this State, with special emphasis on how it will operate in my district from its base at Northfield?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall be pleased to obtain a reply for the honourable member.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In view of the widespread dissatisfaction and extremely low morale within the Agriculture Department, has the Premier yet called for the resignation of the Minister of Agriculture and, if he has not, when will he? The Callaghan report clearly states that morale within the department is extremely low. It states that the department is not fulfilling the functions it should be. Further, the Minister's recent actions have, I believe, cast undue responsibility and an unfair burden on the shoulders of his Press Secretary. (I pointed this out in a debate last evening.) A recent survey has shown widespread dissatisfaction within the department regarding the intended move to Monarto. I therefore believe that it is only a fit and proper course for the Minister to resign. Surely, if it can happen in America, it can also happen in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The final part of the honourable member's question is out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has referred to two matters which are of some moment in the morale of the department and, on this score, I make clear to the House what the Government's attitude has been in relation to the department. First, in assessing the expenditure of the Government on service to industries in South Australia, an examination was made of the proportion of expenditure being given to that part of our total production which comes from primary production compared to the proportion of expenditure being given to the whole of the remainder of industry in the State.

Mr. Dean Brown: I wasn't talking—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked about the morale in the department and, as I am answering him, I suggest that he listen.

Mr. Dean Brown: Yes, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the 25 per cent of commodity production coming from primary production in the State, the sum spent by the Government in servicing that area of industry compared to the whole of the rest was somewhat disproportionate when my Government took office. In consequence, the Government had a careful look at the department's future development. In addition, the Government believed that the development of the department along existing lines was not serving the rural community in the way it should. In consequence, the Government did not provide money for expansion in the

department at a time when it was expanding other areas of Government service to industry, pending a report on the department's future, making certain what those guidelines should be, and the way it should develop in relation to the overall Government priorities in service to the whole of industry. I have no doubt that the result of limiting the development of the Agriculture Department on previously existing lines has had some effect on the morale of the department, but that is not the fault of the Minister. It was Government policy to see to it that the department was carrying out its job and that Government expenditure in that area in future would not be disproportionate to that of Government expenditure on services to the whole of the remainder of employment in industry.

Dr. Eastick: What percentage of the State's income comes from agriculture?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of the total wealth of the State, agriculture provides about one-quarter of commodity production.

Mr. Dean Brown: Get back to the Minister!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is the honourable member trying to do? I am replying to an interjection by the honourable member's Leader: does the honourable member say that that is irrelevant?

Mr. Mathwin: We'll have to get on with another question!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Opposition members may not like this reply—

Mr. Mathwin: It's a bit long.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That situation may have produced some conditions of adverse morale in the department, because there was no expansion on previously existing lines, but that was not the fault of the Minister. It was the deliberate policy of the Government to proceed with the development of the Agriculture Department along the lines I have just enunciated. Secondly, the decision to transfer the department to Monarto was an important decision in relation to the decentralization of administration within the State, and the obtaining of a positive decentralization policy previously specifically espoused in this House by the honourable member's Party many times and specifically praised in this House by the member for the district, who is a colleague (so far as that can be the case in the Opposition) of the honourable member.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why don't you—

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Davenport for the second time. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was a decision of this Parliament: the decision to decentralize to Monarto was endorsed by a vote of this Parliament and supported by the Opposition. I know that the honourable member is attacking it, but that is the history. I admit that, as a result of proposals to transfer to Monarto, concern has been expressed about morale in the department, because at this stage it has not been possible to make clear to Government employees exactly what benefits will be available and what provisions can be made at Monarto for those transferred there: it has not been possible in planning terms to give a final reply at this stage. I assure the honourable member that, when that reply is given, people in the Agriculture Department will see such marked benefits that I am certain morale will change.

In addition, there is a further aspect: in accordance with Government policy the Callaghan investigation has been carried out, and we have accepted in principle the general guidelines laid down in that report. In the development of the department in that way, I believe there will be a marked improvement in morale in the department. I have told the honourable member why there should have been a change in the morale of the department, and the Government does not apologize for the course it has taken. This is not something for which the honourable member can condemn the Minister.

Mr. Chapman: What about the Press Secretary's action?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member's remarks on that aspect do him as little justice as the sort of thing the honourable member said yesterday in this House.

FOREIGN CAPITAL

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Premier indicate what effects the reduction of the restriction on the entry of foreign capital into Australia (as reported in this morning's *Advertiser*) will have on South Australia's industries and the State's economy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As of yesterday there was no great difficulty for South Australia with the previously existing provisions of 25 per cent deposit, except in relation to minerals exploration. The effect the provisions are likely to have is in respect of the availability of capital for risk in mineral exploration, and that is a major area in which we can expect some difference.

PETROL

Mr. MATHWIN: Because of the emergency we are faced with in South Australia in relation to the fuel situation (the reason given for a Bill being introduced by the Premier this week), will the Premier explain the results of any inquiries he has made about the three ships lying off Port Stanvac at present, and reported to be full of fuel? On Tuesday I told the Premier that two ships were lying off Port Stanvac. One had berthed and had been connected to the jetty, but it was not allowed to be unloaded and had to return to its lay-off position. Now, three ships are at Port Stanvac, but I understand they are not to be unloaded.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that a conference on the oil industry negotiations that would affect the discharge of these vessels was to be held in Melbourne at 2.30 p.m. today before Deputy President Williams. We shall have to await the result of that conference before knowing exactly how matters will proceed.

UPPER MURRAY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when it is expected that development plans for the Upper Murray area will be authorized by the State Planning Authority? In the past two years I have tried to obtain information for people who have applied to convert miscellaneous lease and annual licence properties to perpetual lease. This matter was discussed for several years, and by 1971 many applicants in the McIntosh Division of the Cobdogla irrigation area had been told by members of the Land Board that they could soon expect perpetual leases to be issued. Since then, the State Planning Authority has been concerned with this matter and is now preparing plans for several parts of the State. In reply to a question I asked on August 8, the Minister of Works said:

The State Planning Authority is now preparing development plans for the Upper Murray area. Until such time as the development plan expressing the general guiding policy on land use has been authorized, it would be unwise to grant permanent tenure over the land in question.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will take up the matter with the State Planning Office to see what stage has been reached in respect of the development plan and let the honourable member know.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the revenue and other moneys of the State as were required for all the purposes set out in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1974-75 and the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1974.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend money for public purposes, and to enact other provisions incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is my pleasure to explain the proposals in the Loan Estimates which accompany the Bill and which set out in more detail the appropriations listed in the first schedule to the Bill. The expenditure proposals in that schedule aggregate \$181 185 000. The total does not compare directly with the \$168 526 000 recorded as the total of actual payments in 1973-74. In 1973-74, payments of \$14 750 000 on account of tertiary education buildings were recorded through Loan Account. However, for the 1974-75 accounts, I have decided that the tertiary education transactions which are now being financed entirely by the Australian Government should be handled through a trust account as authorized by the Public Finance Act. The only payment through Loan Account this year for tertiary education purposes will be an estimated \$500 000 to wind up the State's liability in respect of the period prior to December 31, 1973, the changeover date. In future years I do not expect tertiary education activities to appear in our accounts other than through the trust account. The more appropriate comparison between the two years would be of the total payments excluding tertiary education activities. The proposed \$180 685 000 for 1974-75 is then \$26 909 000 above the actual payments of \$153 776 000 in 1973-74. I intend to have a table prepared to indicate to members the main areas of financial support from the Australian Government, including tertiary education, and this will probably be attached to the Budget papers. Because of the necessity to look at the State's overall financial position and to have regard to the magnitude of revenue deficits when considering whether and to what extent Loan funds should be held in reserve, it has been the practice for the Treasurer to give a brief review of the two accounts for the past year and of the prospects for Revenue Account in the year ahead before dealing with the details of Loan Account as proposed in the Loan Estimates. I shall follow that practice.

In August, 1973, I reported to the House that the allocation of new moneys determined for South Australia by the Australian Loan Council was \$117 212 000, that repayments and recoveries of expenditure becoming available for

responding in 1973-74 were expected to amount to about \$42 880 000, that borrowings to cover discounts would be about \$318 000, that a capital expenditure programme of \$157 480 000 was proposed, and that, accordingly, there should be a surplus of about \$2 930 000 on the year's activities. In the event there were some quite large variations from the original proposals. Recoveries and repayments at \$46 774 000 were \$3 894 000 above the original estimate. For Public Buildings Department alone, the excess was \$2 211 000 primarily because of additional grants from the Australian Government corresponding to additional expenditures on education and health facilities. For tertiary education buildings the grants received were \$1 396 000 above estimate. On the other hand an expected grant of \$2 000 000 towards the sewerage programmes of the Engineering and Water Supply Department was not forthcoming. Only \$1 600 000 was made available and, as it was by way of a special loan instead of grant, it was recorded outside of Loan Account. Originally, we had expected, grants of about \$2 000 000 towards urban transport projects. Work actually carried out by the Railways Department would have justified grants of \$1 000 000, but these were not received because the relevant legislation was not enacted by the Australian Government. I should add that the established practice is to treat grants for specific capital purposes as being repayments and to credit them to Loan Account, expenditures for the specific purposes being then made from Loan Account, but, where special loans, outside of the normal Loan programme, are made, to record both the liability and the expenditure of the funds separately.

Apart from those variations which were due to changes in grants from the Australian Government, there were excesses of \$1 237 000 in the recoveries from the forestry undertaking following improved operating results, and also increases in the repayments via the State Bank by previous borrowers. As a result of arrangements made with the Snowy Mountains Authority to share certain capital costs of the Hume dam, the State received an unexpected repayment of \$928 000 from the River Murray Commission. The aggregate of \$168 526 000 for actual payments in 1973-74 was \$11 046 000 in excess of the original estimate. There were three major reasons and a number of minor ones for this marked variation. The largest excess was in respect of activities of the Land Commission and the Monarto Development Commission. The original appropriation of \$1 500 000 was shown for convenience against the State Planning Authority pending our introduction of legislation to set up the two commissions. It was expected that most of the funds required for land acquisition would be provided by the Australian Government and provided sufficiently early to avoid a significant call on State funds. Delays in finalizing agreements and administrative procedures led to late payment of the special advances by the Australian Government and the State had to arrange large temporary advances of funds. The actual payments of State funds totalled \$7 625 000 instead of only \$1 500 000 as expected last August. The repayment to Loan Account of part of these funds is now being examined. I shall refer to this again in a moment.

The original provision for advances to the Municipal Tramways Trust was \$400 000. The actual advances were \$4 000 000 in excess of that. Members will be aware of the problems of the licensed passenger bus operators that led to negotiations with the Government as to the future of their services. As a result of those negotiations, it was decided that the best course would be to have the trust take over the service where this was the desire of the

licensee concerned. Accordingly, it was necessary to put the trust in funds so that payment could be made to the licensees for assets taken over. For other Government buildings the excess above estimated payments was \$3 318 000. This was due in part to faster progress than was foreseen in the provisions included in the Loan Estimates and partly to increasing price levels. The larger short-falls of actual payments as compared with estimate were for Highways and Railways Departments. For Highways Department an appropriation of \$4 000 000 had been approved to finance works on the Eyre Highway. As work was not carried out as quickly as earlier expected, the actual advance to the Highways Fund was only \$2 000 000. For Railways Department, payments were \$1 950 000 below estimate. This was mainly in respect of urban transport projects. The final effect of the increases in recoveries and in payments, resulting from variations both above and below estimate, was to give a deficit on the year's operations of \$4 026 000. Accordingly, the balance of funds on Loan Account of \$8 523 000 held at June 30, 1973, was reduced to \$4 497 000 at June 30, 1974.

As to Revenue Account, I intend to follow the normal practice of giving an explanation of recent movements, of the current situation, and of future prospects, when I present the Revenue Budget to the House at the end of this month. In this Loan statement I shall refer only to the main revenue factors which have a bearing on the determination of Loan programmes. On June 30, 1973, the Consolidated Revenue Account recorded accumulated deficits of \$2 035 000. Then, early in 1973-74, the Government was informed that the Grants Commission had recommended a completion grant of \$4 900 000 in respect of 1971-72. Therefore, in framing the 1973-74 Revenue Budget, we had in mind that Revenue Account effectively had a small accumulated surplus of \$2 865 000. The Government introduced a Revenue Budget for 1973-74 which forecast a small deficit of \$1 254 000 at current wage rates, made provision for costs as high as \$10 000 000 to flow from new wage and salary awards becoming effective in 1973-74, and saw the possibility of an overall deficit of \$11 254 000. Half way through the year it seemed that the deficit could be greater than that, but eventually, because of improvements which I shall explain fully in the Budget speech at the end of this month, the deficit for the year was held down to \$3 401 000. The published accounts will record that at June 30, 1974, the accumulated deficit was \$536 000, derived from the 1973-74 deficit less the small surplus of \$2 865 000 referred to a moment ago. However, this year we are again in the situation of expecting advice about a completion grant on the recommendation of the commission. The completion grant for the year 1972-73 could be of the order of \$5 000 000, and this would enable us to think of the 1974-75 Revenue Budget against the background of a useful accumulated surplus. I point out to honourable members that the results of last year's trading mean in fact that the State came out of the year not in a perilous situation but with an accumulated Budget surplus.

Dr. Eastick: You're getting mixed up with 1972-73, aren't you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am simply talking about the situation on the trading account. I point out to the Leader that cash in hand means cash in hand.

Dr. Eastick: I'm getting things in perspective.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I wish the Leader would talk to some of his members about perspective and get things straight. In looking at the prospects of the Revenue

Budget in 1974-75, the Government finds it harder than ever before to forecast how the year's results could turn out. Following the recent Premiers' Conference, I indicated that we could need as much as \$20 000 000 of additional revenues from new or increased taxes and charges, if services of an adequate level were to be provided in 1974-75 and crippling deficits were to be avoided. I have announced some firm decisions already and have indicated other areas in which we may yet have to move. However, since then, we have made strong representations to the Australian Government for additional general purpose grants, and I am confident that our submissions will be successful. If so, we may be able to avoid such distasteful measures as a consumption or retail sales tax. Despite all the uncertainties, I believe I should say, at this stage, that we propose to budget in a way which will keep the 1974-75 deficit within manageable bounds and which should avoid the creation of serious problems for 1975-76. Against this background, I do not think we should aim to hold in reserve at June 30, 1975, any greater balance of Loan funds than the \$4 497 000 actually held at June 30, 1974. Therefore, we propose to appropriate for capital purposes the whole of the new funds which have been approved for 1974-75 and the whole of the large pool of repayments and recoveries which we expect to receive. In doing that, I point out that the State is budgeting more conservatively than any other State except Queensland.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's happened to health and education?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Our health and education expenditure per capita is considerably more than that in Queensland. Queensland is not providing the services provided by this State, and it has larger mineral revenues, so that it is both spending less in service to the public and getting more in, proportionately, in revenue as a result of having additional sources of revenue not available to this State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are those two fields being cut back?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not cutting back on health and education. At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held in June, the Australian Government agreed to support a total programme of just under \$935 000 000 for State works and services. This comprised a basic programme of \$925 000 000 and a special temporary allocation of just under \$10 000 000 for Queensland, specially for flood restoration works. The basic programme of \$925 000 000 derives from a gross programme of \$990 400 000 from which has been deducted the sum of \$65 400 000, being the full year's effect in 1974-75 of the Australian Government's assuming financial responsibility for tertiary education. The gross programme of \$990 400 000 is a fraction over 10 per cent in excess of the 1973-74 gross programme. The increase of about 10 per cent is common to all States. Needless to say, all States made strong submissions to show that an increase of only 10 per cent would not even cover the cost of price rises and that a decline in the volume of physical work would follow. The Australian Government remained firm, however, that it would not increase the level of its support.

South Australia's share of the net programme of \$925 000 000, after offsets for tertiary education, is \$125 498 000. Of this sum, an amount of \$85 213 00 is to become available by way of loan subject to repayment and to full interest and an amount of \$40 285 000 by way of capital grant. In addition to the new funds of \$125 498 000, the Government expects to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$55 100 000. Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions,

which form part of our Loan programme and are expected to amount to about \$402 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us, as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$181 000 000 becoming available during the course of the year. These figures and a comparison with the transactions of 1973-74 are set out on page 4 of the Loan Estimates.

The estimate of \$55 100 00 for repayments and recoveries in 1974-75 is considerably above the actual receipts of \$46 774 000 in 1973-74. The increase is expected to arise from marked increases in specific purpose grants from the Australian Government towards education and health projects, urban transport programmes and water treatment facilities, offset by the effect of dealing with all tertiary education grants through a trust account instead of through Loan Account as occurred last year. The increased specific purpose recoveries to Loan Account will be partly in respect of current activities and partly in respect of the activities of 1973-74. Of the latter, the three major items will be on account of urban transport, the Land Commission, and the Monarto Development Commission. When the urban transport legislation is passed, a grant of about \$1 000 000 will be received on account of work done last year and, when continuing arrangements have been made to finance land acquisition, repayments of about \$4 000 000 will be required from the sums temporarily advanced to the two commissions last year. I intend to comment on the special Australian Government contributions when dealing with the details of departmental programmes.

The total of payments proposed is \$181 185 000 and, as may be seen from the table on page 4 of the Loan Estimates, this would lead to a nominal run down of \$185 000 during the year and would give a balance of \$4 312 000 at June 30, 1975. For housing programmes, under the 1973 Housing Agreement the Australian Government has approved total funds of \$235 000 000 in 1974-75, an increase of about 7½ per cent above the \$218 650 000 provided last year. The proportionate increases vary widely from State to State and they take account of the performances of the various States in using last year's allocations, as well as an assessment of relative needs. South Australia's allocation is a little more than 17 per cent above that of last year. The Australian Government is willing to consider submissions for increased funds if they can be used effectively in this area of high priority and I have written to the Prime Minister to show that South Australia could use additional funds to very good effect.

For semi-government borrowing programmes in 1974-75 the Australian Government was prepared to support a general increase of 10 per cent above 1973-74, with special allocations to some States having regard to particular circumstances, and the Australian Loan Council approved such a programme. Of the total programme of \$636 084 000, South Australia's share is \$29 844 000, which is 10 per cent above the 1973-74 allocation. The allocations within this to the individual statutory borrowers are \$4 000 000 to the Electricity Trust, \$5 800 000 to the Housing Trust, \$3 000 000 to the Festival Centre Trust, \$3 100 000 to the Meat Corporation, \$1 500 000 each to the Land and Monarto Commissions and \$6 000 000 for the larger local government bodies. The balance of \$4 944 000 is being held in reserve, at this stage, towards the financing of Redcliff works in a way yet to be determined. This year, I am very concerned as to whether or not the funds may be available from banks, insurance

companies and other traditional lenders in the volume necessary for semi-government borrowing programmes to be filled. As the rest of the explanation refers to details of departmental estimates, I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF LOAN EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES

HOUSING—Before the financial year 1971-72 there was a Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement under which the States received advances at concessional rates of interest. These advances were used for both construction of housing by the Housing Trust and loans to individuals to finance the purchase of houses. The States, themselves, decided how much of their total programmes, as determined by the Australian Loan Council, should be diverted to housing under the terms of the agreement. In 1971-72 and 1972-73 new arrangements operated under which the States no longer received separate advances, but made allocations for housing from their normal State Loan works programmes, with the concession in interest rates being arranged by a special separate grant from the Australian Government.

The arrangements were changed again in 1973-74 to provide for the Australian Government to make special advances to the States under a new Housing Agreement and outside the programmes determined by Loan Council. Under this agreement the funds are being made available to the State at a rate of 4½ per cent in respect of advances to the State Bank for financing of individual loans and at a rate of 4 per cent in respect of advances to the Housing Trust for house construction. In each case the agreement provides for the funds to be used for welfare housing, which means that assistance by way of either approval of loan or allocation of house is to be primarily to an applicant who falls within the limits of a defined means test on income.

In 1973-74 advances to the State under the agreement aggregated \$32 750 000 of which \$17 250 000 was allocated to the State Bank and \$15 500 000 to the Housing Trust. Early in the year, under special transitional arrangements, the bank used about \$3 050 000 of these funds to complete advances in respect of approvals given before June 30, 1973. Accordingly, about \$14 200 000 was available for commitment to fully means tested approvals. For 1974-75 the total available to South Australia has been increased by about 17 per cent to \$38 400 000. This year we propose to give more emphasis to the Housing Trust which will be responsible for providing housing associated with the Redcliff development as well as for its normal programme. Therefore, the allocation to the trust has been increased sharply to \$20 340 000. The State Bank is to receive a small increase in its allocation so that it will have \$18 060 000 of new funds. The Government has made a submission to the Australian Government seeking an increase in this allocation.

The State Bank makes advances also to people who do not comply with the means test and, for this purpose, uses circulating funds derived from interest margins and repayments of earlier advances and, as necessary, allocations of State Loan funds. During 1973-74 the bank made individual loans to a total of about \$16 200 000 to applicants outside the means test provisions and in 1974-75 expects to make such loans to a total of about \$17 000 000. Of the advances of \$16 200 000 last year, about \$3 050 000 was made available early in the year from the new Housing Agreement funds and the balance was then met from circulating funds. The rate of interest being charged by the bank on loans from the special low interest moneys

to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent while the rate on other loans is currently 6½ per cent. During 1973-74 the maximum loan available to both categories of applicant was \$12 500. The Government has approved an increase in that limit to a new maximum of \$15 000 for 1974-75.

As to the programme of the Housing Trust, the new agreement lays emphasis on rental housing, and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings built with the special funds which may be sold. In the trust activities, too, the Australian Government is concerned particularly with the needs of low income families and the agreement provides that the trust will allocate to persons eligible under a defined means test a high proportion of the rental dwellings available. The trust will continue its other activities which include the provision of houses for people who do not meet the means test, the building of houses for sale as well as for rental and the construction of factories. In carrying out these activities the trust will have available in 1974-75 some \$7 000 000 of circulating funds and \$5 800 000 of semi-government borrowing to supplement the special funds under the new agreement.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$2 450 000—During 1973-74 the State Bank advanced \$2 867 000 under the Loans to Producers Act. About \$1 480 000 was made available to wineries and distilleries, \$573 000 to fish handling enterprises, \$311 000 for processing of dairy products, \$270 000 to fruit canning co-operatives, \$185 000 to cold stores and packing houses and about \$48 000 for other purposes. Of this total, \$2 850 000 was advanced from State Loan funds and the balance from semi-government borrowings. To enable the bank to assist producers in financing their replacement and expansion programmes, it is proposed to make a provision of \$2 450 000 from Loan Account. A further \$500 000 is expected to be available from semi-governmental loans.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$2 000 000—Advances of Loan funds to the State Bank are made from time to time to provide additional capital for the expansion of its banking activities. An amount of \$2 000 000 was made available last year to enable the bank to expand in the normal way and to finance loans for housing in cases where applicants fell outside the means test under the new housing agreement. It is desirable this year to provide adequate funds for these purposes and a further advance of \$2 000 000 is proposed.

ROADS AND BRIDGES, \$1 000 000—An advance of \$2 000 000 was made in 1973-74 towards financing the sealing of Eyre Highway. The Commonwealth Aid Roads Act expired on June 30 last and new legislation is being arranged to grant assistance to States for roads and transportation purposes. The prospects now are that the remaining work on the Eyre Highway will be financed under the proposed National Highways Bill. However, until the necessary legislation is effective, funds may be required to continue work on this project and to cover other transitional arrangements. An advance of \$1 000 000 is proposed for these purposes.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE, \$450 000—Expenditure under the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Scheme last year was \$620 000, taking the total to about \$10 900 000. The widening and deepening of Patawalonga Basin this year will bring the scheme to completion. It is proposed to allocate \$450 000 for these works.

OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$1 800 000—Financial assistance for floodwater drainage in 1973-74 in 37 different localities, totalled \$753 000. Of this, \$238 000 was granted

to Whyalla where a major stormwater drainage scheme is now nearing completion. Four councils were also assisted with the financing of effluent drainage works for which subsidies totalled \$139 000. From the increasing number of requests for assistance, it is apparent that local government bodies are becoming conscious of the need for adequate drainage. Towards meeting this need, it is proposed to provide \$1 800 000 for subsidies in 1974-75. Of this, \$800 000 is towards floodwater drainage and \$1 000 000 towards completion of effluent drainage schemes already approved and in progress or schemes where pollution of water supply by effluent may create a health hazard to the community.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$2 300 000—Expenditure from Loan Account in 1973-74 was \$1 614 000. Work continued in several areas on replacement of the old irrigation channels with pipe mains and on water supply for stock and domestic use. The allocation for 1974-75 is increased to \$2 300 000 in order to further advance the urgent rehabilitation of pumping and water distribution facilities, mainly in the Waikerie and Berri areas.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$500 000—The Renmark Irrigation Trust Act provides for the Government to finance by loans and grants the cost of a new pumping station, rehabilitation of the irrigation works and the provision of additional drainage and of reticulated water supply within the trust area. A total of \$525 000 was expended from Loan Account on these projects in 1973-74. An allocation of \$500 000 is proposed for 1974-75.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$4 200 000—Loan expenditure by the State forestry undertakings in 1973-74 amounted to \$3 300 000. A further amount of \$252 000 was spent out of moneys advanced by the Australian Government under the Softwoods Forestry Agreement. During the year chipping, debarking and moulding equipment was installed and over 300 hectares of land was purchased for forestry purposes. The establishment of about 2 100 ha of land as the 1974 plantation is in progress. A further area of some 2 300 ha is being prepared for planting in 1975. The capital programme for 1974-75, including establishment and maintenance of forests and the purchase of machinery and vehicles, is estimated to cost \$4 400 000. Of this amount, \$4 200 000 is to be provided from Loan Account and \$200 000 from Softwood Agreement funds advanced by the Australian Government.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, \$12 600 000—Payments from Loan Account for railway purposes in 1973-74 totalled \$7 950 000. These funds were used for relaying and upgrading railway tracks, making improvements to signalling and safety devices, constructing buildings and manufacturing rail cars and freight vehicles. During the year the Government entered into an agreement with the Australian Government to undertake projects in connection with urban public transport. We expect to receive assistance by way of grants to the extent of two-thirds of the cost of those projects. On such project, the Port Stanvac to Christie Downs railway, has been in progress for some time and about \$1 500 000 was expended on it in 1973-74. However, the Australian Government's legislation ratifying the agreement and granting financial assistance has not yet been enacted and therefore funds have not come to hand. For the purpose of these Estimates we have assumed that urban transport funds will be made available by the Australian Government this year towards approved projects carried out in 1973-74 and 1974-75. The \$12 600 000 total programme comprises about \$7 100 000 for urban transport

projects and \$5 500 000 for other works. However, the world-wide demand for electrical equipment of the kind we need for our urban transport projects will make it difficult to achieve that target.

HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$5 800 000—Loan expenditure on harbor facilities and buildings in 1973-74 totalled \$6 000 000. The more important works completed last year included the new passenger terminal at Outer Harbor and the special berth for handling steel at Port Adelaide. Progress was also made on construction of the bulk grain and phosphate berth at Port Lincoln, container ship installations at Outer Harbor and the deepening and widening of the Port Adelaide River. A provision of \$5 800 000 is proposed for the financing of these and other projects in 1974-75.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$35 860 000—Payments from Loan Account for waterworks and sewers last year were \$30 160 000. In addition, the Australian Government advanced \$1 598 000 under the national sewerage scheme to assist in overcoming the sewerage backlog in the metropolitan area. Major works completed during 1973-74 included the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main and pumping stations, and sewer facilities in the Stirling, Tea Tree Gully, Morphett Vale, Christies Beach and Port Adelaide areas.

A provision of \$35 860 000 is proposed for 1974-75. Loans from the Australian Government of about \$3 500 000 towards sewerage works are also expected. These funds are planned to be applied to works as follows:

Metropolitan Waterworks, \$11 131 000—A sum of \$1 650 000 is proposed for the continuation of work on the major trunk water main from Darlington to Port Adelaide and for a large capacity tank at Seaclyff. An amount of \$1 665 000 is to be made available for continued work on the Little Para dam. The prime purpose of this reservoir will be to provide a balancing storage for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline system so that the pipeline can be operated safely at its maximum capacity. This project, when completed, will meet the increasing demand for water in the rapidly developing suburbs in the Northern Adelaide Plains. Expenditure of \$3 000 000 is planned for the Hope Valley water treatment plant. This project is the first stage of a programme to supply the metropolitan area with filtered and treated water. Representations have been made to the Australian Government for a specific grant for this purpose. I am confident that our submission will be successful. A provision of \$200 000 is required for the purchase of land in water catchment areas in order to protect the metropolitan water supplies from pollution.

Country Waterworks, \$8 663 000—A further \$700 000 is proposed to continue construction of the water main connecting the Tod trunk main with Kimba. Financial assistance of two-thirds of expenditure on this project is available from the Australian Government. An amount of \$400 000 is required for the construction of three pumping stations on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and \$400 000 for further work on replacement of the old Tod trunk main between Minnipa and Thevenard. The need for an additional source of water on Eyre Peninsula is now becoming acute. A total of \$1 100 000 is proposed for the Uley South Basin scheme consisting of eight bores, a collecting tank and a pumping station to augment supply.

A scheme has been approved to supplement the water supply to the South Coast towns of Victor Harbor, Port Elliot and Goolwa by pumping from Myponga reservoir. An amount of \$710 000 is appropriated for this purpose.

A sum of \$1 000 000 has been included for the replacement of portion of the existing water main of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline with a steel pipeline.

Metropolitan Sewerage, \$8 536 000—An amount of \$872 000 is proposed for further extensions to the Glenelg sewerage treatment works and \$590 000 for additional facilities at Bolivar. An allocation of \$450 000 is planned for the reconstruction of sewers in the south-western suburbs and \$750 000 for the north-eastern suburbs. A further amount of \$500 000 will be needed for similar work in other areas. About \$2 000 000 will be provided for the construction of sewers in new areas at Athelstone, Blackwood, Braeview, Christies Beach and Morphett Vale. As mentioned before, the Australian Government is expected to assist substantially in the financing of sewerage projects.

Country Sewerage, \$3 470 000—This provision is required for sewerage works at Gawler, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Victor Harbor and the treatment works at Murray Bridge, Whyalla and Woodside.

RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$2 250 000—The State contribution to expenditure on capital works carried out under the River Murray Waters Agreement in 1973-74 was \$1 032 000. Our share of the cost of construction of the Dartmouth reservoir this year is expected to be \$4 000 000. Half of this amount is expected to be advanced by the Australian Government and \$2 000 000 is to be financed from Loan funds. South Australia's contribution towards expenditure on other works is estimated to be in the vicinity of \$250 000. A total provision of \$2 250 000 is proposed.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$83 500 000.

Hospital Buildings, \$21 000 000—Expenditure from Loan Account in 1973-74 was \$20 042 000. Works completed during the year included the Northfield Security Hospital, the out-patient department and frozen food facilities at Glenside, the laboratory accommodation at Modbury, alterations to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and extensions to the Group Laundry at Dudley Park. Some of the major proposals for 1974-75 are as follows:

Flinders Medical Centre—A sum of \$14 522 000 is included for continuing work on a ward block comprising accommodation for 370 beds, basic clinical and out-patient departments, operating theatres and radiology facilities. Work will also start on phase 3 of the project comprising further clinical departments and accommodation for an additional 120 beds.

Glenside Hospital—A sum of \$305 000 is proposed for redevelopment of the hospital including the erection of a single-storey 64 bed sub-acute wards building.

Hillcrest Hospital—A sum of \$1 033 000 is provided for the new admission ward, consulting rooms, out-patient facilities, occupational therapy wing, administration building and other facilities.

Mount Gambier Hospital—A sum of \$1 100 000 is included for work to continue on extensions to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science laboratories, a new nurses' training school and an additional wing to the staff block.

Port Pirie Hospital—A sum of \$365 000 is provided for construction of a new geriatric centre, a nurses' home and a surgical ward and for remodelling of the administration building.

School Buildings, \$42 700 000—During 1973-74 actual payments from Loan Account totalled \$30 741 000. This amount was made up as follows:

Primary and secondary schools:	\$
The completion of 37 major projects the total value of which was \$11 478 000 ..	5 800 000
Work in progress on 71 major projects estimated to cost \$33 733 000 in total	8 537 000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	2 899 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	3 091 000
Minor works including grading and paving of school yards, fencing, roadways, minor buildings, etc.	5 374 000
Furniture	1 526 000
Preliminary investigation and design ..	1 371 000
	\$28 598 000

Further Education:	\$
The completion of two major projects with a total value of \$1 614 000	259 000
Work in progress on five major projects estimated to cost \$3 347 000 in total ..	780 000
Prefabricated classrooms	83 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	257 000
Minor works and buildings	254 000
Furniture	167 000
Preliminary investigations and design .. .	319 000
	\$2 119 000

Payments made in connection with pre-school projects totalled \$24 000. The expenditure of \$30 741 000 was financed to the extent of about \$9 900 000 by grants from the Australian Government towards general school buildings, science laboratories, secondary school libraries, technical training and child migrant education. It is proposed to allocate \$42 700 000 for school buildings and associated works in 1974-75 and it is intended that these funds be applied as follows:

Pre-schools:	\$
Work in progress on conversion of four existing buildings to pre-schools at a total cost of \$271 000	254 000
The commencement of 13 new projects with a total value of \$1 052 000	896 000
Preliminary investigations and design .. .	50 000
	\$1 200 000

Primary and secondary schools:	\$
Work in progress on 71 major projects at a total value of \$33 733 000	18 808 000
The commencement of 33 new major projects estimated to cost \$21 072 000 .. .	3 054 000
Emergency classroom accommodation ..	2 000 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	2 350 000
Minor works and buildings	4 288 000
Furniture	1 300 000
Preliminary investigation and design .. .	1 300 000
	\$33 100 000

Further Education:	\$
Work in progress on five major projects at a total value of \$3 347 000	1 770 000
The commencement of two new major projects estimated to cost \$17 339 000 ..	5 575 000
Emergency classroom accommodation ..	150 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	300 000
Minor works and buildings	255 000
Furniture and equipment	150 000
Preliminary investigations and design .. .	200 000
	\$8 400 000

Grants of about \$20 800 000 are expected to be received from the Australian Government in 1974-75 comprising \$1 200 000 for pre-schools, about \$14 200 000 towards primary and secondary school buildings and \$5 400 000 towards further education projects. Of the latter, some

\$200 000 may be re-allocated from buildings to equipment for which the financial transactions would be recorded through Revenue Account.

Other Government Buildings, \$19 800 000—Expenditure from Loan Account in 1973-74 totalled \$16 418 000. Works completed during the year included the Government Printing Department complex at Netley, the Chest Clinic and a number of dental clinics and police stations. The more important provisions for 1974-75 are as follows:

Attorney-General's Department—A sum of \$500 000 is included for a new forensic science building which will accommodate the Chemistry Department, the Coroners Department and the Forensic Pathology Section of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

Department for Community Welfare—A sum of \$272 000 is proposed for the construction of a Community Welfare Centre at Port Augusta.

Department of Correctional Services—A sum of \$230 000 is allocated for additions and safety installations at Yatala Labour Prison, \$280 000 for improvements at Port Lincoln Gaol, and \$60 000 for Adelaide Gaol.

Department of Public Health—A sum of \$2 000 000 is planned for expenditure on the new Principal School of Dental Therapy at North Terrace, \$773 000 for continuation of work on the Dental Therapy Training Clinic at Somerton Park and \$430 000 for the completion of 13 dental clinics already under construction. Australian Government grants are expected for these works.

Local and District Criminal Courts Department—A sum of \$372 000 is required to continue construction of the Adelaide Juvenile Court, \$430 000 for the Mount Gambier court, and \$400 000 to commence redevelopment of the western courts building.

Department of Transport—A sum of \$400 000 is provided to commence work on an office block for this department.

Parliament House—The sum of \$1 250 000 is proposed for continuation of the redevelopment of Parliament House.

New Administration Building—The sum of \$3 950 000 is included for the new office block being constructed on the corner of Flinders Street and Gawler Place.

STATE PLANNING AUTHORITY, \$100 000—In each of 1972-73 and 1973-74 advances of \$1 500 000 were made to the authority, whereas for 1974-75 the proposal is for an advance of only \$100 000. The reason is that the Government had planned to use the authority as the vehicle for land acquisition pending the formal establishment of the Land Commission and the Monarto Development Commission. The authority has acquired land at Monarto and will continue to do so at the request of, and as financed by, the Monarto Development Commission. The Land Commission was established early enough to handle its own acquisition programme and therefore has not needed to call on the services of the State Planning Authority in this respect.

The funds now proposed for the State Planning Authority are to meet the requirements of the Hackney redevelopment scheme and similar projects as may be determined by the Government. As to the use of the funds made available in 1972-73 and 1973-74, I will deal with this in a moment in my comments about Monarto.

LOAN TO ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, \$2 000 000—The capital works programme of the trust totalled \$29 570 000 in 1973-74 and is expected to be

\$34 900 000 in 1974-75. Work will continue on the first stage of the Torrens Island Power Station "B", where expenditure is expected to total \$15 770 000. The first steam unit in this station is expected to be available for commercial use in June, 1975, and the second unit about 12 months later. The power station at Dry Creek is nearing completion. The second gas turbine unit began operating in May last, and the third unit is expected to begin commercial operation this month.

Expenditure on the transmission and distribution system is expected to be about \$15 340 000. Further progress will be made on the reinforcement of supply to the South-East. This work includes the construction of the Para to Taillem Bend 275 000 volt transmission line, the 132 000 volt substation at Kincraig, and additions to the substation at Taillem Bend. Reticulation to rural consumers will again be concentrated in the Lucindale-Kingston area. A provision has also been made to build the Sliding Rock to Nepabunna line. The general expansion of the distribution system in the metropolitan area is expected to continue at a similar rate to that which applied during 1973-74. The trust's programme is to be financed mainly from its own internal funds. Only \$2 000 000 is to be provided from State Loan funds and \$4 000 000 is to be raised by borrowing under the semi-government loan programme.

LOAN TO LEIGH CREEK COALFIELD, \$1 000 000—In recent years, capital expenditure in connection with the Leigh Creek coalfield has been met from internal funds. The programme for 1974-75 has reached a level where an advance from Loan Account is necessary. Of the estimated requirements totalling \$2 324 000, \$1 324 000 can be made available internally and an allocation of \$1 000 000 from State funds is proposed. The largest single project planned for 1974-75 is the development of the Lobe "B" coal area. The proposed works will include diversion of a creek, construction of foundations, a rail siding and provision of conveyors and bins.

LOAN TO NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY, \$5 000 000—I have reported fully to the House, from time to time, on the progress of negotiations with the consortium set up to construct a petro-chemical complex at Red Cliff. Suffice it to say now that the Government is prepared to allocate portion of its available Loan Funds to finance capital services necessary to the operation of the complex although in this, as in some other major matters, we must rely on a heavy infusion of special grants or loans from the Australian Government. The details of the ways in which gas and liquids pipelines, water mains, harbour works and power facilities should be financed have not yet been determined. However, we have decided that an initial allocation of \$5 000 000 of Loan funds and almost \$5 000 000 of semi-government borrowing authority should be reserved this year for those purposes. For convenience it has been nominated as for the pipelines authority.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST, \$2 400 000—The Loan Estimates for 1973-74 provided \$400 000 towards the trust's capital programme. The actual payments to the trust aggregated \$4 400 000, as it was necessary to advance a special allocation of \$4 000 000 during the year to finance the trust in the take-over of private suburban passenger bus services previously operating under licence. For the four years 1973-74 to 1976-77, the capital programme of the trust envisages the net expenditure of about \$22 500 000 at present price levels for the transfer of licensed services, the purchase of new buses, the acquisition of land for depots, the construction of buildings and purchase of plant. If the whole of this programme were accepted by the

Australian Government for support under the urban transport arrangements, then two-thirds of the cost, say \$15 000 000, would be covered by grants and one-third of the cost, say \$7 500 000, would be a charge to State funds. However, we have not been successful as yet in getting approval for the costs of transfer of licensed services to be financed under the special urban transport arrangement and the net cost to the State over the four-year period could be as high as \$9 000 000. A contribution of \$2 400 000 towards the programme is proposed in 1974-75.

UNIVERSITY AND ADVANCED EDUCATION BUILDINGS, \$500 000—It had been my intention to have all payments in respect of the State's liability for tertiary education for the period up to December 31, 1973, brought to account during 1973-74. For 1974-75 onwards the proposal is that tertiary education, being entirely a financial responsibility of the Australian Government, shall be handled through a trust account. However, it was not possible for all the detailed calculations to be given effect to in 1973-74 and, accordingly, it is necessary to appropriate a further sum of about \$500 000 this year to complete the previous arrangements for shared programmes.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$6 000 000—Actual payments from Loan Account in 1973-74 were \$5 496 000. A provision of \$6 000 000 is proposed for 1974-75. The two main grants which are planned to be made available are as follows: A sum of \$1 970 000 for the Home for Incurables to continue the expansion programme which will provide an additional 400 beds when completed; and \$470 000 for the Adelaide Children's Hospital towards redevelopment of wards and theatres in the old portion of the hospital. In addition, subsidies are proposed to 34 other hospitals and institutions.

LAND COMMISSION, \$1 000 000—When the Loan Estimates were presented a year ago, the Land Commission had not been established and, for convenience, funds were included in the provision for the State Planning Authority. The Land Commission was established early enough to conduct its own affairs and, accordingly, did not call on the services of the State Planning Authority, nor did it use the funds allocated to that authority. The accounts record that amounts aggregating \$4 125 000 were advanced to the Land Commission from Loan Account in 1973-74 and this was far above what the Government had intended at the beginning of the year. The reason was the late receipt of moneys from the Australian Government as a result of unforeseen delays in getting agreements signed and satisfactory administrative procedures set up. The State was then forced into the situation of having to make large temporary advances of working capital for the commission. In the event, the cash payments of the commission in 1973-74 were as follows:

	\$
Acquisition of land	8 512 000
Administrative and establishment expenses	102 000
	<u>\$8 614 000</u>

The funds available to the commission were as follows:

	\$
Advances from the Australian Government	8 000 000
Advances from Loan Account	4 125 000
Semi-government borrowings	200 000
Sundry income	6 000
	<u>\$12 331 000</u>

At June 30, 1974, the commission was holding a cash balance of \$3 717 000. The estimated repayments to Loan Account in 1974-75 include a proposed recovery of

\$2 000 000 of the funds made available temporarily in 1973-74. The necessity for working capital and hence the timing of this repayment will depend on the arrangements made with the Australian Government for financing this year's programme of acquisition and development. It is essential that these programmes be planned on a long-term basis by both Governments, and I have suggested an early conference to try to achieve this. In the meantime we are uncertain of the extent to which the Australian Government will provide financial assistance this year. The 1974-75 programme which has been advised to that Government, has been drawn up to give a smooth and balanced expansion in the activities of the commission. It provides for the following:

	\$
Further acquisition of land	16 000 000
Development of land—a minimum of	3 000 000
Administration	420 000
	<u>\$19 420 000</u>

The Loan Estimates propose an allocation of \$1 000 000 of State funds and this may be supplemented by \$1 500 000 to be raised under semi-government borrowing arrangements. This is a rough measure of the extent to which the Government believes it can afford to divert funds from elsewhere to support the commission. It can function effectively only with the assistance of large advances from the Australian Government. As control of land prices is an essential part of the Australian Government's plan to curb inflation I am confident that the necessary funds will be forthcoming.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, \$1 000 000—When the Loan Estimates were presented a year ago the Monarto Development Commission had not been established and, for convenience, funds were included in the provision for the State Planning Authority. The authority had commenced the acquisition of land at Monarto in 1972-73 and, on the establishment of the commission, it was decided that the acquisition programme should be continued by the authority. This situation will continue into 1974-75 when the main programme of acquisitions will be completed. As with the Land Commission and for similar reasons, the State Government has found itself in the situation of having to provide much larger amounts of working capital than originally planned. To June 30, 1974, the cash payments made by the Monarto Development Commission or by the State Planning Authority on its behalf were as follows:

	\$
Acquisition of land	5 322 000
Establishment expenses	225 000
Planning and research	268 000
Development of nursery	126 000
Administration	415 000
	<u>\$6 356 000</u>

The funds made available for the commission's purposes to June 30, 1974, were as follows:

	\$
Advances by the Australian Government	4 413 000
Advances from Loan Account—	
To State Planning Authority	2 800 000
To Monarto Development Commission	2 000 000
Semi-government borrowing	400 000
Sundry income	43 000
	<u>\$9 656 000</u>

At June 30, 1974, the cash balance held by or on behalf of the commission was \$3 300 000.

The estimated repayments to Loan Account in 1974-75 include a proposed recovery of \$2 000 000 of the funds made

available temporarily in 1973-74. The necessity for working capital and hence the timing of this repayment will depend on the arrangements made with the Australian Government for financing this year's programme. As with the Land Commission, it is essential that the Monarto programme be planned on a long-term basis by both Governments and an early conference is required. In the meantime we are uncertain of the extent to which the Australian Government will provide financial assistance this year. The 1974-75 programme which has been advised to that Government provides for the following:

	\$
Further land acquisition	4 000 000
Planning and research	940 000
Design	1 010 000
Development	900 000
Site maintenance and operation	340 000
Administration	1 640 000
	<u>\$8 830 000</u>

The Loan Estimates propose an allocation of \$1 000 000 of State funds and this may be supplemented by \$1 500 000 to be raised under semi-government borrowing arrangements.

This is a rough measure of the amount which the Government believes can be set aside to support Monarto. The planned development can proceed only with the full and continued support of the Australian Government. In the event that this support is not forthcoming to the extent necessary to finance this programme the Government will have no alternative but to require the commission to drastically curtail its operations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, \$1 400 000—Actual payments in 1973-74 were \$692 000. An allocation of \$1 400 000 is required for the purchase of new equipment to replace certain old units and to upgrade the present installation in order to meet increasing demands from departments for data processing services.

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT, \$800 000—An amount of \$800 000 is included this year to provide capital grants to local government and other organizations towards recreational and sporting facilities. This is an area in which the Australian Government is expected to make an increasing volume of grants.

APPENDIX I SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Major Completed Works, 1973-74

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Infants Schools—		
New Schools—		
Holden Hill Infants	197 000	Samcon
Ridgehaven Infants	268 000	Brick
Salisbury Park Primary	420 000	Samcon
Major Additions—		
Ascot Park Primary	610 000	Brick
Gilles Plains Primary	138 000	Brick
Glencoe Central Primary	212 000	Samcon
Iron Knob Primary	154 000	Samcon
Renmark West Primary	176 000	Samcon
Surrey Downs Primary	73 000	Samcon
Tanunda Primary	112 000	Brick
Thebarton Primary	456 000	Brick
Whyalla—Scott Street Primary	78 000	Samcon
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Banksia Park	1 750 000	Brick
Morphett Vale	1 436 000	Brick
Whyalla-Stuart	1 722 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Balaklava	115 000	Brick
Blackwood	240 000	Concrete
Booleroo Centre	134 000	Brick
Elizabeth	218 000	Brick
Gawler	236 000	Concrete
Peterborough	126 000	Brick
Seacombe	489 000	Brick
Taperoo—Open Unit	240 000	Concrete
Vermont Co-ed—Stage I	28 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Hawker	116 000	Samcon
Tumby Bay	753 000	Brick
General—		
Bordertown High—Boys Changerooms	30 000	Brick
Elizabeth High—Craft Block	149 000	Brick
Ernabella Aboriginal School—Staff Accommodation	44 000	Steel framed aluminium clad
Glossop High—Changerooms	46 000	Brick
Kidman Park Girls Technical High School—Craft Block	65 000	Precast Concrete
Naracoorte High—Craft Block	102 000	Brick
Westbourne Park Primary—Landscaping	62 000	—
Yalata Special Rural—Toilets	32 000	Timber

APPENDIX I—continued
SCHOOL BUILDINGS—continued
Major Completed Works, 1973-74—continued

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Subsidized Works—		
Bordertown High—Assembly Hall	94 000	Brick
Henley High—Assembly Hall	284 000	Brick
Naracoorte High—Assembly Hall	73 000	Brick
Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—		
Croydon Park Technical College—Major Additions	1 546 000	Brick
Salisbury Further Education Centre	68 000	Brick

SCHOOL BUILDINGS
Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1974

Locality	Estimated Cost \$	Type of Construction
Pre-schools—		
Conversion of Existing Buildings—		
Ferryden Park	50 000	Brick
Gilles Plains	79 000	Timber
Kilkenny	77 000	—
Strathmont	65 000	—
Primary and Infants Schools—		
New Schools—		
Braeview Primary—Stage I	572 000	Brick
O'Sullivan Beach Infants	297 000	Brick
Parafield—Keller Road Primary	627 000	Brick
Para Heights Primary	838 000	Brick
Pimpala Primary	597 000	Samcon
Pooraka Infants	185 000	Brick
St. Agnes Primary	955 000	Brick
Salisbury Downs Primary—Stage I	520 000	Brick
Semaphore Park Primary	920 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Brinkworth Primary	193 000	Samcon
Cowandilla Demonstration	270 000	Brick
Glen Osmond Primary	170 000	Brick
Goodwood Primary	617 000	Brick
Kilkenny Primary	540 000	Brick
Loxton Primary	650 000	Brick
Madison Park Primary	157 000	Samcon
Murray Bridge Primary	1 230 000	Brick
Naracoorte Primary	642 000	Brick
Northfield Infants	270 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens East Primary	73 000	Samcon
Parafield Gardens Primary	330 000	Brick
Peterborough Primary	698 000	Brick
Port Noarlunga Primary	146 000	Brick
Port Pire—Risdon Park Primary	890 000	Brick
Taperoo Primary	690 000	Brick
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Augusta Park—Stage II	942 000	Samcon
Ingle Farm	2 202 000	Brick
Rostrevor	2 230 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Blackwood	866 000	Brick
Craigmore—Stage I	660 000	Brick
Glossop High—Stages I and II	1 163 000	Brick
Mitchell Park Co-ed—Stage II	112 000	Alterations
Mitchell Park Co-ed—Stage III	664 000	Brick
Mount Gambier—Grant	1 655 000	Mount Gambier Stone
Naracoorte	537 000	Brick
Nuriootpa—Open Unit	250 000	Brick
Para Hills—Open Unit	295 000	Brick
Port Lincoln—Stage I	1 068 000	Brick
Port Pirie	566 000	Brick
Taperoo	816 000	Brick
Vermont Co-ed—Stage II	269 000	Brick
Woodville—Additions Type A	1 045 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Lameroo	830 000	Brick
Snowtown	495 000	Brick
Streaky Bay	785 000	Brick

APPENDIX I—continued

SCHOOL BUILDINGS—continued

Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1974—continued

Locality	Estimated Cost \$	Type of Construction
Special Schools—		
Elizabeth—Stage I	190 000	Brick
Gepps Cross	415 000	Brick
Murray Bridge	244 000	Brick
General—		
Primary and Infants—		
Clapham Primary—Staff Accommodation . .	64 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Elizabeth Downs Primary—Staff Accommodation	51 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Elizabeth East Primary—Staff Accommodation	51 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Para Hills West Primary—Staff Accommodation	64 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Para Vista Primary—Staff Accommodation . .	63 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Stradbroke Primary—Staff Accommodation . .	50 000	Partitions
Area Schools—		
Ardrossan—Changeroom	40 000	Brick
Kimba—Changeroom	33 000	Brick
Maitland—Craft Extensions	57 000	Concrete Block
Orroroo—Changeroom	30 000	Brick
Parndana—Changeroom	46 000	Brick
Quorn—Changeroom	30 000	Brick
High Schools—		
Elizabeth West—Craft Additions	164 000	Brick
Gilles Plains—Craft Block	60 000	Brick
Henley—Craft Blocks (2)	144 000	Brick
Marion High—Craft Blocks (2)	130 000	Brick
Moonta—Craft Block and Toilets	111 000	Timber
Mount Gambier—Art/Craft Block	344 000	Brick
Salisbury—Craft Block	112 000	Brick
Seacombe—Craft Blocks (2)	190 000	Brick
Thorndon—Civil Works	63 000	—
Subsidized Works—		
Gilles Plains High—Assembly Hall	323 000	Brick
Technical College and Further Education Centres—		
Adelaide Technical College—Alterations . .	110 000	—
Peterborough Further Education Centre—Craft Block	106 000	Brick
Port Augusta Technical College—Stage II . .	1 580 000	Concrete Block
S.A. College of External Studies—Air-conditioning	45 000	—
South-East College of Further Education . .	1 505 000	Brick

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Major Works to be Commenced During 1974-75

Locality	Estimated Cost \$	Type of Construction
Pre-schools—		
New Pre-schools—		
Alberton	51 000	Brick
Elizabeth Downs	85 000	Brick
Elizabeth West	81 000	Brick
Goodwood	78 000	Brick
Ingle Farm	81 000	Brick
Nangwarry	79 000	Brick
Para Vista	80 000	Brick
Ridgehaven	82 000	Brick
Salisbury North-West	81 000	Brick
Trinity Gardens	77 000	Brick
Conversion of Existing Buildings—		
Croydon Park	91 000	Brick
Mansfield Park	86 000	Timber
Port Adelaide	100 000	Brick
Primary and Infants Schools—		
New Schools—		
Flagstaff Hill Primary	1 000 000	Brick
Hackham South Primary	720 000	Samcon
Hallett Cove South Primary—Stage I	875 000	Brick
Holden Hill North Primary	895 000	Samcon
Morphett Vale West Primary	950 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens South Primary—Stage I . .	900 000	Brick
Port Noarlunga South Primary—Stage I . . .	1 110 000	Brick
Salisbury South-East Primary—Stage I . . .	950 000	Brick

APPENDIX I—continued
SCHOOL BUILDINGS—continued

Major Works to be Commenced During 1974-75—continued

Locality	Estimated Cost	Type of Construction
Major Additions—	\$	
Beachport Primary	150 000	Demac
Berri Primary	102 000	Samcon
Carlton Primary	185 000	Brick
Coromandel Valley Primary	1 000 000	Brick
East Marden Primary	120 000	Samcon
Nuriootpa Primary	1 000 000	Brick
Salisbury North Primary	800 000	Brick
Seaview Downs Primary	116 000	Samcon
Area Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Yorketown	1 324 000	Samcon
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Parafield Gardens	3 150 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Burra High (including Primary)	1 700 000	Brick
Dover Gardens Co-ed—Stage I	50 000	Brick
Kidman Park Co-ed—Stage I	30 000	Brick
LeFevre Co-ed—Stage I	50 000	Brick
Mawson Co-ed—Stage I	50 000	Brick
Nailsworth Co-ed—Stage I	975 000	Brick
Nuriootpa—Additions Type A	750 000	Brick
Seaton Co-ed—Stage I	30 000	Demac
Special Schools—		
Gilles Plains	615 000	Brick
Elizabeth—Stage II	295 000	Brick
Subsidized Works—		
Elizabeth Boys Technical High—Multi-Purpose Hall	135 000	Concrete Block
Loxton High—Assembly Hall	350 000	Brick
Norwood High—Gymnasium and Change-rooms	105 000	Brick
Salisbury High—Multi-Purpose Hall	140 000	Brick
Other Projects—		
Arbury Park Outdoor School	450 000	Timber
Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—		
Regency Park Community College—Stage I	12 064 000	Precast Concrete Panels
Whyalla Technical College—Stage II	5 200 000	Concrete Block
Yarrabee Botanic Gardens—Alterations for Further Education	75 000	—

Major Projects for which Planning and Design is Proposed During 1974-75

Primary and Infants Schools—	Area Schools—continued
Augusta Park Primary	Cummins
Barmera Primary	Karcultaby
Belair Primary	Keith
Bellevue Heights Primary	Kingscote
Braeview Primary	Miltaburra
Christie Downs Primary	High Schools—
Coromandel Valley South Primary	Adelaide Co-ed
Crafers Primary	Angle Park Community Centre
Delfin Isle Primary	Augusta Park
Direk Primary	Bordertown
Elizabeth Downs East Primary	Enfield
Highbury Infants	Gawler
Lobethal Primary	Glossop
Magill Primary	Hackham
Millicent North Primary	Henley
Modbury South Infants	Kadina
Modbury West Infants	Kidman Park Co-ed
Mount Barker Primary	Marryatville Co-ed
Murray Bridge South Primary	Modbury
Murray Bridge South-West Primary	Nailsworth
Paringa Park Primary	Penola
Redwood Park Primary	Port Pirie
Richmond Primary	Salisbury East
Rose Park Infants	Seaton Co-ed
Salisbury East Primary	Strathmont Co-ed
Seacliff Primary	Thebarton Community Centre
Seaton Park Primary	Vermont Co-ed
Seaton West Primary	Whyalla—Fourth Secondary
South Downs Primary	Whyalla
Stanvac Primary	Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—
Sturt Primary	Croydon Park Technical College—School of
West Lakes Primary	Automotive Engineering—Additions
Whyalla West Primary	Gawler Further Education Centre—Craft
Woodville Primary	Block
Area Schools—	Gilles Plains Community College
Ceduna	Kilkenny Technical College—Major Additions
Coober Pedy	Riverland Further Education Centre—Theatre

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATION AUTHORITIES FOR ACTUAL PAYMENTS FROM THE LOAN ACCOUNT 1973-74

Appropriation Authorities							
Loan Undertaking	Pursuant to the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1973				Pursuant to Section 32 b Public Finance Act	Total Appropriation Authorities	Actual Payments
	Schedule to the Act	Variations Made Pursuant to Section 6 (3) of the Act		Total Appropriation Authorities as Varied			
		Increase	Decrease				
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
State Bank	Advances for Homes	20 000	—	20 000	—	20 000	19 628
	Loans to Producers	2 250 000	600 000	2 850 000	—	2 850 000	2 850 000
	Advances to Settlers	80 000	20 000	100 000	—	100 000	74 340
	Loans for Fencing and Water Piping	10 000	—	10 000	—	10 000	740
	Advances to State Bank	2 000 000	—	2 000 000	—	2 000 000	2 000 000
	Student Hostels	40 000	—	40 000	—	40 000	—
Highways and Local Government	Roads and Bridges	4 000 000	—	2 000 000	—	2 000 000	2 000 000
	South-Western Suburbs Drainage	900 000	—	900 000	—	900 000	620 151
	Other Urban Drainage	1 500 000	—	1 500 000	—	1 500 000	892 197
	Public Parks	30 000	800 000	830 000	—	830 000	250 000
Lands, Irrigation and Drainage	Lands Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	385 000	—	23 000	—	362 000	235 002
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Swamp Lands	1 840 000	—	1 840 000	—	1 840 000	1 613 578
	South-Eastern Drainage	60 000	23 000	83 000	—	83 000	65 901
	Renmark Irrigation Trust	525 000	—	525 000	—	525 000	525 000
	Lyrup Village Association	205 000	10 000	215 000	—	215 000	190 827
Woods and Forests	Afforestation and Timber Milling	3 300 000	—	3 300 000	—	3 300 000	3 300 000
Railways	Railway Accommodation	9 900 000	—	1 500 000	—	8 400 000	7 949 812
Marine and Harbors	Harbors Accommodation	5 500 000	800 000	6 300 000	—	6 300 000	6 006 120
	West Lakes Development	10 000	—	10 000	—	10 000	—
	North Haven Development	—	—	—	340 000	340 000	274 408
	Fishing Havens	300 000	100 000	400 000	—	400 000	376 621
Engineering and Water Supply	Waterworks and Sewers	33 120 000	—	2 460 000	—	30 660 000	30 165 863
	River Murray Weirs, Dams, Locks, etc.	1 100 000	—	1 100 000	—	1 100 000	1 032 500
Public Buildings	Government Buildings, Land and Services	60 100 000	1 600 000	61 700 000	6 000 000	67 700 000	67 200 770
Environment and Conservation	Coast Protection Board	450 000	100 000	550 000	—	550 000	526 000
	National Reserves	350 000	120 000	470 000	—	470 000	330 264
Other Capital Advances and Provisions	State Planning Authority	1 500 000	—	1 500 000	4 750 000	6 250 000	1 500 000
	Electricity Trust of South Australia—Loan to	3 000 000	—	3 000 000	—	3 000 000	3 000 000
	Monarto Development Commission—Loan to	—	—	—	2 000 000	2 000 000	2 000 000
	Municipal Tramways Trust—Loan to	400 000	—	400 000	4 000 000	4 400 000	4 400 000
	Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Loan to	30 000	—	30 000	—	30 000	—
	Industries Assistance Corporation—Loan to	800 000	—	800 000	—	800 000	400 000
	Festival Theatre	320 000	250 000	570 000	—	570 000	520 000
	South Australian Land Commission—Loan to	—	—	—	8 225 000	8 225 000	4 125 000
	Transport Research	500 000	—	500 000	—	500 000	197 950
	University and Advanced Education Buildings	14 000 000	750 000	14 750 000	—	14 750 000	14 750 000
	Non-government Hospital and Institution Buildings	5 500 000	—	5 500 000	—	5 500 000	5 495 635
Miscellaneous	Expenses and Discounts of Floating Conversion and Public Loans	429 000	200 000	629 000	—	629 000	550 577
	Mines Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	350 000	—	350 000	—	350 000	261 939
	Government Printing Department—Plant, Machinery, Stores, etc.	400 000	200 000	600 000	—	600 000	589 923
	Produce Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	400 000	200 000	600 000	—	600 000	599 759
	Supply and Tender Board—Stores	300 000	200 000	500 000	—	500 000	400 000
	Education Department—School Buses	430 000	—	430 000	—	430 000	429 708
	Department of the Public Service Board—Data Processing	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Equipment	1 000 000	—	1 000 000	—	1 000 000	691 662
	Department of Fisheries—Boats and Facilities, etc.	146 000	10 000	156 000	—	156 000	114 731
Total		157 480 000	5 983 000	5 983 000	157 480 000	25 315 000	168 526 406*

* Includes \$513 777 discount on loan raisings

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1975.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the general revenue, a further sum of \$100 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$100 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill which, together with the detailed Estimates of Expenditure for 1974-75. I expect to present to the House later this month. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill, also for \$100 000 000 was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. This Bill is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until the latter part of October, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is usually complete and assent received. This short Bill, which contains no details of expenditures to be made, nevertheless does not leave the Government or individual departments with a free hand to spend. Clause 3 ensures that no payments may be made from the appropriation sought in excess of those individual items approved by Parliament in last year's Appropriation Acts and other appropriation authorities. This is the usual Supply measure: there is no change from the normal measure presented to the House at this time.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Lotteries Act, 1966-1973.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to arm the Lotteries Commission of South Australia, established under the principal Act, the State Lotteries Act, 1966-1973, with powers to borrow money under a guarantee of the Government of the State. The guarantee provided by this measure will ensure that the rate of interest applicable to the proposed borrowings will be somewhat lower than would otherwise be the case. The intention is that, if a suitable opportunity arises in the future, the commission will be able to purchase its own accommodation should this prove to be an economically desirable arrangement.

It goes without saying that the surplus of income over expenditure of the commission is and will be in the future fully committed to transfers to the Hospitals Fund kept in the Treasury. Accordingly, expenditure of the nature foreseen can properly only come from borrowings by the commission. However, any entry into the borrowing field will depend on the overall borrowing programme by Government and semi-government instrumentalities. This programme is, of course, determined by the Australian Government in consultation with the States, and Loan Council, and is clearly necessary to preserve the proper balance between Government and private borrowings.

Accordingly, the passage of this Bill is not to suggest that the commission will be able to borrow immediately, but rather to ensure that should a suitable opportunity arise then, within the constraints indicated above, the commission can take advantage of it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING LOANS REDEMPTION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Loans Redemption Fund Act, 1962.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Housing Loans Redemption Fund Act, 1962, in order to enable the Act to be consolidated and reprinted under the Acts Republication Act, 1967, and to make certain improvements in the administration of the Act. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 merely extends the reference in section 4 (5) of the Act to the Housing Agreement executed in pursuance of the Housing Agreement Act, 1956, to cover all amending agreements executed in pursuance of the Housing Agreement Act, 1961, and of other subsequent relevant enactments. This would catch up the amending agreement executed in pursuance of the Housing Agreement Act, 1966, and any other amending agreements, if any.

Clause 3 amends section 5 by specifically providing that a borrower (other than a joint borrower) may become a contributor in respect of a part of an advance. Although the section as it stands provides that a borrower may contribute for "the advance in respect of which the borrower applies to become a contributor", it has for many years been Treasury policy to enable a borrower to become a contributor in respect of a part of an advance, and this amendment covers a long-standing practice. Clause 4 amends section 6 by extending the principle enacted by clause 3 to joint borrowers who become joint contributors. Clause 5 enables a contributor to contribute in respect of an increased proportion of an advance, subject to approval of the approved authority and to satisfying the Treasurer and the approved authority that he is less than 36 years of age and in good health. The Act as it stands provides that a contributor may reduce the amount of the advance for which he is contributing, but at present there is no provision for him to contribute for an increased proportion of the advance. This clause supplies that omission.

Clause 6 amends section 8 (1) (a) and (b) by allowing interest for a period not exceeding one month after the death of a contributor to be met from the fund. The Act at present allows interest for a period not exceeding one month which would have accrued to the date of death of a contributor to be met from the fund. The Government considers that this principle should be extended to interest accruing for a period not exceeding one month after the death of the contributor as, in most cases, contributors would be making progressive arrangements to meet mortgage payments during their lifetime, and there would be more logical reasons for the fund to meet the interest liability of a borrower for a period not exceeding one month after his death. It is during that period that arrangements are usually required to be made for effecting the discharge or reduction of a mortgage and the documentation therefor.

Clause 7 repeals the existing schedule which prescribes the rates of contribution referred to in section 7 of the Act. Those rates are at present expressed in shillings per annum per £1 000 of advance which is outstanding at the time contributions are commenced and the clause replaces it with a new schedule which expresses the same rates in dollars per annum per \$1 000 of advance. The rates, although differently expressed, have not been altered in any way, but the schedule of rates has been adapted to meet the situation where the proportion of the advance in respect of which contributions are made is increased, as provided for in clause 5.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1973.

Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The introduction of this short Bill follows a recent agreement between the Premiers of the States of the Commonwealth in June of this year, to the effect that pay-roll tax, which is uniform throughout the States, be lifted by one-half of 1 per cent, that is, from 4½ per cent to 5 per cent of taxable wages. The agreement between the Premiers to raise the level of pay-roll tax by the amount indicated was taken in concert when it became apparent that the Australian Government did not intend to increase its financial assistance to the States, and that all States would need to increase their revenues to meet expected revenue deficits in the forthcoming financial year.

The effect of this increase will result in an estimated additional \$5 000 000 of revenue accruing to this State for the remainder of this financial year and an additional \$7 000 000 of revenue in a full year. In form, the Bill is similar to a measure passed by this House in 1973, and once again provision has been made to guard against the somewhat remote possibility that wages will be liable to tax at both the old and the new rates. This could occur only where wages were "returned" as payable in the August, 1974, return or in some previous month, and again "returned" as paid in September, 1974, or in some subsequent month. Nevertheless, to put the matter beyond doubt, an appropriate provision has been inserted.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is substantially the same as the Bill that failed to pass in the last session of the Parliament, only a few minor technical amendments having been made to it. The Bill makes miscellaneous amendments to the Local Government Act and it can be best explained by reference to its various clauses. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition of "ratable property" in the principal Act. The only amendment of substance is that land held by the

Crown under a lease will become ratable property under the new provision. At present land held by the Crown under lease ceases to be ratable property for the purposes of the Local Government Act. Clauses 4 and 5 provide for the appointment of a deputy mayor who is empowered to exercise the powers of the mayor in his absence. Clause 6 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 7 makes an important amendment to the principal Act in regard to the time at which ordinary meetings of the council are to commence. The amendment provides that such meetings must always commence in the evening unless the council by unanimous resolution resolves that they should commence at some earlier time in the day. This amendment is of considerable significance because it will enable ordinary working men and women, and men and women involved in carrying on small businesses, to serve as members of the council. Many are now excluded because the times at which the council meets are incompatible with their employment or their business commitments. Secondly, the amendment will enable greater numbers of ratepayers to attend meetings of the council so that more people may become involved in civic affairs.

Clause 8 amends section 157 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is to ensure that an employee of a council who serves continuously under a series of councils will be regarded as having been in continuous employment for the purpose of computing long service leave. At present his service is only deemed to be continuous with one earlier period of service in the employment of another council. The amendments also provide that the new provisions relating to superannuation and long service leave will apply to controlling authorities constituted under Part XIX of the principal Act. A machinery amendment is inserted to enable the council to obtain details of the previous employment of any of its employees in the service of other councils so far as that is necessary to compute rights of superannuation and long service leave. Clauses 9, 10, and 11 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clauses 12 and 13 provide that a council may insure the spouse of any member or officer of the council while acting in the course of official functions. Clause 14 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 15 provides that a council may, with the consent of the Minister, grant a licence for installing pumps or equipment on or near a public street or road for the purpose of conveying water.

Clause 16 enables a council to grant licences for roadside restaurants and cafes. Clauses 17 and 18 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 19 empowers a council to borrow money for the purpose of enabling it to provide long service leave and superannuation to its employees. Clause 20 provides that a council shall not convert park lands that have been dedicated as such under the Crown Lands Act into a caravan park unless the Minister of Lands has consented to that conversion. Clause 21 provides that a council may lease park lands of up to 6 hectares and, with the consent of the Minister, may lease a greater area. Clauses 22 and 23 deal with the supply of gas by a council. The present provisions under which the council must itself own the gas works are eliminated. The Peterborough council, for example, supplies natural gas reticulated from the pipeline operated by the pipelines authority. Clause 24 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 25 provides that a hide and skin market, or saleyard, must be licensed if established within a district council district. At present a licence is required only if it is established within a township within the district.

Clause 26 enables a council to maintain and conduct a market and saleyard. Clauses 27 and 28 make consequential amendments to the principal Act. Clause 29 provides that where a council takes action to remove unsightly objects, it may recover the cost of its action from the owner or occupier of the land. Clause 30 makes consequential amendments to the principal Act. Clause 31 makes drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 32 provides that a copy of the valuation roll prepared under the Valuation of Land Act will be evidence of the Government assessment. Clause 33 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 34 provides that a council may keep its records on microfilm, and the production of the microfilm record will be sufficient compliance with any requirement to produce the record in legal proceedings. Clause 35 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 36 increases from 10c to \$2 the fee that a council may charge for supplying details of unpaid rates and imposts upon property within its area. Clause 37 makes drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 38 and the schedule convert references to measurements into metric terms.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation for loss arising from measures to eradicate fruit fly. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through all stages without delay.

Motion carried.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the House for its co-operation in agreeing to the suspension of Standing Orders. The Bill provides in the usual manner for the payment of compensation to any person who suffered loss by reason of the actions of eradication officers in relation to those areas of the State affected by the various outbreaks of fruit fly during the early months of this year. The districts involved were Kent Town, North Adelaide, Parkside, Rosslyn Park, St. Peters, Hindmarsh, Hillcrest, Highbury, and Vale Park. All in all, 11 proclamations were made, and it is expected that the total cost of compensation could be about \$50 000.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 directs that this new Act be read in conjunction with the Fruit Fly Act. Clause 3 sets out the basis for entitlement to compensation. Clause 4 provides that any claim for compensation must be lodged with the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee no later than August 31, 1974.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): The Opposition supports this Bill, and I think its concern regarding this measure and the importance placed on it is evident by the fact that members are here to support the motion for suspension of Standing Orders to enable the Bill to proceed. I should like to make one or two comments relevant to this piece of legislation, even though its passage is considered to be urgent. Since the first outbreak in 1947, \$6 687 000 had been spent in controlling fruit fly to the end of June, 1972. In 1972, \$489 000 was spent on

control, and \$19 800 on compensation. The Bill intends to allocate an additional \$50 000 for compensation to those persons who claim compensation from the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee before August 31 next. Those people who have claims have until the end of the month to lodge their claims with the committee.

This year we have seen a considerable spread of fruit fly into the eastern suburbs of Adelaide, as outlined in the second reading explanation, the districts involved being Kent Town, North Adelaide, Parkside, Rosslyn Park, St. Peters, Hindmarsh, Hillcrest, Highbury, and Vale Park. The most important of these, of course, is the Highbury outbreak. I believe the reason for the wide spread of infestation this year is the change in techniques being adopted by the department. The department has been exercising control over a limited area within a radius of about .2 kilometres from previous outbreaks. It has been covering the area during the season with a cover spray and a lure spray, but to cut down costs it was decided to rely more heavily this year on the lure spray. Regrettably, the trapping of flies outside the areas covered by the lure spray proved that there had been some fault in the lure spray used, and so the infestation has extended over an area much wider than may have been expected.

Because of the need for corrective measures, the process involved this year was to strip only ripening fruit, and I hope this is taken into account in paying compensation. People are not being compensated for the total loss of all fruit on all trees. My real concern, and that of people on this side of the House, is that, for the first time, the fruit fly has escaped into the commercial fruit-growing areas of the State. The outbreak at Highbury occurred in a commercial orchard, but it was possible to make special provisions this year for the marketing of fruit from that area.

In supporting this Bill, I draw the attention of the House and the Government to the need to lay down a policy this year on whether it is intended to pay compensation for fruit fly infestation in commercial areas. If that was intended, I should like to know what form the compensation would take. My colleague the member for Chaffey shares my concern that the fruit fly is moving out of Adelaide suburbs into the commercial areas, where it could do tremendous damage and have tremendous effects on the activities of the many people engaged in fruitgrowing in this State. There is a need to lay down a policy regarding commercial areas, as opposed to what has applied regarding compensation paid for co-operation by people who have had fruit stripped from trees in the metropolitan area.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill and echo the comments made by the member for Mallee. I know the Highbury district and the orchard where the outbreak occurred last season, and I cannot stress too strongly the importance of taking the most stringent measures that can be taken to curtail the spread of fruit fly. The outbreak at Highbury was virtually right on the doorstep of the Adelaide Hills fruitgrowing area, including the Paracombe-Houghton area where I live, and I know the havoc that would be wrought among the growers to whom the member for Mallee has referred if the fruit fly spread even 1 km or so east of the Highbury orchard concerned.

The property at Highbury on which the outbreak occurred has for many years been an important commercial producer of fruit, mainly pears. The spread of fruit fly to these commercial areas has much significance for the fruit industry in the State. We may be deluding ourselves by thinking that the measures taken are eradication

measures. A long time ago, when I was a student, I took a vacation job working on the fruit fly eradication campaign. That was longer ago than I wish to tell the House, but it was one of the most lucrative vacation jobs that I was lucky enough to get. That shows how long the fruit fly eradication campaign has been in operation.

It seems to me that what happened in the last growing season emphasized the importance of trying to eradicate or at least keep the pest under control. If the commercial fruitgrowing areas became affected, the loss of export markets not only to the growers but also to the State would amount to millions of dollars. I do not begrudge \$50 000 being provided to control what otherwise could become a major tragedy in the fruitgrowing industry in this State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Compensation."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has referred to 11 proclamations, and it seems that the sixth and seventh were both made on March 14, 1974. I ask the Minister whether that is correct, because it seems anomalous that the date is the same in each case.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I understand that the proclamations were issued on the basis of districts, and the districts would have been defined in those proclamations. The proclamations could have been issued on the same day.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Time limit for claims."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask the Minister how an assessment is made and whether the strippers take some account of fruit removed at the time. I should like to know how claims by householders are verified. What evidence is available to show the accuracy of the claim? Apparently, from what the member for Mallee has said, some fruit was allowed to be used.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern but I do not know offhand what evidence is available to the department to substantiate a claim made by a person under the Act. I know that a record is kept and I think that a carbon copy of the relevant document is issued to the person whose fruit is taken. I suppose that that copy would have to be submitted with the claim. The accuracy of that depends on the human factor and I do not know whether spot checks are made to find out whether the documents are issued correctly. Although I hope that in future we do not have outbreaks and need to compensate people under the Act, I will ask the Minister about the method of making spot checks.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I repeat the warning I have issued before, namely, that, as many of the fruit flies were found late in the season this year, it cannot be established with certainty that the present outbreak has been contained. As the late outbreaks of fruit fly were discovered on the fringe of or the gateway to the Hills area (in a commercial fruitgrowing area), the Government will have to consider seriously its future policy with regard to compensation on commercial crops. With those few remarks, I support the third reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 4 (clause 5)—Leave out "subject to" and insert "make such regulations, as in the opinion of the Governor are necessary to ensure the supply to the community of any goods and services, the shortage or lack of which gave rise or contributed to that state of emergency."

No. 2. Page 2, lines 5 to 7 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 2, line 8 (clause 5)—Leave out "the State".

No. 4. Page 2, lines 20 to 28 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 5. Page 2—After clause 5 insert new clause 5a as follows:

5a. "Compensation—(1) A person who, as the result of compliance with any regulation under this Act or while complying with or being engaged in the carrying into effect of any such regulation, suffers loss, damage or injury shall be entitled to compensation under this Act from the Minister.

(2) Every claim for compensation under this Act shall be made in a form and within a time approved of by the Governor.

(3) In default of agreement as to the amount of compensation between the Minister and the claimant the Minister shall direct that the claim shall be referred to arbitration before a single arbitrator who shall be a Judge of the Supreme Court.

(4) The procedure to be followed at the arbitration shall be as determined by the arbitrator, but, subject to any such determination, the procedure shall be as nearly as possible the same as the procedure in the trial of a civil action in the Supreme Court."

No. 6. Page 3, line 1 (clause 6)—Leave out "1975" and insert "1974".

Amendments Nos. 1 to 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 3 be disagreed to.

The amendments propose to confine the making of regulations in a state of emergency to such regulations as are, in the opinion of the Governor, necessary to ensure the supply to the community of goods and services, the shortage or lack of which gave rise or contributed to that state of emergency. The amendments confine the emergency regulations too closely. I think the Legislative Council does not realize the kinds of regulation that may need to be made in certain circumstances; for instance, in a matter of civil defence it may be necessary for us in certain circumstances (say, a severe flood) to prohibit the entry of the public to certain areas of the State simply in order to ensure proper safety and public provision and to ensure that the civil defence forces are able to act without hindrance. The amendments would make it impossible for us to do this under the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Now we get the answers. I say that because, when questions were asked here the other evening about the extent of the involvement, no clear indication was given by the Premier that civil defence and the types of issue he has just mentioned were likely to be involved. I pointed out that it would be possible to stultify completely the activities of the Supreme Court or, indeed, any other court as a result of the measures originally contained in the Bill. I believe that members in another place have taken a very reasoned approach to the whole issue, having regard to the total exposure by the Premier of the full intent of the Bill and to the fact that he indicated clearly that he was willing to have two classes of citizen in the State if the Bill in the form in which it left this Chamber was implemented.

I believe that the amendments are worth while and, if the Premier is not satisfied that the full intent of the legislation will be possible as a result of the amendments, he

should seek a conference with the other place so that he could clear honourable members' minds and, at the same time, make statements to members about why he wants the conference. He should give us an idea of the full purposes of his measure. It is all very well for the Premier to enter into a hurt discussion with the Attorney-General—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I'm not hurt at all.

Dr. EASTICK: —suggesting that what I am saying is not relevant to the situation. A grave doubt exists in the minds of many in the community about the intent of the Premier and his Government on many of these matters. That situation has been brought into focus because of the Premier's inability to shake off the ties of the union hierarchy under which he labours and which has prevented him from introducing a measure that truly allows the State to look at emergency situations. On that basis, I think it perfectly legitimate that the matter be discussed in a conference. By accepting that fact, the Premier would be doing himself and the State a great service.

Dr. TONKIN: The Premier, in rejecting the amendments as too confining, said that they restrict the powers to be conferred in a state of general emergency. I believe that this is the very feature which makes the amendments so worth while. I do not like the legislation, but these amendments greatly improve it. I thought that the whole exercise recently was familiar. When I went home and read the *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, by William Shirer, and saw the steps taken in Germany to create a crisis and then to take unconstitutional powers (which were not confined but left wide open), I realized how familiar the legislation before us was. There is far too much reliance in Australia on the feeling that it can never happen here. I believe that it could happen here just as it could happen in any other country, and I do not intend to support any measure that could in any way be used by anyone in a position to take over this country and this State. I believe restriction on the powers to be granted under a state of emergency is a wise and necessary move. I support the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr. CUMBE: This afternoon for the first time in this debate we have heard that there are certain classifications of "state of emergency". When we were debating this Bill the other evening, not one word about these types of emergency was mentioned: most of the debate was confined to the supply of goods and services to people. The whole Bill hinges on clause 3, which uses the following words:

to deprive the community or any substantial part of the community of the essentials of life. . . .

These amendments deal directly with ensuring the supply to the community of goods and services so that it cannot be deprived of the essentials of life: they are inextricably connected. The Premier has now raised other matters. What is the basis for his attitude to clause 5 (3) now after being so adamant the other evening? The amendments are worthy of consideration.

If the Premier goes to conference, perhaps some other words can be included in clause 5 so that the peace, order and good government of the State can be considered. We have said that people could be deprived of the necessities of life. In fact, the member for Ross Smith referred to bread. Petrol is another item that comes readily to mind. I suggest that the Committee support the amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Torrens has put his finger on that part of the Bill that is entirely relevant to these amendments. Everything we have been

told makes the amendments most reasonable and consequential. We asked the Premier at some length what constituted the essentials of life and were referred to essential services, food, shelter and the like. It is abundantly clear that the Premier has other matters in mind in rejecting reasonable amendments that positively spell out the areas to which the Premier made special reference during the second reading debate. It seems that he is simply paving the way to reject later provisions that relate to the trade union movement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the amendments and therefore oppose the motion. The member for Goyder and I are the only two members who have consistently opposed this Bill from beginning to end.

Mr. Keneally: Ha, ha!

Mr. McAnaney: But—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Heysen voted for the second reading of this Bill, as did every member of the L.C.L.

Mr. McAnaney: That's where it can be debated within reason.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why do we have a second reading debate? Do we always vote for the second reading of a Bill?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the terms of the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Stuart got me into trouble that time.

Mr. McAnaney: You get into enough trouble on your own without other people getting you into it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You were going to support it if you could have got a limitation on its operation.

Mr. McAnaney: Go up to the courts if you want to talk rot.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have never heard such inordinate nonsense from the L.C.L. as I have heard from the member for Heysen, who is, I understand, the father of the House.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitcham will not refer to the member for Heysen.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But he is interjecting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about your amendment? If you had got the amendment through you would have supported the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to ignore interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I had better because it was such a puerile interjection. The member for Kavel tried previously to ask me a question about my support for the Bill, but he was laughed at by every member. I support these amendments, for what they are worth. I do not believe that they really restrict the ambit of the Bill very much because when we look at it we find that it is still left to the opinion of the Governor and that, as I pointed out during the earlier debate, it is so wide as to make it almost impossible to question, but it is a step in the right direction.

I must say that I wish that the other place had rejected this Bill at the second reading stage and had not gone on with it at all, because it is so bad a Bill in every way that that place has seen fit to try to limit its effect. I suppose members there were really afraid to throw it out at the second reading stage and, for what the amendments are worth, they should be supported.

The member for Bragg referred a moment ago to the Third Reich, and honourable members opposite laughed at him. I think his analogy was somewhat overdrawn, but it was not so overdrawn as to be dismissed altogether. It makes it all the more strange that the member for Bragg voted for the second reading of the Bill. Perhaps it was not until he went home that he read the *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*.

The Attorney-General and the Premier are both members of the legal profession. I cannot conceive how men of the legal profession not only can support but initiate legislation of this kind. They should be hanging their heads in shame instead of supporting this Bill. I heard the member for Playford say publicly the other day that he would never trust power to any Government of any political complexion, yet what does he do here? He supports such a Bill. It fosters my indignation to see a Bill like this. I hope that, for what they are worth, these amendments will be accepted. If they are not, I hope that at least there is such a disagreement with another place that the Bill is lost altogether.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, and Tonkin.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Burdon, Corcoran, and Jennings. Noes—Messrs. Dean Brown, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 4:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

This amendment seeks to strike out the subclause that relates to industrial disputes. This matter was fully debated here previously, and the Government regards the continuance of clause 5 (3) in the Bill as vital to its passing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This most important amendment has been discussed at length. That the Government is willing to leave in the Bill provisions that obviously and grossly discriminate in favour of one section, and one section only, of the community is a most serious condemnation of the Government and of those who obviously have complete control over it. It is disgraceful that a Government is willing to act in this way. If the Bill is to have any wide acceptance this clause must be deleted. It represents a completely false approach to a serious problem. The Government stands condemned by its refusal to delete this provision.

Mr. GUNN: Clearly the Government is under the domination of the Trades and Labor Council, and it is willing to create a privileged group in the community.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must speak to the motion before the Chair.

Mr. GUNN: The Trades and Labor Council is pertinent to this clause, because the Government will be able to exempt members of the Trades and Labor Council and the unions it represents from any control under this legislation. Members of the Trades and Labor Council have disrupted the community and cut off supplies, and women and children have been forced to go without the necessities

of life, yet the Government is unwilling to take action against these people. Men like Munday, Carmichael, Cavanagh, and Dunford are allowed to run riot in the community and destroy democracy. The Premier is afraid to stand up to them, and he and his Ministers are not discharging their responsibility. The Attorney-General, a Queen's Counsel, is willing to support them.

Mr. Wright: Not me?

Mr. GUNN: I will include the member for Adelaide, who belongs to a union that has behaved most disgracefully by putting a curfew on the people of Kangaroo Island. The junior Minister belongs to a union now headed by Mr. Cavanagh, who has completely disrupted community services in this State, and who is the "friend" of the member for Playford. Obviously members opposite are not fully aware of the consequences of this legislation. The member for Florey and others have condemned dictatorial actions of the Government in Greece, but this sort of legislation is similar to that introduced by such a Government. Any member who does not support the amendment does not believe in democracy or a fair go.

Mr. COUMBE: We are now seeing the true hypocrisy of the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are being a bit strong.

Mr. COUMBE: We are reaching the ludicrous position in which the Government cannot call on its own employees to help in the case of, say, a flood similar to that affecting Queensland. There should be some form of industrial conscription, but we know what the true meaning of that is in regard to this legislation.

Mr. McANANEY: It is daily becoming more obvious that there is a need for emergency powers, because those disrupting our society are costing the average citizen thousands of dollars with ships lying idle off our coast. Workmen receiving high wages at an abattoir in this State will not work for some people because they do not like them. We seem to be in a perpetual state of emergency and need some powers to control the situation. Mr. Neville Chamberlain, in 1938, returned from Munich, waved a piece of paper and said, "Peace in our time." That incident reminds me of the present Government's weak attitude, because we do not have freedom and democracy in this State today. We must have powers to control those who are creating emergency situations.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the amendment. When I asked the Premier to explain lines 26 to 28 in clause 5, he said that, if there was a strike in a situation of emergency, others could be persuaded to extend that strike. As I consider that that would escalate any emergency, I oppose the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, and Tonkin.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Burdon, Hopgood, and Jennings.

Noes—Messrs. Rodda, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 5:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be disagreed to.

This deals with general compensation for anyone who suffers any loss through carrying out the present provision in an emergency. This would place the State in an impossible situation. While the State would naturally consider compensating people for acquiring any of their property, imagine what sort of situation we would have faced had a provision of this kind been in operation during the emergency petrol rationing on two previous occasions. In fact, some proprietors of service stations proposed to sue the State because they had made a loss as a result of petrol rationing. Under these emergency regulations, just as in war-time, it is not possible to provide compensation of this kind; if the State did, it would soon be bankrupt. Obviously, when there is an emergency, some people face stringency and have to bear it as best they can. The State endeavours to make *ex gratia* compensation payments wherever some extraordinary difficulty faces a person.

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier has said it would place the State in an impossible position. He reveals that he is not above placing other people in an impossible position as long as he or the State is not placed in such a position—again, two classes of people. It is conceivable that a person told to keep his business open in a period of petrol rationing for the purpose of providing emergency fuel would find the degree of his turnover and the hours involved such as to make it impossible for him to recoup the costs of the service he had been told by the Government to provide, yet he could not take action to recover the costs of providing that service. If he was the only person to remain open (which would be impossible and senseless to contemplate) to supply fuel, his turnover would be likely to be such as to allow him to recover the costs of the operation, but not in circumstances where he was directed to be one of several to take action and was not then able to recover the cost involved in providing the service, even though directed to do so by the State.

The amendment is reasonable. It provides that the matter will go to arbitration if there is any dispute. The very fact that it will go to arbitration means that the State's position will be safeguarded and, even if a person who makes a claim for a loss cannot substantiate his claim, at least he will be on an equal footing with other people, with some expectation of financial recovery. The amendment should be supported.

Dr. TONKIN: I support the amendment as strongly as possible. I do so on the ground of the example that the Premier has given. I spoke only yesterday to my petrol station proprietor, who expressed to me considerable concern and alarm at the course events were taking. He asked me, "Who will pay me for my loss of income during any time of restricted petrol supply? Who will meet my rent? Who will meet my overdraft payments? How am I to live?" Those are basic questions. They apply in many spheres other than the example the Premier has given. Why should the petrol station proprietors bear the brunt of circumstances arising from industrial action, when in the same Bill provision is made for the exemption of people who take industrial action? There is a law for one group in the community and a penalty for other groups. The old story that the proprietors, be they petrol station proprietors or proprietors

of any kind, can afford to sustain the loss does not and cannot apply. This is class distinction with the object of destroying private enterprise. These people need help just as any member of a union needs help in similar circumstances.

Mr. EVANS: The action being taken by the Government adversely affects a minority, and that minority should not be expected to carry the burden for the sake of the majority. What the Premier has said today, is that the State cannot afford to pay compensation to a minority group, which must be made to bear the brunt of action that the Government may take when an emergency is declared, and he has said that the State cannot carry the burden. If the State cannot carry the burden, surely it is impossible for a minority to carry it. I therefore strongly support the Legislative Council's amendment. The Premier's attitude proves again that the Government is willing to kick the small person in the teeth and say, "You do not count for anything unless you belong to the trade union movement."

Mr. McANANEY: Are my colleagues not looking at this matter from the petrol retailers' viewpoint? In a state of emergency everyone in South Australia suffers, through the action of a specific group. It has been argued that the petrol retailers should be compensated, but everyone in South Australia is losing money today through industrial action. It would be far too complicated to administer a compensation scheme satisfactorily. It is the person who is causing the hardship who should pay, but I do not know how we could collect the necessary sum from him. Serious injustices would arise in the implementation of a compensation scheme.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's remarks are extremely pertinent. Some members opposite seem to have made a mistake in reading the provision. The right to compensation is not a matter for arbitration: the right to compensation is at large for any member of the community who suffers any loss as a result of the emergency regulations. Therefore, the situation is exactly as the member for Heysen put it. It is only the amount of compensation that is the subject of an arbitration. A compensation system would be impossible to administer.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 6:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

I agreed in this place to a limitation in the time for this legislation and I think the provision that this Chamber made was proper. To confine it to a period within this year is not sufficient. It is proper to have it confined so that there can be a re-examination during the period of this Parliament. That provision was made by this place and it is proper.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments defeat the purposes of the Bill.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 13, at 2 p.m.