

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, February 26, 1964.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**APPRENTICES.**

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Of recent years much interest has been taken in the fact that there has been a shortage of tradesmen and apprentices in some classifications, particularly the metal trades and building industries. National conferences were held which resulted in a recommendation coming forward, resulting in an amendment to the Metal Trades Award. Under the provisions of these variations to the award, provision was made for reductions in the term of apprenticeship according to the educational qualifications of the applicant, extending to as much as 12 months. Also under these provisions there was an arrangement whereby the apprentices who came under this scheme for a reduction in the term of apprenticeship attended at trade schools for 20 weeks' intensive training. Further to that, the Commonwealth Government financially aided employers who took more than their normal number of apprentices, and provision was made for living-away allowances for country boys who took part in the 20 weeks' intensive training.

Under the South Australian Apprentices Act provision is made for the technical training of apprentices in Part III. Sections 16 and 17 provide for certain trades to be proclaimed under the technical training provisions, and also for certain districts to be proclaimed technical school districts. The apprentices in those districts in those trades which were proclaimed attend a trade school. Section 20 provides that a correspondence course shall be available for those boys who do not come within those districts and who, because of lack of training facilities, train by correspondence. Also, under the regulations to the Act, provision is made for those boys voluntarily to attend a trade school for an intensive training period of two weeks each year. Last year I asked a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education, and received a satisfactory reply. I asked for concession fares for

those apprentices attending such a course. Now that the Commonwealth Government has provided for a living-away allowance for boys attending an intensive training scheme, will the Minister seek an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government whereby this living-away allowance is also paid to apprentices attending the intensive course of training available under section 20 of the Apprentices Act and regulations applying to this section?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I shall be glad to take that matter up with my colleague to see whether it is possible to do as the honourable member asks.

H.M.A.S. VOYAGER.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Last week I asked the Attorney-General whether the Government would make a substantial donation to assist the dependants of men of the ill-fated vessel H.M.A.S. *Voyager*. Can the Minister tell me whether the Government has considered this question?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I regret to say that Cabinet has not yet had an opportunity to consider the question but I will see that it is brought to its notice as soon as possible.

PEST CONTROL.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture an answer to the question I asked last week about pest control?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes. The Minister of Agriculture reports:

The regulations under the San Jose Scale Control Act, the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act and the Red Scale Control Act, were published in the *Government Gazette*, of January 30, 1964. The matter of levies is at present under consideration.

PORT ROAD INTERSECTION.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week about traffic lights at the intersection of Clark Terrace, Port Road and Cheltenham Parade at Cheltenham?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. The Commissioner of Highways states:

Right of entry has now been obtained to all properties, except one, where land is required for road widening. Road work at the intersection has commenced. It is anticipated that the road work, including the installation of lights, will take several months to complete, and that the remaining right of entry will be obtained before it interferes with the progress of the work.

HOUSING TRUST FLATS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to the question I asked last week about the building of flats by the Housing Trust on the corner of East Terrace and Halifax Street?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I regret that I have not obtained a reply to the honourable member's question but I shall follow it up and see that the honourable member has the information as soon as possible.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That Standing Order No. 455, dealing with returns after prorogation, be so far suspended as to dispense with the necessity for incorporating in the Blue Book with the Minutes of Proceedings for the current session those Parliamentary Papers which are not laid upon the table during this session.

I understand that some honourable members are at a loss to understand what this motion means, so perhaps it would be fitting that in moving the motion I should supply them with some information. Owing to the alterations to Standing Orders, which were revised last year, it has become necessary to move a rather lengthy motion regarding papers, something which was required prior to the alteration. This motion is necessary because special circumstances make the new Standing Order unsuitable to this present occasion. While the motion is to some extent self-explanatory I think I should point out that Standing Order No. 455 provides for certain papers received up to two months after the prorogation of Parliament to be printed and incorporated in the Blue Book. With the adjournment of the Houses for the Commonwealth election and Christmas and the continuation of the session until February, the Blue Book could not be made available to members until very late into next session, if this motion were not carried.

The prorogation has normally been in November and two months were provided to allow these papers to come in so that they could be included in the Blue Book. Now we are well into February and there would not be time to get them into the Blue Book for this session. The Blue Book is the large bound volume members see on the shelves outside the Chamber in the President's corridor. It contains the Minutes of Proceedings of the Legislative Council, the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly and a copy of all Parliamentary Papers laid upon the tables of

the Houses during the session. It is a popular Parliamentary name for bulky official reports and papers and obtained its name from its blue cover.

Honourable members will remember that the Council up to 1961 passed a lengthy resolution concerning papers after prorogation, and this became unnecessary when Standing Order No. 455 was amended in 1961. This suspension of the operation of portion of the Standing Order will simply provide for Parliamentary Papers laid on the table of the Council and printed during the session to be incorporated in the Blue Book—those not tabled this session will be incorporated in the Blue Book for next session.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Hon. C. R. Story be discharged from attending the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and that the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan be appointed to the committee in his place.

Motion carried.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

TRADES HALL BILL.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is, as its long title indicates, to empower the sale of the Trades Hall at Adelaide. As honourable members know, the present Trades Hall was constructed some time during the nineties on certain land situated in Grote Street, Adelaide, and I understand that an addition was made to it at the back on another piece of land at a later date. The original piece of land was acquired by some eight persons who by a deed made in 1895 placed the land and certain moneys which they were holding under trust for the erection of a Trades Hall. The piece of land at the back was subsequently acquired by the same persons who apparently declared certain trusts by a further deed made in 1899 which cannot be found and, although it may be assumed that the trusts were identical with those under the first deed, this is not known or ascertainable. For this reason alone it may

be thought there are limitations regarding the disposal of the hall. Be that as it may, the body known as the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated became incorporated under the old Associations Incorporation Act and as such became registered as the proprietor of both pieces of land upon which the hall now stands. I do not go into the details as to the rules and regulations governing the conduct of business of this body. It may be enough to say that the deed of 1895 forms part of, or is incorporated in, them.

The managing committee of the Trades Hall has, I understand, decided, with the consent of resolutions passed at special meetings of the union concerned, the Labor Day Celebrations Committee (formerly the Eight-Hours Celebration Union) and the United Trades and Labour Council, to erect a new hall at South Terrace on certain land which the incorporated body has acquired for the purpose and desires to dispose of the present land in Grote Street on which the present Trades Hall is erected with a view to using the proceeds of the sale towards the erection of the new hall.

Having regard to the fact that the trusts governing the second piece of land under the deed of 1899 are not known and to certain other doubts respecting the power of sale of the Trades Hall which have been expressed, as I understand it, from time to time, the United Trades and Labour Council has asked the Government to introduce the present Bill to make it clear that the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated may sell the premises freed and discharged from existing trusts. The Government acceded to this request and accordingly introduces the present Bill.

Clause 2 is the usual interpretation clause. Clause 3, the main operative clause, provides that the land in Grote Street and the piece behind is from now on to be vested in the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated freed and discharged from all the trusts and conditions in the trust deeds and to the intent that the trustees under both deeds shall be freed and discharged from all such trusts and conditions. The land is to be held henceforth upon trust to sell it with the usual powers to postpone, sell in part, sell by auction or private contract, for cash or on credit and with or without special conditions and generally on such conditions as the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated shall think expedient and to give a free title to the purchasers. There is a proviso that pending sale the incorporated body is to hold the income upon the present trusts.

Clause 4 provides that the proceeds arising from the sale are to be held on trust to apply them towards the erection of a new trades hall at South Terrace and not otherwise. Clause 5 applies the trusts of the 1895 trust deed (which are known) to the land upon which the new Trades Hall is to be built. The reason for this is that the 1895 deed is incorporated in and forms part of the present rules of the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated and it would appear to facilitate the transition to apply those same trusts or conditions to the new land without, however, the (unknown) trusts and conditions of the 1899 deed. In accordance with Joint Standing Orders the Bill has been considered by a Select Committee in another place. The committee recommended its passage in its present form.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill and on behalf of the trustees of the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated I thank the Government for its assistance in so readily agreeing to a request by the Trades Hall to introduce the Bill. The Bill is necessary because, in relation to the portion of the Trades Hall facing Grote Street, there is something in the deed which seems to imply that it cannot be sold or exchanged. Then there is a second piece of land, known as the Price Wing, which the elders among the trustees have always contended could not be sold or mortgaged. That view has been held over many years, and the trustees honoured it in connection with the mortgage. The present Trades Hall is not large enough to cope with the vast growth of the trade union movement. The offices of the unions are scattered throughout the metropolitan area, which is not satisfactory.

Rather than have any slipshod business it was thought best to ask the Government for legislation giving Trades Hall Inc. permission to sell the present Trades Hall site and building, and transfer by a deed of trust to a new building to be erected on land in South Terrace, where it is hoped to have a modern trades hall. In doing this we shall not be breaking faith with anyone. The Government readily acquiesced in our desire, for which we express our thanks. The Bill has been before an Assembly Select Committee, to which evidence was tendered by the Registrar-General of Deeds (Mr. D. F. Collins), the Parliamentary Draftsman (Dr. Wynnes) and myself. The committee recommended that the Bill be passed in its present form. I hope that it will be dealt with immediately and passed to permit Trades Hall Inc. to proceed with the building of a

new trades hall in which it is hoped to house the various trade unions for many years to come.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2): I support the Bill, which permits Trades Hall Inc. to sell the present Trades Hall. This property has a history. It was established in the first place through the efforts of people anxious to improve the lot of unionists. I believe the money required for its building was subscribed by the general public. The hall has served its purpose, and over the years many people associated with it have made their mark in the industrial field. I do not know whether the present Trades Hall would be of interest to the National Trust. Many people will regret that it is to go. I hope that those responsible for the building of the new trades hall will keep in mind the general advancement in South Australia in the control of industrial matters, and that in the coming years there will be sensible control. I hope the new building will redound to the credit of the various trade unions, and allow them to play their part in the development of South Australia.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

SEMAPHORE COMMUNITY CENTRE TRUST DEED BILL.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1953 certain land at Semaphore, which was formerly part of the old Semaphore Signal Station, was sold to the Port Adelaide and Semaphore Sub-branch of the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League. Later, portion of the land was sold to ex-servicemen. In 1958 there was constituted a special trust to build a citizens' community centre as a memorial to servicemen and servicewomen of the Second World War. The trust fund comprised the balance of the land and some £3,000 raised by public subscription. The trustees included officers of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide and of the sub-branch.

The trust fund, however, is inadequate for the erection of a suitable memorial centre and the Bill proposes to vary the trusts created in 1958 so as to permit the trustees to transfer the land to the Poppy Day Trust Fund to

enable the trustees of that fund to erect Darby and Joan cottages for ex-servicemen and their wives in accordance with the provisions of the Act relating to that fund passed in 1962. As to the balance of the fund, it is proposed to authorize the trustees to expend such amount as they think fit on the erection of a building and provision of suitable amenities for the Semaphore Youth Club on land owned by the council and adjacent to the sub-branch club-rooms. The youth club is sponsored by the sub-branch. Any portion of the trust fund still remaining will be paid to the sub-branch for its own use.

Agreement on these proposals has been reached by the council, the trustees, the sub-branch, the youth club and league headquarters. As the trustees are unable to attain the primary objects of the trust owing to lack of finance, the Government considers that the alternative proposals should be authorized. They are consistent with the intentions of the initiators of the scheme and the terms of the trust in so far as the sub-branch will be charged with the duty of performing a service to the aged and to the youth of the community, both urgently needed public services.

This Bill, accordingly, by clause 3, inserts into the original deed of trust three new clauses to provide that the trustees shall transfer the land to the Poppy Day Trust Fund and apply the moneys in the memorial fund to the erection of a youth club, any amounts remaining to be transferred to the Semaphore and Port Adelaide Sub-branch of the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League. On compliance with these provisions the trusts under the deed will terminate. This Bill was, in accordance with Joint Standing Orders, considered by a Select Committee in another place and recommended for passage in its present form.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, which seeks to permit the trustees of a special trust constituted to build a citizens' community centre to transfer land, held in trust, to build what are known as Darby and Joan cottages. This is a most desirable measure and will benefit the community generally. The trustees seek to increase their finances so as to build Darby and Joan flats for members of their organization and one can only admire that attitude. In addition, part of the funds will be used to build a youth club. Both projects are commendable and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern): I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. For several years the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League has considered that something should be done for aged ex-servicemen. When the Commonwealth Government announced that a subsidy of £2 for £1 would be made available for building Darby and Joan cottages the league immediately took advantage of this gesture. The Poppy Day Trust Fund, of which I am a trustee, has accumulated considerable money over the years. The purpose of the fund was to give immediate relief to ex-servicemen in distress without their having to wait for trustees to meet and decide on such matters. This has been a great help to those people and I point out that the Poppy Day appeal has always received a wonderful response from the public. I was pleased to see that the trust fund that was set up could spare a substantial sum of money which was to be subsidized by the Commonwealth Government. The late Mr. R. A. Forde first introduced the scheme of Darby and Joan cottages and he apprised us of the land at Semaphore which is mentioned in the Bill. Let us hope that in the near future the building will be commenced, as I am sure it will be of great benefit to all concerned. I therefore have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

[Sitting suspended from 3.05 to 3.55 p.m.]

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 25. page 2063.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support this amending Bill, the purpose of which is to amend the principal Act of 1961 by inserting in various parts of the Act the words "agent" and "master". Its purpose is to permit the principal Act to be properly policed. One can readily appreciate that, if we have to prosecute the captain or owner of a ship after it has left port, serious delay can occur with the distinct possibility that it will be impossible at any time in the future to serve a summons upon either of them. But the addition of the word "agent" will make it easier for the principal Act to be given effect to.

With the advent of Port Stanvac and ships going there with oil, one can readily understand

the Government's desire to have an Act that is easily policed. I am not suggesting that Port Stanvac has been responsible for the mess that has been seen encroaching upon our beaches. Australian beaches have a particularly good name with the Australian people and it would be totally wrong to permit any pollution on them by the discharge of oil from any ship, particularly oil that may cause this trouble to continue, without some action being taken to prevent it. Such pollution, if permitted, would have a detrimental effect upon our beaches. The people who use them would not care to go to them, with the result that property, businesses and dwellings would lose some of their value. Any measure designed to prevent that kind of thing happening receives my full support. I do not think that this Bill needs long speeches on it, because all honourable members understand it and readily agree with its provisions.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I, too, rise to support the second reading of this Bill. We are all aware that the preservation of our beaches, as pointed out by the Minister in his second reading explanation and by Mr. Shard, is of vital interest to all people in this State. Therefore, any attempts to prevent pollution will be welcomed by the public.

As far back as I can remember, there have always been oil slicks and deposits of bituminous substances along the beaches of the south-east coast. I believe this occurs also along the rest of the South Australian coast. These deposits are submarine by nature and are often seen on our beaches and in the coastal waters. With the jettisoning of oil, it is often difficult to prove whether it has come from a ship or whether it is some of this normal deposit that occurs along our coastline. The problem is that the time taken to decide whether the pollution of the beaches is caused by natural agencies or by the discharge of oil into the water by a ship is such that it is often difficult to launch a prosecution against the owner or master of a ship. Therefore, this Bill inserts the word "agent" in the principal Act.

Section 5 (a) of the Act states that both the owner and the master of a ship are liable for a penalty, in such circumstances. As pointed out by Mr. Shard, this matter is of vital importance to many of our tourist beaches and resorts. Even a beach subject to pollution, say, once or twice a year suffers a serious disability in attracting tourists and maintaining its popularity. No doubt where this pollution takes place a fall in property values can occur and the development of that tourist resort

can be affected. Also, the oil pollution affects much more than our coastal waters and beaches; it affects our rivers and some of our inland lakes—in particular, the Coorong. A further point worth noting is the effect of oil pollution upon bird life. Many times I have seen penguins on the south-east coast dying because they have come into contact with oil in the water. Most of the oil causing this is discharged, possibly, from fishing boats in reasonably small quantities. Numbers of birds are affected. It is remarkable what harm can be done to penguins and other birds. I think that in Victoria the agent of a ship is already included among those who can be prosecuted, but I do not think that situation applies anywhere else in Australia. However, if the principal Act is to be given a chance to work effectively provision for an agent to be prosecuted is a worthwhile amendment. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE BILL.

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

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to give effect to arrangements that have been made between the Government and the Adelaide City Council regarding the widening of what I may call the Morphett Street—Montefiore traffic route of the City of Adelaide. Negotiations have been in progress, as honourable members are no doubt aware, for some time concerning this project which appears to be clearly necessary in the interests of facilitating the movement of traffic to and from the city by what will become a direct route. I think that it is hardly necessary for me to elaborate upon the necessity for an additional wide outlet from the city and the removal of a known bottleneck.

The proposal envisages a widening of the present Morphett Street between Hindley Street and North Terrace, a widening of part of North Terrace west of Morphett Street, provision of a short street from Hindley Street to Crippen Place, east of Morphett Street to carry traffic into Morphett Street. It involves also demolition of the existing Morphett Street bridge which was constructed in the eighties and the erection of a completely new and wider bridge in its place, the demolition of the present Victoria bridge over the Torrens and

erection of a wider bridge in its place with the attendant widening of the road between both bridges and the widening and straightening of the present route between Victoria bridge and Jeffcott Street. In this connection I would refer members to the plan in the schedule to the Bill which shows in general form the proposed new roadway from the northern end of Victoria bridge to Jeffcott Street and the present roadway between those two points.

It is estimated that the total cost of all the works required, including necessary acquisitions of property between Light Square and North Terrace, will be of the order of £1,500,000. It has been agreed that the Government should make all of these funds available in the first instance to enable the work to be undertaken, the council to repay one half over a period of 30 years after the completion of the works with interest at the normal loan fund rate.

This, in short, is the proposal. Legislation to enable the proposal to be carried out is necessary for several reasons. In the first place legislative authority is required in connection with the financing of the project. In the second place, legislation is necessary to enable demolition of the present Morphett Street bridge because it was built under statutory authority. Legislation is also required in connection with the new bridge because it will pass over railway property and clearly statutory authority is required for this purpose as well as for the purpose of preserving the position of the Railways Commissioner in respect of his railway lines. Lastly, legislative provision is required to declare the widened new roadway between Victoria bridge and Jeffcott Street to be made a public road and for the reversion of that part of the present road which goes around Montefiore Hill to the park lands. Specific authority is not required in connection with road widening as such or with the demolition and re-erection of the Victoria bridge as the council appears to have the necessary powers already over these matters under the Local Government Act. This Bill is accordingly introduced to give the necessary statutory authority.

Clause 3 authorizes the erection of the new Morphett Street bridge over North Terrace and across the railway yards, with power in the council to make the necessary contracts in connection therewith.

Clause 4 provides that the plans and specifications of the works are to be submitted to and approved by the Minister, a reasonable requirement in view of the financial assistance

which is being given by the Government in the matter. Clause 5 relates to works over the railway yards. It expressly gives the council power to enter the railway yards and perform works thereon but with two provisos. The first is that nothing is to be commenced until the council and Commissioner have agreed as to the manner and conditions under which the works are to be carried out, including conditions providing for payment by the council to the Commissioner for any works and services necessarily provided by him. Members will appreciate the need for such a provision. It is clearly necessary that no outside body should be empowered to operate over railway property without agreement with the Commissioner as to the manner of operation—otherwise considerable dislocation in the railway services, to say nothing of accident risks of a high order, could occur.

The condition regarding payment for necessary works and services stems from the fact that certain works such as the removal of buildings on railway property must necessarily be undertaken by the Commissioner himself; furthermore, it is the Commissioner's practice to exercise general supervision over works undertaken on his property as well as to provide overseers and the like to warn operators of the approach of trains and other possible sources of damage. The second condition, a usual one inserted in contracts with the Commissioner, is that the council is to indemnify the Commissioner against all claims arising out of or by reason of the exercise of the council powers. For example, the Commissioner could become liable to pay workmen's compensation or damages in circumstances which would not have arisen but for the presence of outside contractors upon his property. Any dispute upon the subject will be determined by the Commissioner of Highways.

Clause 6 empowers the council to demolish the existing Morphett Street bridge after which the Act of 1881 is repealed. Clause 7 provides that after the works have been completed the new Morphett Street bridge is to be under the care, control and management of the council (as was the old one) and provides, further, that the maintenance of the bridge is to be at the expense of the council. The reason for this last provision is that, without it, section 88 of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act would make the Commissioner liable for maintenance expenses. The last sentence of clause 7 provides that the bridge (like its predecessor) is to be exempted from rates and taxes. Clause 8 is in the nature of

a machinery clause in the usual form, providing for the declaration of the new roadway between the Victoria bridge and Jeffcott Street as a public street and the reversion of the portion which is to be closed around Montefiore Hill to parklands.

Clause 9 is the financial clause. Subclause (1) sets out that the cost of the works (which includes the whole scheme as outlined at the beginning of my remarks) will be shared between the Government and the council, with the proviso that the Government shall bear only so much of the excess over £1,500,000 as is approved by the Treasurer. Subclause (2) empowers the Treasurer on the Minister's certificate from time to time to meet all the costs in the first instance out of moneys from the Highways Fund or moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

Subclause (3) provides for repayment by the council of one half of amounts paid by the Treasurer with interest determined in accordance with subclause (4), the indebtedness of the council with interest to be paid in equal annual instalments beginning on a date after completion of the works to be determined by the Treasurer, but so that total liability will be extinguished over a period of 30 years after the completion. Details of the instalments are to be determined by the Treasurer. Subclause (4) is a machinery clause stating that the rate of interest is to be the average rate payable by the Treasurer upon all new loans with a currency of 10 years or more raised by him in the relevant financial year. In accordance with Joint Standing Orders the Bill and the scheme which it covers were examined by a Select Committee in another place. As a result of its deliberations the committee recommended its passage in its present form.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I rise to support the second reading. I shall not recapitulate all that has been said by the Minister. There are provisions in the Bill that protect the rights of the Railways Commissioner and also for the plans and specifications of the new bridge to be endorsed by the Minister. I think they are necessary; indeed, I should add that the construction of the bridge is a necessary project to overcome our traffic problems that are becoming more acute from day to day. There has been much discussion in another place about this measure and, as the Minister pointed out, the Bill has been introduced as the result of a Select Committee's inquiries, the report of which comprised five foolscap pages. The committee inquired into various aspects, such as the suitability of the bridge, its site and so on.

I understand that members of the committee dealt with alternatives that were not suggested in another place and from their considered opinions they have reported favourably on this project. I do not set myself up as a traffic expert. Although it is quite all right for lay people to express an opinion on such proposals as the Morphett Street bridge, in the final analysis it is the expert who formulates the plans for the proposal. In other words—and I may be a little facetious here—one would not go to a blacksmith to have a pair of spectacles made. So, in this case one would go only to an expert to determine whether a project would assist the traffic problem of South Australia (and more particularly Adelaide) or whether it was a redundant proposal. In perusing the Bill I find only one clause to which I take exception and it relates to the payments by the City Council to the Government.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Which clause is that?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Clause 9. As the Minister has said, this project will cost £1,500,000 which will be provided by the Government at the normal rate of interest on borrowings at the particular time. The portion to which I take exception and on which I should like further elucidation from the Minister states:

Notwithstanding any provisions of the Local Government Act to the contrary the council is by this Act authorized to take all necessary steps to enable it to discharge its indebtedness under this subsection.

I should like to know whether the council will extract a toll from motorists travelling from north to south and whether it will impose a special rate upon city ratepayers to keep up the payments to the Government that will be made over a period of 30 years. The Bill as it stands gives the council wide powers and I think it should contain some provision to show exactly how the council should raise the moneys.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Didn't the Select Committee inquire into that aspect?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I do not know. I am not concerned with any other passage of the Bill except this one which gives the council such wide powers.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I suggest you look at clause 7.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am making the speech. We are not all members of the Public Works Committee; we do not know all the angles. There is only one Minister in this Chamber from whom I should like this information for myself: are these powers too wide and too arbitrary to be resting with the

City Council? I point out at this stage that this legislation provides for a bridge to extend over the railway yards and that certain protections have been afforded the Railways Commissioner. I refer now to the possibility of roofing the railway yards for car parking space. Whether this be put into the hands of the Government, the Railways Commissioner or the City Council with amending legislation I am not concerned but suggest that, in view of the bridge's forming part of an arterial roadway and this being an area in the city of Adelaide suitable for parking space, provision should be made accordingly. I have no further comments to offer at this stage. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. As has been mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph, a Select Committee has inquired into this matter. I do not think there is any doubt at all in the minds of honourable members about the necessity for this project because we who travel on this bridge are aware of the bottleneck at the Morphett Street bridge. It will undoubtedly become worse unless the matter is remedied fairly quickly. I think great precaution has been taken in this matter to look after the interests of the Railways Commissioner. We always seem to do that sort of thing. I do not know why.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is the property of the people that is involved.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He certainly has been given the bulk of protection under this Bill.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: That is to protect the taxpayers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I suppose it is, but I notice that the Highways Commissioner, as usual, is making the largest contribution to the expenditure.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Railways Commissioner would not have anything to put into it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, I expect not, except a spanner, if I may say so. The point Mr. Bardolph has made about clause 9, relating to financial provision, needs some explanation from the Minister. I have no doubt that had we had an opportunity to read the Select Committee's report we should have found some solution to this problem.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is not in the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I confess that I have not had a chance to read the report and I think this aspect needs some explanation

from the Minister. I do not have any reason to talk at length on the Bill because it must certainly improve the flow of traffic. I do not know how long the project will take, but the sooner it is commenced the better. I was intrigued to see in the initial stages of the Bill that the City Council "is hereby authorized and empowered to erect and construct a good and substantial bridge over North Terrace and across the railway yards . . .". I presume the Minister and everybody else concerned have taken great precautions to see that this will be "a good and substantial bridge" and that we shall not have any cracks in our new Morphett Street bridge such as have occurred in some other places. I hope that the people letting the various tenders will see that they get the right contractors to carry out the right type of construction on this project. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill. I have no objection to it in itself, but what worries me most is how the proposal will fit in with the overall master plan for the city of Adelaide. Is the work to be done by piecemeal methods? I have no objection to its being done in parts, provided those parts fit in with the master plan. The bridge will tend to channel further traffic into the present restricted outlets to the north of Adelaide, and I refer particularly to the Main North Road. No effort seems to have been made to try to channel traffic to other outlets to the north of the city. I thought that some effort would have been made to find an alternative way of getting traffic out of Adelaide. I feel that the logical way to relieve the present outlets would be to channel traffic through the western suburbs more than is the case now, possibly along Churchill Road, but at times that road is congested with traffic. The access to that road from the city is limited, which is an aspect that should be rectified.

Possibly we should be looking further ahead than we are and thinking of the scheme the Victorians are considering at present in relation to elevated roads over and along railway lines. The day may come when it will be necessary for us to build elevated roads over property, and the logical property would be railway lines. If that were done there would be no acquisition costs, only the costs associated with the building of the elevated roadways. Although I have no objection to the Bill, I think the overall master plan should be adhered to more than it is now, and that we should endeavour to put into

operation certain portions of that plan rather than do things in a piecemeal fashion, as we are at present. As the project in the Bill is a necessity at this stage, I feel that I must support the second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I think it best that I explain at this stage, rather than in Committee, the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Bardolph. The provision they mentioned states:

Notwithstanding any provisions of the Local Government Act, 1934-1963, to the contrary, the council is by this Act authorized to take all steps necessary to enable it to discharge its indebtedness under this subsection.

Under section 856 of the Local Government Act the Adelaide City Council has certain borrowing powers, and there is a general borrowing power under section 425. In this instance the City Council does not want the money borrowed to be covered by the provisions in the Local Government Act dealing with its borrowings.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why not put it in the Bill?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I think it would require an amendment of the Local Government Act. In any case, I do not think it is necessary.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Maintenance of bridge."

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: There has grown up in this place a loose way of drafting Bills. Measures put before us should state specifically what they mean. This clause says:

Upon completion of the said bridge the said bridge shall be under the care, control and management of the council and shall, notwithstanding section 88 of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, 1936-1957, be maintained by and at the expense of the council. The said bridge shall be exempt from all and all manner of rates and taxes whatsoever local or otherwise.

I would like an explanation of that from the Minister. My interpretation of it is that the structure shall have no taxes imposed on it for being situated there. If I get a satisfactory explanation from the Minister, I may have something more to say about the other matter I raised.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I cannot follow the trend of the honourable member's argument. The governing words are "Upon completion". Then the council shall do certain things, and "the said bridge shall be exempt from all and all manner

of rates and taxes whatsoever local or otherwise". I take it that refers to the possibility of imposing tolls.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: That explanation does not satisfy me. The clause says "The said bridge shall be exempt". To be more specific it should say "the ratepayers of the city of Adelaide shall be exempt". That is my point, and the Minister has not explained the matter satisfactorily.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: As I see it, if a toll were imposed everybody using the bridge would pay it, and not only the ratepayers of Adelaide. This is a provision to prevent the imposition of a toll on everybody.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I did not suggest a toll. I am saying that the clause refers to only the bridge being exempt.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Do you want to say "the bridge and all the users"?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Yes. The other point I raised concerns another clause.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I feel that the words "the bridge" are used in a general way, as in the short title where the Morphett Street bridge is mentioned. If the honourable member is talking about a roadway as well as a bridge, that matter is mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I suggest that the Minister report progress and obtain further information because I am not prepared to accept the definition he has given.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: These matters were expressly placed before a Select Committee of another place that has gone into all details and I am satisfied.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Financial provision."

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am concerned with the part of this clause that reads:

Notwithstanding any provisions of the Local Government Act 1934-1963 to the contrary, the council is by this Act authorized to take all necessary steps to enable it to discharge its indebtedness under this subsection.

To make this clear, after "necessary steps" the words "with regard to its borrowing powers" should be inserted to enable it to discharge its indebtedness under this subclause. As it now stands, I believe the clause gives all-embracing powers, which could be interpreted freely by the Adelaide City Council as to what methods it should adopt to liquidate its indebtedness to the Government. I believe that the Minister should allow progress to be reported because I showed him the courtesy of speaking on this Bill this afternoon instead of seeking an adjournment, as is the usual custom when Bills of this nature are first brought before the Chamber.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I ask the honourable member what steps he imagines the council would take to pay its indebtedness.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Honourable members have not had an opportunity to see the Select Committee's report and this clause concerns Opposition members. The Minister's explanation was not satisfactory to me, bearing in mind the way that the Adelaide City Council sometimes raises money. When I was a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation we had to deal with fees for car parking at the Adelaide Oval and in the park lands. The council raised the parking fee from 1s. to 2s., when a 6d. increase would have been sufficient, because of the convenience of the coin. If a toll is ever put on the new bridge people will not use it and traffic will be forced to go another way, which will cause congestion. I want to know if the clause gives the council permission to put a toll on the proposed bridge. Our concern may be unjustified, but I suggest that the Minister should report progress and let us have this information.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: As honourable members have quite rightly pointed out, they have not had an opportunity to peruse the report of the Select Committee. I believe that the request to have progress reported is reasonable and I move accordingly.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.32 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, February 27, at 2.15 p.m.