

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 19, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

STRATA TITLES.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: As there is a lull in the building industry and as it is important that every effort should be made to enliven this industry at the earliest possible moment, many builders and their clients, I am informed, are awaiting with great interest the Bill concerning strata titles referred to in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. It will be appreciated that a clarification of this matter of strata titles will enable further building contracts to be started and will provide a firmer basis than exists at present for the provision of finance in this sphere of the building industry. Can the Chief Secretary say whether it is likely that this Bill will be introduced early in the session?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Government has given consideration to this Bill and intends to introduce it. As we all know, it was mentioned last session. I understand that the Attorney-General and the Parliamentary Draftsman have given much consideration to the matter and, to my limited knowledge, there are difficulties in the framing of legislation regarding strata building, as I understand it is termed. I shall discuss the matter with the Attorney-General in order to ascertain when the Bill will be ready and when it is intended to introduce it.

DIREK SIDING.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of June 21 regarding Direk siding?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have an answer in the following terms:

The cost of constructing the railway deviation was only a fraction of the cost that would be necessary to establish a siding at Direk. If the siding was provided, it would be used only by the Metropolitan Wholesale Meat Co. Ltd. and would, therefore, have to be regarded as a private siding. Accordingly, consideration will not be given to providing a siding and loading facilities at departmental expense, but the department would be prepared to build these facilities if the company was prepared to pay for and maintain them. However, negotiations

are in hand between officers of the Railways Department and the local council with a view to clarifying the nature and extent of the disability caused by sheep movements and ascertaining whether any remedial action by the department is possible.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I thank the Minister for his reply. Will he now say whether the Railways Department has made any proposition to the Metropolitan Wholesale Meat Co. Ltd. about helping to bear the cost of constructing a spur line at this location?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know, but I shall have an inquiry made and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

SCHOOL TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to a question I asked on June 22 about school travel concessions?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. Any child under 15 years of age is entitled to a ticket at children's (or half) rate, which is equivalent to the under-16 student's concession. It is proposed to extend a similar concession to schoolchildren over the age of 15 years travelling to places other than their own homes on *excate* and long weekends. A regulation to give effect to this will be prepared in due course.

WORKS PROGRAMME

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked last week about the works programme, which the Premier claimed it was not possible for the State to carry out as it was committed by the previous Government?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member asked a question some time ago, and last week asked when he could get an answer. I referred the matter to the Premier, who furnished the following report:

My reference to the incoming Government's having inherited a works programme proceeding at a rate greater than the volume of funds forthcoming did not suggest that any particular works or commitments were unnecessary or undesirable. On the contrary, as the greater number of these works had already been examined and recommended by the all-Party Public Works Committee, the Government would not wish to single out any particular work or project and suggest that it should not have been commenced. However, it is apparent that in a rapidly developing country like ours there is such a heavy requirement of desirable works that a responsible Government must make a selection having regard to relative priorities and to the funds available. It,

then, must get the more urgent ones done before committing itself to starting others. The volume of works in progress when the incoming Government took over was such that it was not financially possible to proceed with them all as rapidly as was economically desirable, and it was impossible to commence new works without retarding the progress and increasing the cost of those already commenced. When the 1966-67 works programme is placed before Parliament, members will then be able to identify which works the Government has felt it necessary to complete expeditiously and which it has reluctantly decided to ease back to keep within the funds available.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I was concerned this morning, as I am sure were all members, regardless of Party, to read a report in the daily press about the deterioration in employment figures. I noted with some concern that over 7,300 people were registered as unemployed in South Australia and that there had been a considerable reduction in the number of vacancies, which had decreased to 1,500. As almost 4,000 more South Australians are unemployed now than were unemployed 18 months ago, will the Chief Secretary say what steps are being taken or are envisaged to stop the drift in unemployment figures?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Nobody likes to see an increase in unemployment figures; and certainly the Government does not. True, in the last few months there have been more people unemployed than there were 12 months ago, but it may not be that it is confined only to South Australia: it may be Australia-wide, and perhaps the position is not as bad now as it was previously. The Government is doing everything in its power to continue public works under the Loan Estimates in order to keep the work force employed as fully as possible. Naturally, the Government has not had the chance to examine the figures published this morning; I have glanced at them just casually. No doubt the Treasurer (I know this is true) as Minister of Housing is taking all possible steps to expedite the housing programme and public works. I could have asked for this question to be placed on notice, as involving a matter of policy, but I did not want to shirk the issue. I assure the honourable member and the public at large that the Government will do everything possible to ensure that unemployment in South Australia is kept to a minimum.

KESWICK AND JERVOIS BRIDGES.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I note that tenders are now being called for the erection of the Jervois bridge and for ancillary works. At present we have the Keswick bridge, the Hackney bridge, numerous freeway overpasses and underpasses below Crafrers, and inevitably the overpass to go with the duplication of the main north line railway bridge, just past Cavan. These works are all in or adjacent to the metropolitan area. In the circumstances, does the Government intend to defray the cost of the Keswick and Jervois bridges from Loan funds in order to be able to maintain, and in fact improve, highway facilities in the country areas?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is not anticipated that the costs of the bridges referred to by Sir Norman will be defrayed from Loan funds: the work will be done from the Highways Fund.

BASIC WAGE.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Following the reply given by the Minister to Sir Lyell McEwin last week, I have since had the opportunity of looking at the recent basic wage and margins judgment given by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. I notice that it states, among other things, that it was felt that, pending consideration of a report to be made by Mr. Commissioner Winter covering the whole structure of the wage margins in the Metal Trades Award, some immediate relief should be given to the male low wage earners under that award, and as an interim order, therefore, the commission said that in South Australia no adult male employee under the award should receive an actual wage of less than \$36.05; that is, a basic wage of \$32.30 plus a margin of \$3.75. I understand from what the Minister said last week that Cabinet has decided that, in ascertaining whether any particular employee is in receipt of such a wage or not, the amount, if any, of service pay that he may be receiving is to be disregarded. In other words, the Government has chosen to treat the new minimum actual wage (specifically stated as

such in the judgment given by the commission) as a minimum award rate. My question to the Minister is in three parts: first, does he agree that this is the actual position; secondly, does he not agree that there will be repercussions from this decision in that employers in outside industries will inevitably be forced to follow the Government's action and so ignore the specific terms of the commission's judgment; and thirdly, will he give the Council the reason why Cabinet made such an important decision contrary to the commission's judgment?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: As these are matters of policy I ask the honourable member to place the question on notice.

OVERSEA TOUR.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry representing the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 12 regarding overseas tour expenses of employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The reply to the question "Will the Minister reveal the estimated expenditure on this overseas tour" is \$6,950, and the answer to the question "Does he consider such expenditure worthwhile and prudent in view of the present financial position of the State" is "Yes".

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of June 28 concerning the appointment of justices of the peace?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. It is as follows:

All members of the House of Assembly have now been circularized with lists of existing justices in their districts, together with proposed quotas for the various areas within their districts, showing where there are vacancies for the appointment of justices. After the members of the House of Assembly have agreed with the Attorney-General the appropriate quotas for their districts, then all outstanding applications for justices of the peace will be dealt with as against those quotas speedily.

HOSPITAL RATING.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the contributory scheme for the Lyell McEwin Hospital under Part XIX of the Local Government Act. In the first place, I believe that the average contribution by city councils

to hospitals is about 2½ per cent of rate revenue and for country councils it is about 6 per cent. The demands of the Lyell McEwin Hospital have risen to such an extent that I am led to believe the contributions of some councils will be about 10 per cent. I omitted to mention at the beginning of my question that it also concerns the Chief Secretary. My immediate reference is to the request for an amendment to the scheme under Part XIX of the Local Government Act as it applies to the Lyell McEwin Hospital made in a joint letter from the Munno Para District Council and the cities of Salisbury and Elizabeth of December 13 last year. I believe that this was referred from the Minister of Local Government to the Chief Secretary to obtain his views, and I understand that the Chief Secretary requested that a meeting be held with the councils in April of this year. This meeting was duly held and the councils were advised that they would receive an answer in due course.

I have been advised that to date no answer has been received and in view of the fact (as honourable members are aware) that all district councils are busily preparing budgets for the forthcoming year and that those budgets will have to be presented to the next meeting of the local government bodies concerned, I ask the Minister whether he is able to provide an answer for all the local government bodies I have mentioned.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I consider that the question should have been directed to the Chief Secretary instead of to myself. The matters were referred to the Chief Secretary and I understand from the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that the Chief Secretary met the representatives, discussed these matters and informed them that he would notify them later. As I understand the question at present, the complaint is that the councils have not been notified whether any relief is to be given to them in connection with their contributions towards the maintenance of hospitals.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is right.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: So, as I see it, the question should not have been directed to me but to the Chief Secretary so that it could be ascertained whether the remarks made by the honourable member in relation to no reply having been received are fact or otherwise. I do not know.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In view of the Minister's statement, I must explain that I directed the question to him because the letter had been addressed to him in the first place.

However, having regard to the remarks of the Minister, I refer the question to the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The facts of the case, as outlined, are correct. The Minister of Local Government referred the matter to me, I met a deputation from the three councils concerned some time in May, I think—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: On April 4.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know the exact date. The matter has been referred to the officers of the Auditor-General's Department for thorough examination of the position. I point out that the agreement is only about 15 months old. The previous Government, after much discussion, wanted it altered and wanted to know the facts on it. As yet, I have not received the report but I assure the honourable member that, as soon as I receive and consider it, the various bodies will be notified.

COUNCIL ABOLITION.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Last Friday I, together with the Minister of Local Government, had the opportunity and pleasure of attending the opening of the new Freeling District Council offices. The Minister, during his speech, made reference to the work of the Local Government Act Revision Committee and went on to say that, when a Bill was eventually presented to Parliament, there would no doubt be plenty of material for argument by both Houses of Parliament; that was, if there were still two Houses of Parliament by that time. Can the Minister say whether the implication to be gathered from his remarks is that it is the intention of the Government again to introduce legislation for the purpose of abolishing the Legislative Council or whether he considers that the revised Local Government Act will not come before Parliament until some time in the distant future?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: To answer the last question first, an investigation such as is going on at present into the whole aspects of the Local Government Act will take some time, as I think every honourable member will appreciate. I suggest that, when it is completed, it will have to be examined by whatever Government is in power at the time. I assume that a Bill will then be prepared and presented to Parliament. All this will take some time. I did make the remark, "If both

Houses of Parliament are in operation at that time". Everyone is aware that the policy of the Labor Party provides for the abolition of the Legislative Council and I am not making any apology here this afternoon for the policy. Hence, I made that statement.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Premier recently made a statement that the Government would spend \$1,340,000 on improvements at Roseworthy Agricultural College, mainly in connection with a new science block. Can the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier, say how much of this money will be provided by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I only know what I read in the newspaper when I was a long way from Adelaide. If the question is placed on notice, I shall try to obtain an answer.

HOSPITAL FEES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In Mount Gambier at the weekend I was informed that there had been a change in theatre fees charged at the Mount Gambier Hospital. A private room patient is now charged \$16 theatre fee, as against a fee of \$6 that a ward patient is charged. Can the Chief Secretary say whether this information is correct and, if it is, can he offer any reason for the differentiation between the theatre fees payable by patients in different wards?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not want to commit myself regarding exact figures but I understand that these fees have been changed as from April 1. This procedure has been carried out previously but, as the reason for the change has been sought, I should like to find out exactly. There was some increase in theatre fees when the private ward and general ward fees were increased. I should like to be clear about what has been the practice in the past and about whether that practice has been carried on.

TEA TREE GULLY HOSPITAL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The previous Government made arrangements for and assisted in the purchase of land for the erection of a hospital at Tea Tree Gully. Now, with a change of Government and a change of policy, that has been altered and I understand from press reports that a new site has been obtained for the building of a Government hospital. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the land, which was purchased on a two-to-one subsidy basis as between the council and the Government, has been disposed of and, if so, on what conditions?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot say with complete certainty that the land has been sold but I know that negotiations have taken place with a view to having the land reverted to the Tea Tree Gully council. I am not sure whether the negotiations have concluded or what the conditions were. However, I shall find out and let the Leader know.

BRUCE BOXES.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Recently the Minister of Agriculture provided me with the evidence upon which the choice of the citrus box known as the Bruce box was based. I have perused this file with much interest, and there is no doubt in my mind that our contention that this subject needed further thought was more than justified. There is no sign on that file of the very painstaking and wide-range inquiry that should underlie a decision of such costly importance to the industry concerned.

In fact, I can see nothing in the nature of convincing proof on the very few enclosures on the file which are relevant; there is merely a statement of opinion. I have had to defend the choice of this box against factually reported detailed investigations that have come to me from a wide area, and I have placed on the file for the information of the Minister copies of the summary of some of those investigations. I refer him also to other specific authorities that should be looked at in this matter.

The first is the 1965 report to the Florida State Citrus Marketing Authority by a market investigation corporation; the second and third

are the preliminary and final reports by Mr. J. V. Seekamp, Bachelor of Agricultural Science, on his investigations in Palestine, Spain, Florida and California, which were presented to the board of the Renmark Fruit-growers Co-operative Ltd. this year; and the fourth is the report to this board by Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. recently on the planning for the projected reorganization. Can the Minister give an assurance that these recent sources of information will be considered before any further pronouncements are made on the matter?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Agriculture for investigation and report.

BOTTLE DEPOSITS.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I was perturbed at a report in this morning's *Advertiser* that in the coming summer months there would probably be many more bottles strewn around the countryside because refunds of deposits would not be made on empty soft drink bottles. At present there is a refund of 5c on each bottle, and this assures the return of the bottle. Will the Chief Secretary refer this matter to the Premier, who is Minister in charge of the Prices Department, and ask him to take up the matter with that department to ensure that there will be no increase in the prices of drinks and that the deposit at present being paid will no longer be charged?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to the Premier.

SUPREME COURT STRONG ROOMS.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Has the Chief Secretary obtained a reply to a question I asked on June 23 about storage accommodation in the Supreme Court strong rooms?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Acting Master of the Supreme Court reports:

There are two strong rooms for the storage of files at this court. The ground floor room situated opposite the Master's office contains the files most often needed. These files are available to solicitors on very short notice. The files kept in this room are: criminal, the current year and two preceding years; civil, the current year and three preceding years; and matrimonial, the current year and two preceding years. In addition, such older files as are known to the staff to be current are kept in this room. This is all that the room will conveniently hold, and generally this degree of ready availability is found to be adequate. The

remainder of the files are stored in an underground strong room situated under courtrooms 4 and 5. If a file is required urgently from this strong room, there is a short delay while a clerk goes down to get it. At busy times the delay may be as long as five minutes, but it is very seldom longer. If a file is not urgently required, the records office staff, with my approval, asks solicitors to come back later, and they make two regular trips down to the strong room each day. Solicitors who are familiar with the procedure quite often telephone in advance to ask for files. If the need for a file is said to be urgent the staff makes no further inquiry but goes down and gets the file. This system works quite satisfactorily.

The matter of the availability of storage space for files has had my attention from time to time during the last few years, and I have today made a further personal inspection of the underground strong room. There is shelving erected adequate to hold the files for at least a further four years, and there is space in which shelving can be erected adequate to hold files for at least a further three years. In about six years' time consideration will have to be given to the problem of storing the files, and I have a number of solutions in mind, but there would seem to be little point in going into this matter at present. I do not expect any great difficulty.

UNLEY PARK CROSSING.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Transport say when the Unley Park railway crossing on Cross Road will be rebuilt with modern traffic barriers?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I cannot say at this stage, but I shall have inquiries made in an endeavour to answer the question.

WINE GRAPES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, who represents the Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: About 12 months ago the Minister of Agriculture said he would take up with the Agricultural Council at its next meeting having a Commonwealth plan for wine grape marketing. Can the Minister of Local Government say whether these discussions have reached a stage that will enable any statement to be made on progress on a Commonwealth basis to bring some form of marketing plan into operation for the next season's harvest?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a report.

GAWLER SEWERAGE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Transport obtained a reply from the Minister of Works to a question I asked on June 29 about the extension of sewerage to the Gawler district?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague the Minister of Works has informed me that the sewerage scheme for Gawler is a major one and must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation and consideration. In view of the restriction of Loan funds for current and future works which affect the department's programming, it is likely that the scheme will be ready for presentation to the committee towards the latter part of this financial year. If funds can be made available during 1968-69 and the scheme is recommended by the committee and approved by the Government, it may be possible for a start to be made in that financial year.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE LIFT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of June 28 about the Parliament House lift?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has supplied the following answer:

During the recent Parliamentary recess, the department undertook the remodelling of the large lift in Parliament House. The work was completed on June 20. The modifications required to overcome conditions which had previously resulted in the lift's being out of action on several occasions, and at the same time to produce a result which conforms to the requirements of the Lift Act, entailed a great deal of alterations to the car, the lift shaft and the motor room, together with many on-the-spot improvisations. Unfortunately, a minor defect in the car door interlocking device occurred on Tuesday, June 28, but was rectified as soon as a lift mechanic could determine the exact nature of the fault. Every effort will be made to prevent further faults of this nature. The cost of the complete conversion of this lift was \$6,825. It is not anticipated that any further work will be required on this lift.

EFFLUENT CHANNEL.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Works, an answer to my question of July 5 about the use of effluent from the Bolivar treatment works?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The report of the committee of inquiry into the utilization of effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works was tabled in both Houses on July 12. The report indicates that, if effluent utilization is proceeded with, relatively simple intake works would be provided in the channel in the

vicinity of section 142, hundred of Port Adelaide. The effluent would be discharged to an effluent pumping station for reticulation to a possible irrigation scheme.

RING ROADS.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Roads say whether it is the policy of the Highways Department to continue with its ring route roadway plan around the periphery of the Adelaide park lands?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: At this stage, I would say it is the intention of the department to continue with these roads.

CASES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (on notice):

1. How many people are employed in the production of case timber in the Woods and Forests Department mills in the South-East?

2. Where are these people located?

3. How many will be displaced from their industry with the proposed introduction of the Bruce box?

4. Is any royalty payable on the manufacture of the Bruce box to overseas interests?

5. Is any research being conducted to produce a comparable container from within our own State's economy?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The replies are:

1. 103.

2. 64 at Mount Gambier, 23 at Mount Burr, and 16 at Nangwarry.

3. The Bruce box has already been introduced, but the question of its replacement to any significant degree of the standard box has yet to be determined. In any event, it is felt that alternative products from the saw-mills will prevent any material displacement of labour from industry.

4. The Bruce box is being manufactured by a private firm in South Australia and, beyond a knowledge that the production machine is an American one, the department is not aware of any conditions relating to its use.

5. No.

VIRGINIA TRUCKING YARDS.

The Hon. L. R. HART (on notice):

1. What is the total cost of the recent rebuilding of the cattle trucking yards at the Virginia railway station?

2. How many cattle have been trucked from the Virginia railway station during the last three years?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. \$593,50.

2. Nil.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

Northfield High School,
Oaklands High School.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Enfield General Cemetery Act, 1944-1960. Read a first time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act, most of which have been recommended by the Enfield General Cemetery Trust and the Auditor-General. The Bill also provides for the disqualification as a member of the trust of a councillor of the Corporation of the City of Enfield who ceases to be such a councillor. It confers on the trust power to borrow money for erecting a crematorium and effecting other improvements and makes amendments relating to the investment of the trust's reserve fund, payment of members of the trust and other minor matters. Clause 3 of the Bill brings up to date the reference to the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Enfield in section 5 of the principal Act.

Clause 4 inserts in the principal Act a new section 6a, subsection (1) of which provides that, if a member of the trust who was appointed on the nomination of the city of Enfield was, at the time of his appointment, a member of the Enfield Municipal Council, he shall cease to be a member of the trust and vacate his office as such upon his ceasing to be a member of that municipal council. Subsection (2) provides, however, that subsection (1) shall not apply to a person who, before the Bill becomes law, was a member of the trust and whose term of office had not expired at such commencement. In other words, the section will apply only to members of the Enfield Municipal Council who are appointed members of the trust after the Bill becomes law. Clause 5 inserts in the principal Act a new section 24a under which the trust may, with the consent of the Minister, borrow money for the purpose of constructing a crematorium or of effecting other capital improvements. The repayment of such borrowings may be secured by mortgaging any land

within the cemetery not used for burial purposes. Clause 6 amends section 25 of the principal Act by enabling the trust to apply its revenue in the repayment of moneys borrowed pursuant to section 24a and in payment of interest thereon and expenses incidental thereto.

Clause 7 amends section 26 of the principal Act by extending the Trust's powers to invest its reserve fund in securities guaranteed by the Government of the State or the Commonwealth or in securities guaranteed by or under the authority of a State or Commonwealth Act or by the Treasurer of the State. Clause 8 amends section 31 of the principal Act by striking out the upper limits for members' fees—namely, £50 in the case of the chairman and £25 in the case of other members. This will enable the fees to be fixed having regard to changes in money values. Section 33 at present makes it mandatory for the trust, upon request by any religious denomination, whatever its strength or constitution, to set apart portion of the cemetery for the burial of persons of that denomination. Clause 9 amends the section so as to make it merely permissive for the trust so to do. The Bill is in the nature of a hybrid Bill and, in accordance with Standing Orders, will have to be referred to a Select Committee.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1959. Read a first time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the second reading explanation to be given without delay.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): On a point of order: if the Minister obtains the suspension of Standing Orders, will he give the Council an undertaking that copies of the Bill will be available tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT: It is a matter of whether leave to suspend Standing Orders is granted or not. Is it the wish of honourable members that leave be granted?

Motion carried.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Before giving the explanation of this Bill, I inform the Honourable Sir Norman that the print of the Bill is not on members' files, but I do not desire the debate to proceed until such time as prints are available. The object of this Bill is to

strengthen the provisions made by the principal Act in 1959 to conserve underground waters within the State. It is unnecessary for me to do more than refer to the general shortage of water throughout the State, in many areas of which we are dependent upon the supply of underground water. The principal Act, passed in 1959, was designed primarily to prevent contamination and deterioration in the quality of underground waters. The principal object of this Bill is to prevent deterioration in quantity as well as quality. Accordingly, the Bill makes certain provisions regarding the prevention of the wastage of water, artesian wells, and the licensing of well drillers. The Bill also provides for the abolition of The Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination. I shall deal with these matters in order.

The first set of provisions relates to the prevention of wastage of water. Section 9 of the principal Act empowers the Minister to refuse application for, or to revoke, permits for the sinking or deepening of wells or other works connected therewith if he believes that the work would be likely to cause contamination or deterioration of underground water and "deterioration" is defined by section 4 as meaning deterioration in quality. Clause 7 amends section 9 by empowering the Minister to refuse an application for a permit or to revoke a permit if he believes that the work would be likely to cause contamination or deterioration (as at present provided) or likely to cause inequitable distribution, loss, wastage or depletion in the supplies of underground water. Clauses 8, 9 and 10 make consequential amendments to sections 11, 12 and 18 of the principal Act relating to terms and conditions in permits, transfer and variation of permits and directions to owners or occupiers. Clause 11 makes special provision regarding artesian wells and the wastage of water. New section 20a requires artesian wells to be capped or equipped with valves to regulate or stop the flow of water. New section 20b prohibits a person from causing or allowing underground water to run to waste or extracting from any well underground water in excess of his reasonable requirements with an exemption where the water interferes or threatens to interfere with the operation of underground works so far as wastage is unavoidable. New section 20c requires persons sinking, deepening or enlarging wells who discover an artesian well to notify the Minister in writing of the discovery and under section 18 the powers of the Minister to give directions to owners or occupiers are applied to wells in which an artesian well is

discovered. There is an exemption in the case of a well being sunk under licence under the Mining (Petroleum) Act, 1940-1963.

Clause 12 of the Bill repeals Part III of the principal Act constituting The Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination. It is felt that in view of the provision for repeal to Part IV of the principal Act the advisory committee is unnecessary. Accordingly, the whole of Part III of the principal Act is repealed and in its stead is enacted a new Part III providing a system for the licensing of well drillers. This is regarded as essential to any scheme of control. Just as persons are required to seek permits before sinking wells, so are persons required to be licensed before they may undertake construction or deepening of wells beyond a prescribed depth. These matters are provided for in new sections 21 to 23e, while section 23f provides for an appeal to the appeal board against refusal or cancellation of a well driller's licence.

Consequential amendments are made by clauses 13, 14 and 15. It will be seen that by clause 13 the appeal board is increased from a membership of three to a membership of four, the extra member, who is to be a member of the Licensed Well Drillers Association, being provided for by clause 14. In view of the increase, provision is made by clause 15 for the majority decision to be increased from two to three members of the board. Clause 16 corrects a printing error in section 36 of the principal Act and clause 17 makes certain necessary amendments consequential on the introduction of decimal currency. Clause 18 empowers the Governor to prescribe different depths to apply in different parts of the State. This relates back to the provisions relating to the licensing of well drillers. The remaining provisions of the Bill are formal or consequential.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 13. Page 436.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): At this late stage in the debate I would like to mention a few matters, primarily in answer to criticisms that have been levelled during the course of the debate. However, before proceeding to do this, I join other honourable members in their expressions of sympathy to the families of former members who, unfortunately, have passed on. I

was closely associated with some of those members, particularly the late Sir Frank Perry, with whom I was associated from the time I became a member of this Chamber in 1951. I appreciate the enormous amount of work that the late Sir Frank did on behalf of the State, not only in this Council but also as an industrialist. One must regret the unfortunate passing of such a gentleman when the time arrives. Likewise, I express sympathy to the families of other former members who have passed on. Their passing has been a loss to the State.

I also add my congratulations to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and express my appreciation of his opening of this session and of the address that he delivered. I should like to take the opportunity at this stage of referring to the return of His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan from their sojourn overseas. It is very pleasing to see that His Excellency and Lady Bastyan have returned in such fine spirits. I know that not only honourable members but also all other residents of the State are thankful for the return of His Excellency and Lady Bastyan after their holiday and are happy that they are enjoying such good health.

I desire to make one or two comments on the debate on the Address in Reply but do not want to appear over-critical in any way. I may not say today all that I would normally desire to say on such an occasion. However, honourable members will have ample opportunity to express themselves, if they so desire, when the Loan Estimates and the Budget are before us. At this late stage, I am sure it is considered that this debate should be completed soon and the address presented to His Excellency, and I have that in mind this afternoon.

I should like to deal with one or two matters to which the Hon. Mr. Dawkins referred. He said that the present Government was jumping on the band wagon and trying to claim credit for what the Playford Government had initiated, and he said that this would not wash. We have heard statements in relation to the work that the previous Government initiated, and even this afternoon an answer has been given in relation to matters referred to the Public Works Committee before the last election, and much work was referred to that committee not long before that election. Doubtless, the Playford Government did initiate many references to the committee at that time. Hazarding a guess, I would say that the investigation of work so referred would

keep the committee in operation for the next five years.

If the investigation of the Sturt Creek proposal by the committee is an example, it will take much longer to bring down reports on matters already referred to it. After the last election, following statements apparently made during the election campaign, honourable members opposite were quick to ask questions regarding the intention of the Government in relation to these works, and they asked whether it was not the intention of the Government to continue the policy of the previous Liberal and Country League Government. In other words, some honourable members feared that, because of the change of Government, matters that had been referred to the Public Works Committee by the previous Government would not be proceeded with by this Government and that we would introduce new programmes that, perhaps, should have precedence.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Their fears were well founded.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No, they were not. The honourable member received an answer this afternoon—

The Hon. C. R. Story: There was some trouble about Giles Point, and what has happened to the Keith water scheme?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We know what has happened. It has not been abandoned or pushed out, as has been suggested. The project has been adopted by the Government. Perhaps I should ask the honourable member himself what has happened to projects that were referred to the Public Works Committee a couple of years prior to the defeat of the previous Government and even before that time. What has happened to recommendations of the Public Works Committee that have not yet seen the light of day? I was a member of that committee before the last election and have some recollection of matters that were reported upon but have not come to pass yet. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins mentioned contributions under the Road Maintenance Contribution Act and said:

I know that the district councils have not seen much of it, directly, at all events, since the advent of this Government.

"This Government" means the present Government. I draw attention to the fact that the district councils did not see any of it at all prior to the advent of this Government.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes, they did. Mr. President, I suggest that the Minister be asked to withdraw that. It is a deliberate untruth. Councils have been given cheques directly.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In my first year as Minister, two payments of road maintenance contributions were made, one in the early part of the year, when it was estimated that the return would be a given amount, and one in the latter part of the year, when more money came in than was expected and a second payment was made to the councils. At the beginning of this financial year I was requested to take the same action again this year. I shall now give a few instances of allocations made this financial year to councils, and in doing so I am referring only to grant moneys, not to Loan moneys. In this financial year there are allocations of \$2,413,900 for district roads and \$183,900 for grants in aid, making a total of \$2,597,800. In addition, \$40,000 is provided for rural district roads land acquisitions, and it is estimated that the return this year from the road maintenance contribution will be \$2,000,000.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: How far away are these rural acquisitions?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Some are in the honourable member's district. They are all rural roads. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said that councils did not see any of this.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They have not seen it since this Government came into power.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The Minister said no direct payment was ever made to them.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: A fair sum of Loan moneys is made available to councils in addition to the grants to enable them to buy and replace machinery, etc. Before honourable members say that no direct advances have been made to councils, they should check with the councils to see what their allocations were.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That money is on loan.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins mentioned railway finances, and I shall now give certain figures relating to them. The Railways Department in 1964-65 received revenue of \$2,650,380 from wheat cartage and in 1965-66 this had fallen by \$378,979 to \$2,271,401. In 1964-65 the revenue from barley cartage was \$1,054,264, and in 1965-66 this had decreased by \$198,441 to \$855,823. The revenue from oats and other grains was \$122,218 in 1964-65, and this decreased by \$30,452 to \$91,766 in 1965-66. From these figures it can be seen that the revenue in the last financial year was over \$500,000 less than in the previous year.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We had many problems in shifting stuff in that year.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It was estimated that the Railways Department would earn \$30,214,000 in 1965-66, but actual earnings were only \$29,099,465. The Treasury received \$29,763,044 from the Railways Department in 1965-66, but this included some outstanding amounts from the previous year. The actual earnings were only \$29,099,465, and this figure shows more clearly the true position. The Government has been criticized over railway finance, but the revenue from wheat, barley and oats was less than expected.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think the figures given by the honourable member were deliberately misleading?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: When the figures were checked they were found to be incorrect, at least. It is no good blaming the department, the Commissioner or the Minister, because, when there was a genuine attempt to arrest the drift away from the railways, the legislation was not passed by this Chamber. Because of the attitude they adopted, honourable members must take the responsibility.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Wheat has not been diverted. It is still in the silos.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Hon. Mrs. Cooper complained about heavy commercial vehicles travelling in the centre of the road and making it difficult for other vehicles to pass without having to go to the wrong side of the road. Because of the heavy volume of traffic, it is dangerous for a vehicle to be forced to go to the wrong side of the road to pass another vehicle. Also, it is a bad practice for these heavy vehicles to exceed the speed limits under the Road Traffic Act. This, too, causes considerable danger to other road users. I do not disagree with the honourable member about the dangers involved, but I disagree with her statement that police officers should be released from some of their duties and given road duties to detect these practices. There has been no alteration in the policy regarding these matters for years. The present Government has not altered anything in this regard: it has not withdrawn police from traffic duties to do clerical work.

It is imperative that a certain percentage of the police force should do clerical work and, if some officers did not do this, others would. The traffic division is constantly on duty on roads, and many offenders are prosecuted. I have taken out some figures, but I shall not weary the House by giving them all. I have these figures dealing with each week for the period from July 7, 1965, to June 29, 1966.

They show the number of prosecutions under section 53 for excessive speed by commercial vehicles in respect of aggregate weight and the number of prosecutions under section 146 of the Act for excessive axle loading. Unless honourable members wish me to, I do not propose to cite them now but ask that I have leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Reports of Heavy Haulage Vehicles.

Week ending.	Section 53	
	Excessive speed of vehicles in respect of aggregate weight.	Section 146 Excessive axle load.
7/7/65	30	2
14/7/65	42	15
21/7/65	27	3
28/7/65	23	3
4/8/65	35	17
11/8/65	30	10
18/8/65	26	8
25/8/65	54	6
1/9/65	47	13
8/9/65	32	7
15/9/65	47	10
22/9/65	30	7
28/9/65	24	10
6/10/65	55	18
13/10/65	46	18
20/10/65	47	5
27/10/65	42	13
3/11/65	35	10
10/11/65	32	21
17/11/65	58	12
24/11/65	24	12
1/12/65	52	17
8/12/65	35	11
15/12/65	49	11
22/12/65	26	4
12/1/66	19	11
19/1/66	46	12
26/1/66	59	10
2/2/66	43	4
9/2/66	53	10
16/2/66	57	12
23/2/66	53	9
2/3/66	37	5
9/3/66	53	10
16/3/66	37	9
23/3/66	41	17
30/3/66	65	21
6/4/66	30	8
13/4/66	26	10
20/4/66	34	9
27/4/66	20	8
4/5/66	51	12
11/5/66	31	8
18/5/66	28	10
24/5/66	38	14
1/6/66	37	11
9/6/66	57	11
15/6/66	49	13
22/6/66	60	16
29/6/66	66	27
Total	2,038	552
Weekly average	41	11

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Total prosecutions for excessive speeds by commercial vehicles are 2,038, which reflects not a bad effort by the police force. In addition, the prosecutions for excessive axle loading number 552. This means a weekly average of 41 persons being prosecuted for excessive speeds in commercial vehicles in our metropolitan area. I give those figures in answer to what has been said about drivers of these vehicles and the excessive speeds at which they travel, and about more police being released to deal with excessive speeds on the roads so that further prosecutions can be instituted. These figures speak for themselves. They indicate that the police force is active in this field.

After all, all breaches of the law cannot be detected: they can be detected only when an officer is present and action can then be taken. No matter how many members of the police force we had, it would be impossible for them to be present on every road, especially in the metropolitan area, to detect and prosecute people guilty of speeding. I now deal with some comments by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, who complained bitterly about the rejection of apples.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Let's see how you can get out of this one!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member did not complain so bitterly on this occasion about potatoes as he had done previously: rather he stressed apples being rejected when there was a demand for them, which fruit could and should have been exported. He commented on the repercussion on the State of their rejection and spoke of ships not calling at South Australia because they could not get their loadings, which again was detrimental to the State. Also, he said that the waterside workers were not getting the work they should have been getting. In this instance, the honourable member ran true to form and laid the blame for all this on the Government: the inspectors had rejected these apples and all these other things had flowed from that; this was another instance of the ineptitude of the present Government in allowing this sort of thing to go on, and so on. The honourable member knows as well as other people do, and especially those actively engaged in this industry, that a minimum standard is required. If a grower attempts to use the minimum as the maximum, he must expect some of his product to be rejected. I have no doubt that the honourable member in this instance was speaking more personally than on behalf of the growers generally. Perhaps he had had some of his own

apples rejected. At least on one occasion he did, and he was going post haste to Canberra to lay a bitter complaint about the authorities here rejecting his apples, but he got advice from experts not to do so, because his apples were not up to standard.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: On a point of order, that is completely untrue.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not think it is at all. If the honourable member is honest with us, he will admit that he has had his apples rejected and he was going to Canberra to lay a complaint.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: That complaint will now go forward; it has been withheld.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member said that the allegation was not true; now he is backing it up.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member made some comments about the introduction of Bruce boxes. He spoke of California and places overseas in relation to Bruce boxes, their costs, etc. I am not disputing that, by any stretch of the imagination, but he cannot say that the fault lies with the Government. The Government was not doing this sort of thing. It is not importing Bruce boxes here; it is not getting them made, nor is it buying them from a person importing them under licence. The growers are not forced to buy these boxes to pack their fruit in them: other containers are available. If anybody is to blame, it is those persons who are patronizing, buying and using the Bruce box for their product; it is not the fault of the South Australian Government. Here, again, the honourable member is not factual when making his comments.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is not unusual. Because he is being answered he does not like it. Stick to it, Mr. Minister!

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill): Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: On a point of order, is the Minister under an obligation to tell the truth?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. The Hon. the Minister.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member should look at a mirror sometimes. When he goes to the South-East, he should look in the Blue Lake.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I think all honourable members, with the exception of one honourable member this afternoon, will agree that I do not indulge in, and have not indulged in, untruths in this Chamber. It is not

my policy. It has never been my practice and it is not my practice today. I now turn to the honourable member's comments on natural gas. Here, he was on a good topic, because he does talk a lot of natural gas in this place. I am fully aware that it was not the honourable member's own opinion or information that he was imparting to us when speaking on this matter in the debate on the Address in Reply. It was information that had been supplied to him from another source. Members of the Opposition previously used the term "jumping on the band waggon" in making accusations against the Government, and I consider this a typical instance when the honourable member refers to the supply of natural gas. As I said, they were not his opinions but he was speaking from information supplied by another source.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: A pretty reliable source, too.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I think it was supplied by the former Leader of the Opposition in another place, but the submissions on this question were not all in the best interests of the State. For instance, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford made the following statement on Tuesday, June 28. The statement was made in another place, and I quote—

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member cannot quote from a statement made in another place.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The statement appeared in the daily press as well, and I will quote from the daily press. The quotation is:

The exploration lease covering Delhi-Taylor in the artesian basin is, I think, for 15 years, and probably within five years a large area will be available for subsequent cutting up and allocation to smaller prospecting companies.

That statement has been given publicity and exception has been taken to it by the exploring organization. Having studied the agreement under which these licences were issued in February, 1959, by the then Minister of Mines, I can say categorically that the statement is incorrect. The terms and conditions of oil exploration licences are treated as confidential during the currency of such licences, and because of that I do not propose to reveal the precise conditions in this instance except to say again that the former Leader has not got his facts straight.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That would be unusual!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The statement as publicized is definitely not in accordance with

fact. The honourable member then went on to say:

... the projected power station at Torrens Island, which could, if necessary, be turned to gas for its fuel. Design of the power station was made in the early stage for the two alternatives of fuel, but the authorities had to know by December last whether the fuel would be oil or gas.

I have had many discussions on that subject and I have with me a docket that the honourable member is at liberty to examine later to see whether I am telling the truth. In this docket it was requested that the Electricity Trust know by December, 1964, whether or not they would be utilizing gas.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What is a year or two as far as they are concerned?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Last year would be 1965; the honourable member was only 12 months out!

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: The Minister is twisting again. It was the design that I was talking about.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Let us examine the matter further. I have a vivid recollection of a publication, not only in the press but publicized over the air as well, in relation to the Torrens Island power station. The first two units of that station were ordered so that either gas or oil could be used. I don't think that anybody would deny that statement. However, the fact is that gas would be used in the Torrens Island power station; this is well-known, and at this stage there is no conceivable case for burning it elsewhere. We could make the necessary modifications by early 1969 of boilers Nos. 1 and 2 on Torrens Island. We have been told (and the honourable member leads us to believe) that when these boilers were ordered they would use either gas or oil and would be built accordingly; now we find that they are not built that way. Looking at the other units, No. 3 boiler would be fitted for gas burning when first brought into service about March, 1969, while No. 4 boiler would be brought into service about March, 1970. That is, of course, provided that the Electricity Trust of South Australia knows that natural gas will be available. The honourable member stated:

Last February we had at Gidgealpa sufficient gas proved and available at the bore head to supply our needs for 15 years.

The phrase "to supply our needs for 15 years" is an indication to the general public that we have sufficient gas at Gidgealpa to supply our needs for 15 years. We would not have sufficient gas there to supply the Electricity Trust's

needs for 15 years for its two boilers! In fact, all comments made by the present Government (and I can prove my submission) point out that we have sufficient reserves at Gidgealpa to use 80,000,000 cubic feet a day for a period of 10 years. I also know from a survey that has been conducted (and the estimate is a conservative one) that, within 10 years of natural gas becoming available in the metropolitan area, a minimum quantity of 300,000,000 cubic feet would be required. When honourable members say that reserves at Gidgealpa are sufficient to supply our needs for 15 years they should get their facts straight.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: What about Moomba?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That was not mentioned; the information on Moomba is that it will be twice as big as Gidgealpa, but this has yet to be proved. No mention was made of it by the honourable member because it has only come into discussions recently.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: I take it the Minister is quoting known minimum reserves?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am quoting figures as far as Gidgealpa is concerned, and known reserves there. I repeat: reserves at Gidgealpa would enable the supply of 80,000,000 cubic feet of gas a day for a period of 10 years, and then it would be finished. The field would exist for only 10 years, and yet we have sufficient there, according to the honourable member, to meet our requirements of natural gas for a period of 15 years.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You are citing only known reserves, not total reserves.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But the Minister was nearer the mark than the Hon. Mr. Kemp was.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As I have said, honourable members will have ample opportunity later to discuss this further.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: When will you bring it down?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: More quickly than your Government would have done it. You blow your top and don't know what you are talking about.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member said that Sir Thomas had approached Dr. Coombs and that, apparently, an arrangement had been made with Dr. Coombs about financing the pipeline. I do not deny that Sir Thomas had discussions with Dr. Coombs when the latter came here, or that he took Dr. Coombs to Gidgealpa willingly. However, when the then Leader of the Opposition desired to visit Gidgealpa to see what this was all about, he had to plead with the Premier at

the time for permission to go there. I am not denying that there were discussions between the Premier and Dr. Coombs, but that is all they were. We use the term "sitting around the camp fire at night time".

The Hon. H. J. Kemp: They were sitting on boxes.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member said Sir Thomas told Dr. Coombs, "We have on deposit with the Commonwealth Bank £19,500,000 in funds. We need to build this pipeline and the cost is £20,000,000. Would you consider our borrowing £14,000,000 from the Commonwealth Bank against our funds on deposit, to be amortized at the rate of £3,000,000 a year? I can find £3,000,000 from State Government funds. If you will provide £14,000,000, we can build this pipeline in two years and it will be paid for in six or seven years." This was supposed to have taken place in January or February. There is no doubt that early in September a meeting took place at the inspection by the then Premier and Dr. Coombs, but the funds in the bank at that time were £17,500,000, not £19,500,000.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What's a couple of million between friends?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We are being factual. Again, the then Premier said that the loan would be paid back over six years, with £3,000,000 being paid annually. This money would have had to be found from State revenue. The reserve of £17,500,000 was to remain as a guarantee. Assuming that this discussion took place, what would have been the intention? We hear much about the present Government's increasing this and doing something else? The only ways in which this money could have been obtained from State revenue were by either cutting down State works or increasing taxation. That would have been all right then. However, it is not all right today. Why will honourable members not be a little more factual?

The honourable member said that the money could have been borrowed at a bank interest rate of 6 per cent and that we missed the boat. However, it is not the fault of the present Government. The previous Government's arrangement did not go on. The honourable member has said, in regard to borrowing money overseas today, that the rate of interest is 13 per cent or 14 per cent on the American market, not 6 per cent. However, I know that money is available on the American market at

a much lower rate than 13 per cent or 14 per cent.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: What is the service fee?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I can prove my statement. I have not said all that I wanted to say on this matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You gave them something to think about!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is available only to reliable borrowers.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about reliable information?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall not say more on this matter, because others may wish to speak. As I have said, there will be opportunities to discuss the subject further for the information of the Hon. Mr. Kemp when the Loan Estimates and the Budget are being debated.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I shall be brief, but I have one or two rods in pickle, so to speak. First, I wish to reiterate the plaudits and sympathies that have been expressed by previous speakers regarding certain gentlemen who were well known to us.

I took an unusual step this afternoon in suggesting that the Minister of Local Government should withdraw a statement. I appreciate that, as he has said, he is not in the habit of speaking untruths. I prefer to say that he has made a mis-statement, and I inform him and the Council that it was a mis-statement. I should like honourable members to listen while I relate the position. When the road maintenance tax was introduced, nobody knew what the income from it would be. However, the Government of the day had given an undertaking to the public that it would hand out as grants for district council roads the money so collected. I cannot recall the actual figures but there was money in the kitty, so to speak. A distribution was made, and a further distribution was made later. Those are the facts. Yet, the Minister said this afternoon that the previous Government did not make any handouts to district councils. I ask him to pursue this matter at a suitable opportunity and to express his regret for having made a mis-statement of the position. A list of the payments is in the Minister's office, and he knows that perfectly well.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You're telling me!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Questions were asked about when the next handout would be made. I shall say now what I have said in many places. It was only done by that method in that year because we did not know

how much money would be available for allocation. Grants had already been made based on the programme for the whole year and, therefore, we handed out this money in a not very scientific or efficient manner. We thought that in future we would be able to budget from the money we expected to get from the road maintenance tax and that grants would be made to district councils over the whole year. Much of the money (possibly 40 per cent) would have to be kept by the Highways Department for the maintenance of main roads. This is a maintenance tax, as the High Court deemed it to be. The Minister was wrong when he said that we did not make any hand-outs.

There is another matter that concerns me. In an effort to assist in the big job that has to be done, I have co-operated with the Minister of Roads from time to time. I know that while I was still Minister of Roads plans were drawn up and estimates made for passing bays on the upgrade between Aldgate and Mt. Lofty. I told the Minister about this early in the piece, and he called for a report. Let us consider the history of these extraordinary reports—and they are not the Minister's reports. First, I asked a question about widening the strip on the upgrade. I did not get much information, and some 2,380 pages of *Hansard* later I asked a similar question, in reply to which the Minister said that there would be no passing bays and that provision was already made between Stirling and Aldgate for passing. I think he said that plans were drawn up. He also said that he was unaware of any change of policy. I hope he accepts my statement that the policy has been changed by somebody, because I have given the facts.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I have never disputed your statement.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I know that, but the Minister said he did not know that there had been a change in policy, and I say there was a change. He then said that because of the widening of the section of road between Stirling and Crafers it was now adequate for vehicles to pass. He went on to say that the portion concerned was not sealed but that it was constructed of metal and that there was adequate space for passing if necessary. I do not know whether the Minister has been along that road recently, but it is fully sealed, and has many inches of metal underneath. Surely one does not speak of a piece of roadway 10ft. wide as being a shoulder! If the shoulder is wide enough to permit passing, surely it is extraordinary for lines to be placed on it so that people are restricted in passing. This

does not meet the needs of people south of Crafers, Aldgate and Stirling.

There seems to be an idea that, because a hazard is created when a road narrows or widens, these sections should be constructed. All I can say is that there are thousands of them. However, it is the usual thing under the Road Traffic Code to have notices erected saying that the traffic lane widens or narrows. I can think of many examples of this. Will the Minister have a look at the problem which, although not nation-rocking, concerns thousands of people who live in the locality, many of whom travel up the road five times a week? These things are causing them much inconvenience.

The Tailm Bend to Keith water supply was recommended by the Public Works Committee in May, 1962, and work commenced in 1964. The previous Minister of Works expected that it would be completed in 1967, but the latest predictions, after certain corrections were made in *Hansard* by the Minister of Works—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you mean the previous Minister or the present Minister?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am referring now to the completion date given by the present Minister. He predicted that the main would reach Coonalpyn by 1967, Tintinara by 1968, and Keith by 1970, but said there would not necessarily be any water reticulation in the very dry town of Keith in that year. Honourable members will remember that water has had to be carted there in previous years for household purposes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How long ago?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: About two years ago. I could say, "Hear ye, Brother Walsh", but I prefer to say, "Hear ye, the Premier". I go back to the policy speech that he made on February 19, 1965, in which he said:

I want to make it quite clear that the promises that were made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by a Labor Government.

He then went on to give examples. On page 14 of his statement he gave a lengthy description of how the Public Works Committee worked and how the public works programme was drawn up, and then said:

Any that are already recommended will be proceeded with under the administration and we have the assurance of the industrial organizations that, whenever it is possible to speed up the completion of these works and any others that may be recommended, they will do their utmost to assist.

This is even more interesting when one considers the report in this morning's *Advertiser* about the labour position. He continued:

As a Party, we are very mindful of the need for a public works programme, but we are also aware that we cannot afford to be too elaborate in our approach in these matters when we have to compete against private works, as the labour market has its limitations insofar as manpower resources are concerned, but in the event of any curtailment on the part of private enterprise—

I understand there is some—

our policy will provide for a speeding up of a public works programme which will be to the advantage of the State generally.

This is what the Public Works Committee said in its report (and this was signed by the Hon. S. C. Bevan, with others):

The committee is of the opinion that great benefits will derive from the proposed trunk main which will give an assured supply of water to a vast area of land which has not been fully exploited because it has no appreciable supply of good water. Much of the land will require substantial capital investment for its proper development and it will be many years before some areas will reach full or profitable production. On the other hand, an assured supply will immediately increase production, particularly livestock, on lands which have already been improved and make a worthwhile contribution to the national income.

The Public Works Committee recommended that the scheme be proceeded with, and I considered that to be a public works approved by the previous Government, which the Government said it would honour. It is not a matter of priority: priorities come into the matter only with new works. It is absurd to suggest that no new works not allowed for by the previous Government have started. The Ministers in this Chamber know that other new works have been started. I am not disagreeing with that practice.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you say that we have not started any new works? You cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I say the Government has curtailed certain works. I shall have an opportunity to give further reasons later why I think the Government has curtailed them. At the moment, I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Council do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering amendments to the draft Address in Reply.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Chief Secretary speaks, may I point out there is a list of amendments to the Address in Reply and we can, I think, deal with them all together, if it is the will of the Committee that that be done. If no honourable member opposes this suggestion, we will take the amendments *en bloc*.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not need to read out all the amendments, of which there are five. Every member has a list of them and a copy of the draft Address in Reply. I, therefore, formally move:

In line 1—to leave out “the Honourable Sir John Mellis Napier” and insert “Lieutenant-General Sir Edric Montague Bastyan”.

In line 2—to leave out “Lieutenant-Governor” and insert “Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Governor”.

In line 6, paragraph 1 (line 2)—to leave out “you have been” and insert “His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was”; after line 6 to insert new paragraph 1a as follows:

“1a. We take this opportunity of welcoming Your Excellency back to South Australia.”

In line 9—to leave out “Your Excellency’s” and insert “the”.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I second the amendments to the Address in Reply moved by the Chief Secretary. They are necessary because of the return to South Australia of His Excellency the Governor. I am sure we all agree to these amendments.

Motion carried.

Committee’s report adopted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD moved:

That the Address in Reply, as amended, be adopted.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I point out that an arrangement has been made to deliver the Address in Reply to His Excellency the

Governor at 4.30 p.m. I suggest that now is a reasonable time to adjourn for that purpose.

At 4.20 p.m. the President and honourable members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 4.42 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that accompanied by the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Lieutenant-Governor’s Opening Speech, and by other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Governor the Address in Reply adopted by the Council on this day, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which the Lieutenant-Governor opened the second session of the Thirty-eighth Parliament. I also thank you for your message of welcome to me on my return to South Australia. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God’s blessing upon your deliberations.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Assembly’s request be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative Council to be members of the Joint Committee be the Chief Secretary, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.46 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 20, at 2.15 p.m.