

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 26, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

MINING LEASE.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have received a written complaint about a prospecting claim, stated to have been pegged on August 2, 1965, at a site known as the White Lead Mine, for which application was made to the Mines Department on August 5, 1965. I understand the area was reserved under the Mining Act on January 20, 1966. Can the Minister of Mines furnish information about this application and the purpose of reserving the area?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have had inquiries made about the person referred to by Sir Lyell. The investigation of the whole matter concerned a lapse of time. If my memory serves me aright now, it is just a small area that this person desired to operate, but it is in conjunction with a larger area that has been and was, as Sir Lyell pointed out, reserved under the Mining Act for the purposes of the investigation of the area, because the department feels that there are minerals within the area covered by this lease that are worth exploring and are being explored by the department. Until the department's investigations of the whole area are completed, I am afraid that no lease will be issued. I am sure that Sir Lyell is aware of the circumstances, that a lease will not be issued on a small portion of an area reserved under the Mining Act to be investigated by the department. Those are the circumstances. I confirmed them personally with the person concerned, who some weeks ago came to see me about this matter to ascertain why the lease could not be operated. I explained all these details to him and why he could not operate this lease.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: During the debate on the Address in Reply I mentioned

contributions under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, and made the following statement:

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

The only different thing I should have said there was "I know the district councils have not seen any of it, directly at all events, since the advent of this Government." The Minister took me to task over this. He drew attention to the fact that all district councils did not see any of it prior to the advent of this Government. I have taken this matter up with district council representatives in order to be sure that my facts are correct, and I have been assured that district councils did, in fact, receive two direct payments from the Road Maintenance Contribution Fund prior to the advent of the present Government. However, the Minister then went on to say that in his first year of office two payments of road maintenance contributions were made to district councils. Although I have not been able to find any evidence to support that contention, if such is the case I ask the Minister if he could provide the dates on which those two payments were made to the district councils since the advent of the present Government because, if the payments have been made, I can advise the district councils concerned and correct them in their assumption that no payments have been made.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Without looking at a copy of *Hansard* to check the actual words that I did use on the occasion in question, I mention that on my appointment as Minister of Local Government representations were made asking whether I would do the same as had been done in the previous year when two payments were made to district councils. I then informed the councils that, as we were then in a position to estimate more accurately the returns that would be available to the department, one payment only would be made. I may not be word perfect on that at the moment, and I repeat that it would be necessary for me to examine a copy of *Hansard* to see what words I did use. However, in essence that is what I said, and that is correct. In the year previous to that two payments were made, but no direct payment has ever been made, as such, to any district council from the Road Maintenance Contribution Fund. Payments are made to councils as general grants (that is the term I would use) and include contribution from the Road Maintenance Contribution Fund which is paid into the department.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: They would be additional grants, wouldn't they?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No, not additional grants, but grants that are made. I have gone to some trouble to get the facts on this matter. When members want to get up in this Council and in another place and attribute any occurrence in the State to the actions of the present Government they can expect straight talk and, as far as I am concerned, they will get it! If I may crave your indulgence, Sir, in answering this question I will correct an impression I unintentionally gave when I addressed myself to it previously. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude mentioned it when he spoke, and he also mentioned it to me privately. I have taken out dates and amounts that go back prior to the references I have made. On November 23, 1964, Cabinet approved a £218,000 grant, an allocation based on three times the grant-in-aid; that is, grants to district councils at that time. Here again I am certainly not reflecting on anybody, but the Hon. Sir Norman said that this was a hand-out. On November 24, 1964, the district councils were advised by the Minister, who at that time was the Hon. Sir Norman, and on January 5, 1965, Cabinet approved a second grant of £115,000. Those are the two payments to which I have referred. On January 20, 1965, a letter was sent by the Minister, saying that increased receipts made it possible for additional grants to be made out of general road funds. It was used by the councils for all purposes, not only for maintenance but also for new works. All of these grants were not made out of road maintenance funds. I hope that that clarifies the position. The honourable member can inquire as much as he likes regarding the councils and the councils cannot dispute it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In view of the Minister's comments, can he say whether the statement in *Hansard*, which is, "In my first year as Minister two payments of road maintenance contributions were made", is in fact correct?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They were made in the previous year.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Minister of Local Government wish to reply?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have already replied, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: It is usual to stand up when replying.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Mr. President, when I was on my feet previously, I read out

the dates and other information, and they are in *Hansard*. That was the reply to the honourable member.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That means that the statement was not correct.

POTATOES.

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: Last Saturday, somewhat to my surprise, I was asked by prominent potato growers to thank the Minister of Agriculture for the prompt and salutary correction of the impossible inspection, which has been a matter of complaint by potato growers. The *Hansard* report gives no inkling that such action was contemplated. In fact, all the statements were that the inspection was faultless, that no higher standard ruled and, in fact, that rejections were fewer than in previous years. This shows that not only were the officers who prepared this material for the Minister unaware of the true position, but that they did not bother to check. I think that, probably, in the background a rabbit with an itchy conscience—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must not debate a question.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I ask that the Minister of Local Government convey to the Minister of Agriculture our thanks for a return to normal. However, it has occurred.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall certainly convey the honourable member's thanks to the Minister of Agriculture and I know that he will be tickled pink with it.

RING ROAD.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 19, which was a week ago, I asked a question of the Minister regarding ring roads and asked whether it was the policy of the Highways Department to continue with its ring road road-way plan around the periphery of the Adelaide park lands. The Minister replied that at that stage he would say it was the intention of the department to continue with those roads. On July 21 the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study Survey was released. It was reported in the *Advertiser* of July 22 that the report was released "yesterday" (which was

July 21), by the Minister of Lands. The Chairman of the study, Mr. J. N. Yeates, was reported to have said:

The idea of a freeway around the city on the outside of the park lands, as envisaged in the 1962 Adelaide development plan, could possibly be dropped.

The newspaper report added that Mr. Yeates said, "It does appear now that it could possibly be eliminated." He also said, "I cannot say so definitely at this stage, but there are some objections to it." So that the residents whose properties front the park lands and the city business people who are endeavouring to plan for the future can be more definitely informed, will the Minister of Roads make a further statement on his department's policy on the proposed ring road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The report to which the honourable member has referred is the interim report by the M.A.T.S. It is expected that the study will be completed by the end of this year or early next year. The findings will then have to be drafted and printed, so the final report will probably not be available until early next year. The comments to which the honourable member has referred relate to the interim report. I do not think the Commissioner of Highways can say at this stage what the final report will be, and I know that I cannot do so. There has been no alteration in the policy of the Highways Department, as I have said previously. Until the final report is made I shall not be able to say whether ring roads will be built around the city.

LIQUOR LEGISLATION.

The Hon. R. C. DeGABIS: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of July 13 about a statement made by the Premier at the opening of a new hotel at Penola?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Premier has advised that he has not seen a copy of the *Border Watch* referred to by the honourable member and that in any event he did not make a statement on Government policy at this function.

ROADSIDE VEGETATION.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of June 28 about roadside vegetation at Wellington?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Minister of Forests informs me that the area of native pines near Tailem Bend is a dedicated native pine reserve and that tenders that have been called to fence the area are now under con-

sideration. Signs have been prepared and will be erected as soon as fencing is completed. He also advises that his colleague who represents the area has been active in his desire to preserve this plantation for the future.

BASIC WAGE.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that in the recent basic wage and margins judgment the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, as an interim order, said that in South Australia no adult male employee under the Metal Trades Award should receive an actual wage of less than \$36.05?

2. As Cabinet has decided that, in ascertaining whether any particular employee is in receipt of such a wage or not, the amount of any service pay which he may be receiving is to be disregarded, has the Government thus chosen to treat this new minimum actual wage as a minimum award rate?

3. If so, will the Minister give the reasons why Cabinet ignored the specific terms of the commission's judgment?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The replies are:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (on notice): What proportion of the estimated \$670,000 to be spent at Roseworthy Agricultural College is to be provided by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Strictly and technically the State will provide the whole of the funds for the Roseworthy College project for the primary reason that the Commonwealth cannot constitutionally expend its funds upon such works but can only make grants to the State on the condition that the State itself expends comparable amounts in a prescribed manner. The honourable member's attention is drawn to *Hansard* of July 19, 1966, which contains a statement.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

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

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 19. Page 500.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Enfield general cemetery

was first established under Statute in 1944. I well remember the object. My colleague in Cabinet, the Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh, was interested in promoting a cemetery in the northern part of the city. Since then there have been some four or five amending Bills, most of which concerned financial problems, such as the repayment of certain funds made available by the Government. Most of these Bills amended the periods for repayment or altered the repayment arrangements. The cemetery area is attractive and ideally situated for providing a pleasing burial ground.

The Bill before us differs in some respects from previous amending Bills. The Minister's second reading explanation states:

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.

These powers to establish a crematorium were in the original legislation, but so far have not been availed of. One of the amendments included in the 1952 amending Bill (or, at any rate, in one amending Bill) was the power to enable the trust to sell vacant land not used as burial ground. I take it that is one of the means of raising revenue. Consequent upon that, there are suggested amendments about how the money is to be invested and how repayments are to be made. Clause 4 provides that nominees of the City Council of Enfield no longer remain members of the trust on ceasing to be members of the council. This seems a reasonable amendment, that, if the council has representatives on the trust, they should be members of the council.

Clause 5 is a new provision, 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. That is what I have just referred to: the trust can earn revenue from land not used for burial purposes. All these things will be properly explained, as the Bill has to go to a Select Committee. For that reason, there is little purpose in my raising these points now in detail, as they will be developed when the Select Committee proceeds with its inquiry. It is a hybrid Bill. I do not wish to delay the Council, because the Bill will go before a Select Committee which, in due course, will report back to the Council. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

The PRESIDENT: I rule that this is a hybrid Bill which must be referred to a Select Committee pursuant to Standing Order 268.

Bill referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. A. J. Shard, Sir Lyell McEwin, Sir Norman Jude, C. E. Story and S. C. Bevan; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Tuesday, August 30, 1966.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 19. Page 501.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): The preservation of underground waters is of great importance to South Australia. That would be recognized and acknowledged by all members of this Council. South Australia has a comparatively low rainfall where surface storage is restricted to a minimum, and in consequence the State is largely dependent upon our one major river, which flows through a corner of the State. Water from that river has to be shared with other States. Consequently, in the past the State has developed the maximum available sites for the conservation of water, and it is realized that with such a low rainfall the amount of surface storage provided depends largely upon seasonal conditions. It is somewhat reassuring to find some heavy showers falling at last, and they will assist in replenishing the reservoirs.

We are aware of the amount of consideration that has been given to water storage and the necessity to use to advantage such water as is available from the Murray River and even to increase the benefits available from that source. Therefore, the construction of the Chowilla dam will assist in great measure and I believe that those who follow us will find that further storages will be provided on the lower reaches of the Murray, if it is found that more water can be saved by such means following the establishment of the Chowilla dam. So far I have referred to water conserved by means of surface catchments or from a stream running through the State.

In other parts of the State we are dependent upon underground water, and that applies on Eyre Peninsula, where the supplies of the Tod River were developed. Those supplies were augmented by the establishment of the Uley-Wanilla Basin, followed by the Lincoln Basin.

They were further augmented by the development of the Poldia Basin. Development of the Robinson Basin ensured a water supply for Streaky Bay. That shows to what extent water can be drawn from underground supplies. The South-East is also dependent upon underground water, and both Millicent and Bordertown have underground water supplies. The water supply in Mount Gambier is drawn from the Blue Lake, and that can also be termed underground water.

Two questions arise, and both have been mentioned in this Bill; one refers to supply and the other to quality, the latter being referred to as "deterioration". I think these problems should be referred to as "contamination and supply". It is possible to have contamination arising not from some unhealthy source such as deposits of effluent and wastage. For instance, in the South-East water is drawn from different strata at different levels; some supplies are salt and some fresh, but if by some mischance a mixture of the two occurs (perhaps casing becomes eaten through) such contamination could seriously affect water supplies. Another problem exists on the Adelaide Plains where water is of apparently good quality, but surrounded by water of not such good quality.

Another factor is the sprawl of the city, and as it is pushed further and further out so a type of primary production more dependent upon water develops and in consequence the number of tappings of the existing supply, the number of bores, is increased. Some fears exist regarding the maintenance of this underground supply because of the quantities being taken from it. I suppose to some extent the shallow water supply would be affected by the fact that much of the water that at one time used to flow over the area is now diverted to the sea. The development of housing and the extensive use of impervious paving in backyards and on roadways has resulted in the underground supply being depleted. All these things have some effect on supplies available to the community; that is recognized and accepted.

When it comes to legislation, several problems arise. I remember in 1957 we introduced legislation that was not proceeded with because it was not acceptable to Parliament at that time. In 1959 legislation was again introduced, this time in the Council, and I had charge of the measure. It was well debated on that occasion and if anybody were to read the debates of that time he would see that I was considerably influenced by expressions of opinion during the debate. As a result of that

debate and the opinions expressed I produced amendments nearly as great in number as we had last session on one Bill where the amendments totalled several pages. The amendments in 1959 were moved *pro forma* and then the Council went into Committee. The amendments met the objections of members sufficiently to enable the Bill to be passed. I think there were two or three other amendments carried as well as those which I moved and out of them all a Bill was produced which, I think, was a good foundation for this type of legislation.

I have not mentioned the artesian wells that are another source of supply in our pastoral areas and which are equally important. However, a considerable quantity of water runs to waste from the artesian bores. This cannot be prevented because the water is often boiling when it reaches the surface and it is much too hot for consumption. There must be a certain amount of cooling down and the water runs some distance before it can be used for stock. That is another aspect of this legislation.

We debated many problems, but a Bill was approved in 1959 with certain safeguards, more or less as trial legislation. I know there is legislation on this subject in other States, but I am not one who readily conforms to what is done in other States. If it were just a matter of copying another State it would be easy to legislate simply because somebody else had done so, regardless of whether such legislation were good or bad. The 1959 Bill was the result of taking into account the considered opinions in the Parliament of this State. We are now asked to go back on legislation that was passed here and in another place. As far as my memory serves me, this Bill is only a reproduction of the 1957 measure. Artesian water is mentioned and perhaps I could add that artesian wells can be controlled by the Minister of Lands, if he so desires.

When the legislation to which I have referred was passed, I said to the department, "Go ahead and prove the sincerity of this legislation." During the debate, I often had to say that this was not an attempt to regiment and control people or to say how much water they could use or how the economics of their own farming practices were to be controlled, but that it was an attempt to do a sincere job and to establish that we would have good reasons and arguments before deciding to go further. When I was Minister of Mines, I was assured that the Mines Department was making tests in order to obtain information regarding the

behaviour and quality of the water in the Adelaide Plains area. The department hoped to draw some conclusions from this information about whether there was a likelihood of a collapse of supply in that area. That matter was related to supply rather than to contamination.

However, such information has not been given in the explanation of this legislation and I, as one dedicated to solving the problem of conserving water, would require that information before giving unqualified support to the Bill. I consider that no reason has been given to establish that we have to rush hurdles without having definite information on why we are doing it. When we have the information we can then decide how to handle the matter. The livelihood of the people is concerned in this. A man in this area may be established as a grower of tomatoes or of any other produce and using the water supply in that development. That man assumes that sufficient water of the quality he requires will be available to enable him to carry on production economically. If something happens and that water is not available to him, he is in difficulties. That is where the problem regarding supply comes in and that is where an obligation is involved.

However, any decision must be based on facts. If it is made known to a producer who wants to consume water on an unlimited scale that he cannot have that quantity of water without jeopardizing the supply to his neighbours and everyone else engaged in production he must then plan differently or the Government must find alternative ways of supplying water to the area. None of this information is before us, so how can we make up our minds about whether a crisis exists? Anyone can say that it could occur, and I am one who has been saying that. However, I have been hoping that by this time some information would be established.

On occasions we have drawn off much underground water to augment the supply in our metropolitan reservoirs. I forget the year, but I recall that bores were put down in the metropolitan area and that some people received inferior water. This had an effect, particularly on bath heaters, as magnesia caused corrosion. However, this additional water overcame the problem of availability. There was a considerable lowering of the water table because of that pumping from underground and some of that water had to be made available to people whose bores were no longer effective. That supply was replenished in a good year by using the surplus after the filling

of reservoirs to push water back into the underground storage that had been depleted by previous heavy pumping.

Surely, before we are asked to put into the hands of any department the right to say when and how anybody can get water, we ought to have scientific material to enable us to determine whether there is a crisis or anything requiring legislation that goes as far as this Bill goes. To accept the whole of the Bill, as presented, is to create a position where someone who has no association with the industry concerned will say whether or not a person will have water or whether he is using water that rightly belongs to someone else. I think the only method to adopt is to treat everybody on a parity, not to take water from one to give it to somebody else. It can be done only by working out a quota after making an estimate of the quantity of water available. The quota could be worked out on the basis of the quantity of water available and the area. This would show the quantity that could be allowed to each acre. I should like to have some information on this before I agree to such extreme measures.

I am not trying to be obstructive but want to base my opinion on facts and not on something that has not been tried. This legislation has not even been proclaimed, although I know that certain action is being taken under it in relation to artesian bores. The department has renovated a considerable number of such bores, and I think I am correct in saying that, after the bores were renovated and shut off to a certain stream, complaints made to the Pastoral Board brought about different conditions.

This Bill still leaves the matter to the Minister of Lands, but he has power to deal with artesian bores now, so there is no problem in this regard. The Government is not completely powerless at present in this matter. I think the previous legislation should be proclaimed so that the Government would be able to say, if the legislation were not effective, that it had failed for certain reasons. We have not been given this information; all we have been told is:

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.

I presume the reference to wastage of water relates to artesian wells, because there is power to deal with wastage of reticulated water caused by leaky taps and other things.

Surely the licensing of well drillers must relate only to the water that comes out of the bores, because a driller must be competent to equip artesian bores. He is in business and wants to put down as many holes as he can, irrespective of whether there is any water in them. The Minister also said in his second reading explanation:

The Bill also provides for the abolition of the Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination.

We are not told why the Government seeks to abolish that committee, which was set up by Parliament and which was added to so that it had representatives of district councils and land owners on it. The committee to be set up will not be representative of these people; it will consist mainly of public servants, and I do not know that that is a good thing. Parliament did not think it was in 1959, when it established the advisory committee. I think it is a pity that this Bill has been introduced before trying out the present legislation. I think it would have been preferable to try the legislation and, if it failed, for us to be told where it had broken down.

In the 1959 Act "defined area" was described as "an area defined by regulation pursuant to section 5". It was not necessary for the legislation to apply all over the State, because there was no fear of contamination in some areas. "Deterioration" was dealt with by an amendment made by this Council, and it was defined as "a deterioration in quality". It was also provided that "deteriorate" had a corresponding meaning. This Council was very definite in saying that it should relate to quality. In the definition of "well" a rider was inserted as follows:

but does not include any well used exclusively for the drainage of roof or pavement run-off from a private dwelling or any soakage pit used for the disposal of effluent from any septic tank or of waste water from a private dwelling.

Several attempts were made by honourable members to get what was wanted, and I think Sir Arthur Rymill was one who featured in the discussion. I remember a discussion on limiting the depth to 16ft. but, because of variations in conditions, the words that now appear in the Act were decided on. Those problems still exist. We need information to show us that, if this legislation is not effective, we have to go still further. I am prepared to say here and now that I would accept this legislation if I had proof that it was needed. It is not necessary for me to deal with the few other amendments to be made. One was

that the advisory committee should be extended to include well-drilling contractors; they were to be included in the advisory committee. Then there was a clause to delete the application of the Royal Commissions Act.

I do not know whether I have made it clear that the problem I find in speaking to this Bill is that the legislation passed in 1959, after considerable discussion, has not been proclaimed; nor have we any results of that legislation. We are asked merely to accept something that was rejected in Parliament two years earlier. When I was in control of the Mines Department, it seemed there was plenty of material to start operations and get the necessary data and information for the benefit of this Council, which it has not got at the moment. Without such information, I feel I cannot do other than ask that the 1959 legislation be put into operation; and I shall be prepared to consider amendments to it.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 20. Page 564.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill which, on the second reading explanation by the Minister, I found difficult to interpret. However, on investigation, I have been able to get a clearer picture of this legislation, the object of which, I was told, was merely to remove certain people from being subject to the approval of the Chief Secretary. It appears that on March 31 this year the regulations under the Police Regulation Act were amended to include a new rank—senior constable, first grade. This followed an application from the Police Association. The qualifications for the rank of senior constable, first grade, are set out in a new Regulation 56A, which reads as follows:

(1) A senior constable who passes the examination for sergeant, third grade, shall, on the passing of such examination, become a senior constable, first grade.

(2) A first-class constable who has served continuously as such for four years and has passed the examination for sergeant, third grade, shall, on the completion of that four years' service, become a senior constable, first grade.

(3) A member who has passed the examination for sergeant, third grade, shall be deemed to have passed it on the last day indicated in the time table for the examination. In publishing the results of the examination in the *Police*

Gazette, the Commissioner shall specify the day on which each member is deemed to have completed the examination.

Regulation 5 now defines "non-commissioned officer" as "sergeant of any rank or grade, or senior constable, first grade". Section 11 (3) of the Police Regulation Act (which this Bill seeks to amend) at present reads:

(3) Every appointment by the Commissioner of a member of the Police Force to any rank, grade or class in the detective police, or to any rank above senior constable shall be subject to the approval of the Chief Secretary.

Appointment to the rank of senior constable, first grade, is automatic once the examination for promotion to sergeant, third grade, has been passed. The distinction in classes of detective has been discontinued and members of the Criminal Investigation Branch now hold the same substantive ranks and seniority as the rest of the force. Unless section 11 (3) is amended as drafted, it will be necessary to have all appointments to the rank of senior constable, first grade, approved by the Chief Secretary, which is neither desirable nor necessary, as a result of the regulations that have been gazetted; they are more or less automatic. Therefore, I am happy with that part of the legislation, and support it. I notice there is a clause not referred to by the Minister at all in his second reading explanation. Clause 4 states:

The principal Act is amended by striking out every passage therein referring to an amount of money in terms of the currency provided for by the Coinage Act.

In the Police Regulation Act there are a number of penal clauses involving fines expressed in sterling. This clause means that

those amounts are automatically converted to decimal currency, as is necessary in the case of other legislation being similarly amended. This, too, is non-contentious. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AMENDING FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 20. Page 564.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I have examined this Bill very carefully indeed. I have even checked the arithmetic and can find nothing to say about it other than what the Minister has already said in his second reading explanation. It is purely a formal amending Bill relating to the change to decimal currency. Apparently, a special Act is needed because this matter relates to the Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. An agreement to pass this legislation has already been entered into between all States and the Commonwealth and has been signed by the Prime Minister and the Premier of every State. It seems to me there is nothing we can do except pass the Bill. I recommend that this be done as soon as possible.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.39 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 27, at 2.15 p.m.