

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 11, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

FALL-OUT.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to a question I asked recently about the fall-out following the recent atomic explosion in the Pacific?

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

The Australian Atomic Weapons Tests Safety Committee operates a series of fall-out stations including some in South Australia, and any significant rise in radioactive fall-out would undoubtedly be communicated to the Government concerned. It is unlikely that any effect of the French tests will become apparent in Australia for several months, as movement of contamination of the atmosphere is in an easterly direction. However, further inquiries are being made from the Australian Atomic Weapons Tests Safety Committee to ascertain if any more specific information is available.

BAROSSA WATER DISTRICT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: For several years now there has been an item in the Loan Estimates relating to the Barossa water district. The item has read that a comprehensive scheme has been prepared to improve the water supply in the Barossa water district, to provide for future expansion, and to allow for the subsequent enlargement of mains to the Two Wells district. This area, of course, includes also the district of Virginia. This is a matter of great urgency, because the water mains in this area were laid a number of years ago and are quite inadequate for present requirements. Recently, I had reason to support an application for an indirect service to a person who wished to build a house in Two Wells, but that application was refused. The reply I received from the Engineering and Water Supply Department read, in part, as follows:

The water supply system in the Two Wells area is already overloaded and several years ago it became necessary to take action to safeguard the supply to existing consumers. The decisions included: no indirect supplies to be granted; no extensions in country lands to be recommended; and size of new services abutting existing mains to be limited to half an inch.

Since that time there have been many applications for indirect services, all of which have been refused.

This means that a person who is not abutting a main at present is unable to obtain a water supply which, in effect, means no new houses can be built or any development carried out in those circumstances. In view of the urgency of this matter and the desperate situation of many people with regard to water supplies in the area, will the Minister inform the Council of the future plans in connection with the enlargement of the main to the Two Wells area and when the plans are expected to be put into operation?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I cannot inform the honourable member of the details at present but I will convey this question to my colleague and bring back a report as soon as possible.

PEKINA IRRIGATION BLOCKS.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: On September 29 I asked a question of the Minister with regard to water exploration seeking to provide water for the Pekina irrigation area. I wish to follow that question with another. In view of the success of a bore in the district sunk to a greater depth than the one to which he referred in his reply to my earlier question, is it the intention of the department to put down further exploratory bores, particularly a bore of a greater depth, to explore the possibility of a basin deeper than the one that has been tapped in the present experimental bore?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I thought that perhaps the answer given to the honourable member last week would have clarified the position. At present the department is anxious to obtain a screen that will suit the purposes as far as the fine sands are concerned. I know that the honourable member is well aware of this.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: In the present basin, yes.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In the report it stated that Amdel was experimenting with a screen and considered it might be successful. If the screen is successful, then, further investigations regarding additional supplies will be undertaken by the department. I assure the honourable member that it is the intention of the department to explore the position further as soon as possible in relation

to water supplies at Pekina and, as to any suggestion of a good supply at a depth deeper than the present experimental bore, the department would be prepared to carry out further tests if necessary. There is no doubt about that. If the honourable member requires further information, I will endeavour to obtain it for him.

EQUAL PAY.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have before me the latest issue of the *Public Service Review*, and the editorial therein, under the heading "Don't Worry, Girls", reads:

We advise our female members that they need have no worries with regard to equal pay.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the honourable member should read from those papers.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Apparently, the letter from the Premier to the association gave the Government's reply that it did not intend to dismiss any female officers as a result of its decision to implement a policy of equal pay for work of equal value. Recently I asked the Chief Secretary a question on notice and the reply indicated that five men had been dismissed from Public Service employment in recent weeks. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government will give a similar assurance to that given to women members of the Public Service, namely, that no men will be displaced as a result of the introduction of the policy of equal pay?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That assurance is easy to give. There were doubts within the Public Service that the Government might change the scope of the work of women and bring them lower down the scale to positions in which they would not be doing work equal to that of men. The Government gave an unequivocal answer that that was not the intention. I can be just as definite as far as the males are concerned: no male will be moved from a position held by him so that a female may get his position and receive the same salary as he was receiving.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding Mannum housing?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, the answer is as follows:

The Housing Trust has built 401 dwellings at Millicent and 83 at Mannum and is still building houses for sale and rental in both towns. Two contractors are currently employed at Mannum. One of the difficulties confronting the industry, particularly in smaller towns, is to obtain specialists and the trust does its utmost by making houses available especially for these people. Over the past few months certain of these specialists have been available at Mannum and, therefore, rental houses completed have been allotted to them. Contracts will be let very shortly for further houses that will be available for rental or sale at Mannum.

COUNCIL VEHICLES.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Recently my attention has been drawn to the fact that some councils in country areas (and there may be some in other areas; I do not know) own and use large vehicles that are covered by the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963. The result is that these councils are paying road maintenance tax or contributions in terms of that Act. I have been asked whether I would inquire from the Minister whether he would consider including in the First Schedule of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, which schedule refers to vehicles exempted from the tax, vehicles owned and operated by councils that are used for road construction and maintenance purposes, in view of the fact that, probably, money at present being collected from councils is being paid back to them, merely creating further book work. Will the Minister of Roads consider that representation?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The question can be answered easily. Yes, I shall consider the matter raised by the honourable member.

MAGISTRATES.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The *Government Gazette* of September 29 published a new regulation under the Public Service Act that varied the qualifications required of applicants for entrance into the Public Service as clerks. This matter was also reported in the daily press. I assume that this was the result of a recommendation made by a committee that I understand was set up by the Public Service Commissioner to report on changes necessary or desirable in the qualifications prescribed for appointment to the various groups in the

Public Service. This leads me to say that the qualifications required in this State for the office of stipendiary magistrate are different from those required in other States: I have referred to this on other occasions. An examination of law reports does not disclose that the percentage of successful appeals against the decisions of magistrates in other States is any different from the percentage here. I noticed in a recent circular from the Law Society that the Government was still short of stipendiary magistrates and was making urgent requests for legal practitioners to apply for appointment. Also, we know that several retired stipendiary magistrates are still employed. Will the Chief Secretary obtain a report from this committee on the situation regarding stipendiary magistrates, if such a report has not already been requested?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the best way to get a reply for the honourable member is to refer the matter to the Attorney-General so that he can look at it as a whole. The regulation regarding public servants was brought about because of the alteration to the system of granting certificates that will apply in the Education Department next year. I do not know whether this is related to the matter, but I will refer the question to the Attorney-General and obtain a report.

MIDDLETON ACCIDENT.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: All honourable members would have been most perturbed to read in this morning's press a report of the unfortunate accident that occurred at the Middleton crossing, near Victor Harbour. I speak with considerable feeling on this matter. The facts are that for many years (and these are facts) it has been suggested on many occasions that the seriousness of accidents occurring at level crossings has been not lessened but increased by the presence of very stout iron supports set into concrete. I personally made approaches about having this state of affairs altered. I am again suspicious, without having any of the facts in this case before me this afternoon, that the severity of this accident was greatly increased by the car colliding with these iron supports after hitting the train. I sincerely ask both Ministers to confer together to see whether the position

regarding iron stanchions erected at level crossings can be altered in some respect.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I, too, was upset by the occurrence of this accident. I know that the collision was occasioned by the car running into the side of the train when the train had only just left the station, which meant that it was not moving very fast, anyway. I have previously heard the honourable member's views about iron stanchions and believe some inquiries were made in those days when he himself was Minister. I also saw recently a description of an accident in Victoria. I know that this was not at a railway crossing, but there was a very flimsy type of railing at that site, where a lighter type of railing and a lighter type of stanchion was erected on the dividing roadway, and a motor car collided with this lighter type of railing. The railing pierced the motor car from end to end and transfixed a passenger in that car.

So it is not easy to decide in relation to these things whether there should be a lighter or a heavier type of stanchion; but, whatever the type of stanchion, these accidents do happen. Although I have not the full report of the Middleton accident, the small details that I do have with me indicate that this was an accident that was perhaps contributed to by the carelessness of the people concerned. However, it is sad when lives are lost in this way. I will consider what the honourable member has said and my colleague and I will look at the matter to see what can be done.

AGINCOURT BORE SCHOOL.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There is a school in the course of erection at Agincourt Bore in the Murray Mallee. It is to be an area school. This is in one of the dry parts of the State and it is unfortunate that this school is to be constructed of weatherboard and not be of solid construction. As all the schools that previously housed the students who will attend this area school at Agincourt Bore had flywire screens fixed to them and as no provision is made in the plans for this school to have flywire screens, what is the policy of the department as regards fly proofing in schools such as this under these conditions?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and bring him back a report as soon as it is available.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: My question concerns the recently announced increase in the allocation of university funds this year. It is not clearly stated whether the increase will apply to this year only or to the three-yearly period that usually attaches to such financing of the universities. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Education say whether this uncertainty can be resolved so that the people concerned will know how much money there is to spend?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question about whether the increased allocation applies to this year or to the next triennium to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and bring him back a report.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 2101.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): We have had before this Council two rather sad documents, the Loan Estimates and the Budget for this financial year. All South Australians must be concerned about the deterioration that has taken place in the State's financial position. I think it was the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill who, when speaking in the debate on the Loan Estimates, said that it was impossible to deal with the Loan Estimates without having also some knowledge of the Budget. The two are intertwined and it is impossible to deal fully with one without referring to the other. Both documents show clearly the serious financial position and the changing philosophy, or the changed philosophy, of this present Government compared with that of the previous Government. They show clearly the changing priorities, or the changed priorities, as far as this Government is concerned. For the deteriorating financial position and the changed priorities the Government has given various reasons. Indeed, in both documents and the accompanying statements, the Government seems intent on blaming everyone or anyone but itself. But it is obvious to any person who studies both these documents that we can see before us evidence of 12 months of Socialist administration in South Australia.

I feel that the most damaging effect of this administration has been the failure of the Government to pursue a positive policy of development. If any comparison can be made between the administration of the present Government and that of the previous Government, it is on this question of the changed priorities in relation to essential development in South Australia. This is always and has always been the case with previous Labor administrations in South Australia. During such administrations, naturally there is a turnaround in the essential development of the State and, as inevitably follows, a loss of confidence in South Australia. I am certain that both these documents dealing with the Loan Estimates and the Budget reflect exactly these conditions. As I have already said, the Government is intent on blaming everyone or anyone but has so far been loath to blame itself for this position.

The Government has claimed on many occasions that it has overspent to improve the employment position. I cannot understand that reasoning; indeed, I would say that the handling of the Treasury over the last 15 months has done much to create unemployment in this State. South Australia has held an honoured position in Australia by comparison with the other States as far as unemployment is concerned, but within 12 months it has gone from being the envy of other States to having the highest unemployment figures, in proportion to population, of any State in Australia. That position must in some way be due to the changed priorities that the Government has given to its various departments. In the economy of South Australia we have seen a turnaround in the vital developmental processes so important to a dynamic economy.

This turnaround must be accepted by the Government as its responsibility; it is due in many cases to the changed priorities I spoke of. The Government has on its hands the problem of a slackening of activity in the economy of South Australia and this is more than just the important problem of unemployment. Many people may not be unemployed but nevertheless they have lost a great deal of overtime upon which they were depending to balance their home budgets. That is another side of this turnaround of economic activity in South Australia. I consider that the great strength of the previous administration was that it actively pursued a policy that added to South Australian development; costs were purposely kept down and in that way capital was attracted to the State. As I have reminded

the Government on previous occasions, capital is a very shy bird and can be easily frightened away from investment in this State. If in the governing of this State's finances the priorities have been so shifted as to inhibit development, uncertainty appears and the capital inflow decreases, so the Government must shoulder some of the blame for the position.

If we attempt in any way to match the Eastern States (and every member knows that time and time again in second reading speeches the reason given for increased taxation has been that it brings this State to a parity with the Eastern States) the only outcome will be that we can no longer compete with the industries on the Eastern seaboard. I believe that in one second reading speech given not long ago concerning the Prices Act, for the first time since this Government took office we saw a breath of reality introduced. The statement of the Chief Secretary in his second reading speech on that Bill should be framed and presented to every member of Cabinet because in it for the first time since the Government took office was a realization of the matters I have referred to so far, that is, that if this State is to continue to develop and attract capital and population, our cost structure must be kept below that of the Eastern States. That statement by the Chief Secretary may have been a slip when it sneaked into the second reading speech; it may have been a copy of a second reading speech delivered by a member of the previous Government.

We have heard a number of reasons given (passing the buck to various organizations and people) explaining the deficit in South Australia. One reason given was that there had been obstruction in this Chamber, that Bills were defeated here, and that that meant a loss of revenue. I point out to honourable members that loss of revenue to the Government from that cause was very minor; in fact, my figures show that as far as the deficit of last year is concerned the defeat of these measures meant a loss of only one-twentieth of the deficit incurred by the Government. The fact is that we began the financial year 1965-66 with a credit of \$1,200,000 and finished the year very heavily in debt. A further reason given was that we had a rather difficult year agriculturally; but I point out that such a thing has happened before and of a more serious nature, too. That was not easily coped with, but the position was coped with by the previous administration.

On looking at the allocation of Loan funds (as I pointed out, it is not possible to divorce

the Loan Estimates from a discussion on the Budget) it can be seen that practically every developmental section has been cut. Perhaps I could cite some of the cuts that have been made in Loan allocations. They are: Loans to Producers, down \$300,000; Advances to Settlers, down \$16,000; Irrigation and reclamation of swamplands, down \$37,000; Afforestation, down \$144,000; Harbours accommodation, down \$550,000; Fishing havens, down, \$7,000; Waterworks and sewers, down \$777,000; Hospital buildings, down \$34,000; School buildings, down \$1,100,000; and Police and court buildings, down \$210,000.

Many other examples could be given. The main point is that each of these items represents an important developmental activity and clearly illustrates where the alteration in priorities is occurring as far as this Government is concerned. We can see almost a disinterest in the essential development of this State. We must also remember that the figures are slightly misleading because the position is somewhat worse than the figures show, and to reach a position of comparison two other important factors must be taken into consideration. First, an increase in costs has occurred, and therefore the amount of money provided (if it is the same amount as previously) will not achieve quite as much as it would have during the preceding year; secondly, there has been an increase in population in South Australia. Because of those factors, the drift is worse than the figures indicate.

I want to follow two lines of argument: first, what are the ramifications of previously financing certain projects from Consolidated Revenue and having those items this year appearing on the Loan Estimates, and what are the effects of these altering priorities on the development of South Australia? As one reads the Budget and the statement on the Loan Estimates, one sees that this year many projects, instead of being financed in the normal way, from the Consolidated Revenue Account, will be financed from Loan funds. I do not know that I can cite all the instances from memory, but one concerns subsidies to hospitals, another relates to subsidies to school committees and another relates to tertiary education.

The first effect of this will be the loading of Loan funds with these items and less money will be available for important developmental projects. Many honourable members have complained about the deferment of many of these projects. Some of them have been deferred almost indefinitely. Priority has been removed from the Keith main, although that was an

essential developmental project in that area, and work has been deferred for at least two or three years: one would not know exactly for how long. Many complaints have been made about deferment of the Giles Point project.

One of the reasons for these deferments is that today we are loading our Loan Fund with items that previously were financed from Consolidated Revenue Account. This change must have an impact on our ability to employ people, because employment is affected if such items are not able to be financed from Loan funds. If employment is effected in this way, the State's commitment on social services will increase. This is a vicious circle, in which increased social services result from the curtailment of priorities on essential developmental projects.

Also, difficulty arises because the State is incurring debts that were not incurred previously. This cannot be in the best interests of the State. At the other end of the line, exactly the opposite is occurring. First, works not previously financed from Loan funds are being financed from the Loan programme and then, as in the case of the Highways Fund, exactly the opposite is happening. Yet, both actions have the same result. This matter was dealt with fully by the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, and I think every other honourable member has sympathy for the Minister of Roads. I do not know whether we all go as far as Sir Norman went when he said he would not be surprised if the Minister resigned his portfolio because of the treatment he has been receiving from Cabinet.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Don't get me crying again.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thought the Minister was past that stage. The action being taken in relation to the Highways Fund is designed to bolster up the Consolidated Revenue Account, as was the case in the first instance I gave. I hope to show that Consolidated Revenue Account has been over-strung. Works that have always been regarded as being Loan programme works, such as solid construction in concrete, will be financed by the Highways Fund this year.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You were never able to meet the matching grants when you were in office. Now we are.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That may not be quite right. I cannot speak with the same authority as can Sir Norman on this matter, but I consider that the Minister's implication is not quite correct. The Highways Fund is being required to finance work previously financed by the Loan Fund. There is a demand

for repayment of Loan funds that will be used in the Consolidated Revenue Account.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: They didn't have road maintenance tax before.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, and I think this Government has been happy because the previous Government took much blame about road maintenance contributions. This Government is reaping a rich harvest.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They were so happy about it that they did not remove it in relation to the West Coast.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think they wanted to remove the tax in relation to Eyre Peninsula but the legal opinion on the matter was not of the best variety. We know demands for immediate repayment of certain Loan funds have been made on the Highways Fund. Irrespective of the Minister's explanation, it is patently clear that this policy means that less money will be available this year for expenditure on roads.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Less than should be available.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I intended to say that less would be spent by this Government but that more would have been spent if the policy of the previous Administration had been followed. Although the patterns differ in the instances I have given, in that in the first case there is a transfer from Consolidated Revenue to the Loan Account in regard to various works previously paid for from Consolidated Revenue, while at the other end we have a tickling of the Highways Fund into Consolidated Revenue—

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Some tickle!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, it is a bit more than a tickle, but when eight fingers are tickling there is a fair flow.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about when the Grants Commission told the previous Government it had to pay back the money?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This is interesting. If my memory serves me correctly, it never was the intention of the previous Government that this money be repaid.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Don't give me that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That money was not repaid in the 10 years from 1956, when this commenced. Yet, after this Government was in office for a short time, it was tickling back into Consolidated Revenue. I should like to cite figures from the Budget to strengthen my argument that, in this change of priorities, we have seen a turndown in the essential developmental expenditure in the State. For

the present financial year, the Estimates have increased by almost 15 per cent compared with last year. One would expect from this that each department's allocation would have increased by this percentage, yet the expenditure of departments concerned with the development of this State has been cut considerably. The increases have been as follows: Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, 19.1 per cent; Attorney-General, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Minister of Social Welfare, 25.9 per cent; Minister of Education, 17.8 per cent; Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Irrigation, 4.9 per cent; Minister of Labour and Industry, 16.6 per cent; Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, 9.2 per cent; Minister of Mines, 9.9 per cent; Minister of Marine, 9 per cent; and Minister of Transport, 5.7 per cent. From these figures it can be seen that essential developmental works are being cut in favour of social services.

The overall increase in the Agriculture Department was 16 per cent, but I should like to refer to some of the individual items. In 1964-65 the grant to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute was \$1,040,000, and this year's allocation is \$1,064,000, which is an increase of only 2.3 per cent. The allocation to the Bush Fire Research Committee is 13.8 per cent less than it was in 1964-65, and the allocation to the Chemistry Department is 30.6 per cent less. These are not isolated cases: one can mention many others showing quite clearly that the most important developmental parts of Government activity have been severely restricted and overlooked and that the departments concerned with social services have assumed a greater importance to this Government. If the important developmental projects of this State, which should be expedited, are overlooked, eventually social services will have to be increased. I refer now to the Electoral Department. The Hon. Mr. Hill, I thought, drew out the Chief Secretary very nicely on this matter. At least, the Chief Secretary made the point for him.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We had nothing to hide. There was no drawing out.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is a matter of opinion. I have an extremely high regard for the Chief Secretary, and I do not think that, when he said he believed in the abolition of this Chamber, he was expressing his personal view.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is my personal view.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I sympathize with him in his predicament.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is no use your trying to draw him out. You cannot do it twice.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I understand the Chief Secretary's predicament. The Hon. Charles Cameron Kingston, in his active days, considered that this Chamber should be abolished but, when he was able to express an unbiased opinion, he said that democracy had nothing to fear from the Legislative Council. I think the Chief Secretary will reach this position.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think democracy has a lot to fear from it. If you want to put it on a full vote, I will go along with that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am looking to the time when the Chief Secretary will be free of pressure.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is no pressure. I hope you are here the night I retire, as I will then remind you of this and express my view, which will be the same as it is today.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am looking forward to the time when the Chief Secretary, after he has hung up his spurs, will of his own volition make a statement similar to that made by the Hon. Charles Cameron Kingston.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This is one plank of my Party with which I agree 100 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You have to agree with all the planks. Come on, be honest!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is one I agree with.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I understand the Chief Secretary's predicament.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is no predicament. You are only building up a hurdle to suit yourself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Much has been said about qualification No. 1 for Legislative Council enrolment, and much blame has been placed on the previous Administration, which was said to have sent out cards only to those who had the freehold property qualification. My research shows that this had nothing to do with the previous Administration: that this practice was adopted in 1925.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Who was in power then?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think it was the Gunn Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You only think that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but I know it was in operation in 1925.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was in operation before then.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot answer that, but I know it was in operation in 1925.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then it is time for a change!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My point is that the previous Administration was blamed, because it was said that it tried to get on the roll only a certain class of voter.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It must have agreed for the practice to continue.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Since I have been a member of this Chamber I have never heard anyone on either side complain about it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are complaining now because it is going to be extended.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have not got to that point yet in any way whatsoever.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: So far, I have been trying to put forward an argument that I believe to be correct—that this policy was not dictated or formed by the previous Administration, but it has been in operation for at least 41 years, which is as far back as I can go with any accuracy. As far as I can find out, that is where it began. I may be wrong; it may be further back than that. This was not a conscious policy of the previous Administration.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You should use a computer.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Computers have advantages. I have had a few bills that have come through a computer, and I can say that computers have some disadvantages, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That may be bad for your policy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A further point has been made that this qualification No. 1 is the only qualification that the electoral office ever worries about. Also, if my memory serves me correctly, when I came out of His Majesty's Forces, we were presented then with an enrolment form for the Legislative Council, so the statement that only this qualification was to be pushed on to people to enrol is incorrect.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was it posted out or handed out?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Handed out on discharge. This is from memory, but I have checked with other returned soldiers, who have informed me that my memory is correct on this matter. Now we come to the question that in this present Budget we shall spend some \$70,000 on poking material into a computer to work out the Legislative Council roll. I have

some questions that I should like the Chief Secretary to answer about the computer. As I have pointed out, I have received accounts that have come through a computer. I will say that when the computer makes a mistake it is a beauty: there are no half-measures about it. Recently a woman in Sydney found she had \$10,000 or \$20,000 in the bank that she did not know was there.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: \$1,000,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As I say, when a computer makes a mistake it is a big one. What checking will be done on the results of the computer? How will they be checked? Will all the rolls of the Legislative Council be done simultaneously or will certain sections be done first?

The Hon. C. R. Story: I hardly think they will start with Alexandra, or one of those districts.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I wouldn't know. Between the second reading explanation of the Chief Secretary and now, it is interesting to note that no mention has been made of this. Why was no mention made in the second reading explanation? One would think that with a matter such as this—I shall be corrected—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Keep going! You don't always stick right to the line.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I try to.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will check on that one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: How will this system operate? I know very well that there may be some saving in the compilation of the roll, but this computer is to be used for enrolling all eligible Legislative Council voters. This appears to me to be not in the general spirit of this Council, where enrolment and voting shall be voluntary. This computer can only analyse the information fed into it; it cannot make any decisions on its own. I assume the first thing to happen will be that the House of Assembly roll will be fed into the computer. Then what follows for a comparison? Are we to go to the Returned Servicemen's League and ask it for a list of all financial members in the league and feed that into the computer? What happens to those members who are not financial members of the league? What happens to those who are not returned soldiers? Are we to feed the land tax assessment into the computer alongside it, or are we to feed in all the Housing Trust tenants? Will all that go in? Once we have all this information in the computer, who will check the result, or is the result of the computer to be the final answer to the question: who is

eligible to be on the Legislative Council roll? To me it is outside the spirit of this Council, in that enrolment and voting shall be voluntary. The idea of this Council is to get a responsible cross-section of opinion.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't make me laugh!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am just trying to inform the Chief Secretary. I should hate to make him laugh outright because he has a throaty chuckle.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I enjoy myself when the honourable member talks like that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Anyhow, I hope the Chief Secretary will give this Council more information on how this computer will work and the object behind its use.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have had all the information on that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It may well be in the interests of the people of South Australia, as this State is in serious difficulties, to take a second look at this matter of spending so much money on this doubtful end.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Something that has nothing to do with the Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Is the Chief Secretary going to find shortly what he is looking for in his second reading speech?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot keep going much longer. I am doing the best I can so that the Chief Secretary can find it in his second reading speech.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member may be right, but it is not often that he is right.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I require information on this and I plead with the Government to keep in mind the State's financial position and not to continue to overlook the essential development of this State. It is obvious from a comparison of the 1964-65 Budget with this one that there has been a change in priorities from the developmental side of expenditure to the purely social services side of expenditure, and this can only have repercussions on the welfare of the whole of South Australia.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): In rising to speak to the Appropriation Bill, I wish to confine myself to one or two subjects. However, before I mention these, I must refer to the terrible position reached in South Australia's finances as referred to in the opening paragraphs of the Treasurer's Financial Statement. It is a dismal story of a State that was developing faster than any other

State in Australia, a State that had an excess of exports over imports, a State that was rapidly expanding its educational and medical facilities and its transport system and, while doing all these things, a State that each year managed not only to balance its Budget but also have a surplus. It is the dismal story of that State suffering in a short space of time a conversion into a State that has managed to produce a record deficit, a State in which road development is falling rapidly below the forecast rate of two years ago, a State in which the expansion of educational facilities has had to be pulled far below the rate planned by experts in recent years; a State in which production is ceasing to expand in such a way as could have been expected; a State in which (as a result of all this) work and jobs are not available in the proportion they were only 12 months ago. This is tragedy enough for any modern State in a world in which technology is expanding so rapidly; a world in which other people are running or developing just as fast as we are; but, as if that were not enough, to crown it all the Government blandly tells us that it proposes to budget for a further deficit this year in Consolidated Revenue Account of over \$2,300,000. This surely must show an outlook of complete irresponsibility on the part of the Government.

So we see a sorry picture which I regret I have to repeat to honourable members, namely, that when this present Government came to power there was a handsome surplus in the Treasury. Even on June 30, 1965, after only four months of the Labor Government, the surplus in the Consolidated Revenue Account was \$1,220,526, but in a little more than a year the Government has succeeded in converting that surplus to a great deficit; worse, it seems to be happy to plan for another deficit this year. If South Australia's situation was such that planning for a deficit was the only way to keep the State vital and operating satisfactorily that would be a different matter but it is clear that the deficit this year has resulted in no little suffering and fear to our work force and further deficits can on a long term (and I repeat those words, "on a long term") only aggravate this position.

This ridiculous type of financing and planning can only be looked at as more sinful when we consider the fact that there are signs of clearly wasteful operations being encouraged, such as the proposed wasteful use of \$70,000 on a computer programme which, according to

the Government's statement for all to see, is to be used for what is fundamentally a Party political operation. Why is this? Because one member of the Government is fanatically keen on disrupting the present Constitution of this State.

Turning to details of the Bill, I see that money which was anticipated for education is now being denied to the people of this State by mis-management of Treasury finances. Honourable members will remember that when the Australian Universities Commission was established in 1959 one of its terms of reference read:

The Commission shall perform its functions with a view to promoting a balanced development of universities so that their resources can be used to the greatest possible advantage of Australia.

The commission, I believe, is doing magnificent work and the fact that the total of direct grants to the States for universities by the Commonwealth Government has more than doubled in the two triennia is surely proof that the Commonwealth Government is treating this matter of tertiary education extremely seriously. The figures are:

Year.	\$
1960-61	22,454,000
1961-62	28,322,000
1962-63	31,418,000
1963-64	33,860,000
1964-65	41,274,000
1965-66	46,778,000

The third report of the Australian Universities Commission as given on September 21 last shows that in the 1967-69 triennium the Commonwealth Government proposes to spend as a total on education at tertiary level \$512,000,000, an increase of \$120,000,000, or approximately 30 per cent over the \$390,000,000 being the cost of the present programme which ends in December. The figure of \$512,000,000 is approximately \$56,000,000 less than the programme recommended by the Universities Commission. The reduction arises from a request from the Premiers' Conference held last June. That recommendation was to the effect that consultations should take place between the Commonwealth Government and each of the State Governments separately to decide how high they could go. In other words, the States wanted the right to say the upper limit which they could afford to pay.

It is too easy now to say that the Commonwealth Government has refused the Universities Commission's recommendations and therefore it is no longer possible for the universities to have their money. The point is, it was reduced

at the instigation of the State Premiers; the discussions took place with each State separately and each State indicated the upper limit which it could support.

When one considers the various reports of experts which the Commonwealth Government has to consider when making up its Budget (for example, the Vernon Report, the report of the Defence Department and its service heads, the report of experts in support of the continuation of the Snowy Mountains Authority, or of the expert recommendations for the expansion of the Ord River Development Scheme—these are only a few, but all vital to Australia's prosperity, development and safety—as well as the report of the Australian Universities Commission) then the fact that total expenditure by the Commonwealth Government on education went from \$49,726,000 in 1960 to \$125,238,000 in 1966 and that the estimated total for 1966-67 is \$155,795,000 (or more than three times greater than in 1960) surely is a matter for congratulation.

When, however, in this developing partnership in education between the Commonwealth and the States there is an inability on the part of a State to play its part as is happening in South Australia at present, then it is a matter for alarm and despondency. Certainly it was a relief to see the announcement in yesterday's *Advertiser* that an agreement had been reached between the Commonwealth and State Governments that the University of Adelaide was to receive an additional \$790,000 for the 1967-69 triennium building programme, making the total to be received for that purpose \$2,668,000. However, this is only a trifle when one looks at the overall picture on page 80. Honourable members will see under the heading of "Education, Miscellaneous—University of Adelaide", additional general purpose grant proposed, \$7,390,000; which is a decrease of \$3,320,919 on last year's payment.

What of our new university? When it was established it had high hopes. The Council of the University of Adelaide sent forward its recommendations for its proposals to the Australian Universities Commission with regard to the development of Bedford Park, as it was known then, for 1963-66. The submission envisaged that Bedford Park would accept students from the beginning of the 1966 academic year. The basis of planning was that in 1966 Bedford Park would accept 250 art students and 150 science students. In addition, 70 medical students would take their first year there and then proceed to Adelaide University. In 1966 first-year undergraduate courses in

higher degree work would be available and second year degree courses. Second and third year courses would be added in 1967 and 1968 respectively. By 1970 enrolments at Bedford Park were expected to reach about 2,000.

Later, the handbook said that the university hoped that residential accommodation on the site would be established for a substantial number of students. It was expected that the first halls of residence would be established for a substantial number of students, and it was expected that the first halls of residence would be available by the beginning of 1968. In point of fact, under the financial arrangements today, development of Flinders University is being curtailed and will be much behind the programme referred to by me then. The expected expansion of facilities and of student enrolment has been grossly upset. If Flinders University manages to develop successfully in the next few years, I consider that will be only because of the planning, care and attention to detail given to its future by a handful of dedicated people, not the least being the brilliant economist who is Vice-Chancellor. I seriously remind the South Australian Government that the state of education in a country is generally acknowledged as determining the country's economic growth and, on the other hand, that the economic structure of a country requires an educational development to a certain level to support and maintain that structure. In other words, education and economic development go hand in hand.

The total proposed in the Budget for Railways Department is \$30,936,112. I am sure that the Railways Department does all that it believes it possible to do to reduce the department's annual losses. The Auditor-General's Report for last year states that operations for 1965-66 resulted in a deficit of \$9,011,000, an increase of \$1,883,000 compared with the previous year. Compared with 1964-65, earnings were down \$823,000 and earnings a train mile fell by 6c to \$4.49.

I make the plea that, despite these laudable aims to improve the position, the department could spare a thought for the convenience of its customers among the travelling public and for the improvement of its services, in order to increase its profits. I believe that such an irritating practice as making the large area between the Government Printing Office and the Adelaide Railway Station into a public car park for a total gross amount of \$10,782, so that legitimate travellers cannot park their

cars, either to leave luggage or to meet trains, is sheer lunacy.

On September 13, after I had been personally involved in this matter in the previous week, I asked a question about it. I first asked what space was made available and for how many cars for members of the Railways Department staff. The answer I received was that there was space for 230 vehicles, of which number 23 were reserved for staff vehicles and vehicles used on departmental business by Motor Vehicles Department staff. The reply given to a later question was that only slightly more than 10 per cent of the parking spaces available are reserved for staff vehicles used on departmental business.

When any member of Parliament asks a question and the Minister is willing to give a reply, it ill-behoves any Government department to supply the information to the Minister in a double-handed sort of way. I take a poor view of such an attitude towards both the Minister and the honourable member. At no time did I ask for the number of spaces reserved for staff cars used on departmental business. My question related to cars belonging to railways staff. That the Railways Department was quite aware of the meaning of my question is made clear by the answer to my second question, which was, "Is any charge made to the members of the railways staff for these privileged parking spaces in this public area?" The answer was that a parking fee of 20c a day was charged. I am not naive enough to think that this applies to staff cars used on departmental business.

I truly deplore this attitude of the Railways Department in supplying to the Minister such information in reply to a perfectly genuine question. My fourth question to the Minister was whether he was aware of the inconvenience suffered by people who could not park near the railway station when they were trying to collect passengers, and so on. The answer to that was that he was not aware of it. This, again, is the department's information:

It will be seen that out of a total of 230 parking spaces, only 26 are specifically reserved for railways purposes.

On September 27, a fortnight after I asked my question, I received from a constituent a letter, which included the following:

I was surprised and pleased when looking through *Hansard* No. 12 this evening to notice your question on page 1499 relating to Adelaide Railway Station parking. As late as August 27, 1966, I wrote to the Railways Commissioner

in reference to a similar matter and was not at all pleased with the negative reply I received some 18 days later.

In his letter dated August 27 to the Railways Commissioner, he said:

I feel compelled to write to you in relation to the rules imposed regarding the parking of cars in the railway grounds during departure and arrival times of trains. I was highly incensed this morning when I had need to meet the second division of the Melbourne Express arriving around 10.30 a.m. I am aware that the lower level of the parking grounds is available for such purposes, free of charge. I proceeded to the area, only to find it hopelessly overcrowded with a number of cars circling in an endeavour to find a space. The next best thing was to proceed back to the upper level park, where there was any number of spaces available, and I quickly parked. However, having noticed an attendant collecting fees as I drove in, I felt I should walk back to him at the entrance and explain that my stay would be for an express purpose and for a few minutes only. He nicely but firmly pointed out that he had no alternative but to charge me 40c. This was paid and the ticket attached. I was so annoyed at this imposition that I then called at the office of the station master. I was received sympathetically but told it was the ruling of the powers that be.

Sir, I believe it is outrageous to impose a fee of this magnitude for people using the services provided by your department. If it is necessary to ration the use of available parking spaces, as indeed it may well be, then surely parking meters where one pays on a time occupied basis are long overdue. If the railways are going to compete with their more advanced competitors, such as the airways, is it not time you followed their lead? One reads almost daily of the falling patronage of the railways and the need to encourage greater use of the facilities that are provided. I suggest that, if you continue to inconvenience your customers in the way I was inconvenienced this morning and endeavour to make good your deficit by charging such ridiculous fees as I paid this morning, patronage of the railways will further suffer. Verification of all I have said can be obtained from the station master on duty . . .

On September 14 this constituent received the following reply, which was signed by the Secretary:

With further reference to your letter of August 27, addressed to the Railways Commissioner, I am directed to thank you for the suggestions contained therein. In expressing regret for any inconvenience which you may have experienced in obtaining parking space for your motor car at the Adelaide Railway Station on August 27, it is desired to say that throughout the city area, particularly on a Saturday morning, parking space is at a premium. At the Adelaide station free parking is provided on Railway Road (North Terrace level) and at the quadrangle (platform level) whilst a charge is made between certain hours for members of the public desiring to park motor cars in the area behind the Government Printing Office.

I most sincerely bring this matter to the Minister's attention, and hope that a different approach can be made to it by the department.

I turn now to the Social Welfare Department. Some concern is being shown at the Government's apparent inability to help the lot of the deserted wife in South Australia. When the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill was passed last year, I for one had high hopes for the successful functioning of the new set-up. On page 49 of the Estimates, honourable members will see that an increase of \$111,394 is planned for general expenses, salaries and wages in the Department of Social Welfare, and of this increase \$109,446 is for salaries and wages to the Deputy Director of Social Welfare, medical officer, psychiatrists, and so on. Under the heading "Children's Welfare" there is an increase of \$208,987. Despite the increase of over \$300,000, no improvement has been evident in a matter that was regarded as one of the main aims of the Bill. When introducing the Bill last year, the Chief Secretary said:

It is designed primarily to change the administration of the Maintenance Act and the department administering that Act, to amend and consolidate into one Act the present provisions of that Act, the Children's Institutions Subsidies Act and the law governing the making and enforcement of orders for the payment of maintenance and other necessary expenses of deserted children, spouses and other persons left without means including the reciprocal enforcement of maintenance and other orders between this State, the other States and Territories of the Commonwealth and certain reciprocating countries outside Australia. The Bill will bring the law of South Australia relating to the making and enforcement of orders for the payment of maintenance and other necessary expenses of persons left without means of support substantially into line with uniform principles which have been agreed to by the Standing Committee of Commonwealth and State Attorneys-General and which already have been given effect in the legislation of New South Wales and Victoria.

In other words, if this Act was going to work, it was obvious that it was intended to give some amelioration of the situation in which so many deserted wives and children were left high and dry by the deserting husbands skipping to other States. I supported completely this whole new set-up yet in the press every day there are letters proving that it is not working and that the department is somehow not fulfilling its expectations. Honourable members can find these letters for themselves: they are appearing in a series in the *Sunday Mail*. One letter from a woman states:

In my own case arrears are approaching \$2,000 over two years.

I am aware that some of these arrears occurred before this legislation came into force. The letter continues:

What will be my situation and that of all other supporting mothers in six years if the present apathy of the prosecution department of the Social Welfare Department is allowed to continue? What service is the Social Welfare Department actually performing?

This is a problem that is facing the Government. It has all the machinery: we passed it in legislation last year, and I would be glad to have the matter cleared up by the Minister. These matters may seem of a minor nature when discussing the gloomy financial state of South Australia today, but the welfare of every person in the community should be a major concern for any Government.

The question we must ask ourselves is: how much longer can South Australia afford to be impoverished by political ineptitude? For those who believe in federation—in the system adopted in the Commonwealth of Australia—the inability of the States to manage their finances properly poses a very great threat to our federal system. Even by the most superficial examination of the situation ruling in South Australia at the moment, it is clear that the Government's inability to find finance for the important requirements of the community creates very great pressure and demand from various quarters for more and more federal aid, which results in interference in administration of our social services, and by that I do not mean pensions: I mean social requirements, all those things by which people live—education, medical facilities, transport, and so on. The ultimate of this demand for federal aid can be only the complete destruction of the federal system. Circumstances must inevitably arise in which the States can no longer control their range of activities to make the system of federation worth while. As a person who believes strongly in the States retaining as much autonomy as possible, if only because it brings the seat of Government closer to the people being governed, I abhor the financial mismanagement of the type we are currently observing.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the unimproved value that governs the limitation of holdings for allotment of Crown lands, and to increase the existing value under which transfer, subletting, or surrender for conversion to other tenure may be permitted. These amendments, which have been recommended by the Land Board, after a thorough examination of the position, follow the land tax quinquennial assessment of 1965, adoption of which for the purposes of certain provisions of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1965, has disturbed the pre-existing relationship between permissible areas of holdings and the present requirements of the Act.

The Land Board has examined the situation very closely and having regard to the higher unimproved values of land in certain parts of the State—in the lower and middle north, Yorke Peninsula, certain areas of the South-East, and lower Eyre Peninsula—has recommended that the limitation upon unimproved values for transfer, subletting and surrender for conversion of tenure, be increased from \$24,000 to \$36,000. An examination of the assessment shows this change to be necessary to ensure that landholders in the areas mentioned will be placed in a position approximating that which existed prior to the 1965 assessment. Although there will be some minor changes in the relative position of the landholders in these areas, the increase proposed should achieve the purpose for which it is designed. Although the action now proposed will restore the relative position in the areas mentioned, the board's examination has disclosed that in many parts of the State an increase in the limitation to \$36,000 would permit very considerable aggregations of land if unimproved values were the only factor considered.

With recent advances in developmental and land use techniques, these areas have experienced rapid development with correspondingly marked and substantial increases in land values. Examples are readily available in the mid South-East areas of county Cardwell and parts of Eyre Peninsula, particularly in the vicinity of Kimba and Wudinna, where the land tax assessment is considerably lower than prices realized in recent sales. It is quite clear that, if unimproved values included in the land tax assessment of 1965 were the only criteria of limitation, very extensive areas, upwards of 12,000 acres, could be aggregated. Such aggregations are contrary to the intention of the Crown Lands Act, and for this reason, and in view of the need to meet the constantly

increasing demands of settlers for land, particularly from sons of farmers, provision is made in the Bill for regard to be had to the total area of land that may be held.

With the advances in developmental techniques, improved methods and installation of drainage, holdings of 4,000 acres in county Cardwell are considered to be generous living areas. They would have a potential carrying capacity of from 6,000 to 8,000 dry sheep, although the unimproved values shown in the land tax assessment would not in most cases exceed \$12,000. Similarly, in certain parts of Eyre Peninsula, notably the Kimba district, areas of 4,000 acres of agricultural land must be regarded as completely adequate.

This Bill proposes to increase the limitation in cases of allotments of land under lease or agreement from \$10,000 to \$15,000 (clause 4, which amends section 31 of the principal Act). This section has not been amended for many years and it is now considered necessary to do so in consideration of the increases in unimproved land values which have taken place. Further, it is proposed to increase the limitation in cases of transfer, subletting and surrender for conversion to other tenure from \$24,000 to \$36,000 (clauses 5 and 6, which amend sections 220 and 225 of the principal Act). For reasons already set out, provision is made for a limitation of 4,000 acres upon the total area of holdings except in the case of land situated outside of hundreds or within certain hundreds specified in a new schedule inserted by clause 7.

Further provisions of the Bill (clauses 4, 5 and 6) eliminate reference to "Goyder's line of rainfall" in sections 31, 220 and 225, substituting references to lands outside of hundreds for lands within hundreds specified in the new schedule. These amendments are designed to remove anomalies which occur where Goyder's line excludes some substantial areas of land which, as a result of advances in techniques, are now used extensively for cereal growing. Clause 7 of the Bill inserts the new schedule of hundreds into the principal Act. By clause 3 the Governor is empowered to amend the schedule by proclamation. A map showing the hundreds included in the new schedule is available for information of honourable members. I request that this Bill pass through its remaining stages without undue delay so that it can be given effect to.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary):
I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object will, I think, be apparent to honourable members. Section 225 of the Licensing Act provides for a petition for a local option poll to be presented in February or March, 1955, or any third year thereafter. The next third year period will occur in 1967, that is, next year. All honourable members are aware that a Royal Commission into the Licensing Act has been set up and is still conducting its investigations. Among other things, the Commission will inquire into the subject of local options. It is clearly undesirable that local option polls should be held during the early part of next year, in view of the fact that on completion of the Commission's inquiries legislation may be required. Accordingly, it is now provided that any local option polls should be postponed for one year. The Bill is designed solely to maintain the existing position pending the outcome of the Royal Commission's investigations.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2046.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill. We have had a number of speeches from honourable members on this matter. It is an important Bill in many respects but at the same time there are one or two matters foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Hill in the amendments on the file that deserve our closest scrutiny in the Committee stage. Earlier this afternoon the Hon. Mrs. Cooper made some remarks about our federal system of government. What she said was important, but also in our system of government there is a due and proper place for local government, which after all is the government of the people of this State closer to the people than any other form of government. It plays an essential part in our whole federal system. Because of that we should be careful about how the State Government or any instrumentality of that Government intrudes into the fair and proper field of local government.

On the other hand, I understand that both this Government and the previous Government have from time to time had examples of laxity

on the part of municipal corporations and district councils as regards the essential part of their financial activities. This Bill extends the right given to the Minister to require the Auditor-General to report on any matter; it also gives the right to the Auditor-General, without any request from the Minister, to examine accounts and conduct an audit thereof. I think we have to look at this from the viewpoint that, after all, the Auditor-General's office was created by Statute and he has the statutory power to conduct an audit of the State Government's financial documents at any time. At first sight, I believe one can see little objection to the right of the Auditor-General (or any officer he may appoint) to make an audit of any municipal or district council books on his own motion. This may, perhaps, be considered by some people to be an unwarranted intrusion upon the autonomy of a local government body but, on the other hand, we must face the fact that the Auditor-General is responsible to Parliament.

Local government authorities derive revenue not only from ratepayers but also from Government sources, and because of that I will need convincing that anything is wrong with the idea that the Auditor-General should have the right at any time to make an audit. That seems to me to be the central matter in the Bill; that is, what rights the Auditor-General should have. There has been some feeling that, if an attempt is made to standardize accounting procedures used by various councils, whatever may be the reason for so doing, that is going too far. Of course, it has always been the prerogative of an auditor to say to any firm or individual that a particular system of accounting is highly desirable as far as he is concerned and, although this may not be binding upon the individual or firm, nevertheless I think a certain moral obligation would rest upon the firm or individual to follow any strong suggestion that an auditor might make. After all, if there is something fundamentally wrong with a system that makes it easy for mistakes to be made, or for embezzlement, the auditor is the person responsible for uncovering such errors and he bears a certain responsibility for advising an individual or firm on the type of accounting system that should be used.

I do not wish to say much more about this Bill at this stage, and I do not claim to be an expert on local government. I have not had personal experience of such work nor have

I taken part in local government activities, but many members of this Chamber have had long years of service in local government in one form or another. I will listen with a great deal of interest to the suggestions and comments that such members, in particular, make concerning the requirements set out in this Bill. I think there may be one or two matters that have already been raised during the second reading debate that will need to be given more attention in the Committee stage of the Bill. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2044.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): This Bill deals exclusively with the problem of those sections of wharves at Port Pirie using cranes built and owned by the Broken Hill Associated Smelters, and operated by that company. On this section of the wharves eight cranes operate and, with two new cranes being built by the end of this year, there will be 10 operating at Port Pirie for the B.H.A.S. The cranes work on wharf areas 7, 8, 9 and 10, used for loading and unloading of pig lead and lead and zinc concentrates into railway trucks to dumps and from the dumps to ships' holds for export, some overseas and some for Tasmania. These cranes are essential sinews of the largest lead smelting works in the world which in 1963-64 exported \$30,000,000 of pig lead to oversea markets.

As the Mines and Works Inspection Act applies at present, these cranes are under the supervision of the Act. If accidents occur, the company has the necessary directions under the Act for reporting them. The Act also gives authority to the Mines Department to examine safety precautions in the use of equipment. It is suggested in the amendments before us that wharf areas 8, 9 and 10 will be under the authority of the Mines and Works Inspection Act whereas areas 5, 6 and 7 will be under the control of the Harbors Board.

Let us consider how these cranes are used in relation to the overall problem of the B.H.A.S. and the wharf areas. Areas 8, 9 and 10 adjoin the company's lease and are used principally for the exporting of pig lead. The railway tracks on which the cranes move in a north-south direction run from areas 8, 9 and

10 into the wharf area No. 7, which is outside the smelters area, although the cranes on No. 7 are owned and operated by the B.H.A.S. However, if this Bill becomes law, they will come under the control of the Harbors Board. The cranes, when used opposite wharf 7, are used continuously daily. They are used for the unloading from railway trucks of lead and zinc concentrates, and they are used approximately fortnightly for the loading on ships of concentrates for Risdon in Tasmania. The area covered by wharves 5 and 6, which adjoin No. 7, will also come under the control of the board. This area is used for the export to other countries of lead and zinc concentrates and is under the control of a stevedoring company that uses a system of mobile cranes, motor trucks and ships' slings to load the material.

The pattern is that wharves 7, 8, 9 and 10 are used exclusively by Broken Hill Associated Smelters. Officers of the company have said that these cranes are used for 5 per cent of the time on any general cargo other than cargo that the company itself wishes to load or unload. It seems ridiculous to have wharves 8, 9 and 10 under the control of the Mines and Works Inspection Act and wharf 7 under the control of another authority altogether when, as I have pointed out, all four wharves are used by the company for its specific needs. I cannot see the logic of that. The statement has been made that it has been difficult to get the waterside workers to abide by some rules and regulations laid down by the Mines Department inspection authority and that the waterside workers might not approve of the idea of having to wear hard hats when loading or unloading operations are in progress.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I wouldn't like to have to tell them they had to do that.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If the waterside workers working on wharf 7 did not want to wear tin hats when the cranes were loading concentrates and within a few yards in a northerly direction on wharf 8 the regulations applied, assuming hard hats had to be worn, the men would be obliged to take such safety precautions as were required. That does not seem to be a logical argument.

Regulations are applied in three areas where the company uses the wharf for 95 per cent of the time, while there is to be a different set of rules for another wharf that is used daily and from which ships are loaded fortnightly. We have only one Police Force for all the people and the community is expected to abide

by the rules laid down for the betterment of society. Why should areas be split, when the problem is common? I reserve my decision regarding this Bill until I have received a satisfactory answer from the Minister.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines): I do not desire to speak at length. In my brief explanation, I gave the reasons for introduction of this Bill and I said that, when the Act was previously amended, it was not the intention that wharves 5, 6 and 7 should be included. Honourable members have to some extent disputed that, because of the phraseology of the legislation. However, I still contend that it was never the intention to have all wharves at Port Pirie covered by the Act, because it would be impracticable to bring wharves used for general merchandise and general shipping, for instance, under the Mines and Works Inspection Act. There would be no jurisdiction at all.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the explanation given by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, as Minister of Mines when the previous legislation was before the Council. There is no doubt in my mind that it was intended at the time to cover wharves 8, 9 and 10. We know the amendment was introduced at the request of the Smelters. An accident had occurred on the wharf in connection with the use of a crane on the wharf and the company said that it had no authority to approach in relation to such matters as the reporting of accidents, and requested that the wharves on which it was operating be brought under the Mines and Works Inspection Act for the purpose of safeguarding those concerned while work was being carried out.

During the debate on the 1962 amendment a query was raised by the late Mr. Bardolph as to the effect of the amendment on industrial matters so far as the Waterside Workers Federation was concerned. At the third reading stage those queries were again raised. I repeat that it was not the intention at the time to have all these wharves covered by the Act. The following reply was given by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin to the late Mr. Bardolph:

The amendment was introduced following on a request from the Broken Hill Associated Smelters for some responsible authority to take over control of the safe working of wharf cranes on the northern portion of the Smelters wharf. These cranes handle both inward and outward material for the Smelters and traverse portion of the Smelters, portion of the wharf and also over ships. With respect to safe working practices on the Smelters, the

cranes come under the Mines and Works Inspection Act, over ships under Commonwealth maritime control, but on the wharf itself the cranes are at present no-one's responsibility, *e.g.*, accidents with the cranes on the wharf are not reportable to any authority at present. The whole purpose of this amendment is to ensure a competent authority that accepts responsibility for safe working conditions for the cranes operating on the particular portion of the wharf adjoining the Smelters.

That explanation leaves no doubt about the intention of the 1962 amendment. If, as honourable members have suggested, all these wharves should come under the jurisdiction of the Mines and Works Inspection Act, where it is considered that hard hats should be worn, I should hate, as I have said by way of interjection, to be the person to go to the waterside workers working vessels on other portions of the wharves and tell them that, under regulations made under the Mines and Works Inspection Act, they had to wear hard hats. Honourable members can imagine what they would tell me or anyone else, because there is no jurisdiction under that Act. If honourable members say that all these wharves at Port Pirie should be under the jurisdiction of the Mines and Works Inspection Act, it is just as logical for them to say that every wharf at Port Adelaide or other ports should also be under that Act, because there is the same set of circumstances. Much of the material exported from Port Adelaide is the same type of material as is exported from Port Pirie. We know perfectly well that this was not the intention in 1962, and it was never the intention. Because of that, and because of the understood intentions in 1962, these cranes have not been inspected by inspectors of the Mines Department. The cranes under their jurisdiction have been examined repeatedly, but they have not examined those on the other wharf, because they have not had any jurisdiction over them.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: If what you say is correct, why amend the Act?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: All these wharves are now under the Mines and Works Inspection Act.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: They are not; only the cranes are.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The term "wharves" is used in the Bill. If it is said that the intention was that all these wharves and cranes would be brought under the Mines and Works Inspection Act, it would be just as logical to say that every other wharf in this State should be treated in the same way.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

After "wharves" second occurring to insert "7".

I hoped that we would have had some indication from the Minister about why this change was made. The Minister said that it was purely to deal with accidents. In 1962 a crane dropped a crate of concentrates on the wharf. This caused damage to the wharf, but no-one was injured. The cranes travel over the whole of the wharves mentioned in this clause, and over a portion of wharf 7. The machines there are handling the same materials as are handled on the other wharves. The Minister has said nothing about what happens when the crane gets on to wharf 7. I think my amendment is consistent with what was said in 1962. Wharves 7, 8, 9 and 10 are identical, and I think it is ridiculous to have only three mentioned in the Bill. If the Minister thinks this cannot operate, why leave the other three in the clause? I think it is logical on the Minister's own reasoning that wharf 7 should be included.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines): There are occasions when wharf 7 is used for the exporting of zinc concentrates to Tasmania. I have been told that this takes place once a month.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It is once a fortnight.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My information is that it takes place once a month. However, it is used in relation to the activities of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters in relation to the crane, and in the circumstances I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am still not clear on what happens in relation to wharves 5 and 6. The Minister said by interjection that the wharves would come under the jurisdiction of the Harbors Board regulations, and I asked him what power the Harbors Board had to deal with the equipment on them. I could not find a regulation governing that. I was keen to know that because all the wharves were under that jurisdiction and, if Nos. 5 and 6 are being taken out of the jurisdiction of the Mines and Works Inspection Act, I want to be sure there is something in the regulations to cover the

position on these other two wharves, because there could easily be a hiatus here.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The purpose of the Bill is to protect the employees of B.H.A.S. This was the request we received. Wharves 5 and 6 came under the jurisdiction of the Harbors Board. The people working on them and returning every day are members of the Waterside Workers Federation, working under Commonwealth awards and the Maritime Act. The position here is just the same as in any other industry: there is a responsibility to report an accident to the appropriate authority for the waterside workers. The same conditions apply here as apply in other industries in respect of reporting an accident where working conditions are said to be unsafe. That position would still obtain whether or not this Act was extended to include these people. We had difficulty in framing this legislation to bring the whole of the machinery under the jurisdiction of this Act. Imagine what would happen if we told the employees to do this, that or the other, which was contrary to the working conditions of their own awards!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That may be so, but it does not overcome this fact. I know that the waterside workers are covered by Commonwealth regulations and in other ways whilst actually engaged in loading, but this equipment on the wharves is not the property of the waterside workers or of the stevedoring authority. Somebody has to be responsible for it. When dealing with wharves 5, 6 and 7 the Minister kept telling me that they would be handled under Harbors Board regulations. I tried to find those regulations. He still has not told me whether there are Harbors Board regulations covering my point.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I asked the very same question, whether the Minister could quote from regulations giving protection not only to the people working on the wharves but to other people who from time to time pass over them, in respect of the inspection of equipment. On wharves 5 and 6 there is a mechanical loader, which is not the property of the stevedoring authority and, although it has been the subject of some industrial unrest and has not been used, nevertheless at some time in the future there may be some agreement to use this type of equipment. In the circumstances, I should like the Minister to quote from a regulation under any of the authorities he has mentioned that will take the place of the Mines and Works Inspection Act in respect of wharves 5 and 6.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As I have said, the same conditions apply here as in other industries in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: As I understand it, the previous position was that if an accident occurred nobody was responsible to whom to report. It was nothing to do with the Commonwealth authority. Are these wharves the property of B.H.A.S., or what is the position? Why was there no legislation covering the position then? As I understood it, it was purely for the inspection of machinery: problems of compensation could arise if an accident occurred. Somebody had to be able to say whether the equipment was in proper order and safe to work: in other words, for the purposes of settling compensation and legal problems, the responsibility could be placed on the proper authority if an accident occurred. This is purely a matter of the safety of the machinery; it does not embrace industrial activities. I should have thought that the Minister could tell us what we wanted to know so that we would all be aware of the position. We want an answer to this. In the circumstances, perhaps the Minister could now report progress so that we could later have the benefit of that information. If he has not the information readily at his disposal, it must be obtainable somewhere. Who looks after this machinery? I understand it extends to all the wharves.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: No, only down to No. 7.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Those are the things I should like to be informed upon, if the Minister would do that.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I thought I had made it plain that the wharves with which we were concerned were held under lease from the Harbors Board. These are the wharves with which we are concerned at the moment. As questions have been asked in respect of the other wharves and the matter of jurisdiction, I ask that progress be reported and the Committee have leave to sit again.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 2110.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill was introduced after the electors had been consulted by way of referendum, and to that extent I believe Parliament has accepted the position that a mandate exists to introduce a lottery and, also to

that extent, I believe we must accept the Bill. The problem of lotteries has received much consideration over the years and it goes back to a period that I remember in the 1930's, when there was advocacy to promote a lottery for the purpose of supporting hospitals; and we find that included in this measure. At that time a Bill was introduced in another place and was defeated. Following that, and some time later, a commission was appointed consisting of four members of Parliament and a fifth person.

I do not have the actual report, but I remember a debate in the Chamber, which has been referred to recently. I intend to quote from the report of the debate because all of the information is contained therein. At that time one local government body was a little peevish over hospital rating. It was Mr. J. A. Lyons, M.P., who was really responsible for promoting the appointment of the commission, which comprised two members from each Chamber. The representatives from this Chamber were the late Hon. Frank Condon and the Hon. Collier Cudmore (now Sir Collier Cudmore) while the representatives from another place were Messrs. Hogben and Beerworth, with Mr. Piper, who I think had retired as Chief Judge from the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, as Chairman.

The commission visited every State, and in September, 1936, presented a unanimous report against the introduction of lotteries in South Australia. I think I would be quite fair if I said that when the commission set out on its investigations three of its four members were in favour of lotteries, but after taking evidence they produced a unanimous report opposing lotteries. A Bill was introduced into this Chamber in 1947—it was one of the last of two Bills introduced at that time. The Hon. C. R. Cudmore in his comments referred to the commission as follows (*Hansard*, 1947, page 498):

It interviewed hospital authorities, lottery and Treasury officials, the heads of women's organizations and churches, and even gamblers, who said they wanted a lottery for the sake of having a gamble. I do not intend to quote the report at length. It went into the history of lotteries over hundreds of years and emphasized that in practically all countries where lotteries had been tried they were eventually declared illegal. In England they were declared illegal in 1823. The report shows conclusively that with lotteries there is always a rising trend in connection with prizes and a falling off in benefits. It set out the seven arguments put before us in favour of a lottery and demolished them one by one. I

have always said that people should be able to have a legal bet and that betting between individuals is different from the Government actively urging people to gamble. In that connection I draw attention to what I consider to be the most important paragraph in the commission's report:

“120. In our opinion, there is a real difference in principle between a Government on the one hand taxing private betting or other private activities of the people, and on the other hand introducing a lottery for the purpose of raising money for one of its essential social services. In the former case, the Government takes no part in the promotion of the activities upon which a tax is levied. In the case of a lottery, Parliament, either directly or through a department established by it, promotes the lottery for the purpose of profit and takes an active part in inducing people to subscribe to it.”

The commission's report contained other important paragraphs, but I emphasize that it had the opportunity to study the effect of lotteries on hospitals wherever such lotteries were held, and it was clear that the public had only one thought in mind in investing in a lottery, and that was winning a prize—not helping hospitals. So, through the cowardice of the Government, we have presented to us this Bill for the establishment of a lottery. A clause in the Bill refers to money to be allotted in prizes, and I have mentioned that the hope of winning a prize is usually a person's main interest in a lottery. The allocation of prize money is covered in this Bill, and it also indicates that the lotteries will result in the establishment of a hospital fund, but that is only the milk in the coconut. Clause 17 of the Bill reads:

The commission shall offer as prizes in any lottery conducted under this Act not less than 60 per cent of the value of the tickets offered for sale in that lottery.

That means that at least six-tenths of the money collected in any one lottery will be allocated as prize money. There is no further reference in the Bill to this, but I take it that from the balance must be deducted the cost of printing, commissions, and all administrative charges. As far as our hospitals are concerned, I believe they will get a very raw deal as a result of this lottery, even if it is a success (which I doubt). We are going to try to operate a lottery, which is something Tasmania was unable to do when Victoria took it over from that State. Tasmania got into the position where it could no longer carry on a lottery and it had to be satisfied with the commission paid to it from Victoria. I believe that as South Australia will not be able to have a large lottery, and as the prizes will be the main consideration of the people and not charity,

there may not be any large sum available for hospital purposes.

I think that will be clear from reading the Bill, and the hospital fund is only an excuse for introducing a lottery. I think that the distribution of 60 per cent in prize money is most generous seeing that the people have been told that money will be going to charity. We shall have the added disadvantage that it will be convenient for many people, who up till now have been prepared to assist worthy charities by buying a button, to say to those persons giving up their time in order to sell buttons, "We have a lottery now; we don't want your buttons." I shall be interested if that is not the result. Clause 16 (6) provides for moneys transferred to the Hospital Fund as follows:

The moneys transferred to the Hospitals Fund in accordance with subsection (4) of this section shall, after making any payments made under subsection (5) of this section, be used for the provision, maintenance, development and improvement of public hospitals and equipment for public hospitals in such amounts as the Treasurer shall, upon the recommendation of the Chief Secretary (but subject to appropriations for the purpose for which Parliament may from time to time determine), approve.

We have all the qualifications regarding what will become of the 20 per cent or 30 per cent that remains after the payment of prizes and commissions, the meeting of administration costs, etc., and they make it obvious that the

reference to the Hospitals Fund is purely a blind for acceptance by a gullible public. The use of the money will be at the Government's discretion and, if there is money in the fund, another contribution will be made to Revenue, as we have seen in relation to funds appropriated for the convenience of the Government.

I am sorry that we have had to bring hospitals into this matter. The President of the National Council of Women in New South Wales gave pertinent evidence on behalf of that organization regarding sick and stricken people being dependent on what can be got out of a lottery ticket for the setting of the standard of medical services in the community. I think it is a poor way of tackling a problem that should be the responsibility of a Government itself, particularly a Government that pretends to offer more to the people by way of social services. However, a certain procedure in the form of a referendum has taken place. I regret that I have had to live to see this sort of fund raising used to support our hospital organization. However, in view of what has happened I have to accept the Bill, rather than support it.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.1 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 12, at 2.15 p.m.