

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS

## WATER PUMPING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer to the announcement in this morning's press concerning the likelihood of water restrictions being imposed in South Australia. I think we all realize that South Australia has not received its usual rainfall this year, nor has the rainfall in the catchment areas for the metropolitan area been normal. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague when pumping of Murray water to the metropolitan storages was stopped; what proportion of the reservoirs' capacity had been filled when pumping stopped; and whether the unfortunate breakdown at the Torrens Island power station will restrict the pumping of Murray water?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I was unaware that pumping to the metropolitan storages had been stopped. I think the press announcement concerning water restrictions was to the effect that such restrictions might be necessary if we did not receive good rainfall from now on. I am sure the honourable member agrees with me that everybody in this State should try to conserve water as much as possible. If this is done and we receive reasonable rainfall in the near future, restrictions may not have to be imposed. I shall convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Will the Minister also ascertain from the Minister of Works at what percentage of capacity the pumps have been operating during the winter months?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to do so.

## BUCKLAND PARK

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am asking this question of the Chief Secretary in his capacity as Leader of the Government in this Council because the matter I wish to raise should be dealt with at Government level. Last weekend the *Sunday Mail* contained an article stating that the well-known pastoral property, Buckland Park, was to be offered for sale by auction. This property is of great historical value and covers some of the best scenic country adjacent to Adelaide. In addition, it covers the area known as Port Gawler beach, which is somewhat unique in that it is a privately-owned area on the coast, whose boundary line is defined not by the high-water mark as is usually the case but by a defined line. The Port Gawler beach area is very rich in shellgrit deposits. In fact, areas adjacent to this have been extensively mined over recent years. The area I refer to is mentioned in the 1962 report of the Town Planning Committee as being required for a future recreational area. There is a very grave danger that if this area is auctioned it may be purchased by people who are interested in mining shellgrit deposits. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government has considered purchasing the Port Gawler beach area, which I believe consists of about 130½ acres? If it has not, will Cabinet discuss the matter at the earliest possible date?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: To my knowledge the Government has not considered purchasing this particular area. I should be quite happy to refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Tourism and Lands, whose department would control this matter, and to obtain a report on what could be done.

## LOTTERY PROFITS

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: A recent press announcement regarding the allocation of lottery profits to various named hospitals has caused much speculation among those members of the public who are directly concerned with the administration of hospitals throughout the State, particularly regarding the future allocation of lottery profits. Can the Chief Secretary indicate the policy of the Government in distributing profits from the State lottery to hospitals? Can he say whether

money from this source will be made available to country subsidized and community hospitals and, if it will, whether such money will be in addition to normal allocations?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I should like to give a considered reply to this question. However, I can say that the Act specifically provides what can be done with this money, and that provision will be carried out to the letter. I do not know whether the Act specifically refers to country subsidized hospitals. However, if the money from the Hospitals Fund is used towards paying the maintenance costs for the bigger hospitals, more money is left for capital grants to subsidized hospitals, so indirectly they will get some benefit. I think the main point of the question is whether any such grant will be additional to normal allocations. Although I cannot look into the future in this respect, the answer to that question in respect of this year is "Yes".

#### ELECTRICITY

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: 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. C. D. ROWE: We were all very sorry to read over the weekend that there had been what has been described as a malfunction of the turbo-alternator unit at the Torrens Island power station. We have been extraordinarily fortunate in this State in our engineering works. Over many years we have had no serious or major breakdown, which is a credit to the construction authorities, the department and everyone else concerned. It appears that this malfunction is serious and may involve a delay of some months, or longer, in the use of this unit, which means that capital equipment will be lying idle. Can the Minister make a more detailed statement than that released to the press? I understand it may not be possible or advisable to make a full and detailed statement now, but this matter is causing great concern in many places. Will the Minister be prepared to get a more detailed statement for this Council?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member has put the situation fairly and squarely. I am unable at the moment to give a report more detailed than that already published. An inquiry is to be held, subsequent to which I may be able to give further information. However, at the moment I do not see that I can promise to bring back reasonably quickly a report more detailed than that published in the press. That is as much as I

know about it. The matter has been reported to Cabinet and an inquiry will be held, but that is as much as I can tell the Council. I regret I am unable to give further information.

#### SILVERTON TRAMWAY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Minister of Transport say what progress has been made regarding an agreement with the Silverton Tramway Company in relation to the new standard gauge railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: All I can say is that negotiations are proceeding at the moment between representatives of this State, New South Wales and the Commonwealth. We hope that an agreement can be reached as soon as possible, taking into consideration, of course, that subsequent to an agreement being reached between the parties it will be necessary for legislation to be introduced into the respective Commonwealth and State Parliaments, because the present standardization agreement does not cover anything outside the borders of South Australia. I agree with honourable members that this matter is urgent. I have been interested in it for a long time and hope that, as a result of negotiations now taking place and further meetings that will take place shortly, some agreement can be reached.

#### GOODWOOD ROAD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of August 3 about the extension of Goodwood Road from the Colonel Light Gardens area to Shepherds Hill Road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Two roads are involved in this question. I have already given an answer in respect of the extension of Goodwood Road. The other road is Shepherds Hill Road. I promised the honourable member I would seek further information, which I now have in the following report:

Work is in progress on the widening and reconstruction of Shepherds Hill Road between Main South Road and Blackwood. Progress of the work is dependent only on the provision of adequate finance and completion of land acquisition. Current indications are that the work should be substantially completed by 1969.

#### MATRICULATION COURSES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I recently asked a question of the Minister about the possibility of a matriculation class being established at Balaklava High School in 1968. The Minister subsequently informed the Council that further information on this subject would be given shortly and that much depended on the availability of suitably qualified staff. In addition to the Balaklava High School, can the Minister obtain information regarding any other new matriculation classes that may be established in country high schools in the Midland District in 1968?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

#### BAROSSA WATER DISTRICT

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry representing the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 8 on the Barossa water district?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Works, advises as follows:

The scheme to improve supply to the Two Wells area and supply Virginia is one of considerable magnitude that may well have to be extended beyond that already planned. As previously stated, Loan funds likely to be available to the department are fully committed for several years and present indications are that funds could not be made available before 1969-70 at the earliest.

#### COURT REPORTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of July 18 regarding court reports?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Attorney-General reports as follows:

The reduction in press reports of court proceedings is due to a change of policy by the press, and the Leader of the Opposition should get his facts straight. There has been no change of policy by the Government which, indeed, welcomes the reports by the press of the results of court cases.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (on notice):

1. What stage has been reached in the planning of the Modbury Hospital, including its size?

2. When is it proposed to start construction?

3. What medical and nursing staff is likely to be required for this hospital?

4. What steps will the Government take to ensure that the present shortage of professional staff will not be aggravated by the completion

of the Modbury Hospital before the new teaching hospital adjacent to the Flinders University?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are as follows:

1. Preliminary planning of the proposed Modbury Hospital, including sketches and estimates, will be completed about the middle of next month for reference to the Public Works Committee. The hospital is being planned to provide 240 beds in Stage I, with a further 220 beds in the final stage.

2. The planning programme for the construction of the hospital provides for the Public Buildings Department to be ready to call tenders for preliminary work on Stage I of the project about January of next year, subject to Public Works Committee inquiry and report.

3. At this stage it is not possible to determine accurately how many medical and nursing staff are likely to be required for the new Modbury Hospital, but the whole question is receiving urgent consideration.

4. The Government fully realizes the necessity to provide adequate facilities for the training of sufficient professional staff to cater for the needs of the State and, therefore, it is planning the erection of hospitals at Modbury and Bedford Park with all expedition.

#### LICENSING BILL

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

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The object of the Bill is to give effect to most of the recommendations of the recent Royal Commission on the subject of licensing. The main exception is the suggestion of provision for Sunday afternoon trading in drinking lounges which the Government could not see its way to accept at the present time. Although the Bill follows the general plan of the existing Licensing Act, it was considered advisable, in view of the large number and substantial nature of the amendments required, instead of a complicated amending Bill, to produce a completely new Bill, thereby enabling honourable members to consider the whole matter without considering the effect of piecemeal amendments. The Bill is clearly a Committee Bill, and I do not propose to deal with every clause that it contains because many of them, particularly in the later parts of the

Bill, simply reproduce existing sections of the Licensing Act with the necessary consequential amendments, omitting, of course, provisions which are outmoded.

The main changes in the existing law comprise the establishment of a completely new and permanent Licensing Court, alteration of hours, removal of the provisions for memorials and local option polls, the substitution of licences for restaurants instead of permits, provision for cabaret and theatre licences, and general alterations in procedure to bring the Bill into line with modern conditions. Many drafting and machinery amendments have also been incorporated in the Bill, among these being provision for the payment of fees directly to the clerk of the court instead of to the Treasurer, thereby avoiding unnecessary administrative work. Part II of the Bill establishes a permanent Licensing Court, to consist of a chairman and deputy chairman, and a panel of Licensing Court magistrates in place of the present system of a number of district courts meeting only at quarterly intervals. Any three members of the court, including the chairman or the deputy chairman, constitute a full bench of the court and it is provided that its jurisdiction with certain specified exceptions mentioned in clause 6 can be heard by a single member of the court.

There are many applications of a formal character to which no objection has been taken which may be decided without the necessity of a hearing by the full bench but applications for licences, forfeiture, removal and suspension of licences, the imposition of conditions, appeals from a single member of the court and special cases are to be heard by the full bench. Subject to these exceptions, the distribution of jurisdiction will be determined under clause 6 by rules of court.

Clauses 7 and 8 make necessary administrative provisions, while clauses 9 and 10 provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court or the stating of a special case on questions of law. The new court will sit all the year round as occasion requires either as a full bench or as a single magistrate (for the most part the chairman) sitting in chambers and dealing with matters as and when they arise.

Part III, Division II of the Bill, provides for licences generally. Clauses 11 to 13 reproduce in substance existing sections of the Licensing Act except that the exemption of vigneron's selling on the premises will continue only for a period of 12 months after which a vigneron's licence will be required for cellar door sales. Clauses 14 to 32 inclusive deal

with classes of licence. These will comprise a full publican's licence, a limited publican's licence, a wholesale storekeeper's licence, a retail storekeeper's licence, wine licences, brewer's Australian wine licences, distiller's storekeeper's licences, vigneron's licences, club licences, packet licences, railway licences, restaurant licences, cabaret licences, theatre licences and special licences. Vigneron's, cabaret, and theatre licences are new. Special provision is made in clauses 15, 16 and 17 for the grant of licences at Wilpena, Leigh Creek and Aboriginal institutions, while clause 18 provides for a special licence for the Barossa Valley vintage festival and the annual festival at Hahndorf.

The hours of trading will extend in the case of full publican's licences from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. unless other periods (not exceeding 13 hours) between 5 a.m. and 10 p.m. are fixed by the court. Christmas Day will remain, apart from the service of liquor with meals as at present; that is, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. Liquor with meals will be served on ordinary days until 11.30 at night and on Sundays, Christmas Day and Good Friday between 12 noon and 10.45 p.m. In addition, provision is made for supper permits on ordinary days up till 11.30 p.m. There will be a period of grace of 15 minutes in the case of the ordinary supply and 30 minutes in the case of supply with meals. Special provision is made, not only for the fixing of different hours of trading, but also for the renewal of licences for publicans restricting the supply of liquor on certain conditions set out in clause 19 (3). This provision will make for flexibility in the renewal of publican's licences according to the nature of the business undertaken and the locality. Some hotels may concentrate on bar trade, others on the provision of accommodation and meals while others again may require a full licence.

Clause 20 of the Bill provides for limited publican's licences and is designed to cover motels which will, in general, concentrate on the supply of liquor with meals or supper, or to lodgers. Provisions relating to hours for licensed clubs are similar to those relating to publican's licences except in the case of exempt clubs which will retain their present unlimited hours. Clause 21 deals with wholesale storekeeper's licences. Clause 22 deals with retail storekeeper's licences. It is provided that such licences shall not be granted for a period of three years except to holders of storekeepers' Australian wine licences and thereafter unless there is a lack of facilities

for the supply of liquor. Clause 23 deals with wine licences. It is intended that no new wine licences are to be granted and that existing licences will only be renewed where the premises are of a high standard and food is available. Clauses 24 and 25 reproduce, in effect, existing provisions relating to brewer's Australian ale and distiller's storekeeper's licences. Clause 26 provides for a vigneron's licence and is new.

Clause 27 deals with club licences which, except for exempt clubs, will be able to trade during the same hours as hotels. There is also provision for conditional licences for clubs which do not require a full licence. Clauses 28 and 29 relating to packet and railway licences are unaltered.

The hours for the sale of liquor with meals in restaurants are set out in clause 30 of the Bill ranging on ordinary days between 12 noon and 11.30 p.m., and on Sundays, Christmas Day and Good Friday from 12 noon to 10.45 p.m. or such other hours as the court may fix. There is also provision for supper permits. Cabaret and theatre licences are provided for by clauses 31 and 32, which are self-explanatory. Clauses 33 and 35 are machinery provisions, while clause 34 (which reproduces section 28 of the present Act) provides for a special licence where an application has been adjourned. Clauses 36 to 38 inclusive provide for fees, which have been altered to the extent necessary to give effect to the new provisions. A minimum fee of fifty dollars has been provided.

Division IV (clauses 39 to 49 inclusive) deals with applications for licences and objections. These provisions largely follow the existing provisions but I point out that in future it will be necessary for applicants for all licences except packet licences to deposit plans (clause 40) while clause 41 enables the court to permit alterations in plans, a power which the existing courts have hitherto not had. I point out also that clause 46 of the Bill is new and follows the recommendation of the Royal Commissioner that the onus should be on the applicant for a licence to satisfy the court of certain matters set out therein, generally that the licensing of the premises in the locality is necessary, that the site is suitable and that regard shall be had to public needs. Clause 47 relating to objections widens the grounds of objection that may be taken by including the grounds set out in clause 46 in addition to the present range of objections which may be taken.

Divisions V and VI (clauses 50 to 54 inclusive) deal with the procedure on transfer and transmission. Largely, these clauses reproduce existing sections, but I draw attention to clause 51 relating to the sale of licensed premises, which is new. It provides a new procedure requiring application by the transferor and transferee jointly and the production of certain documents in connection with the transfer. Division VII (clauses 55 to 57 inclusive) deals with the removal of licences, and no substantial alteration has been made to the present procedure, except to bring it into line with the general procedure, with an additional power in the court to approve alterations in licensed premises. Likewise, Division VIII (clauses 58 to 63 inclusive) dealing with the procedure on the hearing of applications has not been substantially altered, but has been brought up to date.

I come now to Division IX (clauses 64 to 71 inclusive) dealing with special authorities to sell liquor. Clause 64 reproduces, with appropriate amendments, existing section 71 regarding booth licences except that, as recommended by the Royal Commissioner, only a holder of a full publican's licence may obtain this type of licence. Clause 65 is new and is designed to cover and extend the range of permits provided by existing sections in the Licensing Act. This clause enables any person, whether licensed or not, to apply for a special permit for the supply or consumption of liquor at an entertainment and sets out the procedure to be followed and the terms and conditions upon which the permit may be granted.

Clause 66 will enable existing licensed or unlicensed clubs to apply for permits for the keeping, sale and consumption of liquor on their premises on such days and during such times as the court fixes, provided that any liquor supplied is purchased from a hotel or a retail storekeeper in certain circumstances unless it is impracticable to comply with this condition. The Royal Commissioner drew attention to the fact that many unlicensed clubs were in fact breaking the law by supplying liquor without any licence or permit, and the new clause is designed to enable these clubs to put their affairs in order by obtaining a permit from the court. The remaining clauses of Division IX reproduce with any necessary amendments existing provisions.

Divisions X and XI (clauses 72 to 84 inclusive) dealing with forfeiture and general matters, reproduce with appropriate amendments existing provisions. I should draw attention to the fact that forfeiture on conviction

on an indictable offence will not be automatic as in the past, and that provision has been made for discretionary forfeiture where a licensee allows his premises to become unsuitable in any particular as well as ruinous or dilapidated as at present provided (clause 72). I point out also that subclause (2) of clause 80 includes directors of companies for the purpose of objections to applications for licences by companies.

Division XII (clauses 85 to 102 inclusive) dealing with clubs has not been substantially altered. All club licences except in the case of exempt clubs will in future authorize trading during the same hours and on the same conditions. Only existing clubs will be permitted to sell liquor otherwise than for consumption on the premises except where the court is satisfied that inconvenience in the procurement of liquor would occur, as in the case of remote areas. Division XIII (clause 103) dealing with licences at Renmark remains substantially unaltered while Part IV (clauses 104 to 115 inclusive) has been altered only to bring this Part dealing with railway licences up to date.

I deal now with Part V of the Bill (clauses 116 to 187 inclusive) which deals with the rights, duties and liabilities of licensees and others, and offences. In the main, this Part reproduces the greater part of Part VI of the existing Act with necessary consequential amendments and the excision of obsolete or outmoded sections such as section 133, requiring publicans to have lamps on the front of licensed premises, section 134 relating to additional bar rooms, section 135 requiring publicans to receive corpses, sections 172 and 173 relating to Aborigines, section 176 relating to the exclusion of children from bar rooms, section 178 relating to the supply of liquor to police on duty, sections 179 and 180 relating to the supply of liquor to drunkards, and section 192 relating to the prohibition of the sale of temperance drinks in licensed premises and the provisions relating to permits.

I shall not deal with all of the clauses in this lengthy Part for, as I have said, this Bill is essentially a Committee Bill, but will draw attention to important provisions or amendments. The first of these is clause 116 which adds to existing section 132 the requirement that a publican who holds a restricted licence shall exhibit on his premises, in addition to his name, a reference to the restrictions on his licence.

I refer next to clause 119 of the Bill which incorporates in rather more up-to-date form the existing provisions of the Innkeepers Act enabling a licensee to sell goods on which he has a lien for a debt owing to him. The Royal Commissioner recommended that the provisions of the Innkeepers Act should appear in the Licensing Act rather than in a separate Act.

I refer next to clause 151 relating to the prohibition of the supply of liquor to minors. To this section has been added a subsection providing that a minor obtaining or attempting to obtain liquor from licensed premises or consuming liquor on licensed premises will be guilty of an offence.

I refer next to clause 159 relating to the register of lodgers. The existing section 194 sets out what is to be contained in the register. The new clause provides that the register shall be in the prescribed form and contain the prescribed particulars. Existing section 195 relating to *bona fide* lodgers appears in a clearer form in clause 160, the amendment providing simply that so long as a person has arrived and been assigned a bedroom during the night of the day of his arrival or during the night of his arrival he shall be a *bona fide* lodger without the necessity of a special declaration.

Clause 165 relating to permits for wine tasting reproduces in a somewhat simpler form the existing provisions of section 199b, but extends the provisions to the tasting of any kind of liquor. Clause 166, which corresponds to existing section 200 relating to the duty to supply food and lodging, has been amended to include holders of restaurant licences with the necessary consequential amendments. Clause 176 reproduces existing section 212 with the addition that the Superintendent of Licensed Premises may be heard on any application, make a report and make submissions or recommendations on any matter, including the fixing of fees for licences or permits. Clause 179 corresponds to section 215 of the present Act, which requires a publican to keep his premises in good repair or to put them into such repair as may be required by an inspector. The new clause transfers to the Licensing Court the power to require a licensee to put his premises into repair, as recommended by the Royal Commissioner.

I refer now to two new clauses, namely clauses 186 and 187. Clause 186 introduces the new principle of the licensing of hotel

brokers. After 12 months from the commencement of the Bill a person acting as agent in connection with the disposal of any licensed premises will be required to hold a licence in terms of regulations to be made. This was considered by the Royal Commissioner to be a desirable provision. Clause 187, which is also based upon the recommendation of the Royal Commissioner, enables the fixing of maximum and minimum prices for liquor.

Part VI (clauses 188 and 189), relating to tied houses and onerous leases, reproduces sections 221 and 222 of the present Act, with a slight amendment to the first clause omitting a reference to the Midland District, since licensing districts will not exist after the commencement of the Bill. Part VII of the Bill is new. It enables the grant of licences in respect of historic inns.

Part VIII (legal proceedings and evidence) requires no particular comment except to say that in clause 192 witness fees are equated to those payable in the Supreme Court; that section 260 of the present Act limiting proceedings to a period of one month after an offence has been committed has been omitted; and that a general penalty clause has been inserted by clause 195, most of the references to penalties throughout the Act having been omitted. The last part of the Bill (Part IX) relating to regulations and forms (clauses 209 to 211 inclusive) reproduces the present Part, with the omission of the separate references to the necessity of regulations being published in the *Gazette* since this matter is already provided for by the Acts Interpretation Act.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, as this is a completely new Bill and essentially a Committee Bill I have not dealt with every clause because many clauses are no more than reproductions of existing sections with necessary amendments. I believe that I have said enough to indicate in broad outline the main purpose and intention of the Bill, which I commend to all honourable members for their serious consideration. I believe the Bill marks a step forward in the social legislation of this State, which at least in this regard has been out of date and lagging behind legislation on the subject in other States of the Commonwealth.

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

## PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1409.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I join with other members in expressing concern about the reduced allocation in the Loan Estimates this year, particularly for the items that deal with development. I think we have come to realize that this Government places little emphasis on developmental projects. It is very vocal on this item, but its actions tend to discourage rather than encourage industries, particularly new industries, to come to South Australia to develop and help increase our export earnings.

None of the items in the policy speech of the Labor Government deal with development. A great deal of emphasis is placed on the abolition of the Legislative Council, on road transport restrictions and on succession duties, and some industrial matters are mentioned. While appreciating that improvements to the Industrial Code and improvements in industry as a whole are necessary from time to time, we must also realize that these tend to impose restrictions and added cost on industry, which is the very thing we should be avoiding in this State.

This State's main attraction over the years has been that it has been a low-cost State. Any actions that tend to increase costs in South Australia undoubtedly reduce not only the number of industries that are prepared to set up here but the expansion of industries already settled in this State. In fact, one may term this Government "the gambling Government"—not because it has introduced Bills dealing with gambling but because it is gambling on the money it will receive from this legislation to help it balance its Budgets. It is gambling, too, in other ways. It has gambled on the season. We have noticed today reference to the possible introduction of water restrictions, something that has not happened for so long that we have almost forgotten the effect of such restrictions. This possibility is probably caused by the Government's gambling on the season, so that it was not prepared to continue pumping from the Murray River and thus ensure sufficient water reserves to see us through a possibly dry summer. In fact, water restriction is more than a possibility at present: it is a distinct likelihood. The Government should not have gambled like that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And, if we had pumped water right through and it had rained,

you would have told us we had wasted public money. Why don't you be reasonable and fair about it?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I want to be constructive.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are not being constructive this way; you want it both ways.

The Hon. L. R. HART: If the Chief Secretary will contain himself a moment—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Why don't you be reasonable?

The Hon. L. R. HART: —perhaps I can make a few helpful suggestions to him.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That would be impossible coming from you, in your frame of mind.

The Hon. L. R. HART: If we get into July and even August and are not pumping to full capacity, previous history shows us that it is most unlikely that there will be sufficient rains to fill the reservoirs.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will refer to you what you did in 1959; we have pumped for more hours than you did in 1959.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That may be so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We did not criticize you at that time.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We have had an increase in population since 1959, and further industries.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Why don't you be reasonable?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Therefore, our water consumption is considerably greater now than it was in 1959.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is easy to be wise after the event.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Government has no case on which to base its decision that it was not necessary to continue pumping water.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Government members always bellow when they are in trouble.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We do not mind being in trouble but at least we want to be reasonable and fair.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We shall try to be reasonable and fair. The main interest of this Government is the recirculation of money already in circulation, whereas it should be

emphasizing the development of industries, which can bring more money into this State and increase the money that can be circulated, because each time money circulates the Government gets taxation from it. The Government is prepared to pursue the policy of recirculation of money it already has; it is not interested in new money.

Unless we are prepared to place the emphasis on development, this State will never solve its financial problems. We have heard much about mandates in recent months—what the Government has and does not have a mandate for. I do not place much value on mandates, but apparently the Government does. If I asked it whether it had a mandate to use Loan money to balance its Revenue Account, the Chief Secretary, being a very fair man, would probably say, "No, we did not have a mandate, but they do this in the other States." So, if the Government has not a mandate to do things, it works on the basis that other States do these things and therefore they must be correct. I want to be constructive in my criticisms today, not destructive or unduly critical of the Government. I want to make a few suggestions about how it can probably save some money. First, I deal with a matter that is not of great concern perhaps to the Government but is of considerable concern to the people of South Australia. In the Loan Estimates last year \$30,000 was provided for a festival hall. This year there is no allocation. I am not being critical, as it may not be necessary to make some provision this year for the much discussed proposed festival hall. If an ordinary low-brow citizen like myself can make certain suggestions about what one may term a high-brow matter, which in the long run may save this State and the Government much money, I think I should do so. We all regret the delay not only in the provision of a festival hall for South Australia but also in a decision on the site it should occupy. We should get down to some realistic thinking on this. We should decide whether a festival hall for South Australia at present is essential. If it was, surely there would not be all this indecision about a suitable site. We should consider some of the facilities already available in this State to see whether they would be suitable to tide us over for a time. It is generally agreed that what is wanted is a hall suitable for the presentation of large-scale concerts, and for that adequate seating accommodation is essential. Acoustics are important, and parking facilities and



accessibility must be considered. Professor Bishop, the Director of the Elder Conservatorium, is reported to have said:

We do not need a great luxurious building, but we do need one which is adequate and meets the needs of normal concert-going. A festival hall would need a capacity of 2,200 to 2,600 to make it an economic proposition for big-scale performances.

At this stage I suggest we examine the Centennial Hall to see whether it would suit the purposes for which a festival hall is required, for the next few years until we can decide whether or not a festival hall should be built and whether we can afford a festival hall of the type at present being discussed. The Centennial Hall has seating accommodation for about 3,000, which is considerably in excess of what will be provided in the festival hall. It has adequate parking facilities, and I have been given to understand by competent authorities that the hall's acoustics are satisfactory, provided that there are sufficient people in it. However, acoustics today are not an insurmountable problem, as they can be improved by certain refinements that can be built into a hall. The Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia Incorporated, which owns the hall, is spending a considerable sum of money on modern dressing rooms for it. I suggest that the authorities examine the question of providing some refinements to the hall, with the idea that it serve the purposes of a festival hall for the time being at least. The next Festival of Arts is approaching, but by the time it is held we will not have a festival hall. If a little money were spent on improving the Centennial Hall, it could possibly be ready to meet the needs of the festival.

Possibly the expenditure of \$100,000 is all that would be required to bring the Centennial Hall up to the requirements for most concert performances. Of course, the hall is outside the city of Adelaide limits, which could mean that it would not be an attractive proposition to the Adelaide City Council. However, this should not deter any move to bring the hall up to concert performance requirements, which could be done at a very low cost and in a very short time, so that it could possibly be ready for the next festival. I suggest that this matter be examined.

There is a small problem at present in relation to the sale of pinus timbers. The Treasurer said that because of the problems of timber sales it was likely that repayments by the forestry undertaking would again be restricted and, therefore, would be below the levels of 1965-66 and the previous year. We are

given to understand that at present there is a considerable build-up of stocks of pinus timber at the Woods and Forests Department's sawmills in the South-East. If that is correct (and there has been no suggestion that it is not), it is hard to understand the Government's attitude toward casemakers in this State, particularly those who make cases for the tomato industry.

Government spokesmen have been very vocal about encouraging industries to establish in this State. The Government has stated that it is prepared to help industries to establish here. However, the tomato-growing industry is a ready-made industry and, indeed, is an export industry that brings money into South Australia. In addition, it has a very high employment content, both directly and indirectly. It exports about 1,000,000 half-cases of tomatoes each year. Last year the average price of the tomatoes exported from South Australia was about \$3 a half-case, which means that the export income from the industry in this State was about \$3,000,000. Due possibly to the floods in northern New South Wales, which is a major tomato growing area, in the coming year the value of exports from this State could increase to between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000. This industry is bringing new money into the State, not recirculating money already here. If a secondary industry with an export income earning of \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 indicated that it was prepared to start up tomorrow, the Treasurer would appear on television and make great capital out of this fact, yet the tomato industry, which is already in existence and which is ready to expand, has been denied timber for casemaking, which is one of its essential requirements.

As the Hon. Mr. Story stated last week, with the people interested in using pinus for casemaking we went to see the Minister in relation to this. We were told definitely that in future the Woods and Forests Department would not be able to supply the needs of box timber for the casemaking industry, yet in just over two years the department is finding it difficult to sell its timber. Despite this, however, it is still not prepared to supply the casemakers. The type of timber they require is not of good quality; it is reject material. In addition to this, on July 18 (at a time when the department must have known that it had increasing stocks of unsold timber) the price of timber to casemakers was increased. When stocks of any material increase, the best way to get rid of them is to lower prices; yet on

this occasion the department increased the costs of this industry. The casemaker contracts to make cases for his clients and he needs to know whether his supplies will continue to be available to him and what his forward prices will be. However, by the mere stroke of a pen the casemaker was told that he would not be supplied with certain sizes of timber in the future and, in addition, that prices would be increased. How can this industry possibly prosper in these circumstances? Is it any wonder that the Government is having problems in balancing its Budget when it is not prepared to assist existing industries in the State?

I turn now to harbours accommodation. It is very pleasing to see that \$600,000 has been provided to commence the Giles Point bulk loading facilities. The total estimated cost of this project is \$2,200,000 and it is pleasing to see that after considerable, possibly unnecessary, delay the Government is prepared to proceed with the work. However, I express concern at the decision of the Department of Marine and Harbours that tenders will not be called for any of this work and that it will be carried out by day-labour employees of the department. If that is so, one wonders if all possible economies are being effected. If that is to be the policy of the Government in relation to Giles Point then surely it will be its policy with other harbour construction work.

With the provision of facilities to accommodate containerized shipping one can assume that the volume of work available will be considerable and will require a vast amount of modern equipment if the work is to be carried out economically. Judging from answers I recently received from the Minister of Marine in relation to quantities, age, and condition of construction equipment owned by the department, it is evident that a vast quantity is old and in poor condition. It would seem probable that, if an expanding programme of harbour works in this State is under way, the Government must also be considering the purchase of modern equipment to carry out the work. On the other hand, if the Government is proposing to carry out the work by using outmoded equipment (by today's standards) it is denying the State economies that must result from calling public tenders in relation to such work.

Almost all of the Government bridge-building construction is carried out by contract, and obviously the Highways and Local Government Department is satisfied with the service and economies resulting from this system. Perhaps the department appreciates economies because it has no Loan moneys available to it. Surely

if it is good enough for the Highways Department to carry out major construction work under this system it would be consistent for the Department of Harbours and Marine to work on a similar policy, particularly when we have contractors in this State qualified and capable of doing the kind of work normally associated with wharf construction. At the present time contractors' plants are not fully utilized by the current volume of work. If the State is to invest capital in plant similar to that lying idle in contractors' yards, then it will be a flagrant waste of public money.

We are often criticized for being critical of the Government. However, my criticism is not destructive and I consider that I would be failing in my duty if I did not attack the Government on its obviously uneconomic policy in connection with harbour works; in particular, in the sphere of construction where the potential advantages of contract work are strikingly clear. One has the feeling that Ministers of the Government are not entirely "with it". I do not wish to be unduly critical of them, but one would assume that if a Minister did his homework he would know the answers to some of the questions posed. It was only this afternoon that I directed a question, which I thought to be of some importance, to the Leader of the Government in this Chamber.

It concerned a matter that I thought Cabinet might even have discussed, since it was a fairly live subject over the weekend, particularly as it concerned a piece of land that had been earmarked for future recreation requirements. The Government should have been aware that the land was about to be sold, yet it is obvious that the Minister in charge of the department concerned had not given consideration to it and that means that Cabinet has not discussed the matter. Last week I directed a question to the Minister of Transport I am glad to see that he is the one Minister now left in the Chamber to hear what I have to say—about the Direk railway siding, a matter on which I have spoken several times in the last few years. The Minister said he did not know the position at present but that he would obtain an answer for me. I thought when I came to the Council this afternoon I would receive an answer but it was not available. In fact, I do not require it because I know what that answer will be; it is also common knowledge in my district.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Then why ask the question?

The Hon. L. R. HART: It has been common knowledge there for the last three weeks, yet when I ask a question I do not receive an answer for several days. The Minister should have been able to give an answer off the cuff. That is the situation we are faced with at present: it appears that the Government is finding the job a little too big for it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Rubbish! You wouldn't know what day it was.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You will find your speech too big for you, too.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It may be too big for the Minister if he stays much longer.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We can handle you quite easily; you are only chicken feed.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I might be a pretty old chicken by the time I have finished. I turn now to an answer I received today in reply to a question I asked last week concerning the Barossa water district. In my opinion, the answer was most unsatisfactory. The Barossa water district had a place in the Loan Estimates for each of the last three years prior to the current one and it is interesting to look at the comments of the Government concerning that water district in the Loan Estimates as presented to Parliament. In 1964-65, under the heading "Barossa water district", the Treasurer's explanation stated:

A comprehensive scheme has been prepared to improve the water supply in the Barossa district, to provide for future expansion and to allow for subsequent enlargement of mains to the Two Wells district. The first step is the duplication of 13,600ft. of main between Sandy Creek and Gawler, and a by-pass at Sandy Creek. This part of the scheme is estimated to cost £90,000, and £1,000 is provided to commence work this year.

In his explanation in 1965-66 the Treasurer stated:

The sum of £90,000 is provided for work on duplicating portion of the existing Barossa trunk main between Sandy Creek and Gawler. This work is the first stage in the scheme to improve supplies in the Two Wells-Virginia area.

That is similar to the year before, except that Virginia is brought in. In the following year, 1966-67, and again under the same heading, the Treasurer's explanation read:

The sum of \$40,000 is required to complete the duplication of portion of the existing Barossa trunk main between Sandy Creek and Gawler. This work is the first stage in the scheme to improve supplies in the Two Wells and Virginia area and will also increase the flow to the Elizabeth-Salisbury area.

However, in the current year's Estimates the Barossa water district does not get a mention. What will the result be? No doubt it will reduce the rate of development or bring it to a standstill. Also, there are restrictions on the use of underground water supplies in this area. This area is being denied the advantage of a good supply of reticulated water.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: There are no plans for the use of effluent, either.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I shall deal with that matter later. The lack of a reticulated water supply is preventing decentralization—another matter about which the Labor Party was very vocal when it was in Opposition but about which we do not hear much now that it is in Government. In the area of Two Wells at present, unless a person is directly on the main, he cannot get a supply of water; he cannot get an indirect supply. If a person wants to build a house in this area he is unable to obtain a water supply.

In addition, the Virginia area, which has not a reticulated supply at present, is being denied this facility until after 1970 at least, according to the Minister. We must realize that even at that time it will depend on finance being available, and it is unlikely that finance of the necessary magnitude will be available in 1970. So, this area will stagnate until then, and probably for many years after. The Government, of course, as I have said, has little appreciation of the need for development and certainly little appreciation of this area's water requirements.

I now turn to a subject which was introduced by interjection a short time ago by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. We are pleased to see the allocation in the Loan Estimates for the Bolivar treatment works, which project was started by the Playford Government. It is well over 12 months since the report of the committee of inquiry into the utilization of effluent from the Bolivar works was laid on the table of this Council. The committee took three years to prepare the report and we have not yet heard how much it cost to prepare it; however I believe it would be a substantial amount, because technical experts were engaged on the committee for three years, which is a fairly long time.

Adelaide was the first city in Australia to have water-borne sewerage; this dates back to 1881, when the Islington sewage farm was established (it was originally known as Tam o' Shanter farm). At that time we made use of the effluent by irrigating the Islington sewage farm. The committee I have been referring to was set up to inquire into the

utilization of effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works. After three years it presented its report, which has been in the Government's hands for over 12 months, but the Government has done exactly nothing and it has made no announcement of its intentions. I have read the report once or twice, although one can only obtain it by rather devious means. Notwithstanding the fact that it was laid on the table of this Council and forwarded to the Government Printer for printing, this report is fairly hard to obtain. However, I have read it and I believe that it is practically valueless, particularly in relation to the utilization of effluent from the Bolivar works. Its only value is to prove to us the things that cannot be economically done with the effluent, rather than the things that can be done with it.

The schemes recommended by the committee will never come to fruition because of the high cost involved. It seems to me that the committee's recommendations savour of Socialism. The committee recommends that certain areas of land be acquired and developed, and then irrigated with the sewage effluent, and then leased to interested people. However, the cost of this land after development will be such that the scheme is never likely to float; this is apparent when one considers the costs stated in the report.

The committee's idea is to develop 80-acre farm units, and under this recommendation the boundary fencing will cost \$700 a mile and the internal fencing \$600 a mile. If I am any judge, this is an excessive amount to spend on fencing, particularly when we remember the purposes for which this country is to be used. The committee expects an 80-acre unit to carry 80 cows and that there will be six paddocks; the total cost will be \$18,400, or \$230 a cow (or \$230 an acre). The estimated return will be \$203 to \$248 a cow, depending on the butterfat yield. Obviously, except under very good management, there is no possibility of dairying on these projected farms.

The position becomes considerably worse when we consider the possibility of using the land for sheep. There is no possible hope of economic prime lamb production but of annual seed production. Perennial grass or sorghum could be grown in a limited way. So, we must forget about this committee's recommendations, because of the high cost of developing these areas. The Minister has indicated lately that the Government is considering a scheme whereby people adjacent to the effluent

outfall channel will be able to use this water. However, I point out that this channel passes through country that is virtually swamp country and totally unsuitable for the use of sewage effluent.

One of the main reasons why high costs are involved in the scheme is that the committee believed that underground drainage would be necessary to reduce the water table and to get rid of surface water. This is probably true for the areas that they suggested could be developed. It is really a scandal that at present we have 20,000,000 gallons of effluent going to waste daily. This is a colossal amount of water, particularly in a dry area like this, where it could be used for irrigating pastures.

As I said, this scheme that was put forward by the committee would involve the Government in a considerable amount of money. I suggest to the Government that if it wants to save a little money it should have a look at the question of conveying this water well away from the sewage works, out on to the country that would be able to take this type of water. It need not acquire land and should leave the private landowner to do all the necessary development. It is only a matter of conveying the water to areas where the type of soil is such that it would be able to use this class of water. The conveying of this water to those areas would possibly be the only cost in which the Government would be involved.

Of course, this may not appeal to the present Government, being a socialistic Government. However, I indicate to the Government that this could increase production considerably. Not every producer wants the whole of his area irrigated. There are plenty of farms within 20 miles of the sewage treatment works where the farmers own anything between 100 acres and 500 acres, and many of these farmers would be quite happy to water only half of their property. In fact, it would probably be a better proposition to water half the property than the whole of it, because anyone who has been associated with stock knows that some dry land is required.

I live, and have done so all my life, adjacent to a low-rainfall area where there is a soil type that would take this class of water. When one looks at what is done in the other States one sees that there should be no great problem in conveying this water to those areas. If we look at what happens in Victoria we find that the waste water from 98 per cent of the sewered area of Melbourne is screened and lifted 140ft. by pumps and then gravitated 16 miles to the Werribee farm where it is purified either by

grass filtration or ponding, with the surplus water then being dispersed to Port Philip Bay.

The cost of the sewage works, including the purchase of the Werribee farm and its preparation, is over \$140,000,000. There is an interesting table showing statistical data for the year ended June 30, 1965, in relation to Werribee. The total area of the farm is 26,809 acres, and the area used for sewage disposal is 16,580 acres. The average rainfall over 72 years has been 18.85in. The net cost of the purification of the sewage per head of population of the Melbourne area served is 60c. However, the profit on cattle and sheep at the sewage farm is \$468,154 annually. The revenue from the sale of livestock is set off against the cost of sewage purification and results in the imposition of a lower sewerage rate than would otherwise be necessary.

That is what is done with the sewage effluent from Melbourne. It is used as an economic proposition. In that case the Government owns a sewage farm. However, the fact remains that this was waste land at one time and the Government purchased it at a very low cost. It was land that was suitable for irrigation from sewage effluent. The situation with land adjacent to Bolivar is totally different. This land is very costly at the present time, and it is not entirely suitable for sewage effluent irrigation. Therefore, I suggest to the Government that it look at this question of conveying this sewage to areas where good use can be made of it.

We find also in Victoria that in 1954 the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board came into being. Its job was to find a means of disposing of the wastes from the gas and paper industries and town sewage. At that time the industrial wastes were considered to be of no agricultural value, if not actually toxic, and that disposing of them into the Latrobe River would only pollute it. There were two alternatives: land disposal to a point east of Longford, near Sale, or ocean disposal. Land disposal was decided on, and a 55-mile-long gravity outfall was constructed from Morwell to 23,000 acres of low-class country five miles inland from Letts Beach on the Ninety Mile Beach. There, 10,500 acre feet of water wastes could lie, troubling nobody. This water was conveyed 55 miles for use for irrigation purposes.

The Latrobe Valley industrial wastes were not allowed to lie idle for too long. Today, 10 years after the first effluent reached the near worthless country, waste is being turned to wealth in no mean manner. The 2,300-acre

disposal area has been named Dutson Downs and has become home for 20,000 sheep and 500 cattle. Some 2,500 acres of irrigated pastures and 3,500 acres of dry pastureland are now flourishing on what in 1957 was loose and sandy soil covered with Banksia, bracken and stunted eucalypts.

I would indicate to the Government that it should have a look at the question of the economic use of sewage effluent, not just sit down and do virtually nothing as it is doing at the present moment. If it valued the suggestions I have put forward, it would find that it would not cost a great deal and that it would get considerable return for the little money it would have to expend. This would bring decided advantages to this State, particularly in a dry year like the present.

I must compliment the Government on making provision in the Loan Estimates for the building of the Snowtown police station. Although I was pleased to see this, I must say that I trust the money will be forthcoming for this much-needed facility. When we look at the history of this matter we find that provision was made on the Loan Estimates in 1964-65 for the building of this police station, but somehow or other it disappeared from the Loan Estimates in 1965-66. At that time, of course, the present Government was in office, and indeed that Government was responsible for closing the Snowtown police station. I trust that in this particular instance the Government is genuine and that this money will be forthcoming.

I notice also that under the heading "Police and Courthouse Buildings" \$150,000 has been provided for the police training academy at Fort Largs. Here again I should like an assurance from the Chief Secretary that the Police Force at present is taking on all the recruits it requires, because there were suggestions in the Police Commissioner's annual report that the Police Force was rather short of officers and that it was not taking on sufficient recruits to cover the vacancies that were occurring. If it is not taking on the recruits that are required, it is little use our continuing with the building of accommodation for them. Therefore, I trust that the Police Force at present is being kept up to strength.

Further on in the Loan Estimates we find that provision is made for the purchase of additional school buses. This provision, of course, meets with the approval of all members. Recently, a little problem about school bus drivers has been brought to my notice. It

appears there has been a considerable delay in paying them. In many cases, the school bus drivers are also schoolteachers, who are paid once a fortnight as teachers. There should be no great problem in paying them fortnightly as bus drivers, but in some instances they have not been paid as drivers for periods of up to four or five weeks, which is regrettable because, when they are paid after such an interval of time, they are brought into a higher income tax bracket. For instance, if a man earned \$8 a week for driving a bus (I do not know the exact figure, but let us take that as an example) and he was paid fortnightly, he would be in a lower income tax bracket than he would be in if he was paid \$40 every five weeks. The Education Department should examine this matter and, if what I have heard is correct, the necessary adjustments should be made.

I have made to the Government one or two suggestions which, if acted upon, could increase the development of this State, and at little expense to the Government. Often the Government says, "You ask us to do something that will cost us more money but you are not prepared to provide us with that money." I now ask it to do something that will cost it very little extra. I support the second reading.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I shall confine myself to one particular item. Under "Public Buildings" I notice an item of \$9,060,000 for "Hospital Buildings". This includes expenditures on the Royal Adelaide, Queen Elizabeth, Glenside, and Hillcrest Hospitals, and so on. In addition, \$3,000,000 is provided for non-government hospital buildings. I looked in vain for a reference to the Modbury hospital. We have heard it said this afternoon that preliminary planning will be completed next month, so obviously there is no need for that to be included in this year's figures. I looked still further for any activity in the production of a teaching hospital, but it was a vain look. I do not begrudge or belittle one iota what the Government is spending on these various institutions that are listed but, bearing in mind that medical services are a key need in any modern community, one has then to go on to recognize that more doctors and training facilities are required. From a perusal of these figures of what is going to be spent in various ways during the coming year, I am forced to ask: where do we stand in our medical needs?

The first question I have to ask myself is: have we enough medical practitioners? Obviously the answer is "No", and this was

recognized by the Government in 1965 when it set up a committee to study the facilities for training medical practitioners in South Australia. This committee made four recommendations, the first of which was:

In addition to the predicted 95 graduates a year from the University of Adelaide, a minimum of 45 additional South Australian graduates should qualify annually from December, 1975.

The second, third and fourth recommendations contain the same sort of reference, that there should be established with a minimum of delay, at Flinders University, a second medical school.

To get more doctors, it is urgent that we have in this State a second medical school, but where do we stand as regards doctors? In 1957 the population of South Australia was 886,252, and the general practitioners totalled 495, representing 57.4 per cent of the medical manpower. In the same year there were 368 specialists and salaried medical officers. In 1965 there were 1,064,000 people in the State, while the general practitioners numbered 565, representing 45.07 per cent of the medical manpower; whereas the specialists and salaried medical officers had increased from 368 to 689. In other words, although both sections of the profession (the general practitioners and the specialists and salaried doctors) had increased in number, the actual proportion of general practitioners in practice in 1965 had decreased from 57.4 per cent to 45.07 per cent.

The Chief Secretary on August 16 told us that a beginning would be made on a teaching hospital in the vicinity of Flinders University in 1970-71; students would start in 1975. This would mean that, if all went according to a strict time table, we could expect some doctors to qualify not before 1978. It is estimated that our population in 1978 will be 1,500,000. I am forced next to ask: from where have we got our doctors so far? Between 1957 and 1964, South Australia got 514 qualified doctors from the University of Adelaide, 113 came from other States, and 251 were immigrants from overseas. Doctors from the last source and, to a certain degree, the second source (those from other States and those from overseas) are not now so plentiful or as easy to obtain as they were. Those sources are drying up because of changing economic circumstances.

To go back to 1957 again, the ratio of general practitioners to population was 1 to 1,764; in 1965 the ratio was 1 to 1,875. In other words, every doctor is now looking after more patients. This change is more heavily marked in the country. If one projects

the figures of the past few years forward, as they have to be, the conclusion reached by this committee set up by the Government and the conclusion reached by other independent bodies is that as from 1976, at the latest, we shall need an average of 45 extra doctors to replace those doctors leaving active practice through death or retirement, and to take up the slack from other years. Since the incoming number of doctors by migration and from other States is not as plentiful as it was (and is lessening), it is quite probable that the need for the extra 45 doctors will arise long before then. I attend medical meetings, and I hear stories about my colleagues who are carrying more than a fair share of the burden of work. At the same time I meet groups of members of the public who are dissatisfied not with the quality of the service they get but because the doctor cannot cope with his work. Medicine is increasingly complex, and it increasingly involves not only scientific advancements but improved and increasing social care. Doctors require today, perhaps more than ever, adequate time to study for refresher courses, post-graduate work and seminars. But the time is not available.

I realize that South Australia is not alone in this regard, but it is worse off than, say, Victoria, which, because material terms are more attractive, is getting more doctors than is this State. The sooner the State has a second teaching hospital, the better for the State and its citizens. I deplore the fact that there is no provision for a new hospital for teaching purposes. It seems to me that to give priority to less vital but perhaps electorally more attractive propositions is really a disservice to the State as a whole. I deplore the absence of funds for increased medical facilities in South Australia.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): The total Commonwealth Government borrowing, as detailed by the Minister when he introduced the Bill, is \$677,000,000. South Australia's share is \$92,820,000, of which \$82,560,000 has been allocated for normal works. I assure the Council that, if that amount were doubled, it would not be adequate. The position has been ably covered by previous speakers, and I do not wish to go over the ground again. However, I am disappointed that little money has been allocated to works in my area. Port Pirie will receive a pittance in relation to bringing its medical requirements up to standard.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The amount of \$100,000 isn't a pittance.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It is, considering the amount that is required. Work is to commence on a pathology laboratory at the Berri Hospital, and some indirect benefit may be derived by the State as a whole from the \$400,000 provided for the construction of a new wing at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. It is true, too, that some who are involved in agriculture will be able to applaud the \$361,000 toward completion of an agricultural college. A considerable amount has been allocated to drainage works. I know that in many instances these are most necessary, as floodwaters have to be drained from living areas. However, it always plagues me to know that so much money must be used to drain excellent water from the southern part of the State, in many instances into the sea. Why this type of work takes precedence over the provision of water in many other areas of the State is something that concerns me.

In some areas the lack of water has impeded progress and caused undue hardship for a great number of years. The Minister of Works described as pathetic the lack of water in such a progressive area as Kimba. I agree wholeheartedly, yet nowhere in these Estimates is any mention made that any money would be provided for a start on the Polda to Kimba main. Nowhere could I see provision for money to be spent on the deepening of the channel to Thevenard or for further investigation into the bulk loading terminal on eastern Eyre Peninsula. I could go on and repeat some of the other projects mentioned earlier, but I have no desire to do this: I merely express my disappointment that so little money has been provided in the Estimates for work on Eyre Peninsula. I know that anything I have to say at this stage will have little effect on the allocations, but I wish to have recorded my disappointment with the allocations as I feel this will help at election time. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

For some years it has been customary for Parliament to approve two Supply Bills so that the current financial commitments of the Government may be met during the period between July 1 and the assent to the Appropriation

Bill following the Budget debate. The Supply Act (No. 1) of 1967 approved by Parliament in June last provides authority of \$36,000,000. As the current requirement to meet ordinary expenditures from Revenue Account is about \$16,000,000 a month it may be seen that the present provision will suffice until the early part of September. It is desirable, therefore, for Parliament to deal with a second Supply Bill before the Royal Show adjournment and to give authority that may be expected to suffice until the Appropriation Bill becomes effective—probably late in October.

The second Bill last year was for the sum of \$24,000,000, giving total authority by way of Supply Bills of \$60,000,000. The Government considers that it would be wise to provide now to cover a possible four months' expenditure (that is, up to the end of October) at a rate of about \$16,000,000 or a little more a month. Accordingly, this Bill is for \$30,000,000, which, together with the \$36,000,000 of Supply Act (No. 1), will give a total of \$66,000,000, and should ensure that a third Supply Bill will not be necessary before the end of the Budget debate. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$30,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages that may be authorized by any Court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages. The clauses all follow the usual form for Supply Bills.

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

#### STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1416.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): This Bill has been before Parliament for some time and has received a good deal of attention from honourable members on both sides of the Chamber; far more attention than I believe it has received in recent times in the press. I think that at the end of a debate such as this (and it is near the end) I should not labour points made by other members who spoke at great length. However, I am interested in the reasons given by the Government for introducing a Bill of this nature, a Bill that is headed:

An Act to authorize the establishment of a State Government Insurance Commission; to authorize such commission to carry on the general business of insurance; and for other purposes.

The reason given may be epitomized as follows: "That, owing to a number of complaints over a number of years . . ." I believe in history, but honourable members will remember as I remember (because the Chief Secretary and I usually get on extremely well) that I tried on many occasions to extract from the Chief Secretary the names of the companies about which these complaints originated, and the nature of the complaints. On one occasion the Chief Secretary was very rude to me, whilst on the second occasion he would not answer me; therefore, I am not much wiser, and I can only conclude that the complaints exist mainly in the eye of the beholder.

The second point given in justification of this Bill was that it would afford good competition for other insurance companies in this State. Tariff companies exist here and compete in this field. I do not think the Government has suggested any collusion exists between insurance companies in this State; if such a charge were made it would be ridiculous, because I believe that with such companies it is a case of "dog eat dog": the operators and the whole business are keen. Whilst insurance companies all get along fairly well together on the surface, I do not think there is a wonderful spirit of *camaraderie* where one does not take a client from another insurance company; I think it is open competition.

Therefore, I do not think the reason concerning complaints can be sustained. If it could, I would have been given replies to my questions. Maybe they are in the Minister's docket.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If you look at the docket you will find some.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Then it takes a lot of paper to make a case. Nor is the second point sustained regarding competition; I think that this is an undertaking entered into by the Labor Government as a result of its policy over the past 70 years. It is Government policy because Government members are followers of Socialism. I believe it is part of the Government's platform to get control of production, distribution, industry, and exchange. I also believe that the reasons of complaints and competition are fractional compared with the main object of the Government; quite properly, because that is the Government's policy, but why does it not come out and say, "We are now starting to implement our socialist policies"? The Government has probably been accused of not getting to it quickly enough.



The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You do not approve of competition, though.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I certainly do.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are opposing it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, I am not opposing it. I turn to 1924, the last time a Socialist Government was in power. Perhaps it was not quite the last time, but it was then in power and attempted to bring in the same kind of legislation, and this has been the pattern followed by this Government: that is, to give everything a run that its predecessors have given a run, whether they lost or won.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is there anything wrong with that?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They attempted in the 1920's to bring about the abolition of the Legislative Council and they had another go at it during the last session. It was done in another form, but it was there.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That was to give a fair franchise.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was there, and it is still the policy of the Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It has some supporters outside, too. A letter supporting it appeared in the paper the other day.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: An unsolicited testimonial!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If we delve into history far enough, we can see that such things are repeated. But the funny thing about it is that the Labor Party usually has only one attempt at it during the one Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If the honourable member were a keen student of procedure he could tell us why we only have one shot at it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Of course, the Government is not in a very strong position to have two shots in the one Parliament and risk a double dissolution.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Government did have two shots at the succession duties legislation.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I asked them to go to the people, but they didn't.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I told you that you did not have the political courage to go to the people. Don't tell us to go.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not want to be sidetracked from this important matter of 1924.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is a long time ago.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins): Order! The Hon. Mr. Story.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In 1920 the State Bank set up its own insurance office, and in 1924 a Bill was introduced in both Houses of Parliament; it was passed by one House but not by the other. It was proposed at that time to use the funds (\$58,000) that then existed in the State Bank insurance office to start a Government Insurance Office. This proposal was defeated. And now, in what are almost the dying hours of this Parliament, with only a few months to run—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There is a long way to go yet.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If that is so, I would think that this important Bill would have been introduced earlier.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is a pity that road transport legislation has not been brought in.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. I think the timing of this Bill is excellent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am completely innocent. Why is the timing excellent?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister may be able to put it over some people that he is innocent, but he cannot put it over me.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What do you think is the reason for bringing it down now?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I believe that, had the Government introduced this Bill earlier and had it been unsuccessful, the Government's bosses would have pushed it to bring it down again now.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member is entirely wrong; he is a long way off the beam.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; it is a very good reason. If this legislation is part of the Government's mandate and if it is so important, it is a wonder it was not introduced earlier. The Government had no mandate for some other measures that were brought in earlier. The Hon. Mr. Banfield made a rousing speech the other day and said that a Government Insurance Office is very much like the lottery. He said that some Opposition members said the lottery would not be a success, but that it had proved a wonderful success. However, when a lottery is planned, the Government knows the price of the tickets, and how much will come in from the lottery.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It cannot know how many tickets will be sold.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Government knows exactly how many tickets it will sell.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is necessary to set up the lottery organization before a ticket is sold.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A lottery is a fixed thing; the prizes are advertised and so many tickets are sold; when the tickets are sold the big wheel is spun.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But the organization must be set up first, and all the tickets may not be sold.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; the Government knows how much it will give away in prizes and how much will be received. Of course, the tickets must be sold before the big wheel spins. Also the Government knows how much it will cost to run the lottery because it knows the size of the staff.

An important aspect in the insurance field is liquidity. When an insurance office is set up, it does not know the size of the first claim that will be made against it. Operating an insurance office is not as precise as operating a Lotteries Commission or a doubles book. Today there is a classic example of what could happen. It is reasonable to assume that under this legislation there are persuasive political powers that will cause the insurance business of Government and semi-government instrumentalities to be taken over by the Government Insurance Office; this has happened in most other States, and it is proposed that the State Insurance Office here will have the same powers as those of the other State Insurance Offices. One State has used the persuasive authority vested in it to bring under its control most of the insurance business of Government and semi-government instrumentalities, and it has most certainly introduced workmen's compensation for everybody. Had a Government Insurance Office been set up a little earlier—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: In 1924.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Even in 1924; it would have had a little more time to run. Had it been set up a few weeks ago and had it possessed persuasive or authoritative powers requiring the Electricity Trust to insure with it, I believe that the Government Insurance Office would have been battling a little for liquidity—if it had been required to pay out a claim of the size we have read about in the daily press.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member is anticipating the placing of the responsibility before it has been placed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; I believe that the Government Insurance Office would have had to settle a claim of about \$1,000,000 if this had happened, and it would have had to come to Parliament for it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I don't know any of the details. What is the position? Insurance may not be responsible for meeting the cost.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Let us go back in history. If we cannot win by projecting into the future, let us consider the earthquake that occurred in South Australia some years ago. That cost the insurance companies of this State over \$6,000,000. Also, if honourable members care to look it up they will find that in the Budget passed by this Parliament it was necessary to make provision for a considerable sum of money to fund the State Bank insurance. Had we had a full-scale State insurance at that time and we were holding more of the money, we would have had to take Treasury funds to pay the people who had claims.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Had the scheme been introduced in 1924 we might have had enough funds by then.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As I said the other day, if the dog had not stopped it would have caught the rabbit. It would take the Government a long time to build up sufficient funds.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Doesn't every insurance company go through this process?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Other honourable members have explained how insurance companies get started and build up their liquidity. We are starting from scratch at a time when I cannot get schools in parts of my district, and when we cannot get a hospital in Tea Tree Gully.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If you had listened earlier today you would have heard that that is going ahead.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: These people have been waiting two years for a hospital that they were promised.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The one they were promised would not have been worth two bob today.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They were promised in the policy speech that they would get a 500-bed hospital immediately.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are going all right with the hospital, so you can't win on that one.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We got a hospital in Elizabeth when people required it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Eight years after the first pronouncement.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Oh no, the honourable member is quite wrong about that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It might have been 10 years after.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The hospital facilities were provided at Elizabeth when they were required. I know the position there quite well. The point I make is that at a time when the Government claims it does not have the money to do certain very important things it will embark upon what could be an extremely costly venture.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The way you are speaking, I know what you ought to do.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Perhaps the Minister will not be disappointed. Regarding this proposed venture, I do not believe that at the present time we could have the sort of liquidity required. I am a little perturbed that we would be vesting this proposed commission with certain powers that could affect Statutory loans made under, say, the Loans to Producers Act, in respect of which the State Bank acts virtually as an agent for Parliament. I wonder how long it would be before the Government Insurance Office persuaded or coerced or otherwise used its authority with the State Bank to see that the improvements provided as a result of those loans were insured with the State Insurance Office. Those loans that are made to various co-operatives are sometimes as high as \$400,000 or \$500,000, although these days they are mainly around the \$100,000 mark. At present the moneys are made available by Statute, and the insuring is done by the companies that receive loans. I can see no guarantee anywhere in this respect. On the other hand, I am led to believe by past history and performance that there is a distinct likelihood that loans that are made available under Statute could very easily be brought under the Government Insurance Office, and this would be undesirable.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Which State has done this previously?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The classic example, of course, is Queensland, where the administration of Government insurance was set up many years before the advent of the Liberal Government. I remind the Minister that we were in the wilderness there for about the same length of time as his Government was in the wilderness here. When we jump on the tiger's

back we find that it is very hard to jump off, and anything that is started becomes part of the financial structure and we cannot divest ourselves of it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can't win on that one.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is only the Minister's humble opinion; I am giving my opinion for export, not for home consumption. The point I make is that when we set up this type of thing we just cannot divest ourselves of it overnight: it becomes part of the financial structure of the running of the State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If it was doing bad things for the State, the State would be glad to get rid of it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No-one has said that the State offices are losing money on it. The Hon. Mr. Banfield quoted figures about this, and we have plenty of additional proof. However, we must not forget that in the figures that are quoted a very large slab of it is in respect of life assurance, which belongs not to a Government Insurance Office but to the policy holders. Of the very large total amount, the Government offices have only about \$4,000,000, so I would not get too excited about the magnificent figures that we see here. Also, they have a complete monopoly of workmen's compensation insurance and practically a complete monopoly of local government insurance. If that is the pattern that we are looking to in South Australia, I think the public should wake up to it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The people have woken up, and they want it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is the first step in complete socialization. In 1924 it was not stated in the Bill or in the second reading explanation that there was going to be complete socialization. However, at page 993 of *Hansard* one member made it very clear that this would eventually take over.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What is the gentleman's name?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister can read it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Tell us his name.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member can read it. The Hon. Mr. Richards and various other people debated the subject. That was back in 1924.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You have been telling us that all the afternoon.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I venture the opinion that we could get ourselves into the same position. I think I have said sufficient

to let honourable members know where I stand in this matter. I am not enamoured of it at all. I think the public want to be well and truly assured that this is not the first step in a complete takeover of insurance. No-one has yet given us a guarantee on this point. I cannot for the life of me see that the reasons given regarding competition and the desire to give people a better go are just.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): In speaking to this Bill I want to indicate right from the outset that I place little importance on the Government's suggestions that it has a mandate for introducing this legislation. The election was not fought on any one issue. If it had been fought on the issue of State insurance, the Government would then have a mandate. However, as things are, if it has a mandate to introduce a State Insurance Office, it has a mandate to introduce practically everything under the sun. If anything is mentioned in the Labor Party conferences, which is after all Labor Party policy, the Government has a mandate for it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is right.

The Hon. L. R. HART: So it has a mandate for practically everything under the sun.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Hear, hear!

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Labor Party also has a mandate to do many things that it has not done so far.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are doing very well. We shall be back next year to do some more things.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We anticipate more legislation being introduced at a fairly late hour this session.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We are spending more time in session than you people did.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is so, but let us look at some of the legislation we have been dealing with. Most of it has set out to increase charges and taxation. To consider the Government's legislation the purpose of which was to increase the production and development of this State, we would not have been sitting here for a fortnight.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We helped the grapegrowers and the citrus growers.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The honourable member comes in with interjections. It is nice to have a parrot or two in the Chamber. It would be dull without him. It is unfortunate he does not make a few more speeches.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I happened to speak on this subject.

The Hon. L. R. HART: You had to—that's the point!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I said "I happened to".

The Hon. L. R. HART: You said you "had to".

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You should wash your ears out; I said "I happened to". The honourable member is quite wrong.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You misquoted him.

The Hon. L. R. HART: What he said will be reported in *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Mr. President, I rise on a point of order. I do not like doing this—

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Hon. Mr. Banfield did not say he "had to"; he said he "happened to" do it.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member made a mistake and everybody knows it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interruptions are distinctly out of order. I warned honourable members before and I hope I can expect Ministers to help me to maintain dignity and decorum in the Chamber.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Let us have the truth, and we will help you.

The Hon. L. R. HART: One would have expected something better of a Minister.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes, and of you, too.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Much emphasis was placed by honourable members of the Government last week on the Liberal Party conferences. Of course, we could say something about Labor Party conferences, if we wished to.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They were in the open.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes, they were, and that is where the decisions are made; but they have not always been in the open. They are in the open in these days only because of the unsavoury comments that have been made about what goes on behind closed doors. Whatever is decided in a Labor Party conference is binding on all members of that Party. So, if it decided that a State Insurance Office should be introduced, it would be binding on the Parliamentary members of the Labor Party to introduce it, even though

it might be against their better judgment. I point out to honourable members of the Government, if they do not know it already, that there is no great need for the press to be admitted to Liberal Party conferences, because the decisions made there are only recommendations. They are not binding on the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But you would not get preselection if you did not carry them out.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I repeat that such decisions are only recommendations made by ordinary members of the Liberal Party, who are not professional delegates.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What happened to Hannaford?

The Hon. L. R. HART: That was his own decision.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What has all this to do with the insurance Bill before the Chamber?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am pointing out that it was introduced at the direction of the Australian Labor Party. The motions discussed at Liberal Party conferences are not vetted before they are submitted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not take that as gospel, either.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Let us look at the legislation that the Labor Government has introduced. Most of it is for the purpose of increasing charges and taxation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not true.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I have already spoken today about the Government's wanting to recirculate money already in circulation. I hate repeating myself, but it is a fact; and each time money is circulated the Government gets a rake-off, which means that less money is available in the public sector. This Government has been vocal in blaming the public sector for not playing its part, but how can it play its part when every time it spends a dollar it is taxed? It has been suggested that improper practices have been indulged in by insurance companies. The Government has tended to include all insurance companies in this accusation that there have been improper practices but, when the Government is asked to state the names of the companies where these improper practices occur, it runs for shelter; it has to.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We do not want to ruin their business.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Ruining their business would be a pity. This accusation that there are irregular practices is only a pretext;

the real reason for the introduction of this legislation was so that the Government could get its hands on finance, and the finance in this case need not be the profits of the insurance company. This worries me. I am not concerned whether or not the commission makes a profit. If it does, the Government is then perhaps entitled to make temporary use of that profit, as it has made temporary use of some other accounts of which it is the custodian—but we will not argue about that. I am afraid the Government will use the money handled by the insurance company. In fact, it has been said by a prominent member of the Labor Party that prior to 1964 the Victorian Government Insurance Office had lent \$23,000,000 to the Treasury and that all this was provided at 1½ per cent interest. Under the Bill power is given to the Treasurer to dictate to the commission how and on what terms its finances should be invested. This worries me. If irregular practices exist the Government Insurance Office will not necessarily cure them; in fact, it will probably indulge in similar practices itself. The Government has said that the State Insurance Office will be run for the benefit of the people, but I believe that it should be run for the benefit of its policyholders. However, we all know that it is the Labor Party's policy to obtain cheap money: the question of cheap money is often promoted by the Labor Party. One should remember that for every cent lent a cent must be borrowed. If the Government is to get cheap money through the Government Insurance Office, it is reasonable to assume that the policyholders will subsidize Government finance.

The Hon. Mr. Story asked why, if this were an important part of the Labor Party policy, the Government had delayed introducing this Bill. Obviously the Government does not want the public to know what will be the ultimate effects of the legislation and it does not want to be in the position of having to find finance to set up the Government Insurance Office. Also it does not want to be in the embarrassing position of having the public know the ill effects of having a State Insurance Office, so it is introducing the Bill at this late stage and hoping that the next Liberal Government will have to find the finance to set up the commission. If the Bill is being introduced for the protection of the public, then why does the Government not introduce legislation to enter other industries in the State? Why does it not enter the oil industry, as there has been much criticism about its conduct?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It would like to get into the steel industry.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The oil industry operates under price control, because the Government does not trust it. If the public needs protection, let the Government go into that industry. After all, there are profits in that industry, too. The British Government entered into the steel industry.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Don't give them any ideas or you will start something.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Any ideas you would give us would not be worth much.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We know the situation the British Government is in today. No doubt our Government would like to enter the steel industry. Although the British Government did that, it did not set out to nationalize insurance. It must have had a good reason for not doing the latter. If we want to protect the public still further, why should the Government not enter into the real estate business? There has been much criticism of that industry.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It's in good hands at the moment.

The Hon. L. R. HART: By means of an interjection the other day a Government member suggested that extremely high profits were being made in that industry. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said that the Government was prepared to go into the insurance business on a completely fair basis. If this could be written into the Bill I would be prepared to support it, but is the Government prepared to state categorically that it will accept all forms of insurance?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's what the Bill says.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The Bill says "may"; it does not say "will".

The Hon. L. R. HART: In New South Wales the Government Insurance Office is just as selective as any private insurance company is. Admittedly, companies in New South Wales cannot refuse workmen's compensation or third party insurance, but they use coercion to get other forms of insurance. In Queensland the Government Insurance Office exercises the same right as private companies exercise, and refuses insurance to people with bad insurance records; indeed, it requires people to take out other insurance as well as workmen's compensation and third party insurance. In addition, I am given to understand on very good authority that the Government Insurance Offices in those States are more particular in regard to the payment of claims

than are the private companies. In Queensland and New South Wales there was need to pay out heavy claims in relation to the flood damage on the Gold Coast, and far greater and far more intensive inspections were made by the Government Insurance Offices there into the damage claims than those made by the private companies.

The other day the Hon. Mr. Banfield made great play on the fact that private insurance companies have refused motor vehicle insurance. By interjection I asked if there were any private companies that had refused to take motor vehicle insurance and Mr. Banfield said, "Yes, any amount of them." In fact, a Minister supported him in this. Let me point out, however, that company can refuse to take third party insurance without the permission of the Premiums Committee.

Will the Government agree to a provision that police officers be not permitted to be used as commission agents by the Government Insurance Office? In New South Wales and Queensland, police officers act as insurance agents. Although I am not suggesting that these occur in Queensland and New South Wales, this could perhaps lead to undesirable practices. Therefore, provision should be made to avoid this in South Australia.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If a Liberal Government does it, that does not mean that a Labor Government must do it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In private insurance companies there exists a relationship between an insurer and his company that is not likely to occur if the State Insurance Office is established. I know of a recent instance regarding workmen's compensation where the claimant did not have a particularly strong claim. He went to his insurance company and laid all his cards on the table, and the company said, "We do not think we are liable. However, we will have to refer the matter to our solicitor." The solicitor said, "It does not appear that you are liable to pay this claim." However, the insurance company, in view of its long association with this client, wrote to him as follows:

We refer to our letter of September 30, and would advise that our solicitors have perused a copy of your letter of September 28 and given us their views. They state that on the facts as known at present they consider that liability should not be admitted, and have suggested that we inquire more fully into certain facts. Depending on these inquiries it is possible that there would be a liability on you to pay workmen's compensation.

This is an important clause. The letter continues:

However, in the circumstances we do not propose to make any further inquiries and are quite prepared to admit a claim under your workmen's compensation policy.

This is the type of relationship that exists between an insurer and his insurance company, if he insures with a reputable firm. Since there are between 160 and 170 insurance companies in this State, there are undoubtedly a number of reputable firms. As the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill pointed out, the insured should ensure that he insures with a reputable company.

I am concerned also with the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Story that, if this legislation is passed, Government and semi-government instrumentalities may be required to insure through the Government Insurance Office. At present most councils insure with various companies; many do so through the Chamber of Manufactures and receive a considerable discount. Will this type of discount be available to these councils if they insure through the Government Insurance Office? Furthermore, will these bodies be required to insure through the Government Insurance Office?

There is no doubt that they will be required to do so because, when we read the Labor Party's policy speech given before the last election, we find that the then Leader proposed the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, something for which the Government has a mandate and something for which it has not yet introduced legislation. The relevant part of the policy speech is as follows:

Labor's plan therefore is:

- (a) To strengthen the State banking system by amalgamating the State Bank and the Savings Bank so that trading bank and savings bank facilities with savings bank cheque accounts will be available throughout the State.
- (b) To provide that all Government and semi-government institutions bank with the State banking institutions. I believe that this will enable expansion of the home purchase plan, industries assistance and personal loan schemes, and also provide for hire-purchase at reasonable rates.

So, if this legislation had been introduced and passed then, all Government and semi-government instrumentalities would have been required to bank through this banking authority. Consequently, it is only reasonable to assume that they will be required to insure through the Government Insurance Office. Is the Govern-

ment prepared to write into the Bill a clause stating that this will not be so? If the Government is prepared to do this, I am prepared to give the measure some support. I believe that this Bill will be dealt with at length in the Committee stage, and there are amendments on file. I am not prepared to support it in its entirety; however, to facilitate its passage, I am prepared to support the second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I wish under Standing Order No. 175 to make an explanation to the Council because I have been misquoted by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, and I think I have been deliberately misquoted. The honourable member said that I said I had to speak to this Bill, whereas in fact I said I happened to speak to this Bill. The honourable member's attention was drawn to this but he continued to misquote me, and consequently I raise this matter under Standing Order No. 175.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It will be interesting to see what *Hansard* has to say.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): The incident this afternoon has been disturbing. I like to keep decorum. However, I hate untruths. It is most unfortunate that, when an honourable member's attention is drawn to an untruth, he persists. I think this is the worst type of debate. I am not prepared to take it, and I make no apologies for saying so. I thank all honourable members who have spoken to this Bill, though naturally I do not agree with all that has been said. If the Government intends to do what Opposition members claim it intends to do, why has it been permitted to pass the second reading?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The second reading has not yet been passed.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, but amendments are on file, and I have been surprised to listen to speeches totally opposing the Bill and then to hear the members making those speeches say that to facilitate the measure they will permit it to pass the second reading stage and see what happens. I say sincerely that if I was utterly opposed to a Bill, as some members opposite are, I would not vote for the second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Can you name the members who totally opposed the Bill but will vote for the second reading?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member who is sitting behind me and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you include me?

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** Nearly every member who spoke did not have a good word to say about the Bill.

**The Hon. Sir Norman Jude:** You ought to be careful: you are quoting people.

**The Hon. A. J. Shard:** That was the tenor of the debate. I did not mention the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and I did not have time to pay him the compliment of reading his speech. However, I guessed what he might have said.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** He said we had a mandate.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** That is so. If the Bill is so wrong and if the Government is going to do, according to Opposition members, such horrible things, I wonder why the amendments are on file and why certain members stated that they would vote for the second reading. I have been around a few years, and I think I can see into the future on this. I wish I could do so on other things. I thought the Liberal Party believed in free enterprise and competition: all that the Government wants to do is to enable a Government Insurance Office to engage in free enterprise and to compete with the people now operating.

**The Hon. C. R. Story:** And without any guarantees.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** Never mind about guarantees. The Government wants to enter the insurance field in free competition. Members opposite have said that the Government has no right to do so. It is their policy to take that view, but if they believe in that policy why do they not support it by voting against the second reading? I support my Party's policy and I make no apologies for doing so. I support it 100 per cent.

**The Hon. C. R. Story:** In writing, too.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** Yes, and if I did not believe in it I would not have signed it, and I would not be here.

**The Hon. C. R. Story:** The Chief Secretary would not be here if he did not sign it.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** The honourable member should know that I would not sign something if I thought there was anything fundamentally wrong with it.

**The Hon. C. R. Story:** You wouldn't be here. That was the problem Bill Quirke and Cyril Chambers had.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** I have been on the road too long for the honourable member to twist my statements. I would perhaps have stayed in my union. Who knows but that I might still have been on the bread cart. I can say that if there was anything fundamental

in our policy that I did not agree with I would not sign the nomination.

The way some honourable members spoke of how these insurance companies had such high costs and were so poor caused me to go home broken-hearted once or twice. However, honourable members were merely shedding crocodile tears. All we want to do is to join with the Liberal Party in its policy and go into the insurance field on a free enterprise basis, on an open market and in open competition. However, the tenor of the debate suggests that all honourable members opposite are opposed to that course. I do not intend to speak at length.

**The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill:** Then you are not going to answer any of the questions?

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** No, not at this stage. I consider that all the questions were answered by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, even though subsequent speakers tried to ridicule him. The majority of honourable members never interjected during his speech: they took it in complete silence, because they just could not throw anything at him. The honourable member made an excellent speech; he put the case from our point of view, and I shall not attempt to repeat the points he made because I doubt whether I could come up to his standard. Members opposite did not answer him.

**The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill:** There wasn't anything in his speech to answer.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** He was putting up a very good case in support of this Bill, and he was heard almost in complete silence.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** Nonsense.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** It is not nonsense. I compliment the Hon. Mr. Banfield on putting up an excellent case from our point of view. Some honourable members have queried whether the Government has a mandate in this matter. I point out that on page 6 of the policy speech delivered by our then Leader, the Hon. Frank Walsh, we see the following:

It is not my intention to deal with industrial matters at this stage other than to mention that our policy on workmen's compensation in particular is to make provision for the right to receive workmen's compensation for any accident sustained whilst travelling to or from place of residence to place of employment.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** We have got that in the Bill.

**The Hon. A. J. SHARD:** Yes, and it is a good thing. The policy speech continues:

It appears that as a step forward concerning the implementation of this very necessary provision, a long-overdue measure—



as explained by the Hon. Mr. Story this afternoon—

it will be required that our policy consider the establishment of a State insurance scheme—

We have not only considered it, we have introduced it—

and a further factor that may also be considered is that whilst it is recognized that workmen's compensation insurance cover for all persons must be provided, it is also compulsory for people who desire to register a motor vehicle to have a third party compulsory insurance policy. Under Government instrumentalities, when things become compulsory, I believe that it is reasonable to give consideration to the right of the individual to have a choice of insurance.

The people outside want a choice, away from the present set of companies, and they want a Government insurance scheme.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They can have any colour they like provided it is black.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member cannot say that. I have here our policy and platform, about which there is no secret: anyone who wishes to have this booklet can do so. In that booklet, under the heading "State enterprises" we see the following:

State Insurance Office covering all insurable risks.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Mr. President, I rise on a point of order. I ask that the document be laid on the table so that we can all see it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will give it to the honourable member. There is no secret about it. I have already told him what our policy and our platform is on this matter. There will be a new booklet out in a fortnight, and it will be in that one, too.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: That was not in the policy speech.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am glad the honourable member mentioned that.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I again rise on a point of order, Mr. President. Am I to consider that the document is now on the table?

The PRESIDENT: Is it the wish of the Council that the document be laid on the table?

Ordered that document be tabled.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not run away from our policy. I have pointed out that that policy is for a State Insurance Office covering all insurable risks, and I think that is an answer to the question raised by the Hon. Sir Norman Jude. In answer to the

Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, I point out that he and every other honourable member in this place knows that it is utterly impossible to spell out in full in a policy speech all that the speech means and all that it does. All we want to do, if the Bill is passed, is to see that all risks are covered. If the Bill is mutilated, we will then have to consider whether it is worth while. I do not know how far the Bill will go, but I have an idea.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Are you insisting on life assurance?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Of course we are. The words "all risks" naturally include life assurance cover. At this stage we want the Bill to cover everything, and unless it is altered that is what we say and what we stand for. I think honourable members know that with all Bills that come from another place we do our humble best here to get them accepted as they leave the other place. If they are not, the Bill goes back to the other House, and if the two Houses cannot agree we then have a conference. At this stage I am not prepared to say what would happen to this matter at a conference, but I can say that, if the Bill is amended here and mutilated to such an extent that it is not worth the paper it is written on, it will not see the light of day. That is only my own opinion.

I again thank honourable members for the time and thought they have devoted to the debate on this matter. I sincerely trust the Bill will have a speedy passage through Committee, and that it will remain exactly as it is at present.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As amendments are not yet on honourable members' files and I have an amendment to clause 2, I ask the Chief Secretary to report progress.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): Yes. I do not propose to ask honourable members to discuss amendments not yet on their files. In the circumstances, I ask that the Committee report progress and have leave to sit again.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.23 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 23, at 2.15 p.m.