

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, September 3, 1969.

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

QUESTIONS

ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I (and I presume all other honourable members) have received many letters from people who are worrying about the problems of abortion or the abortion legislation, should it be proceeded with. Some of these letters are very direct in their request that members declare how they are going to vote on this legislation. We know the Government has indicated that it intends to alter the law in regard to abortion, but we have not heard when this is likely to occur. Will the Minister ascertain from the Attorney-General, for the benefit of honourable members, just what his policy will be in relation to this legislation and when it is likely to be proceeded with?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall endeavour to find out this information for the honourable member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Minister of Local Government referred recently to the activities of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. Has that committee's report yet been made available to the Minister and, if it has, does he intend to table it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The matter of the issue of the report was referred to in this Council a week or two ago when I said that it had been hoped the report would be available by the end of July but that it had been further delayed. The principle reasons for this delay were that it was proving to be a much bigger task than had been expected and also that certain members of the committee had suffered illness. I said then that I would try to ascertain a further target date when the report might be available.

I have had further discussions with the Chairman of the committee, and I believe now that the report will be made available to me before the end of October. The course of

action the Government will take concerning the issue of the report has not yet been decided, so I cannot comment further on the last part of the honourable member's question regarding whether or not the report will be tabled in this Council.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose is to improve, streamline, simplify and render less costly the procedures governing the legislation dealing with strata titles. The opportunity has also been taken to correct the anomalies known to be in the principal Act and to bring some of its provisions up to date with a view to its consolidation.

Clause 2 provides for the Bill to become law on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This will give the general public and the Administration time to become familiar with the new streamlined procedures provided for in the Bill before they are brought into force. Clause 3 corrects erroneous references to the titles of the Acting Registrar-General, the Registrar-General and the senior Deputy Registrar-General.

Clause 4 corrects an obsolete reference to the "said province" by substituting for that reference a reference to the State; clause 5 brings the provisions of section 23 into line with modern administrative practice; and clause 6 deletes from section 28 of the principal Act the requirement that the husband of a married woman must consent to an application by her under that section to bring land under the Act.

Clause 7 amends section 39 by removing the necessity for a caveat to contain an address "within the city of Adelaide" to which notices may be sent and provides that the address must be within South Australia. Clause 8 amends section 64 so as to empower the court to direct the Registrar-General to cancel, correct or issue a certificate of title or any memorial or entry in the register book notwithstanding that the relevant duplicate certificate has not been produced to him.

Clause 9 inserts in the principal Act a new section 115a, which empowers the Registrar-General, in cases where the Crown or some

other statutory authority acquires land compulsorily or in whom land vests by operation of law, to issue a certificate of title to the land without the production of the relevant duplicate certificate or the usual formalities.

This power was sought by the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor in relation to land compulsorily acquired by the Commonwealth, but the Government is of the view that the same principle should apply to any land compulsorily acquired by a statutory authority or vested in a statutory authority by operation of law.

Clause 10 removes from section 184 a redundant reference to the old Trustee Act of 1893. Clause 11 amends section 191 in two respects. First, it removes the necessity for a caveat to contain an address "within the city of Adelaide" to which notices may be sent, and provides that the address must be within South Australia. Secondly, it removes the necessity for a caveatee to give in his application to remove a caveat an address in Adelaide for service of notices, etc., and provides that the address must be in South Australia. With modern means of communication and transport, this amendment would be of great advantage to the legal and business community and could cause no hardship or inconvenience.

Clause 12 amends section 223m of the principal Act so as to widen the definition of "unit subsidiary" by making it possible to include within its scope an area set apart for an amenity like a swimming pool. The clause also strikes out from subsection (4) of that section the redundant words "unless the contrary intention appears", the intention being that, where a unit subsidiary is shown on a deposited plan as appurtenant to a unit, that unit subsidiary is always to be regarded as part of that unit.

Clause 13 amends section 223mb of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) of the clause makes it necessary to distinguish the units shown on a strata plan by numbers instead of by numbers or symbols as at present. It is considered that it is much simpler to identify units that are distinguished by numbers than by symbols. Paragraph (b) of the clause is really consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Commissioner of Land Tax in relation to the schedule of unit entitlements.

Clause 14 amends section 223mc. Subsections (3) and (4) of that section deal with the conversion of titles to existing building-unit schemes to strata titles. As at present enacted, subsection (3) of that section does not permit

of the conversion of title where any of the units in the scheme have not been sold by the registered proprietor of the parcel at the time of the lodgement of the strata plan. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the clause will enable an existing scheme to be converted, notwithstanding that any of the units are still in the name of the proprietor of the parcel.

Paragraph (d) of the clause adds a new subsection (6) to section 223mc. As the Act now stands, under section 223na (11) the deposit of a strata plan and the entering on a certificate of title of a memorial of an application accompanying a deposited strata plan are deemed to be dealings in land.

It is considered by the Registrar-General that an application accompanying the lodgement of a strata plan should be deemed to be a dealing in land in order that the application might be given the status of an instrument with priority over dealings with the parcel lodged subsequently to the application, thus obviating difficulties which could arise in the event of a dealing being lodged in the interval between the lodgement of the strata plan with the Registrar-General and its deposit under the Act.

Clause 15 amends section 223md of the principal Act. As the Act and the regulations stand, neither the council of the area nor the licensed surveyor who certifies the strata plan can be held responsible for the accuracy of the plan. Visual inspections have disclosed discrepancies between the details shown on the strata plan and the actual structures on the parcel.

The object of the proposed new paragraph (b) of subsection (1) is to place an onus on the council to ensure that the strata plan represents an accurate delineation of the units and unit subsidiaries as constructed and laid out on the parcel. A similar onus will be placed on the surveyor by amending the form of the surveyor's certificate to be endorsed on the strata plan.

The new paragraph (ba) (i) is designed to ensure that all the buildings and structures on the parcel have been actually completed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications at the time when the council gives its certificate of approval. The new paragraph (ba) (ii) gives some latitude in cases where, in the process of building, there have been inconsequential departures from the approved plans and specifications.

The object of the new subsections (3a) and (4a) is to safeguard a promoter who proposes to embark on a building scheme for which

strata titles will be required. At the moment, a promoter may obtain the approval of the council to the plans and specifications and may also be notified that the Director of Planning has advised the council that the proposed scheme does not contravene, and is not inconsistent with, any provision of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-67, or with any authorized development plan (regulation 54).

The promoter may then proceed to outlay a large sum in the construction of the building scheme only to find that, when the scheme has been completed and he applies to the council and the Director for their respective certificates of approval, his application is refused owing to a change in the law or the regulations.

The new subsections (3a) and (4a) are designed to protect a promoter from such a predicament. However, the proposed amendments carry a rider to the effect that the construction of the buildings must be commenced within 12 months after the council approved the plans and specifications or the Director gave the prescribed advice to the council (under regulation 54).

The proposed new subsection (7) offers a workable compromise in any case where it is discovered that part of a structure erected on the parcel encroaches on a public street. Its object is to avoid the difficulty and delay which would attend the acquisition of a title, by the registered proprietors of the parcel, to the land encroached on.

Clause 16 amends section 223mf by eliminating the procedures requiring the schedule of unit entitlements or any amendment thereto to be submitted to and approved by the Commissioner of Land Tax or other appointed person. This provision was originally inserted because it was feared that a promoter might set up a fictitious schedule, particularly where he intended to retain one of the units for himself.

From experience, it has been found that schedules set up by promoters are sensible and equitable, and official policing of schedules achieves inconsequential results. The proposed amendments to section 223mf remove the necessity for the approval of the Commissioner (or other person appointed) to be obtained to any schedule of unit entitlement or to any subsequent alterations thereto.

Clause 17 amends section 223mg of the Act by eliminating the functions of the Registrar of Companies as a repository for documents under the Act and in relation to the approval of names and the registration of statutory corporations. Clause 18 repeals section 223mh

and enacts a new section in its place in consequence of the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies.

Clause 19 repeals section 223n and enacts a new section in its place requiring the Registrar of Companies to transfer to the Registrar-General all registers and records kept by him, before the Bill becomes law, for the purposes of these provisions. This provision is also consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies.

Clause 20 strikes out subsection (11) of section 223na, as it has become redundant in view of new subsection (6) inserted in section 223mc by clause 13 (d). Clause 21 amends section 223nc of the principal Act in consequence of the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies. As approval of the names of the statutory corporations has been also eliminated, provision has been made in future for a standard name for each corporation distinguished by the number of the relevant deposited strata plan.

Clause 22 amends section 223ne by making provision for a larger committee and consequently larger quorum at committee meetings. Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the clause are consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies, and paragraph (e) replaces subsection (11) with a new subsection that exempts a corporation from the payment of any fee in connection with the furnishing of any return or information to the Registrar-General under subsection (10) (f) of the section.

Clause 23 clarifies the provisions of section 223nh. Clauses 24 to 28 are consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies. Clause 29 amends section 231 of the principal Act by striking out an obsolete passage relating to hard labour and solitary confinement. Clause 30 makes a conversion to decimal currency of a reference to the old currency. Clause 31 amends section 241 by excluding from its application any strata plan as defined in section 223m, as the section is not applicable to strata plans.

Clause 32 amends section 242 by excluding from its application certificates for units represented on a strata plan as the section is not applicable to strata plans. Clause 33 brings two references to the principal Act up to date. Clause 34 removes from section 245 the necessity for the court to appoint a person to act as next friend of a married woman, as married women are now under no disabilities as such.

Clause 35 brings the reference to the principal Act up to date. Clause 36 amends the Third Schedule to the principal Act by making an amendment to the form of caveat in the Third Schedule in consequence of the amendment to section 39 by clause 7. Clause 37 makes an amendment to the form of caveat in the Twelfth Schedule in consequence of the amendment of section 191 by clause 10. Clause 38 repeals the Fifteenth Schedule to the principal Act which is now obsolete.

Clause 39 repeals and re-enacts the Twenty-Fourth Schedule to the principal Act. This schedule sets out the form of a Certificate of Title for a unit and of a Certificate of Title for common property. The only difference between the existing and the new forms is that the date of deposit of the strata plan is omitted in the new forms. The inclusion of this date serves no useful purpose. Clause 40 repeals and re-enacts the Twenty-Fifth Schedule to the principal Act which is the form of the schedule of unit entitlement. In its new form, the endorsement of the Commissioner of Land Tax has been omitted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RAILWAYS STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENT (COCKBURN TO BROKEN HILL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 1300.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading, and in rising to speak to this Bill I have only a few observations to make. Many members have spoken very competently on it already, and there are a number of amendments coming through. I really only wish to refer to a couple of clauses. Clause 19 is one. I can see no reason for changing the present system by introducing the principle that a person not on the electoral roll or a person whose official address is not recorded anywhere and being under 21 years should be allowed to be a witness as required under section 80 and 81 of the Act.

I consider that a person of the age of 18, who might be a son or a daughter of the enrolled person is, or would be, in consequence of parental or other pressure, unsuitable to act as a witness, because honourable members will

note that a witness, so-called in the Act, has more responsibility than that of observing a signature being made.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Do you know of any 18-year-olds who take any notice of their parents?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Well, we all have hopes. The responsibility of the so-called witness runs to the following: first, being satisfied that the ballot-paper shows no notes or markings when first in the hands of the voter; secondly, ensuring that the ballot-paper is marked in his presence, but in such a way that he cannot see the actual vote; thirdly, observing that the ballot-paper is placed in the necessary envelope, addressed to the returning officer and then, and then only, signing his name on the envelope.

It is clear from the foregoing that the responsibility of a witness extends to ensuring that a set of proper procedures is followed. This, it seems to me, is something that we should not ask a minor to do—a minor who is not only not on the roll and therefore not a voter, but who is also quite possibly subject to pressure to accept undesirable practices in a way that would not be effective with an adult. While the law substantially says that an 18-year-old is not an adult, we cannot or should not ask an 18-year-old to perform an adult duty. While they are minors, we should not place on their shoulders the adult responsibility of ensuring that genuine adults carry out their proper legal duties. A minor is not a suitable person to be forced into refusing to witness a ballot-paper for an adult, or even a parent, because he considers that the rules have been flouted.

There are, let us remember, many aspects of the law being considered at the moment concerning the age of maturity, not least of all the actual right to vote. We have already been told in some quarters that none of these ages should be altered until a meeting of Australian Attorneys-General has given the matter full consideration and has examined the implications in many phases of the law. I believe that all these matters should be treated in an integrated fashion and I would not be prepared to accept these alterations hotch-potch or piecemeal. I therefore oppose clause 19.

Concerning clause 40, I have heard some objections, but I myself am in favour of it. I would not wish to take from our people the right to use features as specified under section 155B of the old Act. I believe that everything possible should be done to increase public

interest in the laws of their country and the people who make them and in elections generally.

We have to put up with hoardings advertising soap powders, sedative pills and heaven-knows-what—why not, then, advertising of our candidates and the Parties they represent? If you get too many prohibitions, what happens? The only opportunities for candidates to communicate with their constituents are through radio, television and newspapers, and these media are so excessively costly that expense is becoming a barrier between many candidates and the people they hope to represent.

It has, however, been drawn to my attention that it has been the practice in the past for certain candidates to hire or take rights over houses or shop fronts adjacent to polling booths, or particularly facing polling booths, and then to set up alleged committee rooms. Thus, large banners can be set up to indicate the candidate's name and the Party he represents, thereby evading the intentions of this provision.

In fact, under the clause as it stands it would be quite possible for a regular rash of banners to appear in so-called committee rooms facing polling booths. Therefore, I consider that clause 40 should be amended in such a way that each candidate or Party should be allowed this privilege for one main office or committee room in any one electoral district, and in Committee I will move an amendment accordingly. I will reserve any other comments until Committee; I support the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 2. Page 1335.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. I said last year that I supported the Public Purposes Loan Bill on that occasion without any great enthusiasm, and I regret to say that the same applies this year. I have that lack of enthusiasm not because of the works set out in the Bill but because much more work ought to be done than is proposed. The other reason why I have no great enthusiasm for the Bill is that Loan funds have been set aside to offset deficits and to provide a little nest egg. One does not have to examine the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation too closely to realize that this is so. Of course, although the Chief Secretary submits the Bill in this Council,

it represents the policy of the Treasury and the Government. The part of the Chief Secretary's explanation that is rather disturbing to me is as follows:

After a careful review of the detailed programmes submitted by departments, including requirements for work already in progress, a broad assessment of the capacity of departments and contractors to plan and carry out new works, and an estimate of the probable commitment which would follow in 1970-71 and future years from the commencement of works this year, the Government concluded that it should plan a general 1969-70 programme at a level sufficient to absorb fully the funds currently becoming available, but that it would be wise to reserve most of the Loan balance held at June 30 last. The latter balance, \$12,477,000, had increased by \$6,819,000 during the year from the \$5,658,000 held 12 months previously, the build-up having occurred because of unexpected repayments and some temporary deferment of payments under large contracts.

The Chief Secretary went on to say:

As I have indicated, the Government considers it prudent at this stage to hold in reserve practically the whole of the Loan funds accumulated to the end of June, 1969. It is quite clear that of the balance of \$12,477,000 so held we must continue to hold \$7,905,000 as an offset to Revenue deficits which had been actually incurred and were outstanding at June 30, 1969. Further, the very difficult problems of the Revenue Budget seem likely to continue. As yet the Commonwealth has not given any firm undertaking to make additional general purpose grants during this year, nor has it yet given any indication that it is prepared to support a rearrangement of the financial agreement expiring next June in a form which will give the States real relief. Therefore, although we have carefully controlled our expenditures and increased taxation, the prospect at the moment is for a deficit situation. In addition, there could be seasonal factors involving primary production and water supply, and marketing problems which would adversely affect movement of grain. Almost certainly there will be wage and salary awards that will increase Revenue Budget expenditures. For any or all of these reasons it is necessary to hold Loan funds to ensure that cash is available to meet the Government's accounts.

I ask honourable members to note how often the phrase "Revenue Budget" is mentioned. The Chief Secretary also said:

Another important consideration is the future effect of our carrying out this year a capital programme about 16 per cent above last year. Many projects to be commenced must carry over into next year, and the maximum increase in new funds that could be safely estimated in 1970-71 would not exceed 7 per cent.

My Party had the privilege of being in office for three years, and we were always told that Loan money should be used for capital and

productive programmes, yet we find that, within two years of the last election, about \$12,500,000 of Loan money has been accumulated and not used. Nearly \$8,000,000 of this is to be used to cover a deficit, and about \$4,000,000 is being paid into the Treasury as a nest egg. The Government will be paying the Commonwealth Government interest on that money. I should like to know what the policy of the Government is on this matter. When we did this we were called everything that was bad; in fact, everything that Parliamentary language would allow. I remember the Treasurer saying last year that the Government was taking this course of action for 1968-69. However, exactly the same thing is happening this year. In fact, the Government has gone even further with regard to some items, to which I will refer presently.

This Government knows that it is not going too well from the public's point of view. However, it will say that it has balanced its Budget, and the public will not grasp the significance of the fact that it has done this with Loan money that the Commonwealth Government has given this State to use on capital works.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What do you mean by "given"?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It does not matter whether it has been given or made available: the point is that this money is not being used for the purpose for which it was made available. I am not saying that this action is wrong, for we adopted that practice and in fact it is quite a common practice in other States. Apart from the members of my Party in this Chamber, every other member here criticized the Labor Government for pursuing this course. When my Party did the same thing when it was in office, we got criticism from all directions, and some of it was not even in very good Parliamentary language.

I want to make it quite clear that I think this Government is taking this action for a purpose, and presently I will go on to prove that the 16 per cent increase in the Loan programme referred to in the Minister's explanation does not apply to some sections of the programme. I am not suggesting that the programme is not being increased by 16 per cent overall, but I say that expenditure on buildings which should be increasing by 16 per cent is not increasing at all on last year's figures. That is the point I am making. The work is there and I think next year there will

be a nice electioneering Loan programme and Budget, whereby it will all be spent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What will not be spent will be the \$8,000,000 we had to find to balance your deficit.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It was not as bad as you thought when you came into power.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It was bad, though, wasn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, it was not bad. It was in a fairly good state, and nobody can deny that. It was nowhere near as bad as the Liberal Party made it out to be. When the Premier was Leader of the Opposition, he did not handle the truth properly; nor did he care. He went around the countryside telling the people that the deficit left by the Labor Party was \$20,000,000.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Rubbish!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: What he said was pretty dirty rubbish; it was not the truth. On the Chief Secretary's own statement, the deficit was \$8,000,000. I make the prophecy that in 1970-71 we shall have a different Loan programme and, when the elections are over and we in this Party return to the Treasury benches, we shall not find them as good as we left them.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We shall not find anything at all.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: You will not get in at all.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you want to make a bet?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We will wait and see next year. I know that, as Chief Secretary, I got left with the promises made by the previous Government—and, what is more, the present Government has not yet fulfilled those promises, in respect of hospitals and so forth. We were committed to a building programme for hospitals that no Government could meet, and those buildings are not yet completed. Tell me whether that is wrong. We honoured those promises to the best of our ability. When the building trade needed a stimulus we went into deficit. I am sure that, of the two evils confronting us, we chose the lesser, the other evil being further unemployment in the very depressed economy of the State, due entirely to drought.

We ran into deficit rather than cause further unemployment, and I venture to say (I do not want it to happen to the present Government) that, if we run into two or three bad seasons, the present Government will do as we did, because none of us wants people looking for

work and not being able to find it. If members opposite had the choice of these two courses, I know which one they would take, but perhaps for political reasons they would deny this. I will leave it at that and refer to one or two things in connection with the proposed works.

The first that I want to mention (and honourable members have heard me refer to this many times previously) is water and sewerage. For water supply and sewerage, a total of \$30,965,000 is provided. The total money necessary for the continuation of the supply of water to the city and its reticulation is \$10,559,000. I often wonder whether the public realizes what it costs the Government to supply it with water and under what difficult conditions it is provided. I fear the public does not realize the serious position this State is in with its water supply. If there is one thing that will hinder our progress it is lack of water. I do not want to debate this now but, if we cast our minds back to the last two or three years and also consider the future supply of water to this State, with all the talk about Chowilla and Dartmouth, I wonder where we are going. I will leave it at that.

It astounds, astonishes and surprises me that some people are prepared to give away what this State was promised in connection with water. I refer to the Chowilla dam. We made an agreement, when the Snowy Mountains scheme was being proceeded with, with two other States and the Commonwealth. All the States involved agreed to a certain procedure. I say without hesitation that that agreement should be honoured. If it is not and we are left without water at some time in the future, then those who try to defeat that legislation will feel sorry.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Wasn't that an election promise, too?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; it was promised that we would proceed with Chowilla on our own. I have never heard anything so stupid as that: it was physically and financially impossible to do that, but that was the statement of the then Leader of the Opposition. The trouble is that members of the present Government have had only one term in Opposition; they have not learnt how to act as an Opposition. I hope that all the time I was in Opposition I was reasonable. It is easy enough to be loud in saying what you will do when you are in Opposition but it is very different from being in Government, as this Government discovered when it tried to do what it said it would do.

I make it abundantly clear that I do not trust other States when they make promises to South Australia. We have been let down too many times for us to believe in what they say. If any State should be held to its agreement, the States that are parties to the agreement with the Commonwealth on Chowilla should be held to that agreement,

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How do we hold people to an agreement involving \$28,000,000?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Legislation has been passed to that effect; it is there.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: By all the States concerned.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I do not want to get into this too deeply, because it may be too dangerous.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think so.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It may be dangerous in this debate but, unless every State agrees that the agreement should be repudiated, it must stand.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: After all, you yourself had the opportunity as a Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, we did not; it had not reached that point.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It had.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We would have gone on with it. In my opinion (and I am no legal authority, so correct me if I am wrong) the next thing we would have done possibly was to refer the matter to arbitration. That has not been done.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I realize that, but you understand where that would lead us. We might be worse off.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is a matter of opinion. If this State did not have water in a dry year and Victoria and New South Wales did not have water and they wanted it, we would not get our quota. If the Chief Secretary believes that those States would let water run through to South Australia at a time when they badly needed it, he has more faith in Governments than I have.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: But we got water from the Hume dam during the drought, in the last year when you were in office.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: When did the work stop?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am entitled to say what I believe, and members opposite are entitled to their opinion. If members opposite as a Government want to repudiate the agreement, that is their responsibility, but I will not be a party to it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was not only an agreement; it was an election promise.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have made my point. I want to leave water, because it is a touchy point with many people. Unless the public realizes how essential and costly it is, trouble may occur in the future.

Turning to the provision of \$27,800,000 for Government buildings, land and services, I am particularly pleased that the rebuilding scheme for the Royal Adelaide Hospital will be continued and that construction work will be carried out at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Strathmont Hospital. I am a little disappointed that only \$400,000 is provided for continuing work on the new hospital at Modbury. I am pleased that provision is made for commencing the construction of new buildings at the Port Augusta Hospital and the Port Pirie Hospital, but I am disappointed that no provision is made for the south-western districts hospital.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We must wait for the agreement with the Commonwealth. The Leader will find provision for this hospital under the heading "University Buildings".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I see. I was perturbed—and the Chief Secretary may be able to reply to this point—because there was some doubt whether the hospital would be recognized as a teaching hospital. I think that \$250,000 is provided in this triennium for the early work on the hospital. Because the Commonwealth Government and the Universities Commission have committed themselves only to such a small sum, I believe that this project may be delayed somewhat longer than was expected.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It will not delay the actual start of the medical course, because that can start without this hospital.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have talked to people on this matter and I understand that the building may be completed nearly two years later than was expected. However, if such a delay does not prevent the intake of medical students into the university we will not be so badly off. I hope there will be no further problems in connection with this hospital, because it is badly needed.

In connection with the Government's setting aside \$12,000,000, to which I have already referred, I am concerned about the provision of \$13,800,000 for school buildings. The actual amount spent last year for this purpose was \$13,270,000, and the amount provided last year was underspent by about \$500,000. If we underspend this year's provision by \$500,000, we will be spending only about the same amount that we spent last year for this

purpose. However, the Treasurer's statement on the Loan Estimates says that we are spending 17 per cent more this year than we did last year. In view of the importance of school building programmes and the trouble experienced by the Public Buildings Department it is conservative to say that the provision may again be underspent by \$500,000.

In 1969-70 we will not be spending as much on school buildings as we did in 1968-69. How can we justify the fact that we are not spending as much on school buildings as we did last financial year, in the light of the \$12,000,000 that we are putting away as a nest egg? I cannot follow this reasoning.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The provision is 25 per cent more than the provision made in the last year of the Labor Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not think it is. I realize that I am not allowed to quote from debates in the House of Assembly but, if the Chief Secretary reads in *Hansard* the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in that House, he will find that the figures for 1965-66 and 1966-67 were perhaps as high as this year's figure, if not higher. I am pleased that \$55,000 is provided to commence work on the third stage of the development scheme for the Police Training Academy. This stage is estimated to cost \$380,000 and consists of the provision of two additional dormitory units to provide sleeping accommodation for 100 cadets.

In my term as Chief Secretary I was disappointed that the then Government could not go on with this project, because I know that the academy is a particularly fine institution and that it turns out good cadets, good policemen, and good citizens. In view of the way that people are acting in the community today and in view of our population growth, we will need more graduates from the Police Training Academy. I give the Government credit for this project and I hope that, with the change of Government, it will be completed without any problems.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We will have it done before then.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If the Government is to spend about \$400,000, it will not be doing badly to complete the project within 18 months.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I thought you were talking about a change of Government, not an election.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope there will be an election before that. I am giving the present Government the benefit of the doubt:

I am giving it 18 months to complete the project. The sum of \$5,000 is provided to commence the construction of divisional headquarters at Whyalla, \$50,000 is provided for alterations to the old Police Headquarters, and \$100,000 is to provide accommodation for the establishment of intermediate courts. All these projects are worthwhile and I have no objection to them. The Labor Government was roasted for providing Loan money for non-government buildings. I would like to read a little of what I said last year as it appears in *Hansard* of September 17, 1968, at page 1122:

When one grows older, one accepts those things. I see that \$2,525,000 is provided for non-government hospital and institution buildings. I would like the Chief Secretary to correct me if I am wrong, but it appears that he introduced this section of the Loan programme simply by saying:

The major building projects at non-government hospitals and institutions, for which the grants are proposed this year, are as follows—

He then referred to the Calvary Hospital and the Helping Hand Centre. I have no objection to either of those hospitals being helped. Indeed, they are worthy of all the help they are given. In the main they were more or less granted assistance during the Labor Government's term of office. However, we got such a grilling on this matter that I wonder why, after members opposite said what they did when they were in Opposition, their Party is continuing with these provisions. All sorts of accusations were made against us. I wonder how anyone making those accusations has the audacity to continue to support the Government. In this statement on the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said:

In reviewing the detailed departmental proposals which had a claim to participate in the available Loan funds, and which had been largely incorporated in the preliminary programme put before the previous Government in March last, the present Government gave serious consideration to the practicability of relieving Loan Account of the burden of those tertiary education and hospital building grants which had been charged consistently to Revenue Account until 1965-66. For reasons which I shall set out fully in the Government's main Budget statement early next month—

I have not yet had a chance to read that statement—

it is clear that Revenue Account is not yet able to meet those grants as it did in the past, and the Government is obliged, though reluctantly, to approve for this year a continuation of the policy initiated by the previous Government for these and comparable grants. However, the Government proposes to shape its future financial programmes in such a way as will ensure the earliest possible transfer of these commitments back to Revenue Account, so releasing further Loan funds for essential capital

works and development. This will enable progressive effect to be given to the Government's desire and undertaking to improve further allocations for school buildings and other capital works.

The Hon. L. R. Hart spoke after I had spoken on that day, and at page 1124 he is reported as having said:

In framing this year's Loan Estimates, the Treasurer had to be acutely conscious of the fact that the Treasury was faced with cumulative revenue deficits amounting to about \$8,365,000, which is big money.

Not the \$20,000,000 we have heard such a lot about!

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That is only revenue that you are talking about.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Hon. Mr. Hart continued:

One thing that had to be avoided at all costs was the funding of the revenue deficit from the Loan Account. By doing this we would have attracted the penal consequences laid down in the Financial Agreement in relation to sinking fund provisions. It has always been the policy of the Liberal and Country Party to meet the costs of non-revenue producing assets from Consolidated Revenue. It must also be remembered that Loan moneys must be amortized over 53 years through a sinking fund, together with interest.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That statement kept him out of the Cabinet.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Did it?

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Those are very wise words.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That was in 1968-69, but in 1969-70 we find that the Government has a nest egg of \$12,000,000 banking up from loans. In spite of that, one line reads: "Non-Government Hospital and Institution Buildings, \$2,400,000". However, the following is an extract from the Treasurer's report under that same heading: "Actual payments from Loan Account in 1968-69 were \$2,093,000." Notwithstanding criticism levelled at the Labor Government, and everything bad that was said about its activities, and notwithstanding the Government statements of last year that I have just read, stating what it would do in that year and implying that that would be the only year (and some honourable members, if my memory serves me correctly, said that that was what it meant), we find that the amount allotted to non-Government hospital and institution buildings has been increased by \$307,000 this year. How hypocritical can people get when speaking about the same things by saying different things when it suits them just because their Party is the Government?

I want to conclude on this note: I have no objection to money being provided for that purpose and I will mention a few of the charitable institutions concerned under this heading. They are: Burnside War Memorial Hospital Inc., Calvary Hospital, the Helping Hand Centres, Kuitpo Colony, the hospital that bears your name, Sir (Lyell McEwin Hospital), the Maitland Hospital, Murray Bridge Hospital, and the Queen Victoria Hospital. I know their problems, and each is a deserving organization in need of the money and each is doing a grand job for the community. I do not criticize the Government for supporting those institutions; in fact, I think (and I believe the Chief Secretary will agree with me) that every dollar spent on helping such places is sound economy for the State because, overall, such

action saves the Government money. Although this matter should not be viewed entirely from an economic angle, I repeat that every institution the Government helps is doing a grand job in the community.

I hope that the honourable members of this Chamber and elsewhere who were so critical of the Labor Government and its policy will be guided by their conscience and say, "Well, after all, you were working on the right lines." With those remarks, I support the second reading and hope the Bill goes through successfully.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 4, at 2.15 p.m.