

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CADELL ESCAPE

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I seek leave of the Council to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Government and the Prisons Department are most concerned at the escape of three prisoners from Cadell Training Centre on Sunday, September 13. It is understandable that the Cadell community should be concerned about this escape, particularly in view of the fact that a local resident was involved. The care with which trainees have been selected for transfer to Cadell is reflected in the fact that in the 10 years of the centre's operation there have been minor walk-offs only, and only this one incident of a serious nature. It has been decided that the best action to take at this stage is to hear what the local community has to say, and to this end the Comptroller will arrange a meeting with local residents for later this week. The Government will consider any representations made by local residents at this meeting.

The use of open prison farms for rehabilitation purposes is a world-wide practice. In the past, the various services provided by the Cadell centre, such as Emergency Fire Services, have provided valuable services to the community. Although the seriousness of this escape cannot be minimized, it is hoped that the community as a whole will realize that this type of prison farm operation has had considerable success and that this form of rehabilitation will not be jeopardized by this one incident.

QUESTIONS

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Although I could give a very long explanation before asking this question, I will try to be as brief as possible. In my opinion, the introduction of medical benefits payable by the Common-

wealth Government on the basis of the common fee principle could have very serious side effects on the future operation of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in South Australia. I think all honourable members of this Council would appreciate that the I.M.V.S., which is possibly the outstanding laboratory of its type in Australia, has a world-wide reputation. There are many aspects of this question on which I could enlarge, but this would take considerable time. Will the Chief Secretary ask the Director of the institute to furnish him with a report, which could be brought to this Council for the information of members, on the ramifications of the adoption of the common fee principle?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have an idea that I have read some dockets dealing with the common fee, and I think the department referred to may have been one of the departments involved, although I am not certain of that. I shall be pleased to obtain a report on the question as soon as possible.

MIDLAND BY-ELECTION

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In last Saturday's *Advertiser* there was an article supplied by the Australian Labor Party referring to the Midland by-election. Towards the beginning of it appeared the words:

The South Australian Legislative Council is one of those barnacles on the ship of progress that time has passed by.

It finished by referring to the Labor candidate, saying:

He has the experience and character to be an excellent Legislative Councillor.

Can the Chief Secretary correlate those two statements?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I would not attempt to do so.

ABATTOIRS BOARD

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I understand that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, under pressure from the trade union movement, has agreed to pay service pay to its employees, and that there is pressure, too, for the clerical staff to be paid service pay.

This would involve the board in the payment of a considerable sum of money, which perhaps it is not in a position to meet. Can the Minister say how the board proposes to meet these payments—whether by Government subsidy or grant or whether it will mean an increase in killing charges? If it is to be the latter, can the Minister say what the extent of the increase in killing charges will be?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will take up this matter with the board and furnish the honourable member with a reply as soon as possible.

NUMBER PLATES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport has a reply to my recent question about whether the Government will proceed with the former Government's proposal to introduce reflectorized number plates.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague has supplied me with the following answer:

The Government is making further inquiries concerning the matter of reflectorized number plates. When these inquiries are complete, the Council will be informed.

DRIVERS' EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I understand the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport has a reply to my recent question about drivers' examinations.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport has supplied me with the following answer to the question asked regarding drivers' examinations, during my temporary absence from the Chamber on September 1, 1970:

Consideration has already been given to the matter raised by the honourable member. As soon as I saw the press report quoting the opinions of Mr. Justice Zelling, I called for a report on the whole question. It is quite clear that the Act as it now stands gives the Registrar authority either to refuse to issue a licence or renewal or, alternatively, to withdraw a current licence if he is satisfied that there is reason to do so. However, the problem that arises in this matter is rather complex, and it affects two professions (namely, the legal and medical professions). It particularly affects the medical profession because, when a doctor examines such a person, he may form the opinion (as he often does) that the person is not capable of doing many things, one of which may be driving a motor vehicle. Alternatively, the doctor may (as happens in many cases) prescribe drugs which, when taken by the patient, may make him incapable of driving a motor vehicle. Unfortunately, the medi-

cal profession regards this sacred cow of doctor-patient relationship so highly that it either refuses or fails to reveal such things to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. The Registrar can withdraw a licence when he is satisfied of the situation. However, if he is not given this information, which the medicos fairly religiously refuse to divulge, the Registrar is placed in an impossible position. This matter has also been discussed by the Australian Medical Association, which has strongly advised against the divulging of this information.

It is regretted that little can be done unless the Australian Medical Association's attitude changes in respect of such persons who should not hold licences but who, under the present system, can get them. If people get killed, as happened recently and upon which Mr. Justice Zelling commented, it is indeed to be regretted. I am appalled, along with all my Cabinet colleagues and, in fact, every thinking person in South Australia, at the frightful road toll as mentioned by the honourable member, but it is just not possible to legislate to compel the divulging of medical conditions which could prevent a person from obtaining or reobtaining a driving licence unless and until the appropriate organizations realize their public responsibility.

WHEAT QUOTA COMMITTEE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Shortly after the present Government took office a committee was established to investigate the shortcomings and anomalies of the wheat quota system. Can the Minister say how many times the committee has met, whether it sits continually, and when its report will be issued?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The committee met yesterday for the first time after being formally informed of its terms of reference, which were published in the daily press last week. (I think the honourable member probably read the press report.) The committee intends, to the best of my knowledge, to meet as often as possible; I believe it will meet once a fortnight or perhaps once a week. It will travel to many parts of the State and, in accordance with its terms of reference, take evidence from anyone who wishes to make submissions. It is hoped that the committee's report will be completed by the end of this year.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: A press release has been made available to honourable members today in relation to the committee's terms of reference. The Hon. Mr. Geddes recently asked what the terms of reference were, so I assume that the press release has been issued in reply to his question. In part, the press release states:

For the purpose of its investigations the committee may take written and/or oral evidence from individual growers organizations and other bodies in South Australia and elsewhere and make such comments, in conjunction with its recommendations, as it deems fit.

The question that worries me is whether this committee will consider every individual wheat quota. If it does not, this may place individual wheatgrowers in a quandary because they will not know whether their quota is being reconsidered. Furthermore, if the committee is to consider each individual quota, will it require further evidence from individual wheatgrowers? Some growers have already lodged complaints against their quota and, no doubt, there is evidence supporting these claims. However, many growers may have taken the view that, although they have not lodged complaints against their quota, they have a justifiable complaint to lodge. The question that might worry these growers is whether their quota will be reconsidered. Can the Minister throw any light on the question of what wheat quotas the committee will consider—whether it will consider all quotas in relation to the overall aspect of wheat quotas, or only those quotas against which complaints have already been lodged?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member really amazed me by the way in which he framed the question, because the terms of reference have already been laid down. If he cannot read them, I suggest that he get someone to interpret them for him. At present, there is a Wheat Advisory Committee, which was formed in the initial stages of wheat quotas being established in South Australia to go into the quota of every farmer in the State. Does the honourable member think that this committee has not done a good job in the circumstances? I do not think there is any need for the inquiry committee to go into every individual quota: that is the advisory committee's specific task. This new committee has been set up and given its terms of reference, and it will operate within those terms. If the honourable member is so concerned about wheatgrowers in general, I suggest that he make personal representation to the inquiry committee.

The PRESIDENT: I point out to the Ministers that, when replying to questions which are asked for the purpose of eliciting information, the reply should be confined to that purpose rather than to engaging in particularly personal debate.

POLLUTION

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about pollution?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Arrangements have been made to distribute future copies of the Public Health Department newsletter on pollution of the environment to all members of Parliament.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the activities of the Committee on Agricultural Education that was appointed by a previous Minister of Agriculture. I understand that the committee has almost completed its work, and I am very interested to know whether the Minister has further information to give to the Council on the committee's activities. I know that the committee has considered this matter for three or four years in a fairly extensive manner. If the Minister has any further information to give to the Council I am sure that it will be received with interest.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot supply any more information along those lines. However, I spoke with the committee's Chairman (Mr. Ramsay) only a short time ago and he told me that it was in the course of completing its report. It had one centre in New South Wales or Victoria to visit. It had intended visiting two centres, but it decided that one was sufficient. Whether it goes to the one in New South Wales or the one in Victoria is a matter for the committee. I mentioned to Mr. Ramsay that it was desirable that the committee's report be furnished as soon as possible so we could have a look at it and get on with the job of agricultural education in this State.

FISHING

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 1 regarding the number of fishing boats engaged in various fishing activities as at June 30, 1968, 1969 and 1970?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director, Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, has furnished details of the number of vessels engaged in the tuna, abalone, crayfish and prawn fisheries for the years 1968, 1969, and 1970, and I seek permission of the Council to have the statistics incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

VESSELS ENGAGED IN FISHERIES

Fishery	June 30, 1968	June 30, 1969	June 30, 1970
Tuna	27	24	17
Abalone	106*	59	43
Crayfish (Rock lobster)	437	414	410
Prawns	30	29	36

* 106 abalone permits had been issued at June 30, 1968, but only 73 divers were currently engaged at this time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director points out that particulars for the shark fishery have not been given because this industry is not subject to control and departmental records are incomplete.

DYSLEXIA

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: My question of the Minister representing the Minister of Education concerns children suffering from the condition known as dyslexia. Can the Minister obtain from his colleague details of the approximate percentage of schoolchildren in this State who are dyslectic; secondly, what special training facilities exist for them; and, thirdly, what part the Government plays in the provision of that training?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will ask my colleague to furnish me with a reply for the honourable member.

EGGS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Federal Council of the Poultry Farmers Association of Australia is of the opinion that the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities' plan or the Commonwealth hen levy is not operating efficiently enough to control the over-production of eggs in South Australia and possibly in Australia, and it has asked that the State consider implementing the licensing of farms or of poultry farmers in South Australia with the object of achieving uniformity throughout the Commonwealth. Has the Minister considered

this request and, if so, is it intended that some form of licensing of egg production in this State will take place soon?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As the honourable member has said, this matter is causing a deal of concern to the egg industry. This matter was discussed at the last Agricultural Council meeting but not to the extent I thought it would be, mainly because we were informed on that occasion that Western Australia was conducting its own poll on whether or not poultry farms should be registered. The poll has been taken in Western Australia, and I understand that about 95 per cent were in favour of it and that only about 30 people voted against it. The fact that it was accepted in Western Australia indicates that licensing of farms should come into effect. However, Western Australia is in a slightly different situation from the other States because we have the Nullarbor Plain between that State and South Australia particularly, and this acts as a barrier against the operation of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution as far as eggs are concerned. However, for the remainder of the States the situation is that we can do something in this matter only in conjunction with each other; in other words, on a uniform basis. I know that the Minister for Primary Industry is also very concerned about this matter, and in a letter I received about three days ago he showed great concern about the over-production of eggs throughout the poultry industry in Australia. The honourable member can rest assured that any decision taken on this matter will have to be a decision of the States and accompanied by uniform legislation, otherwise we will get complete chaos in the industry because of the existence of section 92.

DERAILMENTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Recently I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport a question regarding derailments and matters connected therewith. Has he a reply to that question?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Roads and Transport, has provided me with the following information in connection with the matters asked by the honourable member:

The rehabilitation programme which came out of the report of the special committee set up by the previous Government to inquire into the causes of derailments on the South Australian Railways is being continued as approved by the previous Government. The expenditures for 1969-70 totalled \$634,444.

Maunsell & Partners have not yet reported on the causes of derailments on the new standard gauge line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie.

Regarding the derailment at Murray Bridge, the report states that whilst traversing a 13-chain radius right-hand curve approaching the eastern end of the bridge over the Murray River, a total of 12 vehicles were derailed. The locomotives and the leading 11 vehicles were not derailed; the following 12 were derailed and the trailing 21 vehicles, including the brakevan, were not derailed. The 12 derailed vehicles became uncoupled and were split into three sections, the first comprising two vehicles, followed by a gap of 120yds. to the next four vehicles, with a subsequent break of 10ft. to the remaining six. The track consists of 107 lb. rails, baseplated throughout, and it is on limestone ballast. The speed of the train was between 25 and 26 miles per hour, which conformed with the maximum permissible speed applying to this area at the present time.

Evidence indicates that the leading wheel of the leading derailed vehicle (which was four wheeled and loaded with 20 tons of bulk wheat) mounted the high rail of the curve and travelled in this position for several chains. In so doing, it permitted the opposite wheel to fall inside the gauge. The outer wheel ultimately dropped outside the rail, initiating damage to sleepers and the subsequent derailment of other vehicles. The track approaching the point of derailment had not been the subject of heavy maintenance over a recent period, but from approximately the point of derailment onwards the track had been substantially resleepered. Measurements taken on the ground disclose a change in cant of $\frac{1}{2}$ in. in a length of 10ft. coinciding with a sharpening of the radius of the curve and with a widening of the gauge. These three factors, in combination, are deemed to be the cause of the derailment. Evidence indicates, therefore, that the track condition referred to was the cause of the derailment. The criteria were different from those present on the occasion of previous derailments on the Murray Bridge to Serviceton line. It should be pointed out that it is standard practice to baseplate all curves of 40-chain radius or under. The curve in question was so baseplated.

PRAWN FISHING

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Just before going out of office I had very strong representations made to me by people who had not been granted a licence, although their names had been on the books for about 12 months in some cases, for entry into the prawn fishing industry. During the last 12 months, it has become apparent that increasing numbers of prawns have been taken from the gulfs, and more

recently from the West Coast waters. Towards the end of my term as Minister, I gave an undertaking that I would issue 12 new licences. I asked the present Minister a question, to which he replied on July 22—nearly two months ago—subsequent to a question I had asked him previously. He said at that time that there were just a few more details to be worked out, mostly to do with the conservation of prawns in general. I asked a question subsequent to that, about the method by which any new licences would be granted. First, has the Minister been able to satisfy himself that the additional information he required about conservation is in hand? Secondly, has he so far issued any further licences? If he has not, when is it likely that he will do so?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am happy to inform the honourable member that the issue of prawn licences has been completed: 15 new licences will be issued, and the people concerned can apply formally one day this week. I hope that the situation is, as the honourable member put it, as he promised the industry when he was Minister of Agriculture. I agree with what he did in those days and have assured myself that the industry is capable of having more boats; also, I am pleased to tell the honourable member that this matter has now been finalized.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Following that reply, could the Minister give me some details of the method of granting licences—not in great detail but whether it was on a zoning basis or on a ballot basis?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I did not adopt the balloting system, which was recommended to me in the first place by the Director, because I thought that it was complicated. After taking up the matter with the Port Adelaide Fishermen's Association, the Western Prawn Fishermen's Association and other interested bodies, I thought it better in the interests of the industry generally for people to be taken on their merits having regard to the length of time they had been in the fishing industry in South Australia, the ports where they lived and also the time that their applications for prawn licences had been in existence. Other minor factors were taken into consideration, but I think what I have said explains the situation fully. If I can supply any more information to the honourable member, I shall be pleased to talk to him later.

FERTILIZERS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me what trials have been carried out of fertilizers marketed by

Primary Fertilizers Proprietary Limited? Can he also tell me the results of those trials and say whether any further trials are contemplated?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I understand that trials have been carried out at the department but, to bring myself up to date so that I can give this information to the honourable member, I shall be pleased to get a report from the department and bring it down as soon as possible.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about whether a pedestrian crossing could be planned across the Lower North-East Road at Campbelltown?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague states:

No formal approach has been made to the Road Traffic Board for a pedestrian crossing on the section of the Lower North-East Road abutting the schools or homes mentioned by the honourable member. It will be necessary for the Campbelltown council to conduct a survey of pedestrian movement to determine whether such a crossing is warranted and, if it is, the best place for its installation. The Road Traffic Board will request the council to undertake this survey so that the pedestrian crossing requested can be considered.

MEAT

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture had an opportunity to read the McCall report, which was furnished to me, on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and the Jeffery report, which was also furnished to me, on the overall situation of meat in South Australia? As regards the Jeffery report, is the Minister contemplating any action to amend the Acts specified in the report, as suggested in it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have read the McCall report and also the report of the advisory committee of which the Auditor-General, Mr. Jeffery, was chairman. I am sure that the honourable member will agree that the advisory committee that was set up lacked on it a technical officer, who should have been appointed in the first place. It was just an oversight, but the inclusion of such an officer would have been of great benefit to the committee. Nevertheless, the report is quite good but, if we are to look at the South Australian meat industry, I am sure the honourable member will agree that it will be a big task to rewrite the Act in order to simplify the present

situation, because we have about three Acts, which are all most complicated. I hope that soon we shall be able to look at this situation. It will not be an easy exercise, because it will cover the whole of South Australia. If we are to do this thing properly, we must look at every possible aspect. I assure the honourable member that I am aware of the seriousness of the situation and that a matter of this nature should be implemented as expeditiously as possible. Nevertheless, extreme caution must be exercised on account of the complications that could arise if the exercise was not done properly. I will keep the honourable member informed of the situation from time to time.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1970.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 2. Page 1188.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I have pleasure in supporting this Bill, and I congratulate the Government on the fortunate financial position in which it found itself on coming to office and on the financial position revealed in this Bill. I am glad that the Government is in this position; no South Australian worth his salt would be otherwise than glad that South Australia has more money available to it than it has had in previous years. I endorse the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, who has said that the Loan funds that will be appropriated this year for Government works total \$113,000,000 which, as he has said, is an increase of 11 per cent or 12 per cent. The Leader said, too, that he believed that this reflected much credit on the work done by Sir Glen Pearson, who for two years was Treasurer of this State. I hasten to endorse the Leader's comments in this regard and I repeat that I am glad that the Government is in this financial position and I believe that the complaining that it has done (to put it mildly) does it no credit.

I pay a tribute to Sir Glen Pearson for the way he improved this State's financial position over the last two years, and I very much regret his retirement from politics. He was a member of Parliament for about 20 years, during which time he served for a period as Minister of Agriculture, for a longer period as Minister of

Works, and more recently as Treasurer. The honourable gentleman gave good service in each of the portfolios he held, but he made his most conspicuous mark during his period as Treasurer. With the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I believe that Sir Glen Pearson made a very marked contribution to the improvement in this State's finances following the assumption of office of the Hall Government in 1968.

We have heard much from the present Government about what has been called a lousy deal; however, in view of the present financial position, this is so much nonsense. Dr. Forbes, a Minister in the Commonwealth Parliament, said recently that special grants were based on the growth rate, and I believe that the only possible complaint we can have about our increased grants is that Western Australia got more. Honourable members should take into account the work done by the dynamic Government of Western Australia, which work was exemplified by the visit of the Hon. Mr. Court last week. Those honourable members who were privileged to hear his oration at the annual function of the Agricultural Bureau in Bonython Hall will appreciate the political philosophy and work of the Western Australian Government. That Government has achieved a growth rate of almost 4 per cent, which is very satisfactory indeed. Until 1965 South Australia had a growth rate that was not exceeded by any other State. However, between 1965 and 1968 our growth rate decreased to about 1.7 per cent. Although a real effort was made between 1968 and 1970, we have not yet been able to achieve much of an improvement. That has most to do with the allocation of a grant to Western Australia that was proportionately higher than our grant.

While Sir Thomas Playford was Premier and Treasurer our growth rate was very high and our share of the Loan funds was exceedingly good, having regard to South Australia's percentage of the country's population. Largely as a result of the foundations laid by Sir Thomas Playford, our share of the Loan funds is still high, but it is not as high as it was during his period as Premier and Treasurer. South Australia has about 9 per cent of Australia's population, yet our share of the Loan funds is over 13 per cent—nearly 50 per cent more than we are strictly entitled to receive, on a population basis.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is the percentage in Western Australia?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is probably higher. The Western Australian growth rate is nearly 4 per cent, whereas ours is 1.7 per cent. Where there is a 4 per cent growth rate, obviously there will be more additional schools, hospitals, and other facilities to provide than there will be in a State where there is a growth rate of only 1.7 per cent. The Government has very little to complain about and much to be satisfied about.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Has the formula been altered at all?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It has been altered to improve South Australia's position. Dr. Forbes has said that in 1970-71 South Australia will receive \$143,800,000—\$16,400,000 more than it would have received under the old formula—and over the five-year period our total assistance and revenue grants will amount to \$1,000,000,000. An increase of \$16,400,000 in one year is a sizeable increase.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We had to go to the Grants Commission.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Government got another \$5,000,000 out of the Grants Commission. If the Minister likes to do some arithmetic he will find that the Government at present is about \$38,000,000 better off. When the Government is in such a financial position, I find it hard to understand why there should be any increase in taxation. I quote the words of the Hon. Dr. Forbes in a recent speech:

The principal basis of Mr. Dunstan's and the *Advertiser's* complaint that S.A. got what they inelegantly called "a lousy deal" compared with the other States, was that South Australia's estimated increase over 1969-70 was 12.9 per cent, while Western Australia's was 15 per cent—on the face of it a rank injustice, until you take into account the fact that one of the principal things in the formula on which revenue grants are calculated, and there is a formula and the formula does produce results—it's not just drawn out of some hat—one of the principal things in the formula on which revenue grants are calculated and have always been calculated is population increase for the very good reason that if a State has a higher rate of population growth then its need for resources is greater, it needs more schools, more hospital beds, and so on.

Now South Australia, still suffering from the economic mismanagement of the previous Walsh-Dunstan Government—you will remember prior to the Walsh-Dunstan Government coming into office, South Australia had the highest population growth rate in the Commonwealth—during that period it plummeted to the lowest and in the short period he was in office, Mr. Steele Hall managed by valiant efforts and prudent administration to arrest the decline, but nevertheless South Australia's

population growth is still, as a result of the efforts of the last Labor Administration, the lowest in the Commonwealth at 1.7 per cent. This compares with Western Australia's population growth at 3.9 per cent. So ladies and gentlemen, this fact alone when applied to the revenue grants by means of the first formula more than explains the difference between the percentage increase of South Australia's and Western Australia's grant.

I bring that to the notice of the Minister to answer his query about Western Australia's grant. If a State has a 3.9 per cent growth rate, surely it is entitled to some consideration on that score, although I should like to see extra money going to South Australia. Much as I should like to see our growth rate improve to the extent that we could expect to receive more funds in the future from the Commonwealth (and I hope the Government can achieve it), I believe the Government has much to be thankful for rather than much to complain about.

Regarding the Playford Government which went out of office about five years ago, many people (not entirely away from this place) have tried at times to denigrate Sir Thomas Playford. The fortunate situation in which we found ourselves with a population of over 9 per cent and a Loan share of over 13 per cent was largely the result of the work that was done by Sir Thomas Playford when in office. I pay tribute to him for the work he did, which is still bearing fruit in South Australia today. As the Hon. Mr. Story said, if we total all the figures we find that South Australia has something like \$38,000,000 more to spend than it would otherwise have expected. I endorse the Hon. Mr. Story's comments in this regard.

I regret the lack of increase that appears to have been allocated to the Agriculture Department. When speaking on the Loan Estimates in another place the Treasurer said:

It is customary for the Government to outline its detailed financial policy when presenting the Revenue Budget to Parliament each year, normally in the first week in September, and to refrain from such detailed comment in presenting the capital programme outlined in the Loan Estimates. Nevertheless, members will be aware that there is a relationship between the flow of funds through each of the major accounts, Revenue and Loan, and the extent of the programme which can be financed from each. Accordingly, I intend in this statement to touch very briefly on the recent and possible future overall movement in each account.

If I interpret those remarks correctly, they mean, to some extent at least, that these statements must be read together. As the

Leader of the Opposition said, when this Government came into office it found itself in a very good position, in contrast to what the Hall Government found two years before, when it had a considerable deficit. This Government had \$13,032,000, I think, left in Loan funds and about \$3,000,000 left in the Revenue fund in the Treasury. As I said earlier, it received almost \$16,500,000 from the Commonwealth Government in revenue and an extra \$8,500,000 from that Government in Loan moneys. Now, as the Minister said earlier, it has received \$5,000,000 from the Grants Commission. If one totals those figures they come to about \$46,000,000.

The Government has provided over \$4,000,000 to fund the deficit and another \$4,000,000 in a contingency fund for a possible future deficit. I commend the Government for this, which the Leader of the Opposition mentioned about 14 days ago. When he was speaking I interjected and said, "This is something they used to criticize us for doing." Not long ago, when \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 was put to one side for contingencies, I think the then Leader of the Opposition in another place said that this money should be spent on hospitals or on education, or matters of that nature. I believed, in contrast, that a Government should show financial prudence, and therefore I believe that it is doing the right thing now in providing this \$4,000,000 to cover the present deficit and \$4,000,000 for a contingency fund for future expenditure that is not apparent now. If one looks at the gross figure of \$46,000,000 and subtracts the \$8,000,000 to be funded, as the Hon. Mr. Story said, the Government has about \$38,000,000 more to deal with. The Government should be thankful for this instead of complaining about it.

Turning to the document itself, I am pleased to see that \$4,500,000 has been set aside for harbour accommodation and that berthing facilities for interstate container and roll-on-roll-off traffic have been made. I am also pleased to see that \$1,100,000 has been allocated to continue work on widening and deepening the channel between the outer and inner harbours at Port Adelaide. This is important, because I know that the existing facilities there, particularly for loading grain, are somewhat limited. There is a swinging berth at the Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited terminal that is considerably deeper than the actual channel. If the channel is deepened, this will be a good thing. I also note with interest (even though it is not in my district it will

affect the whole of the State) that \$400,000 has been provided for work on the construction of a new passenger terminal to improve the passenger-handling facilities at Outer Harbour.

I think it would be five or six years ago when I came into this Chamber after visiting briefly Perth and the port of Fremantle, that I pointed out to the then Government the rather primitive situations at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour for oversea passengers and, on the other hand, the very good facilities for passengers at Fremantle. It is a front door to what is still a very considerable number of people coming into this State. Although we know that air traffic caters for a very considerable proportion of the travelling public, many people still come into this country by ship, and it is essential in these modern times that we have proper facilities at the Outer Harbour. Therefore, I am very pleased to see that the Government intends to proceed with this plan, which has been under way now, or at least in the offering, for some years.

I notice that \$50,000 is required to complete work on the bulk loading facilities at Port Giles. I was very pleased indeed to be present at the opening of Port Giles on May 23 last. I believe it is a very good facility for the southern part of Yorke Peninsula particularly and certainly in the short term for the whole of the State in that it provides a deep sea port at which the larger ships can be topped up in a State where, unfortunately, most of our ports are rather shallow. I am very pleased that this facility is now practically complete and that \$50,000 is provided to tie up the loose ends, as it were, at the port itself. I am sorry that this project was delayed for two years. It was delayed in 1965, and it was not started again until 1967. However, at least we have the facility there today, and it is something for which we should be thankful.

I notice under the item "Waterworks and Sewers" that some \$575,000 is being provided for further work on the construction of a pipeline to connect the Tod River main with Kimba. Although this is not in my district, I believe that this matter, like the Keith pipeline, is of interest to the whole State. Also like the Keith pipeline, it is very much overdue, and it is a facility that is needed. I am only sorry that the amount provided is not more and that the work will not be completed more quickly than appears to be the case at present. I have no doubt that honourable members for the Northern District will have something to say about this in due course.

I also notice that \$1,134,000 is proposed to be used to continue the work connected with the construction of the pipeline from Swan Reach to Stockwell. This is something which is in the Midland District, and it is a work that is very well worth while. I believe this project was announced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford about six years ago. It means that the Warren reservoir, which I think holds only about 1,500,000,000 gall. and which has been required to service a very considerable area for such a small water storage, will now be adequate. In previous years a branch pipeline from the Mannum-Adelaide main has supplemented the Warren storage, and that now will become largely a spare pipeline for use only in an emergency. The amount of water that was channelled through that pipeline into the Warren will now become available, for the most part at least, to the city of Adelaide, and therefore not only will the completion of this pipeline from Swan Reach to Stockwell be of benefit to the country areas in that it will be somewhat more adequate than the branch pipeline to which I have just referred and will provide more water for the Warren trunk main system, but it will also mean that, with the use of the branch pipeline no longer being required, that amount of extra water will be available for the city of Adelaide.

I also noticed the amount provided for the Taillem Bend to Keith main, which is in the Southern District. Like the Kimba pipeline, it is very urgent. On the other hand, I am sorry to find that the amount for the Kimba pipeline is only about one-quarter of the amount for the Taillem Bend to Keith pipeline. Once again, although it is out of my district, I believe it is something that concerns the whole State.

In referring to the items under "Country Sewerage", I merely want to touch on the fact that \$500,000 is provided for the continuation of work on the extension of sewerage facilities to Gawler. This programme of taking the sewerage system to service the town of Gawler is very long overdue. It has been discussed in this place and in another place for many years, and it is now happening. However, here again I would suggest that it is happening much too slowly, and I would have preferred to see twice the amount of money allocated to that project.

I now want to say a word or two about the facilities provided for education. I notice with reference to schools and associated buildings that there has been an increase in the amount allocated from \$15,500,000 to \$16,500,000. We

are all aware that there is a shortage of solid construction school buildings. I believe that successive Governments and successive Ministers of Education have handled the explosion in the population of schoolchildren in this State as well as they could have done in the circumstances. I believe that if we take the long view we will acknowledge that the expansion of secondary education to practically every child in the State and the expansion of tertiary education to an increasing number of students has been to the credit of successive Governments.

I am pleased to see this increase and I feel sure that the Government has a responsible attitude in this matter. I did not consider that that was the case while the present Government was in Opposition, because I considered that it tried continuously to make political capital out of the situation regarding schools. In my opinion, this was not so when the Hon. Ron Loveday, the former Minister of Education, was in office in the previous Labor Government, because I think that in that time he recognized the problem and he carried on the work of his predecessor, Sir Baden Pattinson, in a way that was to his credit. I deplore the fact that the Labor Party, when in opposition from 1968 to 1970, used this subject to political ends.

The situation with regard to schools is gradually and steadily being improved. We all know that we have too many prefabricated buildings. We are also very well aware that if we had not had prefabricated buildings we could not have coped with the situation that developed like an explosion in school numbers over the past two years.

I notice that about \$250,000 is provided for a number of new police stations, three of which are in the Midland District. I refer to Blanchetown, Port Wakefield and Maitland. I am pleased to see that these facilities are being provided.

Turning now to Roseworthy Agricultural College, I am pleased to see that \$200,000 is provided to complete the remodelling of the wine cellars. Honourable members will be aware that, with the growth of the agricultural college, there was established in the 1930's a diploma in oenology (winemaking). This is one of the few such diplomas in the Southern Hemisphere. I think at present about 20 students are studying this course, which is a semi-post-graduate course so far as the Diploma in Agriculture at Roseworthy is concerned.

It is a very important course for the wine-making industry in Australia. I am pleased that this improvement is to be made and also that improvements are to be effected to the college building, in the kitchen and the dining-room, which were long overdue.

I had the opportunity of inspecting the facilities with the Public Works Committee when it was last there. Also, another dormitory building is to be built, which I believe in the first stage will cost over \$600,000. The cost will be shared by the Commonwealth, as the college is now a college of advanced education. Roseworthy College has made great progress under its present principal, Mr. Herriot. I understand that it will have nearly 200 students as a result of these extensions. I am not quoting Mr. Herriot on this, but I believe it is his opinion that this is the optimum size for any agricultural college unless it wishes to fall down, to some extent, on the practical side of the courses. I believe that, if this is Mr. Herriot's opinion, it is probably correct, because I know that colleges in the Eastern States, where the numbers are greater, have become largely colleges of demonstration, and very little practical study is done there.

I commend the Government for making further progress with the Roseworthy Agricultural College. At some stage it will be necessary to obtain more land for it. In this regard, I think there are two alternatives, one of which, possibly, at first hearing would be laughed out of court but, on second thoughts, might not be. The first alternative is to provide another 1,000 acres in the area of Roseworthy Agricultural College itself, in which case we would be providing another 1,000 acres on exactly the same sort of agricultural land and in exactly the same sort of environment and we would be providing students with only the same sort of training in the same sort of agricultural country. The second alternative, in my book, is that, if the college could buy a couple of buses and could be granted the use, at some future time, of facilities at the Turretfield Research Centre at Rosedale, the 1,000 acres is already there. It is about 10 miles away, which is no problem, with the use of buses. The environment is quite different. I know from practical experience, living as I do seven miles west of Gawler, how different that is from three or four miles east of Gawler, where the rainfall is 3in. or 4in. higher. The soil is quite different and the seasons come up to a month later. This

sort of difference obtains between Roseworthy Agricultural College and the Turretfield Research Centre. Turretfield would be better suited to any extensions of the vineyards operated by the college. When we look at this a second time, it is not a suggestion that, in the future at any rate, will be laughed out of court. It may be valuable for the college to have two areas in what seem to be, fortunately, a considerably different environment in a matter of only 10 to 12 miles. I commend the college, and particularly its principal, for the work it is carrying on. I also commend its officers, whom I know for their integrity and devotion to the work in hand.

The Electricity Trust is to be granted a loan of \$6,000,000. The trust has done an excellent job, as every honourable member will agree. The expansion of electricity services throughout the State has been greatly to the State's advantage, from the point of view of not only secondary but also primary industry. The fact that the trust has not increased its charges for 17 years, in conditions where there have been consistent increases in charges in almost every other sphere, is greatly to its credit, as it is to the credit of the successive Governments that have seen fit to assist the trust wherever possible. I am concerned that a possible price increase in its charges has been suggested, because I believe it is essential for the development of this State to keep our costs down in both primary and secondary industry. Every honourable member who has anything to do with primary industry will agree that any further increases in primary industry costs at present may well be disastrous for many primary producers who are struggling and are in great difficulty.

Also, we know that any increase in the costs of secondary industry may put us in a position where we can no longer compete successfully with the Eastern States. Our price structure must be watched carefully. Therefore, I am most concerned at the suggestion that there may be some increase in electricity costs. However, I commend the trust for the work it has done. I say to the Government and to the trust itself that something must be done to ensure that the unfortunate series of accidents (three or four of them have happened recently) with stobie poles is not repeated. Stobie poles must be brought under control in some way. I do not believe we should put all electricity cables underground (although I know that the Hon. Mr. Hill when he was Minister would have liked that to happen): I realize it is desirable but quite out of court on the ground

of expense. However, we must be concerned with safety, so the position must be looked at carefully.

I notice a sum of \$900,000 set aside for the new festival hall—a festival hall and not a festival theatre. I hope the festival hall will be a success. I have yet to know (and possibly I need to be instructed on this) of a hall that has been a success as a theatre or a theatre that has been a success as a hall. I have said this previously, and I do not want to labour the point: we need a festival hall but not a festival theatre. I hope that this hall, when built, will be the big success that is needed in this State.

An amount of \$325,000 is provided for the Mines Department. I underline to the Government the importance of the Mines Department in this day and age. I am sure that we need to use the Mines Department in every way possible so that more mineral deposits will be discovered. Australia's development today depends very much upon its minerals, and I do not think South Australia is by any means devoid of minerals. The discovery of mineral deposits has had a considerable bearing on the development of other States, and I hope that it will have a similar bearing in South Australia. The Government should not lose sight of the importance of developing the activities of the Mines Department. I congratulate the Government on the fortunate financial position in which it finds itself and I hope it will be able to keep this State's finances on a satisfactory basis. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I agree with the previous speaker that it is very difficult to obtain a clear picture of the whole financial implications of the Bill without considering, too, the revenue figures for the State. However, my short remarks will refer only to the Loan Estimates. I support very strongly the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and other honourable members concerning the unjustified political criticism of the Commonwealth Government that was made after the Loan Council meeting last June.

South Australia once had a high rate of population growth because of the development of industrial activity and because we were able to obtain migrants easily; in those days our rate of population growth was high and Western Australia's rate was low. Now, the position has been reversed and we have to accept the fact that the Commonwealth Government, in making special financial grants, must allocate special funds to those States

where the rate of population growth has been high and where the people require servicing by way of public works.

The most recent figures I have been able to obtain may vary a little from other figures that have been quoted, because they have been taken at a different time. At June 30 this year the annual rate of population growth in South Australia was 1.74 per cent, whereas in Western Australia the increase was 3.52 per cent. So, the rate of population growth in Western Australia has been more than double that in South Australia.

When we remember these figures, we realize that the special consideration given to Western Australia is justified. In his second reading explanation, the Chief Secretary said that we had been allocated \$8,500,000 more than the amount we received for the previous year through the Australian Loan Council. With adjustments to our grants by way of allowances for housing and with adjustments for recoveries, we have a total works programme for the current financial year of \$113,220,000.

The very fortunate financial position in which the Government finds itself is undoubtedly highlighted by the fact that it does not plan to use all the funds at its disposal at this stage. The total carry-over credit of \$13,032,000 on June 30 has been absorbed as follows: \$4,300,000 will be used in connection with part of the current year's works programme, the revenue deficit of \$4,579,000 is being funded, and this leaves the credit of \$4,153,000 which has been mentioned by previous speakers.

This is indeed a very fortunate financial position for the Government to be in. It has said that it does not have immediate plans for using this money; its financial position in regard to its Loan funds is such that it is setting this money aside as a reserve. Because of this very fortunate financial position, some of the criticism levelled earlier at the Commonwealth Government has proved to be unjustified.

Because the Government has such a reserve in the kitty, I think it should have announced some of its plans for public works that have not reached fruition; surely the Government must be giving serious consideration to such plans. In his second reading explanation the Chief Secretary said that South Australia is being given \$20,520,000 worth of semi-government Loan borrowing power this year. This

will mean that semi-government authorities in this State will not be short of funds in this financial year.

The Government should be giving serious consideration to some building projects, particularly further and adequate accommodation for public servants. I know there is a plan for financing accommodation for public servants from funds other than Loan funds, but that plan may not come to fruition. I suggest that the Government should finalize plans for developing the vacant site at the corner of Grote Street and Victoria Square. I have always believed that the grouping of Government departments around the periphery of Victoria Square is very wise and proper.

I think it provides better efficiency within the Public Service generally when Public Service departments are close to one another. When a Government is faced with a Loan position in which it can simply put aside in the kitty a sum of over \$4,000,000, one cannot help but ask: is the Government proposing to upgrade its plans to provide accommodation on a site such as that which has already been acquired for that purpose?

Another department in very serious need of much better accommodation is the Motor Vehicles Department, the present site of which is completely inappropriate for its needs and the needs of the public who are motorists and who call there to renew registration and drivers' licences. It is most regrettable that traffic bottlenecks occur at such a department's door, and I believe that early consideration should be given to the construction of a new building for this department. The department needs a site which provides a considerable amount of vacant land for parking, which is fairly close to the Automatic Data Processing Centre at the rear of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's building in Victoria Square, and which is close to the Police Department's building.

Land now vacant, or low-price land (by comparison with other sites) along Wakefield Street, would be an ideal position for such a building. Finance for the construction of such a building might be available from the Highways Fund but, certainly, assistance would be needed in the initial stages from Loan funds. I urge the Government to consider seriously the question of better accommodation for the Motor Vehicles Department.

Under the heading "Highways and Local Government", there is a proposed payment of

\$1,000,000 for roads and bridges. I gather from the Chief Secretary's remarks that most of this money has been set aside for work in connection with the proposed new ferry service from the mainland to Kangaroo Island. The Government is making allowance for special work on roads that will be needed within that ferry plan.

I commend the Government for accepting the plan of the committee that investigated the question of transport between the mainland and Kangaroo Island. I have not been able to ascertain any recent information concerning the plans; however, I gather that at present the whole matter has been handed over to the Marine and Harbors Department for investigation.

I suggest that this should be a separate undertaking from other harbour work and one that would be very well managed and controlled by a separate trust or board. It is my view that a separate trust or board planning and supervising the actual work and running of a special ferry service from Cape Jervis to Kangaroo Island would be the most efficient and economic way in which such a service could be run in the long term. The ferry, when installed, will be a great boon to the people of the island and of great benefit to tourists and others in the State, because it will provide an opportunity for easy travel to and from the island.

A great number of South Australians have never visited the island, whose economic potential is not fully appreciated by the State, mainly because of the problems of transport that have existed in the past. From a tourism point of view, there are attractions on the island that are unequalled anywhere else in the State. Not only will the ferry service be needed, but also a bridge is required.

Some planning has taken place for this bridge across American River to provide an arterial road running east and west across the island. The road from the metropolitan area to the ferry landing has been upgraded.

The Sellick Hill road has been completely rebuilt, and the District Council of Yankalilla has completed splendid work on a difficult road towards Cape Jervis. So there is a plan, including the ferry service, that will be unique and of benefit to the State. I imagine that the Loan funds set aside will at least put in train the initial construction required for the implementation of such a plan.

From the Chief Secretary's remarks, I take it that, under this line, some funds will be required for general road widening and road

and bridge building throughout the State. It can be seen that, whereas in the previous year \$200,000 was provided by way of estimate, an actual payment of \$1,000,000 was made. This was mainly because acquisitions were required, for which some Loan funds were used.

Regarding roads and bridges, the questions of the use of Loan funds and of highway funds run parallel. Unfortunately, as members of Parliament, we are unable to debate at great length the whole question of the budgeting or spending of highway funds. In fact, this year many of us have not been given the opportunity even to see the road programme for the current financial year. One reason why I believe that we have not been circulated with the road programme, as was the case in the two previous years, was that the road programme involves the estimated expenditure for all roads throughout the State, including the metropolitan roads contained in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals.

There is no doubt that the work involved in the M.A.T.S. Report will continue this year. The road-widening programmes which have been continuing now for many years and which are approved in the M.A.T.S. Report are a part of the report and will continue this year. In my view, some of this money will be used for that purpose. We have heard much about the report being withdrawn, but it has not been withdrawn: if it had been withdrawn, the estimated expenditures on roads for this year would not be what they are.

The Commonwealth Government, which is providing money for the widening of roads in accordance with the M.A.T.S. Report, continues to provide funds for that purpose. All the talk one hears about the report being withdrawn is false. Further information concerning the \$1,000,000 provided for roads and bridges in this State appears in the Loan Estimates and, as further evidence that the report has not been withdrawn, there are the Chief Secretary's comments regarding the Municipal Tramways Trust. For the first time for some years the Government intends this year to take money from Loan funds towards the purchase and upgrading of the M.T.T. buses for metropolitan Adelaide.

On page 8 of the summary of the M.A.T.S. Report the figure of \$28,400,000 is mentioned as being required over a 20-year span for bus equipment and depots. Following that information, a paragraph on page 10 reads:

The estimated total cost of new bus equipment and bus depots is \$28,400,000. The

importance of the bus system has long been recognized by the State Government. It has been the Government's policy to make funds available for this purpose, and it is assumed that it will continue to make funds available when required.

That is exactly what is being done within these Loan Estimates: funds that are now required within proposals set out in the M.A.T.S. Report are being allocated, and this is further evidence, in my view, that the M.A.T.S. plan simply has not been withdrawn at all.

I wish to refer now to the sum of \$7,800,000 set aside within the Estimates this year for railway accommodation. I was very pleased to receive a reply today to a question I had asked concerning the rehabilitation programme for the main lines of the South Australian Railways this year. That reply was that the Government was continuing the rehabilitation programme that the previous Government set out. That programme was a six-year plan and involved a total expenditure of \$8,500,000.

One of the essential projects which the South Australian Railways will be faced with and, in my view, should be facing up to at present is the construction of the proposed underground railway beneath King William Street. This was recommended in the M.A.T.S. Report, and it is part of that report's public transport proposals, which total \$107,450,000. We often hear the comment that the M.A.T.S. Report did not take public transport into consideration.

Therefore, it is interesting to see that more than \$107,000,000 was estimated as being required for expenditure on public transport improvement. The very key to the proposed rail improvements in metropolitan Adelaide is this subway that was proposed under King William Street. It was proposed to link the two existing southern suburban rail lines with the two existing northern suburban rail lines, and thereby to introduce the most modern rapid rail transit system that could be found anywhere in the world for a city of the size of Adelaide.

It was necessary that the general plan that the previous Government agreed to in principle be investigated more fully as the next stage in this rail programme, and it was necessary that a detailed feasibility study be carried out with regard to this proposed subway. Before the previous Government left office, terms of reference for such a survey were drawn up by the Metropolitan Transportation Committee,

which very seriously considered the views of the railway authorities on this matter.

Part of that feasibility study was to ascertain whether or not electrification of our metropolitan railways should be considered. It is my view that ultimately we will have to electrify and that we should electrify our metropolitan railways. The aspect of pollution is a very serious one facing all metropolitan areas today, and a public transport amenity such as a rapid rail transit system running on electricity does not in any way pollute the air by comparison with a diesel system.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Sir Thomas Playford promised electrification of railways many years ago, didn't he?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, he looked into it, but he was not in the happy position of having millions of dollars in the kitty: he used all his funds to the limit because in those days the State was expanding at a very great rate. The amount of money needed to begin electrification or to begin the subway that I have mentioned is relatively small compared with our total Loan programme.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You did not even bury your stobie poles with the \$4,000,000, so how are you going to electrify the railways?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I make the point that in the interests of this State and of metropolitan Adelaide in particular the Government should investigate in greater detail the proposed public transport sectors that were included in the M.A.T.S. Report, and the most important of these is the proposed rapid rail transit system for metropolitan Adelaide. It cannot progress any further until a further feasibility study is undertaken of the proposed underground, of the proposal to electrify our railways, and of the proposal to upgrade the whole metropolitan railway system so that a modern rapid rail transit system can be introduced.

Time passes on with this question of transport, while the population increases greatly and while the need for action increases. Therefore, I urge the Government to put in train this plan to investigate in great depth this railway proposal, because if we do this we will be achieving for Adelaide what other Governments have achieved in other States. I refer particularly to what New South Wales achieved way back in the 1920's.

We know what great benefit the underground system and the electrification is to metropolitan Sydney at the present time. That was achieved many years ago, and Adelaide should be moving step by step towards a public work of this kind. It is in years such as this when a Government can put aside more than \$4,000,000 and say, "We just haven't any use for that at present, and we are going to keep it in reserve," that action like this should be taken.

There are some other headings in the Estimates for which I commend the Government, and one of these is the allocation to the State Planning Authority. As mentioned by the Chief Secretary, this authority will be in need of considerable funds in the next year or two. Since it first began its operations in regard to the acquisition of land for regional reserve and park purposes, it has never been short of funds to the extent that it has not been able to purchase land that it has wanted to purchase.

When the authority was first instituted, a fear was expressed that a great deal of land that was marked down for reserve purposes on the metropolitan plan would be offered to it and that it would not have funds in hand to acquire it. However, that has not been so.

The owners of land have preferred to hold their properties and, no doubt, are using them for rural and other purposes. There has not been that rush to sell large sites. However, over the last few years negotiations in some parts have been commenced and are reaching the stage where some large areas of land will have to be purchased. So the allocation of this sum from Loan funds is appropriate. I commend the Government for it.

I was pleased to see, too, that the public parks allocation of \$300,000, which traditionally has come through the Loan Estimates, is continued this year. There has been building up in the public parks reserve fund a fairly large sum of money simply because local government, which is subsidized to the extent of 50 per cent of the purchase price, has not seen fit to allocate its own approximate 50 per cent to the purchase of land as council areas.

I had always had in mind that this credit could at some stage be used for the purchase of the larger parks which the State Planning Authority proposes to purchase and develop and which will serve more than one council area. They will be a form of regional park.

However, this Government's policy is turning more towards using this money to assist in the development of council reserves after they are

purchased. I hope that emphasis will be placed on the development of parks and reserves not only for the council area concerned but also for two reasons: first, because some councils are faced with the embarrassing financial position of having to develop their own parks and reserves which, in the main, are used by tourists who come from other council areas, other parts of the State and, indeed, other parts of the country generally, and the councils have not been able to afford the money for this kind of development in some instances; and, secondly, because they use their own ratepayers' funds for this purpose as they have not been able to receive the amount they should receive under tourist headings. So, under the Government's new policy, an opportunity is provided for that kind of parks and reserves development, and the people of the State will benefit generally as a result of that new policy.

There are some other headings in which I am particularly interested and upon which I may comment during the Committee stage. I summarize my remarks by saying that I support the Bill in its second reading. I commend the Commonwealth Government for the allocation it made to this State this year. I trust the public of South Australia appreciates the problems facing the Commonwealth when allocations like this are made because of the need to give special assistance to States that are growing rapidly in population. I cannot help mentioning again that the Government is in a fortunate position when it can set aside over \$4,000,000 of Loan funds and keep that amount up its sleeve in this early part of the financial year.

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1262.)

Clause 12—"Powers and functions of commission."

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee reported progress, it was considering clause 12, and new subclause (4) had just been inserted. There are also subclauses (4), (5) and (6) in the clause as printed. Subclause (4) inserted by the Committee will, therefore, be new subclause (3a). Subclause (5) about to be moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris will now be subclause (3b).

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

After new subclause (3a) to insert the following new subclause:

(3b) The Public Trustee shall not, upon acquiring an insurable interest or thereafter, insure with the commission any risks currently or previously insured with any other person carrying on the business of insurance in South Australia, unless such person is unable or unwilling to insure or continue to insure such risks on reasonable terms, or unless for prudent reasons associated only with his duty as a trustee, the Public Trustee is unwilling to insure or continue to insure such risks with that person.

I feel almost impotent in moving this amendment, knowing the fate that overtook one of my amendments to this Bill when last before the Committee. However, two amendments to clause 12 have been agreed to, and new numbers have been allocated to the subclauses. This amendment follows the same pattern as the previous amendment to which the Committee has agreed. It is currently the practice of the Public Trustee as well as the practice of all private trustee companies to allow insurances to remain with existing insurance companies when they take over the administration of an estate. With the establishment of a State Government insurance office, this subclause ensures that this current practice will be pursued by that office.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I oppose the amendment. It is unreasonable, as in the case of new subclause (3a), to give by legislation a specific direction to the Public Trustee. This is a policy and administrative matter and in any case the Public Trustee would be bound to do his best in the interests of the beneficiaries.

The Committee divided on the new subclause:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

Noes (5)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard (teller), and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

New subclause thus inserted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

In subclause (5) after "and" second occurring to insert "subject to subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 17 of this Act, but otherwise".

I am concerned to see that the services rendered by the Government Printer, the Crown Solicitor, the Public Health Department and the Hospitals Department are correctly paid for. I can refer to several instances where services of those types have not been paid for by Government insurance offices in other States.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I oppose the amendment. If the amendments relating to new clause 17 are accepted, this addition may be logical. However, it seems quite unnecessary. Obviously, the Auditor-General will in any case call for full and proper reimbursement to be made by the commission and to be required by the department providing the relevant services.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

In subclause (5) after "department" second occurring to insert "But no schoolteacher employed by the Government of the State shall act as an agent for or on behalf of the commission, and no member of the Police Force shall act as an agent for or on behalf of the commission for the purpose of arranging contracts of insurance (excepting contracts of insurance complying with Part IV of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, as amended, in relation to permits to which section 16 of that Act applies) or of making inquiries concerning insurance claims, unless such inquiries concern any accident or offence or suspected offence, or any contravention or suspected contravention of, or any non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with, any law and such inquiries are of such a nature as a member of the Police Force would ordinarily make in the discharge of his duties as such".

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that public servants who are in peculiar positions of authority will not be involved in any work on behalf of the State Government insurance office. For several reasons certain public servants should not be allowed to act as agents for the commission. In New South Wales it is mandatory that no police officer shall act in any way for the State Government Insurance Commission. If the clerk of a court acts for the commission and he is relieved for a period by a police officer, that police officer can do all the work that the clerk normally does except work associated with the State Government Insurance Commission. I do not wish that the procedure followed in Queensland (in relation to police officers acting on behalf of the State Government Insurance Commission) will be followed in South Australia. I approve most heartily the position that applies in New South Wales.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I oppose the amendment because it seems quite unnecessary. I should not anticipate that there would be any proposal so to use teachers or police officers.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13—"Execution of contracts."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

After "behalf" sixth occurring to insert "The rights transferred and vested in the workman by virtue of section 13 (1) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932, as amended, shall apply in respect of policies issued by the commission in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to and in respect of policies issued by other persons engaged in the business of insurance in the State."

This amendment is rather similar to a previous amendment that was carried by the Committee. Whilst the Workmen's Compensation Act provides that the Crown is liable as an employer, it does not provide that the Act as a whole binds the Crown. It seems desirable, in the interests of workmen in South Australia, that they should be protected by my amendment.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have not had any advice on the amendment. However, as the Bill will no doubt be dealt with in another place, rather than hold it up any longer I shall formally vote against the amendment, with the right to change my vote if I am wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I advise the Chief Secretary not to vote against the amendment, which is in the interests of those who would be claiming workmen's compensation. All the amendment does is make the Crown liable.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Let the amendment be passed, and I will stand corrected if I am wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It might be embarrassing for the Chief Secretary if he voted against it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I advise the Chief Secretary to vote in favour of the amendment, which was designed to protect a workman who may be injured and who may have a claim under the Workmen's Compensation Act in the event of his employer's bankruptcy. Section 13 of the Act provides that where any employer has entered into a contract of insurance to cover himself for worker's compensation liability and becomes bankrupt, the

rights of the employer become the workman's rights and he may make a claim accordingly, notwithstanding the employer's bankruptcy. The reason for the amendment is to ensure that the Crown is in the same position as other insurance companies and will be able to meet such a claim and not claim immunity because the Workmen's Compensation Act does not specifically state that it is binding on the Crown. I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 14 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Contributions in lieu of taxation, etc."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

To strike out subclause (1) and insert the following new subclause:

The Commission shall pay to the Treasurer annually—

(a) as an underwriting or trading charge, such amount as the Auditor-General certifies is, in his opinion—

- (i) the equivalent of all rates, taxes and fees, other than income tax, which the Commission would not be liable to pay but would, if it were any other person engaged in the business of insurance, pay to any State or Commonwealth Government department or instrumentality or to any local government authority;
- (ii) the difference between the actual purchase price of goods and commodities purchased by the Commission and the price for which such goods and commodities would be purchased by any other person engaged in the business of insurance, but only to the extent that such difference is due to exemptions in force under any Acts of the State or Commonwealth relating to sales tax, customs and excise duties and levies in respect of goods sold to any department or instrumentality of the Government of the State;
- (iii) the value of office accommodation, goods and services supplied by any department of the Public Service or the Government or any instrumentality of the Government of the State computed in relation to the service of any particular officer or employee on the basis of his salary or wages, allowances or other remuneration with such additions for pay-roll

tax, workmen's compensation, superannuation, sick pay, holiday pay, and annual and long service leave, as will meet the cost to the Government of employing him for the period employed on the business of the Commission and, in relation to office accommodation, goods and all other services, on the basis of what any other person engaged in the business of insurance would pay for similar accommodation, goods or services to a landlord or supplier that is not a department of the Public Service or the Government or any instrumentality of the Government of the State;

and

(b) as an appropriation of profit, such amount as the Auditor-General certifies is, in his opinion, the equivalent of income tax which the Commission would, if it were any other person engaged in the business of insurance, be liable to pay.

While the clause makes it mandatory for payment through the Treasury of certain taxes from the State Government insurance office it does not, in my view, take into account all rates, taxes and fees for which the insurance office will escape payment. I am aware that many provisions in such Bills as this one, requiring State Government instrumentalities to pay taxes, impose on them only notional liabilities. However, I am concerned to see that every State liability, be it notional only, is firmly established.

The amendment ensures that the State Government office loss ratios and expense ratios which, no doubt, will be published and which may be taken into account for rate-fixing purposes, will be computed on the same basis as similar ratios for private insurers. I do not believe there can be any real objection to the State Government insurance office being in exactly the same position as are private insurers regarding the presentation of accounts. This is the amendment's aim.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I oppose the amendment. Regarding rates and taxes, including the equivalent of income tax, the clause in the Bill appears to be adequate. Whatever may be the strict law on the subject, it is not proposed that the commission should claim exemption from local government rates, water and sewer rates, etc. There is no objection (but no necessity) to providing that the commission shall not be so exempt.

It would be impracticable to apply subparagraph (ii) of the amendment and, in any case, the commission, being a trading concern, would not ordinarily qualify for exemptions from sales tax, etc. Regarding free service from other departments or any indirect subsidy on account of particular charges not rendered in full, this would be contrary to present practice, and in any case the Auditor-General would not condone any significant undercharge or indirect subsidy.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (5)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, R. A. Geddes, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Accounts and audit."

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In order to meet the convenience of an honourable member who wishes to move an amendment to this clause, and in view of the fact that we have made good progress today, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SALARIES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1253.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which is a simple measure designed to increase the salaries of the Chief Justice and the puisne judges of the Supreme Court. This kind of Bill comes to us from time to time as costs of living increase and the need is found to adjust the salaries of judges and other high officials in this State so that they are more in line with the salaries paid to their opposite numbers elsewhere.

A short time ago we passed a measure in this Council increasing the salaries of the new judges of the Local and District Criminal Courts. Therefore, I think it is obvious that we must support the Bill now before us. In fact, I think there is some urgency in this matter now, because I note with interest that

the salary we have already approved for the senior judge of the Local and District Criminal Courts is higher than the salary at present being received by a puisne judge of the Supreme Court. Therefore, the question of an increase in salary for the latter person should be dealt with expeditiously.

I note that the new salaries of \$23,000 for the Chief Justice and \$21,000 for the puisne judges have been arrived at after consideration of the salaries being paid in the other States. Also, adjustment has been made because of the fact that there is a contributory pension scheme in South Australia. I am sure all honourable members realize that the judges of the Supreme Court have been working very hard, particularly in the last few years. I hope that very soon the new Local and District Criminal Courts will relieve the Supreme Court of a considerable amount of work. Indeed, I think this is becoming a very pressing matter, because some of the court lists in the Supreme Court are very lengthy indeed. Once the new courts system operates and some of the criminal work is taken away from the Supreme Court and some of the civil work is removed from that jurisdiction to a lesser jurisdiction, I think we can look forward with confidence to shorter cause lists in the Supreme Court. It may take another six months for this to materialize.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Will there be a reduction in salary then if there is less work?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not think I could agree that there should be any reduction of salary once a certain order has been created. I think one of our problems not only with regard to higher officers in our Public Service but also right throughout our whole wage-fixing system is that it is very difficult to disturb any established order of things. As I said in the other debate a few weeks ago, salaries have a kind of social significance, and it is not possible sometimes to lift one particular bracket of employees over another bracket without there being some severe repercussions. Of course, none of this I am saying applies to Supreme Court judges. We all know that those judges do an excellent job. They are the top legal men in this State, and they certainly do not deserve to receive anything less than is being received by their counterparts in other States. Therefore, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1252.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. During my term as Chief Secretary a considerable amount of research and thought was given to the matters contained in the Bill. Many people were consulted, their views were sought, and advice was taken on this matter from the other States of the Commonwealth. Legislation in force in the other States governing these matters was also studied, and the Government of the time decided on a certain policy to be followed in relation to the amendments now before the Council. At the time of the change of Government, a similar Bill had been drafted and was ready for introduction. Although there are minor changes in this Bill, it is almost identical to the Bill drafted by the previous Government.

In perusing the second reading speech, I must admit I cannot find exactly how the Government intends to control these lotteries. Most of the meat in the sandwich will be in the regulations made under this legislation, which will come to the Council later. I fully appreciate the difficulties facing a Government in placing the full necessary control machinery in an Act of Parliament, because I have been in a similar position. I have expressed myself here previously on this matter, that where possible I like to see the Government's intention expressed in the Act itself; but in this case it is reasonable that the control measures should be in the regulations. This is the sensible approach to the matter. I give the Chief Secretary due warning that this Council will give close attention to the regulations to be framed under this legislation. I know that he will have fully informed himself on the many difficulties and dangers that lie ahead in placing on the Statute Book this type of legislation. It was some of these dangers with which the previous Government grappled.

Perhaps I could detail some of my thoughts on this matter which may be of benefit to the Chief Secretary who, I hope, will be the Minister administering this legislation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: For a long time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The only thing I am worried about is the fact that the Chief Secretary must retire at some time and I have no guarantee from his colleagues in

Cabinet that he will be hanging on to the Lottery and Gaming Act; but, if it is in his capable hands, I shall not need to worry very much.

Lotteries, raffles, sweepstakes, guessing competitions, skill-words and art unions cover a wide range. There is a vast difference between, say, a raffle on a street stall for a plum pudding and the highly organized art union involving probably \$30,000 or \$40,000. Between those two extremes we have many grades of lottery or raffle. I know it is difficult to draw arbitrary lines and place these various types in set categories. Nevertheless, I believe that in this vast array of devices for and means of raising money, from the small raffle for a plum pudding to the large art union, there are three distinct types of raffle. The first is the 10c or 20c "on the day of" type of raffle, if I may put it in that way. I have already referred to the street stall raffle; there is also the football clubroom raffle, the Returned Services League dinner raffle or the raffle conducted at any dinner or dance where the tickets are produced and sold and the draw takes place.

This is a particular category of raffle as opposed to two or three other types. In other words, we have here a situation where anyone involved in buying a ticket is present at the draw, the prize goes to the winner and the proceeds go to the particular organization running the dinner or function. I believe we need very limited control measures for this type of raffle, but there must be some. It would be foolish to have this type of raffle with no control and completely illegal.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I can ease the honourable member's mind and say that some control is proposed in the regulations over that particular type of raffle.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Chief Secretary but I should like to proceed with my remarks.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You go on.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The second reading explanation explains the legislation but does not indicate just what the Government intends to do. I sympathize with the Chief Secretary in his being unable to introduce the legislation in any other way. I should like him to listen to my thoughts on the matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Over your first category of raffle there will be some control.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am pleased to hear there will be some control. I hope,

too, that in this group there will be a very low limit on the total amount of prizes that can be given. In this category, I should not like to see prizes of \$200 or \$300 being offered: they should be small—otherwise, we shall be in grave difficulty in the future. We must always be aware that there are in our community a few rather shrewd people who will easily find themselves in the position of being able to promote a small lottery for their own personal benefit and gain. Once the Government steps in and says, "We shall legalize a certain thing", it must give the people a guarantee that, when they do buy a ticket in a raffle, either small or large, at least they will be given a fair go. So the second category is where the prizes are larger and the raffle is run over a slightly longer period. Probably the larger type of raffle or lottery in this category in our community is the motor car raffle, where there are possibly 400 entries at \$10 each and the prize to be won is a new motor car. From that "on the day of" type of lottery to the motor car type of lottery, we come into the second category.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They will be well cared for.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The third category is the large art union, where we are liable to get prizes as high as \$40,000 or \$50,000, as happens in other States. In these last two categories the Government should exercise extensive and very careful control so that the public is completely protected from any exploitation.

There is a limited amount of money in the community that can allow these promotions to succeed. Since only a limited number can be successfully promoted, the advantage may well be with a handful of large charitable organizations. In connection with the promotion of the larger type of lottery and art union, one can see the possibility of worthwhile smaller charitable institutions finding it increasingly difficult to get a share of the fund-raising market. The question needs a very strong approach by the responsible Minister. Once the Government legalizes the small lottery, the intermediate lottery and the larger art union, it also has a duty to ensure that all is above board. I support the second reading of this Bill, which is almost identical to the Bill that was drafted before the previous Government left office.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is identical: it has not been altered at all.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is a slight alteration. I make these few comments knowing that the Chief Secretary is already aware of most of the points I am raising.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have put hours of work into the Bill!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We will look very closely at the regulations that are made under this Bill. I support the second reading.

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

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 2. Page 1189.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Hon. Mr. Potter has already spoken on this Bill, and I agree with him that it is somewhat technical. The Chief Secretary gave three reasons for its introduction. As the Commonwealth Government had made available to South Australia a sizeable grant of \$27,000,000 for capital purposes in lieu of Loan money and has agreed to assume responsibility for existing State indebtedness at a rate of \$27,000,000 a year, this significant alteration in the approach of the Commonwealth to State finances calls for certain machinery amendments to the principal Act.

The replies to the questions I asked during the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill appear to have been given in the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation. I said earlier this session that there had been a significant change by the Commonwealth Government in relation to State finances. This change has been noticeable since the present Prime Minister has been in office. Much publicity has been given to the so-called "lousy deal" that South Australia received from the Commonwealth Government, but I do not think the public of South Australia has been fully informed of the true position. The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation states clearly that the \$27,000,000 will be not only interest free but also a straight grant to South Australia with no strings attached and with no repayments of either interest or capital. This will relieve the Budget of \$3,000,000 in one year and, if the grants continue (and it appears that they will), the budgetary relief will escalate accordingly. Further, the Commonwealth Government has undertaken to assume responsibility for \$27,000,000 a year

of the present State debt structure. This will have a similar effect upon South Australia's Budget. The overall position is that the State Budget will benefit by about \$6,000,000 a year, and the benefit will escalate at that rate if this policy is continued.

I am sure that the public of South Australia is unaware of the significant change that has taken place in the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to State financial problems. I hope the Chief Secretary will correct me if my arithmetic is not completely accurate. No-one could ever accuse me of being a centralist: my views are too well known on this topic for that accusation ever to be made. Irrespective of the political colour of the Government in the House of Assembly and irrespective of the political colour of the Commonwealth Government, my views will always be strongly put on this vital question, and I do not think we have yet solved the problem of continuing Commonwealth involvement in many areas of State administration where I believe the Commonwealth should not intrude. However, at the same time I am equally sure that the credit due to the Prime Minister for the significant change that has taken place in the last six or eight months in the Commonwealth's approach to State financial problems has not been adequately recognized by the people of South Australia. This change of attitude, for which I give full marks to the Prime Minister (and I have had my arguments with him on various matters), has created the need for this Bill. The first set of amendments deals with the changes needed in the Act to cater for this significant change by the Commonwealth Government towards State finance. The second set of amendments deals with the excess expenditure allowable from Consolidated Revenue and, as most honourable members know, this amount has been fixed at \$1,200,000, I think since 1964. I agree with the Government that this amount is rather small when one considers the size of the present State Budget.

I know that the restriction of \$1,200,000 created difficulties for the previous Government. If my memory is correct, in 1949, under Part VIA of the Public Finance Act, an amendment was introduced to allow the excess expenditure to be at the rate of \$800,000 a year, which was increased to \$1,200,000 in 1964. In 1949, the allowable excess was $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total State Budget but, by 1964, the figure had fallen to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total State Budget. In

1964, when an amendment was passed to increase the figure to \$1,200,000, it was increased to $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent of the total State Budget.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Are these restrictions applied by the Commonwealth authorities?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. This is the amount of money that can be expended by the Government on a Governor's Warrant. I believe the Act states that the Government can expend over and above the lines approved by Parliament a certain figure, and of that figure I think that half of it can be expended on a Governor's Warrant on lines not included in the appropriations for that financial year. In 1949, the figure was $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total State Budget; by 1964 it had fallen to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and, by amendment in 1964, it was increased to $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Hitherto, it has fallen to well below $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total State Budget, and this has created difficulties. Clause 7 (2) states:

The Governor in any financial year may by Warrant appropriate to the Public Service within the State not more than an amount equal to one per centum of the total of the moneys appropriated from the general revenue of the State, by Appropriation Acts described as such, for expenditure during the financial year in which the Warrant is issued, or, if no such Appropriation Act has at the time of the issue of the Warrant been enacted, not more than an amount equal to one per centum of the total of the moneys so appropriated for expenditure during the last preceding financial year, and of such amount not more than one-third shall be appropriated for purposes other than previously authorized purposes.

As one can see, in 1964 the figure of $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent was sufficient, and it was not until the last couple of years that any difficulty arose. I prefer a fixed figure in the Act rather than a percentage of the total State Budget. However, I have no very strong feelings on this point and raise it purely to express my preference. Since 1949, it has always been included in the Act as a total amount, and I prefer the actual total amount to be included in the legislation. I should like the Chief Secretary to consider this question to see what objection he has to having written into the Act a fixed amount rather than a percentage.

The third set of amendments deals with the deletion of certain procedures no longer relevant, and there is no need for me to comment on that score. I support the second reading.

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

RIVER TORRENS ACQUISITION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1256.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): As I recall the history of the matter dealt with in this Bill, the problems associated with the Torrens River were investigated very closely by a committee which initially comprised members of councils whose areas fronted or included the river. Later, as I recall it, a further committee was appointed that carried on this research into the problem of the ultimate beautification of the river through metropolitan Adelaide on either side of the area controlled by the Adelaide City Council.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It did a good job, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not too sure whether or not it did do a good job. First of all, I think that every honourable member will agree that there is a need for the Torrens to be beautified in the parts of metropolitan Adelaide through which it flows. Many places, east and west of the city, through which the river flows are in a shocking condition. Much publicity has been given to these water holes and to these scruffy parts, if I may use that expression. While I am sure that all honourable members are in agreement with the need for action and ultimate beautification, the question of machinery to achieve this need must be looked at very carefully: that machinery is the basis of the Bill before us.

I have always been a great believer in the greatest amount of autonomy being given to local government. I have always believed very firmly that the progress and welfare of local government depend on the control and powers that can be left in the hands of councils. From my experience, this is the real strength of local government in this State. The greater the degree of involvement of Government departments and the greater the degree of interference by central government in local government, so the beneficial effect of local government on the community lessens proportionately. Indeed, I think the State Government ought to take a very close look at its view of local government on this question of interference by central government.

We have heard many reports of a proposal to introduce compulsory voting into local government in this State. Local government does not want this, and it is making its voice heard clearly throughout the length and breadth

of this State at the present time. It does not want any interference on that particular point. That is only one example of central government interfering with local government to the detriment of local government and the people generally.

We see in the Bill before us that the Minister of Works intends to acquire the power to take over land in local government areas—land through which the river passes and land that is bordered by the banks of the river. What surprises me is that the Minister then proposes in this legislation that he be given the power, if he so wishes, to transfer that land so acquired to the particular local government area involved. I believe that after acquisition he should transfer that land to the local council involved so that the council can beautify along the same lines and along the same principle as the city of Adelaide has beautified the banks of the Torrens in its area.

If the Minister was given the power under this Bill to acquire and he decided that he was not going to transfer, here would then be another authority interfering with local government's responsibility to beautify land within its areas. I do not think local government would be very happy if the State Parliament gave the Minister the right to acquire land along the Torrens but simply left it to the Minister's discretion to transfer the land back to the respective councils.

I approve of the suggestion that there should be a common authority to acquire the land. There is no doubt that over the years action that has been attempted to bring about this goal to which I have referred has not been successful, and I believe that there is much merit in establishing one authority with the right to acquire compulsorily the Torrens River bed and the land along the banks. However, once that authority has acquired the land it should then hand the land back to the respective local councils. I feel sure that, if that occurred, the local councils would be very happy because then they could set about their task, with the land under their control, to beautify as they would wish to beautify and as their local ratepayers and the people who live near the river would wish their council to beautify the land. In my view, this is a very serious point in the legislation now before us.

I have endeavoured to contact the Local Government Association on this matter in order to obtain the association's views. Whether or not the Government has referred the matter to the association, I do not know.

I believe that all matters which affect local government and in respect of which legislation is proposed ought to be referred to the Local Government Association for opinion before they come into Parliament. I believe that that ought to be done by the Government of the day. I am not saying that the Government of the day should necessarily accept the views of the Local Government Association, but I do believe that the Government of the day should be armed with the opinions of the association.

I remind the Council that the Local Government Association represents almost all the councils throughout the State. Its worth as an authority to speak on behalf of local government has been enhanced because of the amalgamation of the former local government group that represented the metropolitan councils and the other local government group that represented the district councils. Now we have the one common body, and the views of that body should be sought. Unfortunately, the Secretary of the association is now in Melbourne, I am told, attending to civil defence matters and I have been unable to discuss this matter with him.

I consider that this Council should know the views of the Local Government Association on this matter before the Bill reaches the Committee. It might well be that the councils involved along the Torrens are satisfied for the Bill to remain as it is. Also, it might well be that they are satisfied that the Minister of Works, whoever he might be (and whatever the Government of the day might be), could keep the land as a reserve under the control of another Government department. Perhaps the councils might be satisfied to allow a Government department to do it. Personally, I do not think they will be satisfied with that.

As the Bill reads at present, it is possible for that to occur and for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to beautify the Torrens in such council areas as St. Peters and Payneham, and so forth, and also in the western region of metropolitan Adelaide. My thinking certainly will alter somewhat if those councils are quite satisfied with the Bill as it is at present. However, I see it initially as a further danger to local government. I had an example only the other day when, in answer to a question, the Minister told me that the Government was going to take the control of child-minding centres out of the hands of local government and put it into the hands of the Minister of Social Welfare. Here is another example of this kind of central government interference.

With any legislation that comes before this Chamber, I believe that it is our duty to watch this aspect of more central control being taken over local government than there is a need for. In this Bill we have one example of it. Other than the points that I have made in objection to it, I support the general principle of the Bill. I wholeheartedly support the ultimate aim that lies behind the legislation in regard to beautifying the Torrens along its whole route through metropolitan Adelaide. However, I might have something further to say in Committee.

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 2. Page 1198.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): This fairly short Bill makes some amendments to the Housing Improvement Act. This Act, which was passed in 1940, included amongst other things a Part dealing with the control of rentals of substandard houses. Power was given to the Housing Trust to declare certain houses substandard and, following that declaration, the rents of those houses were assessed and fixed by the trust. The owners thereof were subject to certain restrictions thenceforward as far as recovery of the premises was concerned. The Act has been amended over a number of years. Some fairly substantial amendments were made during the regime of the last Labor Government, from 1965 to 1968.

Clause 3 of the Bill defines what is meant by "rates" and goes on further to define "rent" or "rental" as applied to the use of furniture or accessories appertaining to a house. We are told by the Minister that this has been a provision that some landlords have used as a way of escape from the actual charging of a fixed rental. Mainly, they have charged an extra rental for furniture. True, there are unscrupulous landlords and there is a justification for closing a small gap of this kind. I also agree very much with the Leader when he says there are unscrupulous tenants. I have had many instances brought to my attention of a tenant making an agreement with a landlord to pay a certain rent for a particular house into which he is prepared to go and for which he is prepared to pay that rent. He pays it for a considerable period of time and then, for some reason or other, he gets

behind with his payments. When he is a few weeks behind with the rent he decides to go to the Housing Trust to have the house declared substandard. When this is done, it puts the landlord of the premises at a disadvantage, because he has a large debt of unpaid rent on his hands, which he finds great difficulty in collecting.

There are tenants who do not hesitate to stoop to that kind of dodge in order to get out of their financial responsibilities which they were perfectly willing to assume in the first place. However, in saying that, I am in no way suggesting that landlords should charge exorbitant rents for substandard premises, and there is nothing in this Bill unfair to them in any respect. These are all amendments designed to give further protection to people seeking to have a substandard house declared substandard and the rent fixed. I have looked carefully at the Bill and can see nothing in any provision that would be unfair to landlords. In fact, I think these amendments are a logical extension and refinement of the legislation already in existence. Therefore, I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOODWOOD TO WILLUNGA RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF TERMINUS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 1253.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support this Bill. The Minister's second reading speech was brief and mine will be likewise, as the closing of this line has been thoroughly investigated by the Public Works Committee and it is obvious from that committee's report and the close inspection made of the operation of the line that it no longer serves a useful purpose in the State's railway system.

The track was laid in 1914, when traffic problems were very much simpler than they are today and alternative transport was quite different from what it is now. It is with some sadness that many people view the closing of a railway line that has played a part in the history of this State, but the Goodwood to Willunga line was planned through country involving steep grades and sharp curves, making it most uneconomical for the line to be upgraded to provide a fast commuter service. The South Australian Railways Department is well aware of the fact that there could be a future need for a fast commuter service to serve the southern part of Adelaide. This has

been investigated, and the desirable alternative appears to be to extend southwards the existing spur line that goes to Port Stanvac. I understand that some land has already been purchased for this purpose.

The figures in the Public Works Committee's report and the Transport Control Board's report show that this line has been virtually obsolete for a number of years. As I have already said, the very nature of the country through which it travels makes it uneconomical to upgrade it to the standard required to provide a proper service for the district.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3, Page 1254.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support this short Bill to amend the Companies Act. It is designed to assist companies having the problem that they were formed initially as companies with no liability. The principle has always been in the past that companies of no liability are companies formed because their principal interests are in the mining industry. Under the Companies Act as it now stands, it is not possible, because of a possible diversification of a mining company's interests as its modern technology and financial needs vary with the times, for it to cease to be a mining company of no liability. There is no legal provision for it to change its title in relation to the rights of its shareholders. A no-liability company is a company in respect of which the acceptance of a share does not constitute a contract to pay calls. It is a privilege unique to mining companies and it has had its repercussions.

A shareholder in a certain well-known no-liability company failed to pay a call; subsequently there was a great hue and cry when the value of that company's shares rose and the shareholder's holding had ceased to exist. This Bill will to some extent make it possible for mining companies to be concentrated in South Australia; many public companies have made Canberra their headquarters for financial reasons. If mining companies establish their headquarters in South Australia it will be

possible for them to change their nature. The Bill is straightforward, although I was a little concerned about new section 26a, part of which provides:

The copy of the resolution to be lodged with the Registrar under subsection (1) of this section must be so lodged within the 14 days next ensuing after the right to make application to the court . . .

I thought that this period might not be long enough but, after looking at the principal Act, I realize that it is an acceptable period. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I, too, support the Bill. I seem to be speaking today on several matters that were considered by the previous Government. I find no fault with the purpose of the Bill. When this matter was discussed, although there was no opposition to the content of the Bill, there was discussion on the question of moving away from what had been established as uniform legislation throughout Australia. I am no admirer of uniformity purely for uniformity's sake. To advance an argument that we should fall into line just for the sake of falling into line or that we should not introduce an amendment because we would destroy uniformity carries no weight in my mind. However, any legislation that moves away from uniformity in connection with the Companies Act needs to be very carefully considered. I believe that a much larger revision Bill is to be introduced later; I think it has been agreed to by Attorney-Generals throughout Australia.

The Bill now before the Council permits no-liability companies to be converted to limited liability companies; such permission is not included in the proposed uniform legislation. This Bill is important to South Australia. Although we have departed from the concept of uniformity, I believe the departure is justified in the special circumstances applying in South Australia. I therefore support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 16, at 2.15 p.m.