

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Thursday, October 15, 1970

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

**QUESTIONS****WOOL MARKETING**

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Commonwealth Government recently announced that it would set up a statutory wool marketing authority. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what benefit the authority will be to South Australia and whether any legislation will have to be introduced?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I anticipate that discussions at the special meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council to be held in Canberra on Monday will centre on the respective areas of responsibility of the Commonwealth and State Governments in the implementation of the proposals announced by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry for the establishment of a statutory wool marketing authority, to be known as the "Australian Wool Commission". It would appear that from a legislative point of view, to conform to the Commonwealth Constitution, transactions in wool within a State would come within the jurisdiction of that State, while interstate trading would require regulation by Commonwealth legislation. Thus it is likely that Commonwealth and complementary State legislation would be necessary. However, until the whole question has been discussed at the council meeting I am unable to give the Council any specific information on the proposal additional to that which has appeared from time to time in press reports.

I think the commission that will be set up in accordance with the announcement of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry will benefit the wool industry generally, and I am very hopeful that next Monday's discussions will assist the industry throughout Australia. This is a step in the right direction; it was discussed at the last meeting of the Agricultural Council at Mount Hagen, and I am pleased to say that the contributions I made to those discussions have borne fruit. The establishment of the commission is necessary at this time, when wool is so prone to price fluctuations. Any scheme of this nature that tends to arrest fluctuations will be in the interests of Australian woolgrowers generally.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It would appear that woolgrowers throughout Australia are not completely unanimous on this subject. At next Monday's meeting will the Minister be suggesting that woolgrowers generally be given the opportunity of having a poll to express their views on the subject?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: From all reports I have seen and also from what has been published in the press (and this was spelt out forcibly and announced by the Minister for Primary Industry), the so-called "Wool Parliament" in this country is unanimous in its decision to support this statutory body. I do not think there is any real line of demarcation or variation in the thinking of people concerned with wool throughout Australia. I know that in the past certain sections of the industry have been at sixes and sevens, but I think that, generally, from what I can gather (and no doubt this matter will be discussed by the Agricultural Council) the wool industry is united in this matter. However, I am willing to discuss with the Agricultural Council the matters raised by the honourable member in order to ensure that the wool industry generally favours such a scheme.

**DENTAL HOSPITAL**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of September 22 about the delays in getting treatment in the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The approximate waiting times for treatment in the various clinics at the Dental Department, Royal Adelaide Hospital, are as follows:

Prosthetic Clinic (dentures)—about two years; Conservative Clinic—about 12 months; Orthodontic Clinic—about five years. In this clinic the shortage of trained staff is acute and has been so for years; Oral Surgery Clinic—no waiting list for procedures carried out under local anaesthesia; however, when patients require hospitalization, delays often occur due to the shortage of beds.

Any patient who has a serious medical condition such as diabetes, gastric ulcer, etc., is given preference. Preference is also given for some social reasons, for example, mothers with large families and children with severe dental problems. The staffing position at the Dental Department has been completely reviewed in recent months by an appointed Dental

Advisory Committee and the committee's detailed recommendations for staffing improvements in this department are currently under consideration by the Public Service Board.

#### OCCUPATION CENTRES

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In 1963 the Education Department appointed Mr. Stott as a supervisor of occupation centres, but this position was not given its true recognition in the form of that title, with the result that Mr. Stott, who has done a good job since his appointment, is receiving less salary as the supervisor of occupation centres than, in at least one instance, a person whom he has to supervise. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Education to consider recognizing the position of supervisor of occupation centres as an official position, and also consider increasing the salary, in order to overcome existing anomalies?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a reply as soon as it is available.

#### PRAWNING

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as Minister in charge of fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Recently, regulations have been gazetted that change the zonings in the prawning industry. Can the Minister say whether an agreement has now been reached on the allocation of the applicants (I think he told me previously that there were 15) to the various zones and whether these zones have been accepted by the industry generally?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I told the honourable member some time ago that everyone connected with the prawning industry would be advised of any alterations before they were put into effect. This was done, and everybody that was consulted at the time was completely in accord with the new arrangements, although there were some reservations about certain boats going into certain areas. However, I have heard no adverse reaction and, so far as I am aware, the prawn fishermen are happy with the present situation. I did hear only a day or so ago that several people

engaged in the prawning industry wished to see me about certain matters. Whether or not this is related in any way to the point the honourable member is now raising, I am unable to say, because those people have not said exactly what they want to see me about. So far as I am aware, there have been no queries on the matters to which the honourable member has referred.

#### EGG INDUSTRY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I have asked several questions concerning the problems of the egg industry. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this matter will be on the agenda for discussion by the Ministers of Agriculture in Canberra next Monday?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The meeting in Canberra has been called for discussions on certain specific subjects and, as the egg industry is not one of them, it is most unlikely that it will be discussed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. SIR NORMAN JUDE

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

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the Hon. Sir Norman Jude on account of absence from the State.

Motion carried.

#### BRANCH FROM SANDERGROVE TO MILANG RAILWAY (DISCONTINU- ANCE) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I move:

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

It authorizes the Railways Commissioner to take up or otherwise dispose of the railway line branch from Sandergrrove to Milang and is introduced in consequence of the decision to close the line. The line to be taken up is delineated on the Parliamentary plan referred to in clause 2. A copy of the plan is available for perusal by honourable members. In substance, the Bill follows similar measures that from time to time have been introduced into this House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides appropriate definitions for the purposes of the measure, including a reference to the 1881 Act, which originally authorized the construction of the railway. Clause 3 enables the Commissioner to take up portion of the railway authorized by the 1881 Act, and clause 4 incorporates this Act with the South Australian

Railways Commissioner's Act, to which it is complementary. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

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

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1733.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I take this opportunity of congratulating the Hon. Mr. Russack upon his election to this Council. I particularly commend him for the very fine maiden speech he made yesterday. It is obvious from the manner in which he prepared his work and delivered his speech yesterday that he will be a worthy representative of the Midland District in this Chamber.

I support the Leader of the Opposition in this place in his remarks on the Financial Statement of the Treasurer for the State's Budget of this current year. A practical appreciation of the approach to the finances of this State can always be gained each year from an inspection of the appendix attached to the Financial Statement concerning the surpluses and deficits on various services both for the financial year immediately preceding the year under review and for some years before that. That appendix to Parliamentary Paper 18 is found on page 9.

If we consider the successive Governments holding office during these financial years, I think for the purposes of this exercise this is a reasonable assumption because, although the Governments have changed in either March or April in a calendar year, the effective control of finance has been measured more by the particular financial years under review. I say this because, understandably, commitments made by former Governments in the months of, say, February, March or April must be honoured and carried through to about the end of the financial year.

If we go back for a period of five years, which takes us back to when there was a change of Government from the former Playford L.C.L. Government to the Walsh A.L.P. Government, we find that at June 30, 1965, there was a surplus of \$1,222,526 carried forward in Consolidated Revenue Account into the new financial year. The first full financial year of that particular Labor Government showed a deficit of \$6,834,136. After absorbing prior surpluses, a deficit of \$5,611,610 was carried forward in Consolidated Revenue Account.

In the following year, 1966-67, there was a surplus of \$106,345. After allowing for this surplus, a net deficit of \$5,505,265 was carried forward in Consolidated Revenue Account. The last year of the Walsh Labor Government, 1967-68, brought a deficit of \$2,859,872. That was carried forward in Consolidated Revenue Account.

The first full financial year of the Hall L.C.L. Government, 1968-69, brought a surplus of \$460,091. After allowing for this surplus, a net deficit of \$7,905,046 was carried forward in Consolidated Revenue Account. In the year just concluded, 1969-70, there was a surplus of \$2,920,425. After allowing for this surplus and an application of \$406,059 from Loan Account towards unfunded deficits, a net deficit of \$4,578,562 was carried forward in Consolidated Revenue Account.

From those figures, two very important points emerge, and they highlight the orthodox manner in which the former Hall L.C.L. Government approached the problems of finance. This approach is absolutely essential for the State's interest if it is to progress and if the people are to gain the benefits that flow from such sound methods of finance. I notice that, whereas the former Labor Government came into office (and again I deal with the ends of the financial years) with a credit of \$1,222,526, it went out of office with a total deficit of \$8,365,137.

By comparison, over the past two years the Hall L.C.L. Government entered office with that deficit exceeding \$8,000,000 but was able, by its approach to the State's finances, to improve them so that the deficit was reduced to \$4,578,562. I plead with the present Government to consider that, in the challenges that will undoubtedly lie ahead in the next year or two concerning State finances, an extremely cautious and orthodox approach be adopted so that results of that kind can be achieved—and not of the kind that were achieved in the years 1965-68.

The other rather pleasing and interesting feature is that in those two years from 1968 to 1970 a surplus was achieved in both years. I will not dwell at great length on some of the major grievances which one hears in one's district at present, which can be tied to the various increases mentioned in the Bill, and which are allocated for this financial year, except to say that they are of a very serious and major kind.

I support previous speakers' remarks of commendation of the Commissioner of Police and the Police Force on the service that they

have given, and are still giving, to the State. I commend the Hon. Mr. Russack for raising the question of the disquiet that is apparent throughout the whole of the State at the news of the Government's intention to introduce compulsory voting in local government. People fear it from the political viewpoint, because it is my view that the Government has a clear intention of introducing politics actively in local government, and this is something that would be to the detriment of the State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Doesn't the Lord Mayor get backing from the L.C.L.?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then it wouldn't be anything new if politics came into it!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I said "actively", if the honourable member had listened.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I did listen.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member can give me reasons and prove that the Lord Mayor's endorsement by the L.C.L. is an active political measure and that he votes in any way according to any meeting of L.C.L. members, I should be pleased to hear it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: So he gets endorsement only for the fun of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, he gets endorsement, but politics is not pursued actively in the Adelaide City Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Oh, no! That's good!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I know that, because I was a member of the council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's what makes me think it was political.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I was not endorsed by the L.C.L. but served as an independent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It's an active matter politically in Salisbury at present.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will not mention at length the third great grievance—the shopping hours referendum—but much further discussion will take place on that matter later. I now turn to the question of road safety. We find the appropriations for the South Australian Road Safety Council on page 77 of Parliamentary Paper No. 9, under the heading "Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government Department".

The appropriations are a little confusing, but I do not blame the Treasurer for that, because some of the sums were previously shown in other categories. However, I would like this matter to be clarified so that I can

be sure of the provision the Government is making for road safety this year. The provision for the South Australian Road Safety Council under the heading "Salaries and wages and related payments" is \$17,863, which exceeds last year's provision of \$15,006 by \$2,857.

Under the heading "Contingencies" on page 78, \$14,500 is provided for the Road Safety Council. To make the position a little more complex one has to turn to the heading "Miscellaneous" on page 82 to see that last year \$13,000 was spent.

Thus there is a difference of \$1,500 between these two figures. Therefore, there is a total increase for the current year of \$4,357. Also, under the same heading we find that \$6,255 was spent last year on special road safety campaigns. It appears that, in the aggregate, \$1,898 less will be spent in this new year than was spent last year under this general heading.

Because of the manner in which the Estimates have been prepared in regard to this matter, the position is somewhat confusing. It may be that there is a line somewhere that I have been unable to find. In due course I should like further explanation of this point, particularly because I notice from the report of the Road Safety Council for the period July 1, 1970, to September 30, 1970, that the Chairman said:

The favourable decision by the Treasury and Cabinet on council's submission for a grant of \$25,000 for 1970-71 afforded much satisfaction and encouragement. This is an increase of \$12,000 in the actual amount, although last year \$7,000 was appropriated by the then Minister from departmental funds for special Christmas and Easter seasonal road safety campaigns. A favourable decision by Parliament is awaited.

Because I am unable to tie up this statement with the actual figures that have been provided in the Estimates, I ask for an explanation so that this important matter can be clarified. On September 17 a press announcement by the Minister of Roads and Transport stated that fees for drivers' licences in this State would be increased by 50 per cent, and that this was expected to bring in about \$500,000 which would be allocated to road safety and improvement of railway crossings. If that sum is to be brought into the general revenue of the State, I would think it would have been proper (and certainly the Government, I imagine, would have had some knowledge of it) to mention it in the Budget papers.

Of course, net proceeds from the Motor Vehicles Department must at present, by law,

be allocated to the Highways Fund. It would appear that there is a plan to channel money into the Highways Fund and use it for road safety purposes and for improvement of railway crossings. That intention, in itself, is quite good, but the Highways Department is not short of money for these purposes, and it never has been.

I can well remember the problems (if I may use that word) that I experienced with the Railways Commissioner when I was endeavouring to have him make improvements at railway crossings and install more and more flashing lights. It was not money that was restricting the programme: time and time again the Commissioner of Highways said to me, "I have got more and more money to allocate for this important purpose." The problem lay in the ability of the South Australian Railways Commissioner actually to do the work.

It was not until, in effect, I had to threaten the Railways Commissioner that private enterprise would have to go on to the right of way and install these lights (if the Railways Department staff was unable to do it because of pressure of work) that the Railways Commissioner extended himself to the very limit and agreed that he could make installations to the value of \$150,000.

It was therefore even more surprising when the Minister recently told me, in reply to a question, that about \$191,000 was to be spent on improvements to railway crossings. So, much more explanation must be given as to the real reasons for motorists in this State having to pay increased taxation of this kind.

More reasons must be given as to where the money will go and it must be made clear whether it will go into general revenue or the Highways Fund. Further, more reasons must be given as to whether it is necessary for such money to be found when, in regard to flashing lights in particular, finance has not been the basic problem in the past. I hope that in due course we will receive these explanations so that motorists throughout the length and breadth of the State will clearly understand the reasons for the increase in fees for drivers' licences.

Honourable members no doubt heard yesterday the distressing news that the road toll in this State has reached record proportions. Up to 10 a.m. today 276 persons had been killed in this calendar year in South Australia; this figure must be compared with the 201 deaths that occurred in the same period last year and the 275 such deaths that occurred during the whole of last year. Consequently,

there will undoubtedly be a record number of road fatalities in this State this year; it will be the worst year ever. The matter is of such serious proportions that it is necessary for the Government to have an extremely close look at where it is going in its endeavours to assist in this tragic problem of road deaths. When the approach of the two major Parties to this matter is compared, it is clear to me that the present Government Party stands guilty in that it has not considered this question of road safety as seriously as it should have done.

It is interesting to note that, in the policy speech of the Leaders of the major Parties before the last election, Mr. Hall referred to four specific points. He promised that, if he was re-elected, he would appoint a Minister of Road Safety. He acknowledged in his speech that road safety was one of our greatest challenges, and said that his Government, if re-elected, would introduce special drivers' licences for drivers of heavy commercial vehicles and bring about the compulsory mechanical inspection of heavy vehicles. Lastly, he said that his Government would introduce a fair and just points demerit scheme.

The only reference I can find in Mr. Dunstan's policy speech under this whole heading was a brief reference to the need for a points demerit scheme. The record of the previous Government on this matter stands on the actual results for the year. In 1969 the road fatality rate in South Australia was reduced by 8.7 per cent, and was the best result of any Australian State. In that year South Australia's ratio of fatalities for each 100,000 population was 61 compared with the Australian figure of 79.

The previous Government appointed a Road Safety Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Pak Poy, and that committee is still making a thorough and deep investigation into the causes of road accidents. The Hall Government, apart from introducing special road safety campaigns at Christmas and Easter (which, I might mention, were successful, if one judges by the reduction in the road toll during those periods), was particularly keen on and made every endeavour to introduce with expedition a points demerit scheme, but in this particular endeavour it was thwarted by the Labor Party.

I considered our points demerit scheme as being a major contribution to reducing the road toll, but, after lengthy debate in Parliament, the Labor Opposition in the House of Assembly with the help of the Speaker, Mr. Stott, fobbed it off by referring it to a Select

Committee in December, 1969. If that scheme had been introduced at that time I believe it would have been effective early this year.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: There would have been another 100 people alive.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, and it would have saved a great number of lives during this calendar year.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What do you base that on?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On the worth of points demerit schemes throughout this country and throughout the American States.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you think that Select Committees are worth their salt?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This scheme was not put off so that a Select Committee could consider it. It was obvious after the lengthy debate that took place here that, on the advice of experts from the Police Department, the Motor Vehicles Department, and the Road Traffic Board, there was an urgent need for a fairly tough points demerit scheme. However, pressure was brought to bear from a certain union concerning that scheme and, no doubt, that was a contributing factor in its being shelved.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is that why L.C.L. members are serving on the Select Committee now?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They had no alternative.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, they had; they could have refused.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They were in the hands of the Government in another place and, as usual, they were co-operative.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They could have refused if they had wanted to.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Members of the Party opposite have refused to serve on a Select Committee in this Chamber, but it was not a question of members refusing to serve on the Select Committee dealing with the points demerit scheme. It was a question of playing politics and of not having a proper regard for road safety in this State. If the scheme had operated this year it would have meant (and this is my firm belief) that we would not have had a record number of fatalities.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is only a belief, without anything definite.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Labor Party would put the safety of people and the saving of lives on the roads of this State before politics, then the whole State would make more progress in this area. However, the

damage having been done, I hope that, first, the points demerit scheme when introduced by the present Government will have some teeth in it and, secondly, that whatever the Government's proposal it will be introduced expeditiously. If such a scheme is basically weak it will not have its proper effect, because there is no doubt that in this area people are demanding firm action.

A points demerit scheme that does not cause people to take extra care on the road is completely wasted and ineffective, but a scheme which causes all drivers to take extreme care and which causes the repeat offender either to improve his driving or be removed from the road is the kind of scheme that is urgently needed in this State.

I turn now to town planning. It is pleasing to see an increase in the appropriation for the State Planning Office and the State Planning Authority and I commend the Government for that action. During the past two years there has been considerable criticism of the former Government, and of me as the Minister administering town planning, on the basis that not enough money was spent on it and that certain decisions were being taken to curb the introduction of modern town planning in this State. Using figures from the Auditor-General's report and the Estimates, I will try to refute that implication.

I refer to a recently published book by Mr. Hugh Stretton, *Ideas for Australian Cities*, in which, in the chapter dealing with Adelaide, my name appears on several pages. It makes a clear implication, in my view, that I permitted self-interest to dictate certain decisions and actions in which I was involved, and I take this opportunity to refute entirely implications of that kind.

It has always been rather obvious to me that self-interest must from time to time be alleged against any member of Parliament. Members naturally deal in their own speeches with subjects concerning their own work or professions. It is most advantageous for a wide range of occupations and professions to be represented in any House of Parliament, as I think honourable members will agree, and there certainly is a very wide range of vocations in this Council. For instance, we have farmers, graziers, solicitors, trade unionists, an orchardist, a shopkeeper, and a medical practitioner. Also, some honourable members have interests in stud stock establishments. When advocating measures, members express the views of those in the same work and the same professions as themselves. Also,

the views of the clients and principals of some of these people must be expressed here.

Members have this interest, but this is entirely unrelated to an endeavour to further one's own personal business or professional interests. This question applies to new members particularly, because it takes new members some time, usually a year or two, to become fully conversant with the whole ambit of affairs dealt with in a Chamber such as this. Those new members must and should talk about subjects of which they have some intimate knowledge because of their particular vocations. The book about which I spoke contains the kind of objectionable statement to which I have referred. Speaking about me, the author said:

He was an enthusiast for anything that might help to sell more houses . . . . He pestered the Government incessantly, as the demand for houses flagged through a bad recession, to get more money lent on mortgage to young people.

As I said a few moments ago, I entirely refute any suggestion that I had any objective to benefit myself personally as a result of statements I made. I had no aim whatsoever to help those people involved in land agency business. Regarding the reference to young people and the need for them to buy houses, I had in mind the welfare of those young couples, and I had in mind also the state of the building industry in South Australia at that time.

Members will recall that in 1965 and 1966 the building industry was at a very low ebb and, in my view, it was essential for any member to do what he could to improve that industry, because at that time it meant a great deal to the much needed recovery of the State for the building industry to be improved and, by channelling money into it by way of mortgage to assist young people to buy houses, the industry in turn could have been assisted. This was my sole intention.

I cannot help stressing that these and other statements in this book have hurt and upset me considerably, and I can only say that, while the author may have been quite well intentioned (and, indeed, may have been sincere), I believe he was extremely unfair and unjust in commenting in the way he did. These matters have been brought to my notice by a considerable number of people, especially young people who have read this book and who have come to me to discuss this matter. Those people gained the same impression as I did when I read the book.

I referred to some other criticisms that have been made over the past two years. Those criticisms deal with some of the fundamentals of this whole area of town planning as they affected my Party at that time and as they affect my Party now. In general terms, I stand by some of the fundamental principles that I enunciated at that time. I stand by the fact that in the whole realm of town planning there is a need for people affected by it to be given full opportunity to be heard before final decisions are made, and I stand by the view that there is a need for local government to have adequate powers to implement planning.

Also, it is important to accept fully that there is a need for the State Planning Office to remain a planning instrumentality and for it to interfere only to a minimum with other departments and their particular work. I still believe that that planning department should not hold property on behalf of other Government departments. I still believe most strongly, as I believed two years ago, that there is a need for private enterprise and those people affected (this includes departments as well as individuals) to be adequately represented on the State Planning Authority.

I go along with the recent view (it is a view that has been brought to my notice in about the last 12 months by people making representations to me) that there is a need for a representative of conservation on that planning authority. I believe that great care should be exercised before renewal schemes for inner suburban areas are implemented to include flats which might be occupied by people with children, because I objected most strongly years ago to the principle of South Australian children having to play together in communal playgrounds between high-rise blocks of flats, and I still hold to that view. Provided that the State can build cheap housing in fringe suburbs for people on lower incomes, I believe that the State should so build in the outer suburbs where children can have a much better life through their childhood than they can in the playground environment to which I have referred.

I stressed two years ago, and I stress again, that I am not opposed to the general principle of town planning. Indeed, I favoured it then and I favour it now. However, with the passing of time a greater emphasis has been placed on some aspects of town planning. This is quite understandable, as with the passing of time one must change one's views to a certain degree. Greater emphasis is now placed on the question of environment, particularly

visual environment, and with those views in general principle I wholeheartedly agree. But the administration of town planning in the past two years, which the author of this book implies was negative, simply was not negative.

I have taken some figures from the Auditor-General's reports, which give ample evidence of the continuing expansion of the State Planning Authority and the State Planning Office here in Adelaide. For example, on June 30, 1968, the reports show that the annual payments within the South Australian State Planning Office were \$121,608. A year later, which was the first year of the Hall Government, on June 30, 1969, the annual expenditure had risen to \$168,983; and in the last year completed, ended June 30, 1970, the figure had risen to \$192,562.

For those same three years, the payments as shown in these reports for the State Planning Authority increased from \$69,606 to the next year's expenditure of \$154,489; and last year that figure rose to \$335,809. As further evidence of this expansion, one can quote the amount of land purchased by the State Planning Authority for mass recreation areas in metropolitan Adelaide. At June 30, 1968, the value of land purchased was \$62,262. In the first year of my administration, that figure rose to \$202,064. At June 30 of this year, the total amount of land purchased by the State Planning Authority cost \$505,555.

Those purchases of land were not annual: they were aggregated under those headings. However, it showed that there was an increase in the two years of 58 per cent in the expenditure of the State Planning Office, and an increase of 382 per cent in the expenditure of the State Planning Authority. If we want to work the other out on a percentage basis, the value of land held after two years of the L.C.L. Government was 712 per cent higher than the value of the land held when that Government took office.

The same story of expansion can be told when one looks at the figures before us under the heading "Public Parks". In the Auditor-General's Report on page 126 the total grants to corporations and councils for the purchase of council parks, reserves, playgrounds and areas of that kind, for the year 1969-70, amounted to \$238,786. The total grants in the year 1967-68 (that is, in the year prior to the Hall Government coming to office) as shown in that report on page 75 amounted to \$96,300.

Indeed, that report shows that over the whole period of the Public Parks Act, from 1943 until

the end of June this year, a total amount of \$1,361,800 was spent on public parks or, I should say, was allocated to councils for that purpose. Of that total, since 1943, 17.5 per cent was spent in this last year ended June 30, 1970.

The important and difficult questions in regard to town planning dealing with the hills face and quarrying in the Adelaide Hills were not matters that the Government of the day turned its back on or tried to avoid making decisions on. Indeed, on matters concerning the hills face, I always endeavoured to encourage the people involved and the council to get together in discussion with a view to the land under dispute being purchased.

In this regard, some success was achieved. A large area of land in the Mitcham council area was purchased by that council, after being the subject of a bitter dispute. As regards quarrying, it appears to me (and again I rely on a rather practical or pragmatic approach to planning) that ultimately with the passing of time (and I realize it will take many years to achieve this) some of the land with quarries on it coming within the hills face zone can be purchased by the State Planning Authority. Indeed, that programme was commenced during the two years of the last L.C.L. Government.

It was commenced by the purchase of land on which a quarry was situated in the eastern foothills and, against considerable opposition, the Government decided that that quarry should close down. This was some positive action by the Government to begin the long battle to achieve improvements in this vexed question of quarrying in the Adelaide Hills.

There was no attempt whatsoever to hide from the people decisions about subdivisions or resubdivisions of land within the hills face zone. In fact, at my insistence and as a result of representations made to me by people involved in one of these disputes, the State Planning Authority must now publicly advertise the fact that it has before it subdivisions within that area for consideration.

So, for the public (and I am somewhat critical of local government in this matter) which was not being informed or was not able to obtain information through the local council to the effect that consideration was being given to proposals of this kind, this was a double check that the people affected had ample opportunity to know what was going on and, in that way, maximum discussions and representation could take place.

I mention, too, that not only were those original principles in regard to town planning basic and, in my view, essential, as they still are, but with the passing of time greater emphasis is being placed on matters of environment, and particularly visual environment. Obviously, one way in which to improve environment is to set aside areas for outdoor leisure activities. The programme is running along well for the State Planning Authority to acquire major metropolitan open spaces amounting in all ultimately to some 6,600 acres.

We have heard at times that not enough money has been allocated for this purpose, but at no time during the period of the former Government was there a shortage of money for this purpose. If it could be reasonably claimed that the acquisition rate was slow, when one considers a total of 6,600 acres as the target, it is apparent that the reason was that the land was not being offered by people, who preferred to remain on it for some more years.

I mention, also, that the figures of the money allocated and used for the purchase of this land do not paint the whole picture. It was interesting to note that 83 acres of land within the old Islington sewage farm area was made available as open space land; it is an acreage worth about \$600,000. Ultimately, it will be of great benefit to the people in the north and the north-western suburbs. I could go on and on.

I could deal with the model by-laws which were approved and which I hope before very long many local government bodies will accept concerning improvement in the visual environment. A start was made on the undergrounding of electricity cables in the streets of metropolitan Adelaide, and a Government decision was made that with any new subdivisions the Director of Planning and councils had the right to insist on the subdivider undergrounding the services at the subdivider's expense and in conformity with the specifications laid down by the Electricity Trust.

I do not want to go into further detail on this matter. There is the example of progress being made in regard to planning along the periphery of Victoria Square. The Lord Mayor's Committee was set up, and is actively pursuing this matter. A special allocation was made to retain the services of Professor Dennis Winston, a town planner of world repute, to assist in this matter, and many other decisions were made which, I think to any reasonable person, was ample proof

that progress was being encouraged in the whole area of town planning.

It is pleasing to see that the Estimates have been increased further by the present Government for the year under review. I trust this will mean that proper and further progress will be made in town planning in the State because that, of course, will bring great benefit to all the people and interests of the State.

I turn briefly to the line that deals with the Railways Department and refer to the Treasurer's Financial Statement. At page 6, it states:

So far as railways are concerned a review is currently being made concerned with a variety of aspects of railway operation, charges, finance, and other activities in order to contain and if possible to reduce the heavy loss impinging upon the Budget.

I am at present concerned with further details of the review the Treasurer has stated was currently being undertaken. I ask whether further information regarding this review can be supplied. For example, who is carrying out the review? What are the terms of reference? I do not blame the Railways Commissioner for having views that he and his department would like to have some rural business such as the transport of grain and wool channelled off the road and on to the railways.

In fact, I commend the Commissioner that in many matters of rail freight he takes the view that his department should range competitively alongside road transport, although he has the other view that I have mentioned. My point in asking for further explanation of the admission made by the Treasurer in his statement is that country people should have maximum knowledge of investigations of this kind because, naturally, they will want to make their own representations.

If the review is concerned with that, in particular, before decisions are made that will upset these country people (if decisions are to be made) it would be extremely wise of the Government to make a public announcement and for the matter to be discussed so that the objections that undoubtedly will come will not be made when the horse is out of the stable, so to speak, but will be made at a time when the Government can take notice and heed of them.

Despite the fact that the overall railway deficit is getting to very large proportions and, of course, is a very worrying matter, there are some aspects of railway operations that give some encouragement to those who concern themselves with this most unfortunate drag on the State's general finances and on

the Revenue Account. I commend the Commissioner for his endeavours to introduce greater efficiency and economies into his department and in the various areas of his department's vast operations.

I know that he is always earnestly looking for ways and means to assist the financial position. I believe that the decision (which at the time was criticized considerably both in the areas concerned and by the Labor Party Opposition of the former Government) to close some uneconomic railway lines has proved to be one that simply had to be taken in the State's interest. I always concern myself more with the actual working result of the railways than with the totals that include the debt charges, because I believe it is the deficits on the working which must be tackled and which it is any Government's responsibility to endeavour to improve as years go by.

It is interesting to see on page 149 of the Auditor-General's Report that the working deficit for the railways in 1967-68 increased considerably over the previous year and years to \$6,574,349. In the following year, 1968-69, the figure was reduced slightly to \$5,870,885. In the year just passed, 1969-70, it was reduced further to \$5,721,346. During these periods there has been a considerable increase in remuneration at all levels to the staff and to the work force of the Railways Department.

Those gradual reductions give some encouragement that progress, although slow, is being made in this most important area of watching the finances of this department. It is also interesting to see the figures published on page 152 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June, 1967. If we add to those figures other figures from previous Auditor-General's Reports we see that the total staff of the railways is being reduced gradually: it is not being reduced by retrenchments because, regarding the plan to close some railway lines, a specific instruction was given to the Commissioner that there were to be no retrenchments. The work force was about 9,000 people and the figure for June 30, 1970, was 8,960.

With a staff of that kind, some people from time to time do leave of their own free will, and adjustments can be made so that replacements are unnecessary. In 1966 there was a slight increase of 27 people in the work force of the Railways Department; in 1967 there was a further increase of 119 people; in 1968 there was a further increase of 25; in 1969 there was a reduction of 81; and in the year

just ended there was a reduction of 282. So I commend the Railways Commissioner for his plan to make every possible endeavour to assist this State's finances and thereby to assist the people of the State; because it is the people of the State, through taxation, who must make up the deficit of the Railways Department.

It is most disappointing to find that no allocation has been made this year for any feasibility study into the proposed underground railway beneath King William Street. Before the previous Government left office it had a close look at this question; the underground railway is part of the proposed rail rapid transit system. The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report had been approved by the previous Government and we needed a detailed feasibility study by experts either from other parts of Australia or from other parts of the world.

Although it was to be done under the auspices of the Metropolitan Planning Committee, this section of the plan would undoubtedly have been financially debited to the Railways Department. As no estimate has been provided for it, I can only assume that the Government is just not proceeding with this plan to build an underground railway; this is in conformity with its announcement that the M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn.

This very important and urgently needed public transport facility, which was recommended in the M.A.T.S. Report, must be proceeded with. It seems that it has been either shelved for 12 months or cancelled. I do not want to give the impression that the matters I have mentioned in some detail are the most important grievances that one could bring into this Council from one's own electoral district.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Have you still got some more?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Since the honourable member presses me, I cannot help saying that the most important grievance that comes to me is from people in my electoral district who are alarmed at the fact that, in a time of crisis and when the Commissioner of Police had knowledge that violence would inevitably take place in Adelaide, the Premier of the day did not support his Commissioner and the Police Force. I agree with the remarks already made in commendation of the sterling service given by the Commissioner of Police and his officers.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): In speaking in reluctant support of this Bill, I wish to congratulate the new member for the Midland District (Hon. E. K. Russack) on

his election and particularly on his maiden speech, which he made so ably yesterday. I think we shall hear from this honourable member very profitably and pleasantly in the years ahead. In connection with the Emergency Fire Services of this State, I think the charge must be laid against the Government that it is running this whole show on the cheap and thereby endangering many people's lives.

A horrible comparison could be made between the amount of money at the disposal of these people and the expenditures made in other States. We are asking Mr. Kerr to take on his shoulders responsibilities greater than those that most other public servants have to bear. His responsibilities do not arise every day of the year but they are overwhelming when castastrophic conditions occur.

The whole of the work materially done by these people is unpaid (except perhaps for the group who take an extra duty without any recognition when they are employed by the forest services of the Woods and Forests Department). Insufficient recognition is given to the work expected of these people and of the tremendous risks they take. This whole question should be investigated immediately.

We must look for new means of fire control in the heavy forest and scrub parts of the State that are still covered with natural vegetation. While these areas of scrubland remain, we must find a very much better means of controlling the build-up of fuel than we have had in the past. In fact, the attitude taken in recent years will greatly endanger people near such areas unless controlled burning methods are undertaken soon. We simply do not take advice from people who know what is wanted. The necessary organization must be in the hands of the gentleman I have mentioned.

I refer now to an incredible position: we are suffering from a very serious shortage of water, yet we have 26,000,000 gallons of usable water running to waste every day, and the Government refuses to do anything about it. In the early stages when the Bolivar sewage works were set up, it was laid down that that water had to be treated so that it could be used. The Virginia district was established and people were encouraged to go there, although someone knew that the underground water supply was insufficient to sustain the development that would take place.

A clear instruction was given that the Bolivar works had to treat water so that it could be re-used, and money was granted to the Engineering and Water Supply Department

to set up the works to make this possible. The position now is that the department is refusing to allow this water to be used, because it considers that it cannot guarantee that the water is safe. Who is responsible for this decision? Millions of dollars have been spent there in good faith with the assurance that the water would be usable. Officers of this department, when examined by the Public Works Committee, gave the assurance that it could be done.

For this waste of about 26,000,000 gallons of water a day someone must be responsible, but at present that person is hiding and saying that the water cannot be used, because it may carry a virus. This is not true. In the Virginia district many people have become established, but have now been told that they can only have a restricted water supply. Hundreds of families are involved, but the Government will do nothing about it.

When people in the district suggested a proposition to make use of the water they were told by the Government that the water could not be used. The person responsible for this incredible situation should be brought into the public gaze, instead of being able to hide behind committees, as he is doing at present. Water being poured into the sea from the end of the effluent channel is creating a difficulty and hazard, because it is spoiling much of the coastline. It is only a matter of time before the crabbing beaches north of St. Kilda will be overwhelmed by a mass of lettuce weed, which grows on effluent water.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: There is a lot there now.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes, it is covering the area and killing the mangroves, but the water could be used by market gardeners who need it and who must stop their production unless they get it. Water is being given to a couple of land developers so that they can sell blocks of 10 acres for people to grow almonds.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I could put you on to a good land agent.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am glad to hear that, because there is a need for a deep inquiry into this matter that should have full judicial status. If my inquiries continue along their present lines, I am sure that eventually we must ask for a Royal Commission to inquire into this matter.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Not another one! There will not be enough of us to go on the committees.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: We do not want a Select Committee: it has to be a Royal Commission, and I am sure that prosecutions will follow it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You will have us working around the clock.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes, and I mean to.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think a Royal Commission is necessary for this?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The trouble is that full judicial inquiry has been badly degraded in recent years. This is a type of inquiry that is of tremendous importance to the community if it is properly used, but one of the greatest tragedies today is that it has been used for political purposes. The question of this water supply is not political. The inquiry should find out why a public servant, who should be serving us, has fallen down on his job. This has led to incredible hardship for many people in the Virginia area who will become bankrupt if this water cannot be presented to them in usable form.

We truly believe that the water is usable, and it is only because of the incredible messing around between committees (which the service seems to love so much today) that the water cannot be used. The Munno Para District Council placed before the Government a scheme which would not cost South Australia a cent and which would give people the opportunity to use the water, but it has been fobbed off. I leave it at that.

In other parts of the District of Southern, water crises are rapidly arising. The previous Minister of Mines gave an undertaking that the Langhorne Creek water basin would be investigated, but this work has been stopped. Again, this area is completely dependent on underground water supplies from which the withdrawal is greater than the intake, so that a considerable industry built up in recent years is having trouble.

It is urgent that this position should be considered and the true situation ascertained as quickly as possible, because once these water beds are over-pumped they can be permanently damaged. In this district, which depends so much on underground water, it is obvious that the supply is being overdrawn.

In recent years wild statements have been made about the quantity of water in the South-East. The fact is that again this year the water table in the Mount Gambier and Mingbool areas has fallen. It is urgent that a hydrological survey should be made of these areas, and continued to be made, in order to

ensure that we do not over-exploit the immensely valuable water resources in these areas.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Is this reasonably indicated by the water level?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: It is indicated by the water level in the Blue Lake at Mount Gambier. The Leg of Mutton Lake, which was such a lovely feature, is now just a little puddle, and the pier that was erected to service boats in Lake Brown is now high and dry. A large body of water in the South-East is beneath the colloidal limestone.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What about the Virginia area?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: That also has been grossly over-pumped and the level is at least 200ft. below sea level within a mile or so of the beach. I was interested when the Hon. Mr. Hill spoke about road safety and the points demerit scheme, as I think I was the first person to ask that this scheme be considered in this State. It is probable that the Police Department and those responsible for road safety were examining this question much earlier. However, we have the simple fact that already this year we have reached a record number of road deaths, even though there are still two months of the year left.

Yet this is probably the least important side of this. What is even more important is the cost in distress and real trouble that attaches to the many more people who are injured and often permanently disabled and who have to be maintained for the rest of their life in a paraplegic state. This is a terrific cost to the community and, apart from any moral consideration, it should be considered very closely indeed by any Government.

I do not know just what proportion of the hospitals and medical services of this State is concerned with the care of road accident victims, but it is certainly a very high proportion indeed. Without any other consideration, will the Government look at this aspect, if it will not appreciate the moral need for speed restrictions to be placed on road users?

The figure of about 270 road deaths this year just seems to be a figure that appears in the newspapers, but we must think of the distress caused to the families who have suffered this loss, and we must think of the hundreds and hundreds more who have been permanently disabled and who have to be maintained in the community in a vegetable state until eventually they are released by death, possibly 50 or 60 years in the future. I think there can be no

doubt whatsoever that we must stop pulling punches in this matter of road carnage.

So often when this subject comes up and there is a proposal for a points demerit system we hear comments such as, "Oh, but this is not fair; you cannot possibly give this man three black marks for exceeding the speed limit." The point is that we cannot possibly accept this loss any longer, because we cannot afford it. Certainly, we cannot morally afford it. The fact that the points demerit scheme has been pushed into the dark cupboard of a Select Committee for political reasons is very bad indeed.

I have no doubt whatsoever that as road users we have to accept a maximum speed limit for the whole of the State, and we have to accept the very strict and severe discipline that is necessary to enforce it. Many people will say that this is not fair. Just think how unfair it is to those 270 families who have suffered loss this year.

I now wish to refer to the question of agriculture and the complete failure of our Agriculture Department to appreciate, as it should have been able to, the difficulties our primary industries are now facing. It is some years now, I think, since we asked the department to investigate and search for alternative cash crops for this State which would enable us to break away from the nexus we are in with our total dependence on so few crops. I have been interested in this subject primarily because of the very great difficulties that have ruled for several years in our high-rainfall districts where there is no cash crop for much of the land.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What about rape?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Rape is an oil-seed crop. It has been grown here for many years, but in terms of research it has been completely neglected. The Victorian department has encouraged quite a nice sideline crop in that State. However, if too many people get into it, it will break down again.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Hasn't it broken down in Victoria because of wogs and diseases?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think this is mainly a matter of inexperience in growing. When a cereal grower gets into crucible crops he is up against a completely different pestology circumstance than he has ever had to face before, and this is where there is a need for pilot research—work that must be done ahead of the people who have had no experience in these lines before. This is supposed to be a function of our Agriculture Department, but it has done nothing about it whatsoever. I do

not know how long it is since the first attempts were made to grow soybeans in this State, but I know that we had some quite reasonably successful crops.

Soybean today is the basis of very large industry elsewhere in the world. It is the soybean which is feeding a tremendous proportion of the Asian population, and (unfortunately for our meat industry, perhaps) it is chiefly the basis of artificial meats such as bacon, ham and beef which can be turned out so cheaply. This is the sort of thing which will confront our agriculture in Australia, without any doubt, yet we are completely ignorant about it. We do not know how to grow the soybean, yet we still have to try to sell beef, pork and mutton against it.

I believe there is a very grave defection of duty in not looking for these alternative cash crops and these alternative means of marketing we so greatly need today. I am sure that we must have a complete change of attitude in this department. I hope the Minister appreciates the need for this; in fact, I am sure he does.

There is a great need to keep certain parts of our State in a livable condition, and in this respect I refer to the Adelaide Hills. I consider that this area has reached the stage where landholders have to accept that there can be no more clearing and that there can be very little more development in the sense that there has been development in the past.

I am afraid that many of the communities have to appreciate that, if Adelaide is to have a pure water supply, we cannot have many more people in the Adelaide Hills. I referred to this matter yesterday. Apparently, it is acceptable to the authorities that a community like Hahndorf can grow from its present size of 800 people to 3,500 people. I am sure this is impracticable and will mean that many people in the Adelaide Hills will suffer and lose.

What must be laid down are unmistakable and clear guide lines so that people can fit themselves into the needs of the whole community with the minimum of loss. Instead of there being thinly disguised regulations, there must be a clean and hard attack on this problem, not only in the Adelaide Hills but in many other parts of the State as well. This cannot be done piecemeal: it must be done as a whole. As I say, clean and hard guide lines must be laid down.

The terrible position arises that the country will become completely treeless in many areas that are now well covered by trees unless something is done about it. I refer here to the red gum belts which are so beautiful in certain

parts of the State. They stretch through the higher rainfall areas of the State, including the South-East. This is lovely woodland country. Fortunately, they occur in areas of land that will be preserved by the owners, but they must be given assistance.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I think that in England there is a law forbidding the clearing of trees in certain areas without permission.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think that is right. However, it would be wiser for us to follow the Scandinavian precept that has worked so well, where a person may remove a tree but it is his duty to replace it with two or three trees, according to the area.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Our Government had a model regulation planned and completed on this: it is now up to the councils to adopt it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: It is not mixed up with another blinking committee, is it?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The honourable member is not in a good mood today!

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Let me go over once again the list of matters that I have in front of me and see where there is room for improvement. First, we have an Emergency Fire Services system that is being run so cheaply that it is having great difficulty in retaining its personnel; indeed, it is having to work overtime. Then there is the incredible amount of water being allowed to go to waste although we are always being asked to conserve water. Although it is desperately needed, it is now being diverted to certain areas so that land developers can make profits.

Then there is the problem of the Langhorne Creek scheme, which is being withdrawn. Then there is the problem of water in the South-East, where there are not sufficient safeguards for its use. These are all urgent and important matters that are being lost sight of in a cloud of superficial politics today. They must receive urgent attention. Reluctantly, I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): First, I thank sincerely the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and other honourable members generally for their ready co-operation in ensuring that this Bill is passed today. I know that the time allowed for debate has been short but, through no fault of our own, the recent fortnight's recess has resulted in this urgency. The Government sincerely appreciates the co-operation of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in this direction.

I take this opportunity, too, of thanking the Leader for his remarks about me and my

being back in my position as Leader of the Government in this Chamber. I include thanks to those honourable members (in fact, all honourable members) who made inquiries about me while I was away. I am glad to be back here. While it is nice to be in hospital and have the best attention, it is not the best of places to be in: I would sooner be at home. I hope I do not have to go to hospital again.

I take this, my first opportunity, of congratulating the Hon. Mr. Russack on election to Parliament. Of course, I would far sooner have welcomed his opponent, but somebody had to win, and I congratulate him. I sincerely welcome him to this Chamber. He will find that in the future, in debate, I shall not always be as kind to him as I am now. He may already have heard me say this, that, while we may have our political differences within this Chamber, if an honourable member finds himself in difficulties, with the friendship and fellowship prevailing here, he knows full well that other honourable members will come to his help. The Hon. Mr. Russack will learn to appreciate that. I also take the opportunity of congratulating him on his maiden speech yesterday. He had something to say and he said it well. Whether or not I agree with what he said is beside the point: it was well prepared and well delivered.

Without my trying to be egotistic, the honourable member's speech took me back many years to when I was in another place. I was much more nervous than the honourable member was yesterday when I delivered my maiden speech in that place. When I had finished my speech Sir Robert Nicholls, who was the Speaker at that time and was respected by all members, called me to him and congratulated me on my speech. To the best of my memory, I think his words were: "You had something to say, you said it, and you sounded as though you meant it." That very kind remark of Sir Robert Nicholls applied to the Hon. Mr. Russack yesterday.

I shall not attempt to answer all the points raised in this debate, as I have said previously when rising to reply to other debates; I shall not try to answer off the cuff the points raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Kemp today but, if any honourable member has raised a point that he wants answered, if I cannot answer it myself I am sure one of my colleagues will be glad to answer later. First, let me reply to some points made by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris who, among other things, spoke of the nurses' new curriculum. I am glad to say that I think that, in the main, the problems of

nurses and their service conditions have been overcome.

They appreciate the new curriculum that will be introduced next year for their further education and the benefits they will gain under the latest nurses award. I think their problems have largely been solved. During my short stay in hospital, I had an opportunity to talk to several sisters and trainee nurses (first year and third year) and they left me with no doubt in my mind that their main concern was the wherewithal to keep body and soul together. I fully realize the difficulties that will have to be faced. I do not have to be told about them because I know that the Leader has some idea of the amounts of money that the various organizations might be out of pocket—it is staggering! I do not think there is any one section of the community that should be penalized in remuneration because of the repercussions it might have on others. I hope that we will find the answer to the problem.

Regarding the maintenance payments to subsidized hospitals, I do not think that the Leader and I are far apart on this matter. The matter of maintenance subsidies to subsidized hospitals was considered by the subsidies committee and the maintenance subsidy recommended in each case took into account the financial position of the hospitals at the time. That is the way to do it. Neither the Treasury, the Auditor-General nor anyone else will let any Government anticipate what is in front of it. I agree entirely with the Leader that Government hospitals have no right to impose charges for their patients lower than, or to any great extent lower than, a neighbouring subsidized hospital. When the Leader was speaking I interjected that that had not happened for some time and said that it must go back a number of years. During my time, in the Hon. Mr. Russack's area there was a problem with the Wallaroo Hospital. However, that position was corrected, and it made the surrounding subsidized hospitals happy.

Charges in Government hospitals have not been introduced to the present time because of the fact that honorary medical officers will be paid from January 1, 1971, and it is necessary for the Hospitals Department to take into account this cost in recommending new hospital charges. A short answer would be to say that the question of charges in Government hospitals is under review—under serious review, because of the circumstances. It would not be appropriate to anticipate revenue in the Estimates before

regulations to vary them have been approved. I could well expect a question from the Leader on this matter. The investigation by the Public Service Board into the fees of honoraries at hospitals that was commenced in his time has been concluded satisfactorily. Although I have not read the report, I understand that, while it might not be fair to say that complete agreement has been reached, an agreement as a first stepping stone for the payment of honoraries has been reached and will operate, if endorsed by the Government, from January 1, 1971.

We are now in a position to know what the cost of these services will be. No matter how distasteful it might be (and I have said this before), hospital charges will have to be increased and, when the time comes, an announcement will be made. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Hart said:

Because I now intend to deal with hospitals, it is unfortunate that the Chief Secretary is not in the Chamber at present. I realize that the Minister of Lands is in the Chamber but he is not in his seat. The main difference between the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Modbury Hospital is that the former is a going concern. The Lyell McEwin Hospital is fortunate in that it has a competent administrator, Mr. J. W. Joel: the success of any hospital depends largely on how it is administered.

I agree with the last sentence in that quote. However, when I am out of this Chamber I am generally engaged on Parliamentary business. Those honourable members who were here yesterday will know that when I was out of the Chamber I was working like a beaver and I saved Parliament possibly hours of work and hours of additional expense in overtime. In addition, with the help of the Hon. Mr. Springett, I was looking after a sick member of Parliament. Members' remarks are often misconstrued. With the possible exception of you, Mr. President, I can say that I sit in my seat longer than does any other honourable member in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think that the Hon. Mr. Hart is out of the Chamber on Parliamentary business today?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I never shoot the other fellow, but I want to place my remarks on record for the Hon. Mr. Hart's benefit. I have read his statement on the Lyell McEwin Hospital with interest. It is a rather detailed report. I have my own ideas on where he obtained the information and possibly on who prepared it for him. I agree that this hospital is one of the most complicated regarding Commonwealth payments for pensioners.

Because it is not a State hospital and is not accepted for Commonwealth benefits it cannot qualify for more than the \$2 a bed-day that pensioners are entitled to; they are not entitled to \$5 a day. When I was in Government previously this was one of the first matters that I took up. I have not attended a Ministers of Health Conference since my return to Government. However, I understand that such a conference will be held in Melbourne on November 20 so that we can decide between ourselves what is the main thing that the next Ministers of Health Conference will deal with.

I assure the Council that the first matter in my book will be Commonwealth Government assistance to pensioners who, in my opinion, are the Commonwealth Government's responsibility. That Government takes income tax from these people all their working life, and I consider that it is only fair and reasonable that it should be prepared to pay the bulk of the cost of hospitalization in their declining years and not make the position as difficult as it is now.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Commonwealth should pay only the actual cost of hospitalization?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. We do not get anything like the cost today nor will we get anything like what it will be in the future. I admit that I do not think a hospital should show a profit on pensioners, but I do not think that the State, a hospital, or an aged persons home should bear any loss. I do not think that the Commonwealth or the State should bear the whole of the cost. With their pension, plus something more, we ought to be able to keep the subsidized hospitals and organizations at a good and decent standard, and no-one should be out of pocket.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Should the Commonwealth pay the cost of a public ward bed for pensioners?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It should pay something like that. Our thinking is about the same on this matter, but I may not express it in the same way. I was successful in getting an improvement last time. I hope that something is done for the pensioners very soon. If we do a reasonable thing for the aged we will have to consider how much we have left for education and other things. There is only a certain amount available and, if we take it for a certain purpose, we do not have it for another purpose.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Commonwealth Government is in the same boat.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not so sure about that. I think it can transfer money from one purpose to another more easily than the State Government can.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Commonwealth Government might slice the State's money, too.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is a point. I do not think that the Commonwealth Government, the State Government or anyone else has scratched the surface in connection with the growing problems of aged people. In the next decade this will fall around our heads and we will wonder how it happened.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: It has already fallen.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is getting difficult now.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: People are really in trouble.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It will grow even more difficult each year unless something is done now. It has been one of my hobby horses for many years. All I can say to the Hon. Mr. Hart and other honourable members who have mentioned this matter is that I hope something will soon be done to alleviate the position.

The Government as a whole is most interested in the question of our water supplies; it has been one of my pet subjects. If we do not have water of good quality we are done. I thank honourable members for their attention and courtesy in assisting us to get this Bill through today. If any honourable member wants a reply to a particular question, I shall do my best to get it for him.

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

#### RIVER TORRENS ACQUISITION BILL In Committee.

(Continued from October 13. Page 1663.)

Clause 6—"Exemption from rates, etc."

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): In reply to the question asked earlier this week by the Hon. Mr. Story, I point out that in 1966 a case was before the Supreme Court; the decision was brought down by Mr. Justice Walters. It was clearly stated that the Government was not liable to pay fencing costs on the area in question if that area was used for public purposes. Clause 4 (3) of this Bill and the Land Acquisition Act deal with land taken over by the Government or councils. If any portion of land dealt with

by that Act is owned by a person who previously expended money on a fence, full compensation is paid to him.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: As improvements?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. However, in connection with the matter the Committee has been considering, I repeat that, where the Government takes over an area of land for public purposes, the Government is not liable to pay any charges for fences that are already there.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Can the Minister say what is the purpose of having this clause in the Bill?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I did not draft the Bill, but I think the clause provides a safeguard. It spells out the position about land acquired, so that all parties know the full details.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am still not quite clear. Under the Fences Act the details are set out, but the operative section is section 31. Under the Railways Commissioner's Act the Commissioner is not obliged to fence waste or pastoral Crown land, but he is obliged to protect property that he has acquired and to keep gates and fences in order. Under the provisions of this Bill it is conceivable, under some of the old titles, that the boundary goes to the middle of the river.

If land is acquired for the common good of all people a new boundary fence should be erected. I realize that the treatment of the Crown is satisfactory, but I cannot see that councils have the same rights, except those given to them under this legislation. They could not acquire the land in their own right, except for a specific purpose. I suggest that the words "under the Fences Act" be deleted, and then the Crown would be treated in the same way as any other purchaser of land.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There may be grounds for a case that this reserve land should be fenced along boundaries where it adjoins private property. If the land on the river bank is beautified, a common fence of the same construction would add to the aesthetic value, rather than each person erecting his own fence on the boundary.

The Act at present specifically prevents the purchaser from obtaining half the cost of his new back fence from the Crown, and he would have to erect it at his own cost. However, in the interests of the new beautification a common fence along the backyards of properties may be necessary to ensure the best beautification treatment. In that case the

Crown would not make any claim on the owner, but would be in the same position as the Education Department when it builds a cyclone fence around a school yard adjacent to private property. I think the aspect of the Crown having to erect a fence that it considers is necessary for beautification at Crown expense should be fully considered.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Under the Bill the Crown has the fullest authority to build a fence if it so desires, and clause 6 is inserted to spell out the court's finding in 1966. If the clause had not been included the matter might have to be reconsidered by the court, and perhaps the same ruling would be given. According to the people who drafted the Bill, clause 6 was included to spell this out. If a fence exists, compensation is payable under the Land Acquisition Act. However, if the area is to be set aside for a public purpose, such as a reserve, the Crown may decide not to fence it at the time of acquisition. That does not mean that the Crown does not have the right to fence the area if it wishes to do so. The point is that there is no liability on the Crown for fencing when such an area is set aside for public purposes. If clause 6 was removed, the whole thing would be thrown back into the melting pot.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It could again become a matter for challenge.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, and possibly the court would rule in the same way as it ruled in 1966.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: This is an interesting matter. It is possible that land acquired adjacent to the river bank will comprise land on which fencing already exists. I think it is quite clear that in those circumstances compensation is payable to the owner, under the provision of the Land Acquisition Act, for those fences that are acquired with the land. I do not think there is any problem in that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Would he get reinstatement as well? I think he would.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Presumably, most of the fences acquired would be demolished, anyway, if the land was going to be used for public recreational purposes. The original owner would have been compensated for the loss of those fences. Therefore, I do not think that is a matter that need concern us. On the other hand, the land may be unfenced, in which case two possibilities could arise. Either the Crown, as the new owner of the land, would want to fence a particular section of it to divide the land acquired from the land owned

by the previous holder, or the owner of the land would want his land fenced.

It seems clear that if the Crown wants to fence along the boundary of the land it has acquired there is nothing to stop it from doing so, as the Minister has said. It is perfectly legal for the Crown to erect a fence at its expense. However, I should like the Minister to tell me whether in those circumstances one-half of the cost can be recovered from the adjoining landowner. I am not sure what the position is. It seems obvious to me that if the landowner wishes to have a fence erected he has to erect it at his own expense, because under this Bill the Crown is exempted from the provisions of the Fences Act and therefore is not bound to make any contribution towards the cost of the fence. Section 31 of the Fences Act was probably the basis of the decision in the case referred to.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If the Crown erects a fence along the boundary of the land it acquires, that does not come within the Fences Act at all. The Crown would not have to pay half the cost of fencing erected by the adjoining owner.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Is it the position that the original owner cannot claim against the Crown?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is right.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think it is grossly unfair. I think the case decided was one in which a council was deemed not to be liable to an owner because it was a trustee for a reserve which was unalienated Crown land in the first place. The owner would have no rights whatsoever while that land was dedicated as a reserve, and he would have to bear the full cost of fencing.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is, if no fence had already been erected.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He would be entirely responsible for putting up a fence.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That happens now in the case of a private home.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Under the provisions of another Act, improvements are taken into account when assessing compensation for the acquisition of property. The fence in question might have been perfectly adequate for the purpose for which it was erected a long time before. We have never been given a clear picture of just what this land might be used for, and it is quite likely that a person will want to put up an adequate fence for protection. The Fences Act is very old, and it has not been looked at for a long time. I

venture to say that that Act did not envisage the sort of situation we are now discussing.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It needs looking at.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, very much. It is a completely new situation. We should make sure that the Crown and the councils are covered. Clause 6 is in the Bill; if it does not apply, we can write in the rule that Judge Walters pronounced in the case of a piece of reserve land that had been dedicated to a council.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—"Licence."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

To strike out "land acquired under this Act or" and "in or upon that land".

As far as I can see, this clause has been devised to give the Minister power to allow such bodies as the Adelaide City Council to make use of river water under licence, but I do not think it is appreciated that the whole of the park lands around Adelaide is watered from the River Torrens and there is no withdrawal of water from the public water supplies. However, the clause as drafted gives the Minister power to license any use of both the land and the water and it would be in order for a licensee to set up a gravel pit or a sand pit and build dams or anything that might enter into the politics of the moment.

The whole spirit and purpose of this Bill, as far as we can determine, is to keep this land as a beautiful reserve. This clause goes far beyond the intentions of the Bill. My amendment would have the effect of giving the Minister power to grant licences, at his discretion, for the use of water, with strictly limited licensing of the use of the land for other purposes.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think it desirable to alter the wording of the clause because, if it is altered as suggested, it will restrict the Minister in the use of the land. I do not deny it could be used for a gravel pit.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: It has been used for that in the past.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Everything that the Minister grants and all that the licensee may do will be set out in the licence. I do not think the Minister would permit him to open a gravel pit, because that would defeat the whole purpose of the Bill. In the circumstances, the licensee would have to be convinced that the Minister had licensed him to do what he wanted to do and that it was specifically set out in the licence issued to him. If the honourable member did not think that a licence issued by the Minister would cover

all these things, there would be some ground for his moving this amendment but, in the circumstances, it is necessary that the relevant words be retained. The licence issued would have all the necessary information written into it so that the licensee would know exactly what he could and could not do with the land.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: That reply makes me even more suspicious, because the Minister has not confirmed that the purpose of this clause is, primarily, the use of water. Therefore, I think it is necessary to limit the ambit of the clause strictly to water.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It is also in respect of land.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: No. As it reads, the Minister can grant a licence for use of water for any purpose whatsoever, at his discretion. The purpose of the clause is to allow the Minister to give licences to people like the Adelaide City Council to use water from the river. It is important that it still be retained as a purpose, but to take the licence beyond that is putting unlimited power into the hands of the Minister—for any purpose he likes. If we do not limit this power, a blinking freeway will be built!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I cannot help thinking that the whole clause means that the Minister does not intend to hand over the land to local government for beautification purposes at the earliest possible moment. I do not think the Minister should involve himself at all in granting licences for the land acquired or in granting licences for water to be used by any individual or interest.

The purpose for which the Minister buys land is simply to act as a common acquiring authority for all the land along the Torrens on either side of the city of Adelaide. The intention of this Bill is that, he having accomplished that purpose, his aim is fulfilled; and then, as soon as possible, he must transfer this land to the council concerned. It flows from that that it is that council's obligation to beautify that land. That is the sequence and that was the whole purpose of this Bill being prepared in the first place.

If after acquiring land for that purpose the Minister then decides he wants to issue licences for some of that land or to issue water licences to business interests or some institution, he is going further than the Bill intends. This is the principle that concerns me. I do not think this clause deals with the question of the Minister granting a licence to a council so that it can use the water for beautification purposes: that can be considered later when

the council, having the land in its own name and under its own control, sets about its plan for beautification.

If it wants to create dams and pools along the river and can use to advantage some of the water so stored for the river bank, it simply treats with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This Bill, if anything, encourages the Minister to hold on to the land after he has acquired it and to see that it is not used for purposes other than those intended. There is danger in having this clause in the Bill.

If the Minister has some evidence of examples where there is a need for the clause, further to the explanation that has been given, and if there are specific interests involved that he thinks need water for a certain period, the disclosure of that information may throw a different light on the matter. But as it stands, surely our intention is to see that the Minister, having acquired the land, shall pass it over to local government at the very earliest possible time. I am very doubtful that there is any need for us to become involved in granting the Minister the rights that the clause grants.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I tend to support the views put forward by the Hon. Mr. Kemp and the Hon. Mr. Hill. The Minister in his second reading explanation said:

Consequent upon this acquisition, the Minister is charged with the duty of performing such works as are necessary to ensure the unimpeded flow of waters over land acquired by him and with the duty of improving and beautifying the river. He may, however, transfer the acquired land to the care, control and management of the local council, in which event those duties are to be undertaken by that council.

However, this clause seems to contradict the underlying principle outlined in the second reading speech, that is, that the Minister may grant to any person a licence entitling him to exercise such rights in respect of the land acquired or the waters on that land as he thinks fit and may specify in the licence. Somewhere there seems to be a contradiction between the spirit of the second reading speech and the wording of the clause. I should like the Minister to give the Committee some information on this matter.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I read it, and as the Hon. Mr. Hill has said, this land will eventually revert to councils. However, that might be the case, but again it might not be the case. The second reading speech says that the Minister may transfer the acquired

land to the care, control and management of local government, not that he "shall".

The Hon. C. M. Hill: But you gave an undertaking that this would be done.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister does not have to do it; it does not say that he "shall" do it. He may do it in the future. He may want to transfer land to someone else who might be running stock in the area and requiring a watering point in the Gorge area. If the Minister does not grant a licence to the man asking for it and lay down certain things that shall and shall not be done, the man will not know where he is. There must be some latitude in this matter. I suggest that the honourable member have another look at the situation. It may be that the Minister may issue a licence to someone other than a council. This is why the licence clause has been included; so that we can lay down rules and regulations. If a man has sheep or cows in the vicinity of the river he should have unimpeded access to the river to water his stock.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving another amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

To strike out clause 7.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may not take that course of action. He may vote against the clause.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: May I give an explanation?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In clause 10, power is given to make regulations under the Act that will allow all of the requirements the Minister has detailed, so clause 7 now becomes redundant.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The Hon. Mr. Hill has introduced a point into the debate that is important. However, when one looks at the Bill's provisions and the second reading explanation one wonders whether or not the Hon. Mr. Hill really has any warrant for suggesting that the statement was made that the Government intended to be merely an acquiring agency for the purpose of handing the land over immediately to local government. If this is so, it seems that clause 7 becomes unnecessary. If this is not so, and if the Government intends to delay the handing over of this land, or in some circumstances does not intend to hand it over to local government, clause 7 becomes necessary because it is essential that the Government be able to grant a licence. Clause 5 is one of the main parts

of the Bill. It is necessary for the Minister to grant a licence for the purposes set out in clause 5.

Reference was made to a sand or gravel pit. It might be necessary for someone to remove sand from a spot in the river to ensure that the water flow will be unimpeded. If land is beautified and remains vested in the Crown it might be necessary for the Minister to grant a licence to an organization to run a picnic or to sell liquor on a section of the beautified land.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Where is "beautified" mentioned?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: That word has been used.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Only in debate.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes. The word used in the Bill is "improvement". However, we have worked on the assumption that this improvement was by way of beautification. It seems that any step towards improvement or ensuring the unimpeded flow of water would involve the granting of a licence to workmen or contractors to carry out this work. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Hill that if the Crown is to be only an acquiring authority and the land is transferred immediately to a council, the council would be in a position to grant licences. From what I understand, it was never said that this would be done. It is only in some circumstances (perhaps in most circumstances) that the land is to be transferred to local government. It may well be that the actual transfer would be effected after certain works had been done by the Minister. In those circumstances, the retention of clause 7 may be very necessary.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I want to take the Minister up on his reference to the earlier debate on this matter and in connection with his reference to "may". He said a moment ago that earlier he had not said "shall". Previously during the Committee stage the Minister said:

Regarding the question of the word "may", I point out that the Government does not intend to hold on to this land: the only reason why the word "may" is included is that the councils may not want the land. If the word "shall" were included, the Government might be obliged to dispose of it to a body that did not want it. I hope my explanation satisfies the honourable member.

In reply, I said:

I accept the Minister's assurance (and I should not have to draw it out of him as a dentist draws out a tooth) that the Government does not intend to retain the land. I think that is what he said.

The Minister replied:

Yes.

I then said:

This is the assurance that I was wanting the Government to give. I believe that one should not have to go to such lengths to draw such an assurance from the Government when an honourable member in good faith seeks that assurance during the second reading debate. I thank the Minister for the assurance he has given.

Despite what he said earlier, this point has come subsequent to that and the Minister has given an assurance that at the earliest possible time the land will be transferred to local government. If it is to go to local government and if the only purpose for the Minister's being involved at all is to act as a common body to acquire compulsorily the whole of the land concerned, there is no reason for clause 7 to be in the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I hate to disagree with the honourable member, but he is playing on words. It is only natural that this land could go to councils eventually. The whole point is that it could be a long time before that took place. It is the Government's policy that this land will inevitably be handed over to councils. That is its obligation.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: How silly can you get!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: A person may say in the morning that he plans to do a certain job in the afternoon, but he does not do that job because something else crops up in the meantime. To play on words is absolutely ridiculous.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member is trying to say that I have given an unqualified guarantee that the Government will hand over the land immediately, but I have not said that at all. The Government does want councils to look after the improvements to this area, but there is a limit to what we

can expect. Circumstances may arise where the council may not want it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The councils initiated the whole move.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They may be quite justified in wanting it now, but later there may be a small section of land that they do not want, and the Government may be left with it.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I think the Minister was rather closer to the mark in some of the sentences in his last reply. In recent years acquisitions of land by various authorities have been made when land has become available and it has been held against the implementation of a plan. While these properties are being held they are put to other uses. I can visualize the position where land is acquired along the river up to the top of the bank and it can easily happen that that land is being used by adjoining landholders for watering stock and other purposes. Until the land is required for the actual works proposed, such uses may be sensible. This is a fairly logical explanation.

In connection with clause 10, regulation is a somewhat clumsy method of handling small portions of land. If we are to pass this Bill at all, I fail to see that clause 7 is very damaging in the powers it gives. Surely, if the Government is going to acquire the land and if it is restricted in the further use it can make of it (because of amendments made earlier by this Committee), we are not giving excessive powers to the Government if we approve this provision, which deals with the granting of a licence by the Minister.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 10) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 20, at 2.15 p.m.