

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 24, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**VOTING**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about voting? At the time I asked my question on this matter, there were other questions on it from other honourable members. With the concurrence of those members, I ask the Chief Secretary to reply to all the questions.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to deal with all the questions if the honourable members concerned are happy about that arrangement. The Attorney-General has supplied me with details of voting at by-elections for the House of Assembly over the past 12 years, and the percentage vote in periodical and general elections since 1959. No details are available in regard to the size of the donkey vote in relation to compulsory voting. As the tables are quite lengthy, I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

PERCENTAGE VOTE AT HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY BY-ELECTIONS SINCE 1959

Date	House of Assembly District	Percentage of enrolled electors who voted
23/4/60	Light	92.30
5/11/60	Frome	88.78
15/12/62	Mount Gambier	93.91
9/2/63	Yorke Peninsula	93.98
28/9/63	Stirling	93.53
3/10/64	Semaphore	77.75
22/6/68	Millicent	97.41
3/7/71	Adelaide	74.29

The following table gives details of percentage votes in periodical and general elections since 1959:

Date	House	Percentage of enrolled electors who voted
7/3/59	House of Assembly (31 districts contested)	93.95
	Legislation Council (Northern and Central No. 2 contested)	81.14
3/3/62	House of Assembly (31 districts contested)	93.98
	Legislative Council (Central No. 2, Midland and Northern contested)	83.56
6/3/65	House of Assembly (36 districts contested)	94.59
	Legislative Council (Central No. 1, Central No. 2, Midland and Northern contested)	80.22
2/8/68	House of Assembly (All 39 districts contested)	94.48
	Legislative Council (All districts contested)	95.15
30/5/70	House of Assembly (47 districts contested)	95.03

Details of the Referendum (Metropolitan Area Shop Trading Hours) are as follows:

Date	Percentage of enrolled electors who voted
19/9/70	Referendum 89.18

No details are available in regard to the size of the donkey vote in relation to compulsory voting.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In reply to the Hon. Mr. Banfield, the Attorney-General has supplied me with figures on the percentages of polls conducted for House of Assembly and

Legislative Council elections held on the same day, as well as the percentages of polls conducted at by-elections over the same period. As the figures are in tabular form, I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

PERCENTAGES OF POLLS

Date	House	Percentage of enrolled electors who voted
3/3/56	House of Assembly (23 districts contested)	93.90
	Legislative Council (Northern District only contested)	69.69
7/3/59	House of Assembly (31 districts contested)	93.95
	Legislative Council (Northern and Central No. 2 contested)	81.14
3/3/62	House of Assembly (31 districts contested)	93.98
	Legislative Council (Central No. 2, Midland and Northern contested)	83.56
6/3/65	House of Assembly (36 districts contested)	94.59
	Legislative Council (Central No. 1, Central No. 2, Midland and Northern contested)	80.22
2/8/68	House of Assembly (All 39 districts contested)	94.48
	Legislative Council (All districts contested)	95.15
30/5/70	House of Assembly (47 districts contested)	95.03

The percentages of electors enrolled, who voted at Legislative Council by-elections for the same period are as follows:

Date	Legislative Council District By-election	Percentage of enrolled electors who voted
16/9/61	Central No. 1	7.32
20/10/62	Midland	43.38
15/12/62	Southern	34.18
4/12/65	Central No. 2	43.71
29/10/66	Northern	46.47
12/9/70	Midland	39.22
3/7/71	Southern	32.14

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In reply to the Hon. Mr. Cameron, the Attorney-General has supplied me with details of numbers of people prosecuted for not voting in the last five general elections and the shopping hours referendum, and also the number of people who did not

vote. Information regarding elections in Great Britain is not available. As the statistics are in tabular form, I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

ELECTORS FAILING TO VOTE

Year	Electors who appeared to have failed to vote	Electors prosecuted in general elections pursuant to Sec. 118a of the Electoral Act. This column includes prosecutions <i>re</i> sec. 118a (11) <i>a</i> and <i>b</i>	Numbers of cases of penalty imposed by Returning Officer for the State for failure to vote, etc., <i>vide</i> Regs. 44 and 45
1959	25,809	Figures not available, but summonses issued would be about 20	N/a
1962	26,735	As for 1959	N/a
1965		18 names were submitted to the Crown Solicitor, but only 13 court prosecutions were successful	687
1968	33,678	No prosecutions appear to have been instituted in the courts	200
1970	31,581	111 names were referred to the Crown Solicitor for prosecution. No details of the results are available	138
1970 (Referendum)	50,181	197 names were referred to the Crown Solicitor for action pursuant to section 13 of the Referendum (Metropolitan Area Shop Trading Hours) Act, 1970. It is understood that a number of summonses have been served in the Holden Hill area. The remainder are now in the course of service by the police	117

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In reply to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, I point out that enrolment on the Legislative Council electoral roll and voting at Legislative Council elections are voluntary. Enrolment for the House of Assembly is voluntary, but once enrolled voting is compulsory. At present 390,411 electors are enrolled as entitled to vote at Legislative Council elections.

In reply to the Hon. Mr. Story, I point out that House of Assembly enrolment is not made compulsory by either the Constitution Act or the Electoral Act. Once enrolled pursuant to the Electoral Act, an elector is required to vote in House of Assembly elections pursuant to section 118a of the Electoral Act. The Commonwealth Electoral Act makes enrolment compulsory. An arrangement between the Governor of South Australia and the Governor-General dated January 7, 1925, (and as amended on June 10, 1925) provided for an enrolment form to be used jointly for Commonwealth enrolment and House of Assembly enrolment. House of Assembly enrolment is not compulsory, and the statement on the claim form concerning House of Assembly may be deleted by an elector who is enrolling. Enrolment for the Legislative Council is voluntary. A separate claim form for the Legislative Council enrolment is used.

TON MILE TAX

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In March last, in reply to a question regarding road maintenance tax and its possible abolition, the Minister replied that a committee was then investigating the method of collecting tax and various other aspects of road transport. When will the committee table its findings, and does it intend to take evidence in country areas?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply when it is available.

FAMILY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on July 29 regarding the minimum age at which a girl may seek treatment at the Family Planning Association's clinics?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The aim and policy of the Family Planning Association is to provide advice and practical help to

married couples who are seeking to plan their families in an orderly manner. From time to time medical officers attending the clinic are consulted by young persons who are not married and who may or may not have reached the age of 17 years. Circumstances differ widely, and medical officers' opinions vary, but the usual practice in such cases is to advise these young people of the physical, mental and social dangers of any promiscuity. Where a young person is nevertheless determined to enter into sexual relationships, or is already doing so, many doctors consider it wiser to give contraceptive advice than to refuse this, thereby increasing the risk of unwanted pregnancy in a person ill-equipped to face it.

VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe the Minister is well aware of the very urgent situation prevailing at Virginia, which has been presented by my colleagues and myself in this place, and by the member for Goyder in another place. My question relates to the projected soil tests to be carried out in that area by the Department of Agriculture, either in association with or for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and which are expected to take up to three years to complete. Information received recently from the district and from other sources leads me to believe that these tests have not even been started. I believe the Minister is impressed by the great urgency of the case presented to him. Is it a fact that the tests have not yet been started? If that is the case, when are they to start, and will the Minister do his best, in view of the great urgency of the situation in that district, to expedite the matter?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain the information for the honourable member and bring it back to him as soon as possible.

HILLS TRAFFIC

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Last week we had in the Adelaide Hills probably the heaviest fogs that have been experienced for a long time, and it is manifest that many people using

the roads under these conditions are not aware of the law that requires headlights to be switched on and not just side lights. This is giving rise to a very dangerous position, because this section of the road that is subject to fog is also speed zoned up to 50 miles an hour. Can publicity be given, particularly to people in the Adelaide area, to the fact that headlights must be on full when travelling in fog? Also, will the Government consider imposing an upper speed limit under foggy conditions that will override the speed zoning in operation in this area?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will bring the honourable member's suggestion to the notice of my colleague for his consideration.

YORKE PENINSULA HOSPITALS

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Recently I asked a question of the Chief Secretary concerning Yorke Peninsula hospitals. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The committee to inquire into hospital services in the Kadina-Wallaroo-Moonta area has submitted its report, which has been considered by the Government. Hospital projects, both current and in the immediate future, will require all available Loan funds, and for this reason the Government has made no decision at this stage to implement the committee's report. Appropriate upgrading work at Wallaroo and Kadina will be authorized in due course.

SOCIAL WORKERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the possibility of social workers being employed by Government departments to assist people who must re-establish themselves as a result of their houses being compulsorily acquired?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport has indicated that at the end of January, 1971, he made a press statement in connection with the Government's acceptance of the Breuning report and included in that press statement was a reference to the matter raised by the honourable member. The Minister indicated that a Re-housing Compensation Committee would be included in legislation that the Government intends to introduce this session and that this committee would have the authority to deal with resettlement of families who suffer because their home is required by society. As stated, it is expected that the Bill will be introduced this session, when full details will be announced.

WHEAT

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it is a fact that South Australia is to receive a quota for hard wheat? If it is, can he tell the Council what the quota is and the areas of the State where it will apply? Can he also say whether the quotas will be allocated by the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee or the Wheat Deliveries Review Committee?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I join with the honourable member in hoping sincerely that South Australia will get a hard wheat quota. I have raised this question several times at Agricultural Council meetings, and it was only at the last such meeting that I received the full support of all the other Ministers for the suggestion that South Australia should be granted a hard wheat quota. Of course, this is outside the scope of the Agricultural Council, being a matter for the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation. I understand the next meeting will take place in September. I certainly hope that our delegates to that meeting will be able to put a case that will be beneficial to South Australia and that we shall be granted a hard wheat quota. Exactly how this will evolve and be distributed we do not yet know. Perhaps we can first wait and see whether we get this hard wheat quota, and carry on from there.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In the wheat stabilization legislation we have legislation unique for agriculture demanded by growers and left in their control. It has, I think, become an increasing worry for growers that gradually this control seems to be drifting away from them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are talking about the wheat delivery scheme, not stabilization?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The wheat quotas. This has been a matter of considerable worry to many of our constituents, that gradually control seems to be drifting away from them. Can the Minister say whether there has been a change in the policy of the Government, that the administration of this Act is to be abrogated to the appointed committees, or is the control to be left with the advisory committee that originally took the responsibility?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not quite get the tenor of the honourable member's question. It has always been the policy, of

this Government at least, not to interfere with the advisory committee's deliberations. That has been forcibly demonstrated over the last two seasons. I myself do not wish to interfere. I believe that the growers have done an excellent job in handling the affairs of their industry right through the Australian Wheat Federation throughout the States. I should be reluctant to indicate to this Government that any steps should be taken to interfere with the present system.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I draw the Minister's attention to an article dealing with the Government's plans regarding wheat, which appeared in the press just prior to the last election, part of which is as follows:

Labor would study the possible advantages of allowing the transfer by choice of wheat quotas by individual farmers. This would be on an annual basis by private negotiation.

It could allow smaller farmers to change their main unit of production economically, and larger farmers to operate more efficiently. The exchange would not affect continuing allocations.

Many people in the farming community remember this statement, and are concerned about the Government's policy regarding the transfer of allocations under wheat quotas. Can the Minister therefore say whether the Government has a policy on this matter and, if it has, when it intends to implement that policy?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The whole matter of the transfer of quotas was examined by the committee of inquiry that I set up last year to investigate the problems facing the wheat industry, and when that committee's report was handed to me I forwarded it on to the advisory committee for its comments. I also made it available to Professor Jarrett of the University of Adelaide, who was on the inquiry committee, to put the case regarding the transfer of quotas to the advisory committee. This has been done, and the committee has decided not to take any action at this stage. However, the door is still open for this to happen, if the committee decides to do something along these lines. There is no binding Government policy on this matter, which will be entirely one for the committee to handle.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Minister for his reply to my question on the transferability of wheat quotas. It appears from that reply that the Government does not intend to alter the present Act without the agreement of the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee. Can the Minister say whether the Government intends introducing legislation to alter the composition of the committee?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. However, if the committee wants to have its composition altered, I shall be happy to look at the situation. The industry has handled the job reasonably well and, if it proceeds along the same lines in the future, I am sure that everything will be fair and above board. I do not wish to interfere in the matter.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am sure that most honourable members will be pleased to hear that, in connection with changes in legislation, the Minister intends to be guided by the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee. Can the Minister say what is the Government's intention regarding the future of the Wheat Deliveries Review Committee; what is the future of the joint committee that fixes the contingency reserve; and what is the Government's intention regarding quotas in respect of individual short-falls?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The question of short-falls is a matter for recommendation by the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee. This has been the situation ever since quotas were introduced.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The change in quotas due to short-fall.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is still a question for the advisory committee to determine. The future of the review committee will depend entirely on whether or not that committee is satisfied (and I might add that this committee was set up under the Act) that all people who wish to do so have appealed against their quotas and that the whole of the wheat industry had reached a common denominator. When this position is reached, there is no reason why the committee could not be terminated.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: That would be a long way away, wouldn't it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Possibly it could be cleared up this season, because the contingency reserve of 700,000bush. fixed last year took care of many appeals. This year, in its letters to me, the review committee has indicated that it is quite possible that any appeals that should have been heard last year, and for which application has again been made this year, will be the final appeals to be made. Here again, I would have to be guided by the review committee on these matters.

PASTORAL LEASES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand the Minister of Lands now has a reply to a question I asked him about a certain statement made in another place about the closing of some pastoral leases for regeneration.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Environment and Conservation has advised me that in his initial reply to a similar question he was asked in another place he said that the matter was under consideration. The Pastoral Board has pointed out that it must be realized that the honourable member has based his question on a reply given in another place by the Minister of Environment and Conservation on the basis that he said that a study was being made into closing down pastoral leases. The Minister said, not that a study was being made into the closing for 20 years of some pastoral leases but that the matter was under consideration along with many other matters referred to him by many people interested in conservation.

NURIOOTPA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. L. R. HART: I understand the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, has a reply to my recent question about the Nuriootpa Primary School.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Education, has advised me that the current planning for the replacement of Nuriootpa Primary School envisages that tenders will be called towards the end of 1972 with an estimated availability date of June, 1974. This means that funds will first be required during the 1972-73 financial year. The project, therefore, does not appear in the Loan Estimates for 1971-72. However, these dates are tentative and subject to the availability of funds.

BIRDSVILLE TRACK

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 10 regarding the allocation of

Commonwealth money spent on the Birdsville track?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague reports that the total expenditure on the upgrading of the Birdsville-Marree Road to June 30, 1971, was \$513,529, of which the Commonwealth Government has paid \$300,000 in accordance with the State Grants (Beef Cattle Roads) Act, 1968.

ABATTOIRS

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether an industrial dispute arose at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board works at Gepps Cross last week, resulting in a stoppage and, if so, what were the reasons for the dispute and the means by which it was settled?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I understand that there was a stoppage (I do not think it was of a long duration) at the abattoirs last Friday afternoon, and that the matter was settled the following day by the board in collaboration with the unions concerned. I think the matter was resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I thank the Minister for his reply to my question. I believe there has been an understanding between the unions and the board that any matter concerning the employees' welfare will be treated by conciliation. Can the Minister say whether the matters of additional annual leave and a week's pay and also an extension of sick leave entitlement were concluded because of Government intervention?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Government's policy is to grant Government employees four weeks' annual leave and 80 hours' sick leave. Those benefits have been granted to Government workers in other State instrumentalities, and the Gepps Cross abattoir falls within this ambit. They were granted to the employees there because of the Government's policy.

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: The Minister has said that abattoir employees are virtually Government employees. I find that very interesting. If I understand the situation correctly, the Government has absolutely no control over the affairs of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, except that it has lent much money to

that instrumentality. When I recently asked the Minister whether a guarantee had been given that the killing charge would not be increased as a result of the Government's loan, the Minister assured me that no tags were attached to it. As the Minister would say, one cannot have it both ways. However, I believe that, in his reply, he is trying to have it both ways. Can the Minister say whether I have been correctly informed when I say that, within 24 hours of a demand being made to the board, four weeks' annual leave and five weeks' pay were granted, and a \$5 wage increase was recommended to be put to the appropriate tribunal? Is it a fact that the employees received those additional benefits by Government direction?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: In the first place, honourable members often refer to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board as a public utility. This means that it comes under the responsibility of the Government to see that everything is carried out and is beneficial to the people who put their stock through the abattoir. It is not a private instrumentality. I do not know where the honourable member got his information about four weeks' annual leave and five weeks' pay. I do not know whether the board has granted those benefits, but I will check up to see what the board has done in that connection. I do not know whether the board has granted a \$5 wage increase. However, I would think it would be a matter for conciliation. As I said to the Hon. Mr. Russack, it is Government policy to grant to workers in Government instrumentalities (and I classify the abattoir as a Government instrumentality, because it is a public utility) four weeks' annual leave and 80 hours' sick pay.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Is it not a fact that the sick leave entitlement to abattoir employees at present is not much greater than that of employees of any other Government instrumentality?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think the entitlement is 40 hours; that entitlement applies to many other instrumentalities in the State.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister assure the Council that he will not approve any regulations made by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board to increase killing charges? It is possible that if the board is

involved in making increased payments to its employees it may have to increase killing charges to compensate for the increased costs involved. I direct this question to the Minister of Health because in a recent Ministerial statement the Minister of Agriculture said that all regulations made by the board were subject to the approval of the Central Board of Health and confirmation by the Governor in Council, and when so confirmed and published in the *Government Gazette* they then have the force and effect of law. On that basis, I assume that regulations made by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board come under the perusal of the Minister of Health, and I seek the Minister's assurance that he will not grant any increased killing charges that may be requested by the board.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have no control or direction over the Central Board of Health. It is not for me to give an assurance. It will have to be a Cabinet decision, not mine.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will the Minister say which Minister of the Crown, on the direction of Cabinet or otherwise, assured the union that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board would meet the demands of the union in order to enable a return to work last Thursday? I believe that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board has a policy of very long standing regarding employees, and it has always negotiated with them. To the best of my knowledge, the board has not met since the dispute occurred, but the men have returned to work. Did the Minister and the Government assure the union that the demands of its members would be met?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Some loaded questions are being asked this afternoon. I can give the honourable member a specific reply now: I did not issue any instructions to the union. I have never spoken to the union on this matter. I cannot speak for other members of Cabinet but, if the honourable member would like me to ask each individual Minister, I should be quite happy to do so. However, I do not see that it has anything to do with the situation. If any approach were made, the parties involved would probably be the union and me, as Minister of Agriculture. I can assure the honourable member that I did not at any stage contact the union along these lines.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will the Minister obtain for me a factual report from the board on the circumstances leading up to the stoppage on Wednesday last which was satisfactorily negotiated, as I understand it, on Thursday last? I should like a factual report on the circumstances leading up to it and the way in which negotiations for the men to return to work were accomplished.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will endeavour to get the information for the honourable member and bring it back as soon as possible.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister of Health say to which Minister the Central Board of Health is responsible?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: To my knowledge, none.

ABORTIONS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: As I am extremely concerned (and I know many other people are, too) about the figures published in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding the big increase in the number of abortions that have been conducted in South Australia, will the Chief Secretary say whether the Government is considering tightening up the Act so that the number of abortions will not increase any further?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I should like to clarify my position on this unsavoury matter. The legislation permitting abortions to take place in this State was introduced not by either political Party but by a private member. I think all members are concerned about what is taking place. The Government has not considered introducing an amendment to the Act. It is a matter that concerns the social conscience of every honourable member. Any member has the right to do something about it if he so desires.

ROAD EXPENDITURE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the sum that councils were granted for roadworks from the Highways Fund for the year ended June 30, 1971, and the estimated comparable figure for the current financial year?

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

The total expenditure by councils of Highways Department road funds during the financial year 1970-71 was \$8,715,900, and the proposed allocation to local authorities during the current financial year is \$10,000,000.

BUMPER BAR

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On August 6 an article appeared in an Adelaide paper concerning a safety bumper bar which, it was claimed, was being introduced in America and which was to be incorporated in all 1973 model cars produced in America. The bumper bar is an impact-absorbing bar attached to the vehicle by a system of springs. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether the Australian Transport Advisory Council has considered such a feature for Australian-made cars, and, if it has, whether a design rule has been formulated, and when can we expect this requirement to be lawful in Australia? Secondly, if the council has not yet considered this safety feature, will the Minister ask his colleague to put the question to the council on behalf of South Australia when next it meets?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and to bring back a reply when it is available.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Elizabeth Occupation Centre,
Port Lincoln High School (Replacement).

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For some years it has been customary for Parliament to approve two Supply Bills so that the current financial commitments of the Government may be met during the period between July 1 and the assent to the Appropriation Bill following the Budget debate. The Supply Act approved by Parliament in April last provides authority to the extent of \$60,000,000, and, as was expected, it will suffice to cover ordinary day-to-day expenditures from Revenue Account until the end of this month. It is desirable now for Parliament to consider a second Supply Bill to give authority that may suffice until the

Appropriation Bill becomes effective, probably late in October.

This Bill, for \$40,000,000, is the same in all respects as the second Supply Act passed in 1970-71. Together with the \$60,000,000 of the first Supply Act for 1971-72, it will give a total of \$100,000,000 to meet the normal running expenses of the Government. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$40,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries and wages that may be awarded by a wage-fixing body. I submit the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill, because I know it is absolutely essential that it be supported. Anything I did to upset the Bill would not be supported by my colleagues, because they always realize their responsibilities. For many years it has been the custom of Parliament to consider two Supply Bills, one of which relates to the period prior to the passing of the main Supply Bill. The sum provided in this Bill would at one time have been regarded as a huge sum. When I was first a member, the value of all the projects proposed in such a Bill was less than the sum provided in this Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You must have been pretty expensive then.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have seen under two successive Labor Governments this position drift most seriously, as the Hon. Mr. Banfield has pointed out. It seems inevitable that it will not be long before the people will change that situation and we will get back to stability—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But the increase in the costs of government will go on just the same.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —and the Hon. Mr. Banfield will not reach the front benches, as he hopes to do. Clause 1 is formal; clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$40,000,000; and clause 3 provides that payments are not to exceed last year's Estimates in certain respects. For instance, the payment of any increase in salaries and wages that may be awarded by wage-fixing bodies may be made. The whole thing is covered by Statute. We may not always accept as correct what the courts award, but we accept the principle of arbitration and, therefore, as this whole matter is guarded by Statute and by the courts, and provided it is done by the courts, I think Parliament has no objection whatsoever. I therefore support the Bill.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 19. Page 929.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill and the second reading explanation set out the Loan programme to be followed for 1971-72. I think the first point that needs emphasizing (and this is very clear from both the second reading explanation and the Treasurer's statement) is the impact which has been made on the funds available and which will eventually be made on the Budget by the changes taking place in Commonwealth-State financial arrangements. I think that is one of the outstanding points one can see in the presentation to this Council of the second reading explanation and the paper accompanying that document. On page 4 of Parliamentary Paper 11A the following appears:

Turning now to the volume of new funds expected to become available towards financing a capital works programme in 1971-72, I report that at the meeting of Loan Council in June last the Commonwealth agreed to support a total programme of \$860,000,000 for all State works and housing purposes. This figure is an increase of \$37,000,000, only 4½ per cent above the 1970-71 total of \$823,000,000, which included a special \$3,000,000 for Western Australia. Excluding that special \$3,000,000, which is not repeated this year, the increase is just under 5 per cent. South Australia's share of the total determined is \$117,900,000, which is \$5,480,000 above the allocation of \$112,420,000 for 1970-71. Under the new arrangements agreed between the States and the Commonwealth in June, 1970, and reported to the House 12 months ago, \$28,760,000 of our allocation is by way of grant, free of interest and repayment, and \$89,140,000 by way of loan, subject as in the past to payment of interest and sinking fund. One sees that there is a Commonwealth allocation of nearly \$29,000,000 to the State by way of grant, free of interest and free of repayment, and I think that anyone who looks at this will realize that it will eventually have a marked effect on the Budget of the State. Although I have certain views that I have expressed before in this place on this matter, I think we can extend our congratulations to the Commonwealth Government on this occasion. Although I have these reservations, we can at least say that the Commonwealth is adopting a more realistic attitude in relation to State finances.

The allocation last year was \$112,420,000, and this year it is \$117,900,000, an increase of about \$5,500,000. However, \$28,760,000 is by way of grant, free of interest and repayment,

and \$89,140,000 is by way of loan, subject to the payment of interest and sinking fund. The balance held in the Loan Account at the end of the last financial year was \$14,800,000. When one adds to that the new funds available of \$117,900,000 and the expected recoveries, one sees that there is available in the Loan Account this year a total of \$156,200,000.

These Estimates before us cover a total of \$141,400,000. Therefore, the Government is looking for a surplus in the Loan Account at the end of this financial year of about \$15,000,000. Although the Loan Estimates and the Budget are quite separate, they cannot be totally divorced, because one definitely has an effect on the other. Over the years we have seen a change in policy, with Loan funds being used for purposes for which they were not used in years gone by.

As Parliamentary Paper 11A points out, the revenue deficit over the last five or six years up to the present time is \$4,579,000. The Council will recall that the big reduction in the total revenue deficit of the State was made in the years 1968-70 when the Hall L.C.L. Government was in power. When the Government changed in 1968, it inherited a substantial revenue deficit, which was reduced to about \$4,500,000 by 1970. It is reasonable for the Government to hold in reserve Loan funds to cover revenue deficits. If my memory serves me correctly, in the 1968-69 Budget about \$12,000,000 was held in the Loan Fund to cover existing deficits.

It is perfectly reasonable that a Government should do that when it inherits a large revenue deficit. But, with the present situation and the improvement in the Commonwealth-State agreement, I am not quite sure why the present Government sees a need to budget for an excess of \$15,000,000 in its Loan Account. As I have pointed out, the present accumulated revenue deficit totals \$4,579,000 as opposed to almost \$10,000,000 in 1968. I understand that the reason why in 1968 the Loan Estimates catered for a surplus in Loan Account was to cover the existing deficit, but I am not sure why at present with the other factors bearing upon it the Government should anticipate carrying forward a surplus of some \$15,000,000 in Loan Account.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Don't forget the Government is buying that A.N.Z. Bank building.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is nothing on the present Loan Estimates for doing that, but in this situation (and I think the Ministers would possibly agree with me on this) the

suspicion arises in the minds of honourable members that the Government may be anticipating a further large revenue deficit. If that is the intention, I should like the Government to indicate to this Council that that is the reason but I cannot see any logical reason why, when there are matters needing urgent attention, we should at this stage be holding in our Loan Account about \$15,000,000.

I shall now deal briefly with some of the allocations of funds that have been made for certain purposes. First, I will deal with allocations to various hospital works. On page 9 of Parliamentary Paper No. 11 there is a list of hospital buildings totalling \$11,950,000. Although we approve of the money being spent on many of these hospitals—the Royal Adelaide, the Queen Elizabeth, Glenside, Hillcrest, Strathmont, and Modbury Hospitals, and so on down the list—there appear to me to be some omissions from that list. The Chief Secretary may be able to supply to the Council the reasons why some hospitals are not included in these Loan Estimates.

The first one is the new teaching hospital associated with Flinders University. The previous Government placed a high priority on that project. There is no need for me to present the reasons why that was so; the concept of that hospital is most exciting. I understand it is the first teaching hospital in Australia to be sited within the confines of a university. The design and teaching philosophy of the hospital will place it in the forefront of teaching hospitals not only in Australia but also in other parts of the world. The Chief Secretary may correct me on this but, as I understand it, the hospital should be ready for teaching purposes or for medical students by 1975.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: As I understand it, 1975-76.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. I think the teaching should begin for the three years in the first part of the medical course.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have been told we are ahead of schedule. There must be provision for it somewhere in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is why I am directing your attention to this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will try to get the details.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have drawn attention to it because it may have been overlooked.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Planning is proceeding and is ahead of schedule. I have been told that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I would appreciate information on that and hope that the Chief Secretary will be able to provide it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: As a matter of fact, a committee of the top three people is convened for next Tuesday to decide the next step.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am pleased to hear that because I know that honourable members would be concerned if the teaching hospital was not ready to take medical students in 1976. I believe that the first students emerging from hospital training should be in 1979. The pre-clinical years can be done without an established hospital but, after that, a teaching hospital is required. I should have thought that somewhere in this year's Loan Estimates money would be available for that purpose.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The money may be allocated under "Education".

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It could well be. I refer now to another matter in respect of which there is probably money on the Loan Estimates—the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I have always had the idea that, as far as the teaching hospital at Flinders University is concerned, the one thing that will be required is a paediatric unit in relation to teaching. In this regard, I suggest the Adelaide Children's Hospital be expanded to take control of and run the paediatric section of the teaching hospital at Flinders University. I do not think one can have anything but praise for the way in which that hospital operates. It occupies an important position in our teaching hospital system.

I should like to see the concept of a separate children's hospital under a separate board of management also developed in relation to the Flinders University teaching hospital. Anyway, I hope that in reply the Chief Secretary will be able to give us a little more information on that. Perhaps, as he indicated, the appropriation of the Loan funds for this purpose comes under the line "other hospital buildings". I see, too, that the sum of \$4,500,000 is provided to continue work on the first stage of the new Modbury Hospital (comprising 250 beds) which, I understand, is eventually to have 400 beds. I should like now to refer to the time lag that can occur in the construction of hospitals. We are now in the 1971-72 financial year, and the Flinders teaching hospital will be required by 1975. Many members will remember the promise made in 1965 regarding the Modbury Hospital, which is still not completed. On this score alone, therefore, some interest in this matter is warranted.

I should like also to refer to one or two other matters regarding hospitals, the first of which is the cost of providing hospital beds in some areas, a matter about which I am concerned. I do not want anyone to think from what I say that I am opposed to the excellent work being done by the Home for Incurables; nor am I criticizing the work done at any subsidized hospitals. However, I draw honourable members' attention to the Treasurer's statement regarding the Home for Incurables, which appears at page 15 of his explanation, as follows:

The Government proposes to meet the full building cost of \$11,000,000 for the expansion programme spread over several years; 400 additional beds will double the present accommodation; the sum of \$800,000 is provided so that construction may commence this year.

I would be the first to praise the work done at the Home for Incurables. However, honourable members should take note that 400 additional beds are being provided. One can say that, although they are not expensive beds by comparison with those in a hospital accommodating acute cases, the cost of providing 400 additional beds still works out to about \$30,000 a bed. This is a matter that must engage the attention of every member in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That isn't exactly correct, you know, because they are demolishing one ward, and are then rebuilding it and bringing it up to standard. The cost of 400 beds is included in the whole cost to which you are referring, so it is hardly a fair comparison.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realize that. I think the Chief Secretary would appreciate that I am well acquainted with this programme. Nevertheless, it must concern every member when he sees the provision of additional beds costing about \$30,000 each. I refer also to the Keith Hospital, another project with which I am familiar. In this respect, the Treasurer stated:

The Government is providing subsidies towards the cost of increasing the bed capacity of this hospital from 33 to 52 beds.

That is an increase of 19 beds. The Treasurer continued:

The estimated total cost is \$650,000, and a subsidy of \$320,000 is proposed for this year.

That sum is only for the provision of extra beds. There may be other upgradings of services, but the cost in respect of this hospital is once more over \$30,000 a bed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Why don't you get on to the worst one of them all—the one up the river?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the Chief Secretary is probably referring to the Barmera Hospital, which is in a slightly different situation. It is being completely rebuilt, with all services and nurses' accommodation being provided. The total cost of that 44-bed hospital, with nurses' quarters and all services provided, is \$1,250,000, or slightly under \$30,000 a bed. However, if one compares this with other hospitals, which are just being extended and in which no services are being provided—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think you will find that there is also an extension of services there, which costs money.

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

The Hon. A. J. Shard: However, I do not detract from the fact that the cost of hospital beds is frightening. The Government agrees on that point.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In drawing these comparisons I have selected the most expensive schemes involved. Although at the Home for Incurables and at the Keith Hospital only extensions of existing accommodation are occurring, the beds are still costing about \$30,000 each. I do not oppose these schemes but merely draw this aspect to the attention of honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can't get hospital beds on the cheap today.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is correct. In many of these extensions to existing hospitals, particularly when in some cases they are not necessarily hospitals dealing with acute illnesses which require the provision of expensive facilities, the cost of providing amenities to the community appears to be rapidly escalating.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Is this work being done by the Public Buildings Department or by contract?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the Home for Incurables and the hospitals at Barmera and Keith are all being done by contract.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: Isn't it true that one of the most expensive services is the human service?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is so, especially when a special adviser is called in. There are other matters that interest me a great deal, such as the allocations to the Mines Department and to the Police Department for new buildings. I should like to compliment the Governments that have been in office for the last few years on the improvements that have

been made throughout South Australia in the facilities made available to the Police Force and, indeed, the improvements that have been made in the court facilities in country areas. I am pleased to see that the programme this year also caters for police stations throughout the State that need upgrading. I refer now to the festival theatre, which was virtually brought into being by the previous Government. In this respect, the Treasurer said:

In addition to the normal annual appropriation of \$900,000 towards the theatre, a contribution of \$800,000 is appropriated in the Loan Estimates as a first instalment toward a cultural complex associated with the theatre, and which is presently under discussion with the City Council. It is expected that this matter will be the subject of enabling legislation in due course.

Will the Chief Secretary in reply enlarge upon that statement? Members of this Council have no knowledge of what will be done or of what the final programme will be regarding this addition to the festival theatre project. I should like now to raise a matter that I have raised before. I believe that in this debate all members should try to be as constructive as they can. Some time ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether any progress had been made on a plan to increase the area of what I termed wood block farming in South Australia. I refer the Minister to the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill recorded in *Hansard* of September 4, 1963 (page 823). I should like to restate briefly the case that I presented at that time. Compared with other countries, Australia is virtually devoid of forests. Australia has only 1 per cent of its total area under economic forests, whereas Japan has more than 60 per cent and the United States of America 39 per cent. In fact, practically every country in the world has more than 30 per cent of its area devoted to economic forests.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What about Saudi Arabia?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I said "practically". The Minister would be astounded at the area devoted to economic forestry in most other countries in the world. Australia imports large quantities of softwoods and softwood products each year; such imports are probably greater than those of all other agricultural products combined. At present about 500,000 acres is under economic softwood plantations in Australia.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The figure is greater than that; it is more than 1,000,000 acres. I planted the one millionth acre in New South Wales last year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The source of my figures is a paper presented by Mr. Fielding at a conference of the Institute of Forestry in Australia. Foresters estimate that Australia will require 5,000,000 acres of softwoods to be in production by the year 2000 if it is to meet its needs. Why have we not encouraged wood block farming on an individual farm basis? What prevents members of the farming community in South Australia from becoming wood block farmers? How can we overcome the factors that prevent such development? One factor preventing this development is the question of succession duties, which assume great proportions when a forest is growing and, on the death of the farmer, the whole thing is valued and there may not be any income from it for another 20 years, yet there may have to be a large capital outlay on the death of the farmer. Further, income tax militates against wood block farmers. After 20 years there is a fairly large income, which is aggregated into one year.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It would have been more correct to say "After 10 years."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: One would be lucky if he could get that. Nevertheless, it is impossible for a person having 100 acres of pine-growing land to become a wood block farmer, because he cannot wait 15 or 20 years for his first income. These factors that prevent the development of wood block farming must be overcome. If the industry could be developed, some very suitable land could be used for the production of softwoods instead of some other primary products; such a change in land use would be in the best interests of the districts concerned and of Australia. The factors I have referred to can be overcome by adopting a plan under the Woods and Forests Department. In South Australia a total of about 100,000 acres on individual farms could be devoted to the economic production of softwoods. Over 40 years those areas would produce more than they do with their present forms of production.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: On present-day prices?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No; on any prices.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You cannot look ahead 40 years.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think we can. Some of our best country will produce a higher income over 40 years from 100 acres devoted to forestry than from any other form of production. Maybe I should exclude market

gardening from that statement, but softwoods will return a much higher income over 40 years than will dairying, beef production or wool production. First, money must be made available on an annual basis to the person undertaking wood block farming. Secondly, the Woods and Forests Department must supply an advisory service and control the supply to the pulp mills, to Government saw mills and to private enterprise. But there must be a controlled programme so that the various large industries based on Government forests can be taken into the general organization of the wood block farming.

An annual payment can be made to a person in such a scheme. It may be \$10, \$15 or \$20 an acre for his wood block area. At the end of the 40-year rotation there would still be in that account a fairly large sum of money to go to the grower, but in the meantime that person has an annual income, which can also take into account an 8 per cent levy for loss by fire and also other questions of insurance. The whole scheme can be self-supporting, self-generating, with a very little infusion of Loan funds into developing the scheme throughout South Australia.

Looking at the factors involved, this would be not only in the interests of the various areas that grow softwoods. In most areas of first-class softwoods 20 acres can sustain a family, and there are very few forms of primary production today where such an area can do that. It is a tremendous incentive to decentralization of industry, because with the timber industry the raw product must be processed at the forest level, whereas with other forms of primary production the question of establishing decentralized industries around them presents some difficulties.

As I pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture when I asked a question recently, I have spoken previously on this matter and I ask that the Government, through the Agriculture Department, look seriously at this question, because I believe something can be done in this area for the benefit not only of the national situation, but also of the State and in the interests of decentralization.

I ask the Minister to look closely at this matter with a view to introducing a scheme such as I have suggested. It has been mentioned that some allocation of Loan funds to farmers for the development of softwoods is possible, as in Victoria. I do not believe that answers the basic question. It must be a scheme that is better developed rather than just a question of making Loan funds available

to farmers for wood block farming. It must be a comprehensive scheme, and I recommend that the Minister should look at schemes of this type in Great Britain, New Zealand and the United States, where there is tremendous encouragement for individual wood block farmers. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): When the Minister introduced this Bill last week two main points concerned me in his preliminary remarks—first, the point raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris regarding the carry-over of the balance in the Loan Account for this current financial year, and, secondly, the evidence that the Commonwealth Government has been very fair and just in its treatment of South Australia regarding financial allocations, in some contrast to the impression one gathers when one hears so much criticism of the Commonwealth Government in that regard.

In the past financial year the Government did not spend all the money it intended to spend from its Loan allocation. The original provision, as the Minister said, was \$113,220,000 and the amount spent was \$110,666,000, a reduction of \$2,554,000 on the original provision. With the normal adjustments that occur it meant that on June 30, 1971, there was a balance of \$14,811,000 in the Loan Account.

It is proposed to carry forward the main portion of that amount this year, and it seems a large balance to carry forward. If the spending does fall short, as it did last year, it will mean an even larger sum might appear on our books at June 30, 1972. One wonders whether our planning in the areas where real expansion is necessary, such as in hospitals, education and other service works, including water and sewerage, electricity, and services of that kind, is as bold as it should be.

One wonders also what will be the view of the Commonwealth Treasury if we continue to carry forward large sums of this proportion. I hope that will not affect the consideration the Commonwealth Government extends to South Australia in the future. If the Chief Secretary could supply, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris asked, some more information regarding the need to carry over such a large sum of money I would be interested to hear the explanation.

The second point I made concerned the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to South Australia regarding financial allocations. Three portions of the Minister's speech

emphasized this matter. The first is the sentence in which he said:

The immediate problem of 1970-71 was largely met by increased Commonwealth grants, and the Commonwealth has also offered some assistance towards the 1971-72 problems, both by way of a supplementary grant and by way of an improvement in financial assistance grants as part of the overall arrangements to transfer payroll tax to the States.

Here is a transfer to the State of a growth tax. Elsewhere the Minister said:

Under the new arrangements agreed between the States and the Commonwealth in June, 1970, \$28,760,000 of our allocation is by way of grant, free of interest and repayment, and \$89,140,000 by way of loan, subject as in the past to payment of interest and sinking fund.

Of an allocation of \$117,900,000 it is very pleasing indeed to see the Commonwealth give to the State free of interest and repayment approximately \$29,000,000.

The last point is that from the total allocations within Loan Council of \$860,000,000 to all the States, South Australia's share is to be \$117,900,000, which is \$5,480,000 above the allocation for 1970-71. That is clear evidence that this State is receiving fair treatment from the Commonwealth.

I want to refer to some matters under the various headings the Minister mentioned. The first deals with the Railways Department grant, and under that heading I seek further information concerning the rehabilitation programme of the railway lines which were subject to investigation after several serious derailments occurred in South Australia a few years ago. In this Council on September 15 last year the Minister said:

The rehabilitation programme which came out of the report of the special committee set up by the previous Government to inquire into the causes of derailments on the South Australian Railways is being continued as approved by the previous Government.

The previous Government planned for the sum of \$8,500,000 to be spent on this rehabilitation work over a six-year period. The need for the money to be spent was most urgent, because the cost to the State of derailments was great; and, of course, of greater concern still was the worry that if derailments continued ultimately passenger trains might be involved in accidents and there could be serious danger to life as a result.

However, it seems to me from my investigation of the Loan Account expenditures that in the first year \$634,444 was spent on this work, in the second year \$501,556 was spent on it, and in the Estimates before us there is a proposal for \$875,000 to be spent. Those

sums are below the normal sums that would have to be spent if the whole \$8,500,000 was spent on this programme. Also, in his second reading explanation of this Bill the Minister said:

In addition, \$875,000 is proposed toward the special programme of upgrading main lines. This special programme is estimated to cost about \$5,050,000, of which \$1,136,000 had been spent to the end of June last.

It may well be that there is money to be spent on this work which does not come within the Loan Estimates. I can recall that this may have been the case in the first year when this planning took place. However, I would appreciate an explanation from the Minister of the exact financial position regarding this rehabilitation work so that I can keep myself informed as to its progress and be certain that this most urgent work is being carried out in accordance with the programme that both Governments agreed to.

Under "Railway Accommodation", I notice that there is a further allocation for new housing within the Railways Department. At the end of June last, as stated in the Auditor-General's Report, the department owned 2,220 houses. I believe it is time the department ceased building new houses and, indeed, it is time it took steps to quit many of the houses that are in its name at present. As an alternative to this principle of railway ownership of houses, I think the department concerned should turn to the Housing Trust and have its employees either rent or buy Housing Trust houses in country areas.

The amenities and the services within Housing Trust houses are probably better than they are in most railway houses. I think that, from the social point of view, railway employees living within a township among other residents, as compared with living within a small group of fellow railway workers, is far better. I fear that the cost of administration and of maintenance by the Railways Department of its own houses is high. When railway townships such as Taillem Bend are looked at from this overall point of view, one sees some very unfortunate circumstances where people live all their lives in such a railway town and as retirement approaches they see no hope at all of remaining in that same environment in that same town to which they are accustomed to living, and they must move out of the railway houses and seek accommodation in some other part of the State.

I think the old principle of the establishment of railway towns and the establishment

of groups of railway cottages all close together is something that ought to be looked at very closely. Ultimately, this principle should be changed. With the co-operation of the Housing Trust, I think that from the financial point of view as well as from the social point of view both the department and its employees would be much better off.

I notice that the south-western suburbs drainage scheme is nearing completion. This is a vast undertaking to which very little publicity has been given over the years. I compliment the senior engineers and planners in the Highways Department as well as the private contractors, all of whom have been concerned with the work of the scheme. The total scheme is a project involving the expenditure of \$11,000,000. Ultimately, it may cost more than that. It is therefore quite a large public undertaking, and it has been very successful. It was absolutely necessary as a service to metropolitan Adelaide, and I commend all those that have been concerned in it.

I commend the Government for continuing the programme of further stormwater drainage work in country towns. I recall that during the term of the previous Government the policy was changed and country towns were included in assistance for floodwaters drainage. This change had to occur. As country towns grow and as financial problems present themselves to the local government bodies in those towns, it will become necessary to continue this work, and I am pleased to see that the present Government is continuing that course.

Under the heading "Municipal Tramways Trust", a further \$1,000,000 is allocated to the purchase of modern buses for metropolitan transport. The upgrading of the metropolitan buses and bus services was part of the M.A.T.S. Report. When these new buses are purchased in the current year, they will be one-man operated buses. I commend both the management of the trust and the union involved for the manner in which the parties have co-operated so that the introduction (I may say the inevitable ultimate introduction) of one-man buses could be achieved with practically no industrial trouble.

As a result, the changeover is taking place now, and I think that patrons are well satisfied with the new buses. I think that the manner in which discussion has taken place between employer and employee is deserving of congratulations.

Like the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I was perturbed when I read the Minister's second reading explanation concerning the festival theatre allocation. Most people interested in this matter have regarded the real need and the real focal point on which to build permanent festival arrangements as being one major festival theatre. The construction of that is now well under way. All the controversy about the choice of site and so forth is now behind us. The total cost is given by the Minister as \$5,750,000, of which the Government will ultimately provide \$3,950,000, the balance of \$1,800,000 being provided by the Adelaide City Council. Money has been set aside over the years and the Government is proceeding to allocate this year \$900,000 for that purpose.

Real alarm will certainly arise at the further allocation of \$800,000, which the Minister said would be appropriated for a cultural complex or a further theatre. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that we have heard no more about that in this Chamber. That is true, but we have read about it with great interest in the newspapers since the Minister's speech was circulated. One cannot help questioning whether or not the Government is proceeding too fast in its plans to build a further complex adjacent to the festival hall.

I was always keen that the land on the western side of the festival hall should be left so that ultimately, when the need arose and this State could afford it, further buildings forming some kind of complex could be built. But, when we look around the city now and observe the variety of halls there are and the space that is available for performances which take place during the Adelaide Festival of Arts and which in future will be supplementary, of course, to the main usage of the festival hall, we see that at present, and surely for the next few years, ample accommodation is available for such supplementary performances.

There are theatres such as Her Majesty's; there is an attractive modern theatre at Elizabeth; there is a splendid theatre in the Adelaide Teachers College building; and the Adelaide Town Hall can be used for certain performances. There is the Arts Theatre in Victoria Square, and the Apollo Stadium is suitable for some performances. There are also the Bonython Hall and other large halls. There is the hall at Prince Alfred College, which has been used for previous Festival of Arts performances.

One wonders whether this Government is rushing too much in this additional expenditure

proposed now. If I recall the newspaper article correctly, the estimate was \$2,500,000, and, being realists, we all can reflect what that figure will jump to by the time such amenities are completed. One wonders whether or not this Government is rushing madly into this proposed spending. I think it is spending the people's money in this regard too quickly.

I looked closely at the plans provided by the newspaper in regard to the proposed development, and I wonder what will happen to the *Advertiser* sound shell in Elder Park. It seems to me from the drawings that the new developments will cover that part of the park where the sound shell is at present. I am sure the donors who generously and graciously made that gift to the city would like to know what the Government has in mind for the sound shell.

Another matter with which I have been concerned for years is the Railways Institute building. I have asked questions in this Chamber time and time again about this matter. I do not want to be disrespectful to the Minister but I believe I have been fobbed off in regard to the Railways Institute building. Just what are the plans for it? Where has the site been chosen to rebuild it? There was some reference to it in the news the other night.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What happened years ago?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I can tell honourable members what happened when we were in Government. We made provision for the Railways Institute to occupy another building. The Government approved financial allocations to convert this temporary accommodation into suitable space. I personally went to the trouble of inspecting one other building, with the Railways Commissioner, on the other side of North Terrace from Parliament House, to see whether the Railways Institute might be interested in buying the freehold so that it could be housed in alternative accommodation. Plans were in train to expedite the building of the new building that the railway employees required and deserved. I do not know what happened to those plans; I can make no progress in finding out. If the Minister could assist me in that way, I should very much appreciate such information.

I refer now to the allocation of \$900,000 for the Kangaroo Island ferry. I believe there has been some delay in the arrangement to provide this ferry, and I should like some information on that. The report of the committee that inquired into this proposal was available in about June of last year.

The present Government, through the appropriate Minister, accepted the report and, as I recall, stated that plans were proceeding to initiate the ferry service; but the people of Kangaroo Island are worried about their future in this regard. Very little information has been given to the public about the progress of the planning for this new transport service.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do you think it is a good idea?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is a splendid idea, which I wholeheartedly support. I should like to see it brought to fruition, because the people on the island fear the possible stopping of the *Troubridge* service. As the Minister knows, there have been troubles regarding the private operator who built his own small ferry; and, of course, regarding the producers over there. Also, we must consider tourists, because they will flock to Kangaroo Island in greater numbers when the ferry service is in operation. In fact, in my opinion, they will come from all over Australia to see Kangaroo Island.

I commend the Government for setting aside money to upgrade the South Australian Tourist Bureau office in Sydney, \$100,000 being allocated for that purpose. Whenever I pass that office in Sydney, about twice a year, I feel it is not a good advertisement for South Australia. It urgently needs modernization and improvement.

I am concerned about the Public Buildings Department allocation of \$100,000 towards district offices, workshops and depots in country areas. More and more work under the supervision of officers from that department should be done in rural areas by private contractors in country towns and country districts.

If it is proposed to expand the workshops and depots in country areas by this allocation of money, that is a retrograde step. More and more work through this department should be done by private contract, and Parliament must watch closely any moves to expand the area of this department's operations which involve actual work being done by day labour by employees of the department.

The item that concerns me more than any other is the allocation of \$500,000 towards transport research. I seriously question whether Loan funds should be used for this purpose. Wherever one looks in the Minister's explanation, in which the various paragraphs and headings have been set out, one sees where improvements and other constructions have taken place, or where purchases of properties of one kind or another involving the use of Loan funds have been made.

In other words, the State's assets are increasing in value, subject, of course, to depreciation adjustments, and so on. Whether it be real property or in the form of chattels, a growth of assets is occurring in the expenditure of Loan funds.

Surely when we look to the matter of research moneys for transport not based upon a certain department but simply to probe the future of this area of work, money for this purpose, if it is to be spent, ought to come from Revenue and not from Loan funds. However, that is not all. The real disaster comes when one sees that this is simply the beginning of what is, in my view, a fantastic waste of public money.

It is all tied up with the appointment of a Director-General of Transport, an appointment which, I understand from the press, has been made, there having been an announcement that a Dr. Alston has been appointed.

When interviewed, Dr. Alston said that he had not yet completed discussions with the South Australian Government about the appointment, but was looking forward to coming to South Australia. As I have said previously, this is the beginning of what will undoubtedly be empire building within a new department.

I do not blame Dr. Alston for this, nor do I cast any reflections upon him; but all members realize, when appointments of this kind are made, the size and scope of the departments that must follow under such an appointment. Indeed, Dr. Breuning, whose report has influenced the Government to make this appointment, said, regarding this future expenditure:

To carry out new developments, a special group of professionals is needed which can execute all required steps from generation of ideas to demonstration and evaluation of practical success. The group should consist of about 12 professionals of diverse backgrounds in engineering, economics, social sciences, electronics, and so on. It should be supported by a long-range budget to assure continuity. An initial financing of \$5,000,000 for the first five-year period is suggested.

That statement follows Dr. Breuning's recommendation that a Commissioner of Transportation should be appointed. The Government has simply changed that title to Director-General of Transport. Therefore, the Government has launched on this huge undertaking, involving \$1,000,000 for each of the next five years. It has also launched upon the undertaking to employ senior professional men in this new department, and the first allocation, of \$500,000, is now before us.

No doubt Dr. Alston will supervise this expenditure. I repeat that this allocation simply flows from the acceptance of Dr. Breuning's report, an acceptance which itself is most revealing, because honourable members will know that the Government did not even refer the report to this Council for discussion: the report was simply debated in another place, and the Government seemed to accept that that Chamber's verdict on the matter was all that was required. It is interesting to read the following statement made by Dr. Breuning at page 11 of his report:

Consideration could be given to providing no service to future outer neighbourhoods and suburbs.

He is dealing there with bus transportation, and is saying in his report, which has been accepted by the Government, that the Government could consider not providing bus services to those outer suburbs at all. Elsewhere in his report, Dr. Breuning turns down rapid rail as an urgent measure for Adelaide. In this respect he says:

Specific recommendations for suburban rail passenger service do not seem to be indicated at this time. Similarly, development of a subway system seems premature.

When one sees the Government, influenced by Dr. Breuning (who spent four weeks in Adelaide with one assistant before submitting his report to the Government), making the appointment it has made, and taking \$500,000 in what must be the first bite of \$5,000,000 over five years (because the report has been accepted as a total programme), that is nothing but utter extravagance.

I agree that research in transportation and in other areas within the umbrella of transportation always needs to be carried out. In the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report, which we were told had been scrapped, it was always envisaged that research would be continued, although kept in proportion.

The Commonwealth Government has provided, and earmarked, special funds for research within the allocations made to the Highways Fund each year. That is the kind of money that this Government should be using for research if it wishes to conduct further research in these matters. Indeed, the Highways Department cannot use that allocation for any purpose other than planning and research, as the Commonwealth Government has stipulated that it must be used for this purpose. Surely the Government can turn to the best experts it can find in the world in the transportation field, and obtain the services of such consultants to carry out feasibility studies. That is the best

way in which to derive benefit from research money: to appoint the best firms in the world involved in transportation planning and to retain them as consultants to report on the matters that must be examined.

The Government does not have to allocate the sum of \$500,000, as it is doing this year, to achieve this. Some encouragement could be given to Professor Potts, a gentleman for whom I have a high regard. Without Government assistance, he is carrying out studies on some form of dial-a-bus system. I noticed in the press that General Motors- Holden's had allocated \$3,000 to assist the professor in his studies. This is the kind of research that can be expanded so that long-term future planning can be taken care of.

The Bill provides that \$500,000 will be allocated to transport research, but we must remember that only a few years ago this State spent \$700,000 on the preparation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. Surely that was expenditure on research. Is the Government now telling the people that that sum was totally wasted?

Is the Government telling the people that public servants and the three best transportation firms in the world did not know what they were doing? It must be remembered that much of the \$700,000 was spent during the term of office of the Labor Government from 1965 to 1968. Following that vast expenditure it was necessary only for the departments to settle down to planning, using their highly skilled and dedicated officers.

All the terms of reference for a feasibility study into the necessary underground railway were laid down for the present Government to pursue. It was a question of applying tight financial control and using departmental talent to implement the plan prepared for metropolitan Adelaide. Dr. Breuning came here for only four weeks and brought one assistant with him. Dr. Breuning admitted that the M.A.T.S. plan was splendid and that he did not intend to improve it. In his report he said:

Our report is an outgrowth of two extensive and detailed earlier studies on whose excellent background work we have built, and which we have related to the mandate given us. Our recommendations are therefore a step beyond these studies, rather than a re-evaluation.

So, spending \$500,000 on transport research is extremely wasteful. There is absolutely no doubt that, if the Government has \$500,000 to throw around, it should spend it on schools, hospitals and other social purposes, instead of on the wasteful kind of transport research proposed in the Loan Estimates. The real tragedy

is that the taxpayers of this State must pay for this research. We all know that money does not grow on trees. The \$500,000 to be spent on transport research must be found somewhere. As motorists drive home each night they are not at all concerned about transport research: they want action now to alleviate traffic snarls, which will get worse.

Instead of wasting \$500,000 on investigating ways of implementing a dial-a-bus scheme or some form of capsule transport, the Government would be well advised from the political viewpoint to turn its attention to helping those metropolitan motorists who are complaining that nothing is being done to solve the problems that confront them every working day as they drive home.

The heading "Transport Research" in the Loan Estimates alarms me. No doubt Parliament will approve the allocation, but the Government should carefully watch the way this

\$500,000 is spent. I am sure that members of Parliament and the general public will be watching the matter very closely because the people are dissatisfied with the Government's futuristic transport schemes. There is a crying need for improvement in metropolitan roadways and freeways and in other traffic facilities.

I hope the Government will spend this allocation carefully. If the appointment of Dr. Alston is confirmed and if he arrives here, a close watch will have to be kept on the growth of the new department that will be established under his control. I believe there is absolutely no need for the sum provided for transport research to be allocated at all.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.36 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 25, at 2.15 p.m.