

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Fruit Fly (Compensation),
Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

SHARK FISHING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Victorian Government's announcement yesterday that a ban had been placed on the catching and selling of school sharks will, I think, have a devastating effect on the fishing industry of South Australia. The General Manager of Safcol stated that the ban effectively wiped out the shark fishing industry in South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. The announcement raises so many questions that need to be answered, and fairly quickly, from the point of view of both the whole fishing industry and the health hazard involved that, rather than directing a series of questions at this stage, I ask the Minister whether he is prepared to make a statement on the situation.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am obliged to the Leader of the Opposition for warning me of his question before I entered the Chamber as it gave me an opportunity of preparing some information that I can now give the Council. Shark examined in South Australia has contained mercury varying from 0.3 parts per million in gummy shark (Wallaroo), 0.7 p.p.m. in schnapper shark (Tumby Bay), to 1.0 p.p.m. in a large shark taken in Foul Bay. In the United States of America, it is permissible to sell shark containing up to 0.5 p.p.m. This is also the Australian recommendation. Japan and Sweden permit up to 1 p.p.m. I understand Victoria has found amounts up to 2.5 p.p.m. in larger sharks. The level increases as the shark grows larger. Effects on humans depend on the amount of shark that people eat. There is some uncertainty about the safe limit, but the Australian recommendation of 0.5 p.p.m. would allow 1½ lb. of fish to be eaten weekly with safety. It would appear to be unwise

to eat the large amounts of shark (especially from large fish) that some people in Victoria appear to eat. Smaller amounts of mercury have been found in other fish.

I have asked the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation in South Australia to prepare a full report on the effects of the Victorian Government's decision to ban the sale of some shark in that State. The type of shark involved is school shark that is more than 28in. in length; I am not sure whether that length includes the head and the tail. The information I have received is that school shark up to 3ft. long contain less than 0.5 p.p.m. I have also asked the department to collect further samples of fish from South Australian waters to be tested by the Chemistry Department for mercury contamination. I will be contacting the Victorian Fisheries Minister, Mr. Hamer, to discuss with him the effects of the ban upon the South Australian fishing industry.

Health authorities have expressed differing opinions about the effects and levels which mercury contamination in fish can have upon human health, as evidenced by the reported statement of Dr. Mellanby, Director of British Monks Wood Experimental Station. Last Friday at the Adelaide University I attended a lecture by Dr. Mellanby, who spoke on this very topic. I believe that a statement in today's *Australian* is attributed to Dr. Mellanby. I was most impressed by the way he handled his subject matter last Friday and by the tolerance he showed in connection with all subjects he dealt with. No decision will be taken affecting the sale of fish in South Australia until the full test results are available; and then a decision will be taken only after there has been detailed discussion and consideration with my colleague the Minister of Health and his departmental officers. I am extremely disappointed that the Victorian authorities took this drastic step without informing either Tasmania or South Australia.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I appreciate the information the Minister gave about the effects of the ban on the consumption of shark or flake in Victoria, but it does not cover the real problem of the fishermen themselves. No doubt the Minister is aware of the capital investment in fishing boats, and I know of one boat which is returning to the South-East newly equipped for shark fishing

at a cost of between \$7,000 and \$9,000. No doubt each fishing boat has a similar amount of equipment on board; this means that the total investment in this industry amounts to about \$1,000,000. In some cases, boats have left the crayfishing industry to take up shark fishing and, if they return to the cray industry, they will cause further problems in the industry. Will the Minister consider compensating those fishermen, who will suffer a direct loss as from yesterday, in relation to capital involved, or will he take up this matter with his colleagues in other States?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I see it, there are only about 10 full-time shark fishermen in South Australia, of whom two are in the South-East. Most of these fishermen combine shark fishing with other operations such as crayfishing, if they are licensed to do the latter. I am prepared to take the honourable member's question further and see what can be done in the light of the present situation; this will have to be done in conjunction with the other States, as the honourable member has suggested.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I realize that seawater naturally contains a certain percentage of mercury. I understand, too, that sharks, because of their feeding environment, absorb mercury and retain it in the body. Would it be possible for an analysis to be made of the seawater off the South Australian coast in an endeavour to prove to the sceptics that the mercuric intake of the shark is from natural sources, and not from any man-made pollutant or discharge, waste from factories, or the like?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be pleased to take up the honourable member's question and bring back a reply.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Advertising agencies in South Australia are becoming very concerned about the dramatic increase in the influence in this country of foreign-owned advertising agencies, particularly American agencies. I believe that in the last nine years the turnover of foreign-owned advertising agencies has increased from \$25,000,000 to \$162,000,000. I believe that all State Govern-

ment advertising in this State is handled by Hansen Rubensohn-McCann Erickson Proprietary Limited, which is a wholly-owned American company. I also believe that the same firm handles the Labor Party's advertising on a State and Commonwealth basis. In view of the Labor Party's policy on foreign ownership, will the Leader of the Government in this Council ask the State Government to reconsider its policy in relation to advertising by Government departments being handled by a wholly-owned American company, thereby allowing some of the advertising for the State Government to be let to South Australian-owned firms?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am unable, and I do not wish, to answer the question off the cuff. However, I hasten to say that some of the statements alleged to have been made in a certain letter are not true, because not all Government advertising is handled by that firm. As there is a background to the whole position, I will have a considered reply prepared before giving any additional information.

HOSPITAL STAFFING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding the staffing of hospitals?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question was asked in the Address in Reply debate. The overall position with regard to the staffing of all Government hospitals in the State is quite satisfactory and in none of these hospitals in either metropolitan or country areas are there any empty beds because of lack of staff. The Royal Adelaide Hospital, whose own staffing situation is excellent, is recruiting and training nurses for the Modbury Hospital, which has not yet commenced general recruitment of trained staff. Inquiries for nursing vacancies at Modbury, however, have been heavy, but active recruitment is not expected to commence until about November next. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital new wards are being completed and will open progressively. Nursing staff are currently being recruited so that they will be available as the new wards become ready for occupation. The country Government hospitals are generally stable as regards trained staff but, as is usual at this time of the year, they are experiencing some difficulty with regard to "undergraduate" staff; this will be rapidly overcome, however, with intakes of school-leavers in the new year. Any minor deficiencies in these areas, however, are not serious enough to affect the occupation of available beds in any of the Government hospitals in the country.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have been informed by the Secretary of the Yorke Peninsula Local Government Association of the very great concern of member councils in that area regarding the considerable reduction in the allocations of Government grants for council work in this financial year. That concern has been emphasized to me in subsequent discussions I have had with the Chairman of the Minlaton District Council. I understand that this may cause some dislocation in council work and that reconsideration of the grants is desired. Will the Minister therefore ask his colleague whether this matter can be considered further?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

ABATTOIRS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: An increasing number of my constituents whose livelihood depends in varying degrees on the efficiency of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board have repeatedly asked for information regarding the expected report by Mr. Gray, who was engaged by the Government and was believed to be making a report on the situation. In reply to previous questions asked of him, I understood the Minister to say that Mr. Gray was purely an adviser to him and that no public report would be made. Will the Minister therefore say whether the general public, which wants to know what this capable man has suggested, is to be denied such information until legislation is introduced in this Council?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Having made the position clear on so many occasions, I do not know how I can get it through to honourable members at this late stage. I hope that the results of Mr. Gray's deliberations, which were carried out in conjunction with the Director of Agriculture, will be forthcoming soon.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister of Agriculture inform me of the total cost to the Government of Mr. Gray's report on the abattoirs?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will get a detailed reply. I have a rough idea of the cost, but I want to be specific in dollars and cents for the benefit of the honourable member.

TREE PULL SCHEME

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As he has just returned from a meeting of the Agricultural Council in Queensland, can the Minister say whether the tree pull scheme was discussed and whether the council reached any agreement on whether there should be a means test and on the total amount that would be allocated to each State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No, it was not discussed at any great length. It was discussed only briefly. It is a matter between the Ministers handling rural reconstruction in the various States, and as some Ministers who handle rural reconstruction matters are not Ministers of Agriculture the matter was not discussed at great length.

MURRAY NEW TOWN

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question refers to an advertisement which appeared on page 54 of the *Sunday Mail* of August 12. It appeared in the real estate section for the firm of Taplin and Company Proprietary Limited, advertising 82 acres of land at \$1,000 an acre. The land was described in the advertisement as follows:

This estate should provide the residential and recreational heart of Government-proposed Murray New Town.

If this information is accurate, how did the firm obtain it? Will the Premier make an early announcement detailing the position of Murray New Town so that no commercial advantage will be available to those people who either have prior information or make intelligent guesses? Has the Government released any details of the proposed Murray New Town to any private land or estate developer?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will do my best to get the information for which the honourable member has asked.

STOCK TRANSPORTATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On July 26 I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, regarding stock transportation, particularly with reference to noxious weeds having been found on stock which had been carried from South Australia. Has the Minister a reply to my question?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Animal Health Adviser at Jamestown (Mr. Hodge) reports that Bathurst burr and horehound plants are present in the area surrounding the Commonwealth trucking yards at Port Pirie, but not in the yards. He states that the yards are not in bad repair but are too small to handle large mobs. They are badly drained and become very muddy in wet weather. It is considered that the escape of sheep referred to by the honourable member was possibly due to human error rather than the state of the yards. As the trucking yards and the surrounding area are the responsibility of the Commonwealth Railways, I intend to take up the whole matter through the appropriate channels with the Commonwealth.

KANGAROO SHOOTING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation, a reply to the question I asked on July 20 regarding kangaroo shooting?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague reports:

Property owners in South Australia who consider that kangaroos are causing, or are likely to cause, damage to crops, stock or other property, may apply in writing to the Director of National Parks and Wildlife for a permit to destroy a stated number of kangaroos. There is no charge for such permits, which are granted in cases of genuine need. Before permits to destroy kangaroos are issued, an inspection of the property is normally carried out by an officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, to verify whether or not a permit is justified. Merchants, skin dealers and others who sell the skins to processors or other persons must have a permit to keep and sell protected animals (carcasses and skins). Persons holding permits issued under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, are required to keep record books showing stock incoming and stock outgoing.

Interstate trading in kangaroo meat and untanned skins is subject to control, and permits for import and export must be obtained from both the South Australian and other State fauna departments. In most cases where a permit to destroy kangaroos has been issued, the permit is endorsed with a condition which states that only those kangaroos which, when dressed, have a minimum carcass weight of

36 lb. or more may be destroyed. Kangaroos which do not meet this required weight limit may not be destroyed. All kangaroo carcasses delivered to meat processing plants must not weigh less than 36 lb. The following numbers of kangaroos have been destroyed since 1966 in South Australia. These figures have been compiled from returns made by shooters and land owners:

Year	Actual Number Destroyed
1966	146,529
1967	129,050
1968	80,999
1969	82,966
1970	98,103

(Many returns for permits issued in 1971 are still outstanding and, therefore, it is not possible to give the actual number destroyed for 1971 or 1972.)

Although it is not possible to give exact figures of the total numbers of kangaroos in South Australia, wildlife officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, who have been closely associated with the granting of licences for some years, suggest the figure is about 500,000. There is no doubt that the levels of destruction in the years 1966 and 1967 were depleting the general population level. This was recognized by the wildlife officers, and steps were taken subsequently to reduce this to about 80,000 per annum, which appears to be at the appropriate level to maintain the population equilibrium. Recent reports indicate that kangaroo numbers are currently slightly increasing.

Very little is known about kangaroo population dynamics but it has been suggested in A.C.F. Occasional Publication No. 4 *The Commercial Hunting of Kangaroos*, by Francis Ratcliffe, that an acceptable guide to a "safe shooting figure" was one in six. On the basis of the present suggested total population of 500,000, an annual "harvest" of 80,000 is within the safe limit. Present indications of slight increases would tend to confirm this situation. Should, however, adverse climatic conditions prevail, steps will be taken to ensure that permits are not issued to destroy kangaroos for numbers above the "safe shooting level". It may be of interest to note that over a comparable period the number of kangaroos taken in South Australia was about one-tenth of the number taken in Queensland.

LIGHT RIVER BRIDGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the Light River bridge?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads and Transport, has informed me that he wrote to the honourable member on August 3, 1972, giving him all the information available about the new bridge over the Light River.

SOUTH-EAST FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked recently about fire hydrants on the Tailem Bend to Keith main?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has informed me that water for fire-fighting purposes cannot be drawn direct from the Tailem Bend to Keith main, but water can be made available from 2in. standpipes fixed at intervals, as required. Up to the present time, only one fixed standpipe for fire-fighting purposes has been installed. However, consideration can be given to the installation of additional standpipes at specific locations, if application is made to the department through the district council concerned. Water for fire-fighting can be drawn direct from fire plugs on the branch mains, through the portable "red" hydrants, supplied to Emergency Fire Services for this purpose.

KINGSCOTE AREA SCHOOL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the Kingscote Area School?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Kingscote Area School has ample accommodation to meet its requirements but it is the quality of that accommodation that is a matter of concern. A new wooden administration/staff room dual unit is to be provided. The priorities for the provision of wooden rooms in schools have been based on the need for classroom accommodation and, therefore, the administration unit for Kingscote cannot be given a particularly high priority. It is expected to be erected during 1973.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport an answer to the question I asked on July 19 about a standard gauge rail connection to Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: When the present Government came to office, the present Minister of Roads and Transport found that the previous Minister had agreed with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport that no standard gauge rail connections of any kind were to be made to South Australian industry. It was only owing to strong efforts by the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport that connections are now to be made available to Mile End, Elizabeth and Woodville industrial complexes. The

matter of a line to Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park was strongly pressed with the Commonwealth Government, but not agreed to by it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I take a point of order that the first part of that reply is grossly untrue.

VEGETABLE GROWING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: During the past five years the processed vegetable industry in the South-East has made considerable progress, particularly in respect of pea growing. However, like all new industries in a district, several problems in the cultivation of vegetable crops have begun to appear. In the formative years of any industry such as this, it needs expert assistance from the Agriculture Department in the form of research into the problems as they appear. Can the Minister say what assistance the department is giving at present to this growing industry, and will he establish a research station in the South-East to assist growers in many of the problems appearing in this rapidly developing industry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am prepared to get a report from the Director of Agriculture on what services are provided by the department for vegetable growers in the South-East, and to find out exactly what the situation is regarding the building, perhaps, of a research station in order to assist the growers in that area. I do not know exactly what the situation is, but I shall find out for the Leader and bring back a reply.

RADIATION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about radiation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In his reference to the level of radiation from medical diagnostic radiography, Dr. P. M. Ronai was quoting data given in a 1958 report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. These data were compiled from international sources and relate to an average annual genetic dose to the total population from diagnostic procedures compared with that from all radioactive fall-out from nuclear testing and also from natural background radiation. Accurate assessments of the average genetically significant dose contributed by diagnostic radiography to a population is very

difficult to obtain, requiring extensive well-planned studies. A survey in the United Kingdom in 1957-58 is considered to be the most valid study of a population. The assessed average annual genetic dose was 14.1 millirads. The dose contributed by fall-out was 1.25 millirads, and that from background radiation about 100 millirads. In contrast, a survey in the United States of America in 1955-56, considered much less reliable than the United Kingdom study, found doses of 141 millirads from diagnostic radiography, with the same contribution as in the United Kingdom from fall-out and background radiation. A more comprehensive study is being conducted at present in the United States of America to obtain more accurate assessments.

The equivalent figures for Australia are 162 (1956-57), 1 and 100 millirads respectively. However, the Australian figure of 162 millirads annual average per capita has been seriously questioned. (It was based on a small survey in New South Wales by J. H. Martin in 1956-57.) The figure is commonly quoted, and indeed is the only assessment available at this time. In 1970, the National Health and Medical Research Council, being concerned that accurate data was unavailable, commenced an Australia-wide survey with the active participation of State Departments of Public Health to determine the mean genetic and bone-marrow doses to the Australian population. The first stage of the survey, to collect comprehensive figures on diagnostic procedures, has been completed. The second stage, to determine dose-rates, is about to commence. It is expected that the survey will be completed in 1974. The probable effects of medical radiation to the population of South Australia will then be assessed.

PARK LANDS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Local Government to my recent question about the control of the Adelaide park lands?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Government has no plans to take over control of the Adelaide park lands from the Adelaide City Council.

CARPENTERS ROCKS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Marine.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I believe that at Carpenters Rocks, a small port in the South-East, an attempt has been made to provide a safer passage for fishing boats going into and out of that port. However, the underwater explosive that has been used has not been successful. In fact, the passage is now more dangerous than it was prior to the activity carried out by either the Marine and Harbors Department or the Minister of Works Department. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether it is intended to take further action to ensure that there is a safe passage for the small fishing boats, whose owners will not be able to continue their activities because of the pile of rocks in the passage?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 15, 1971, I said that during 1970 the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee was printed and circulated to councils throughout the State. I asked what the Government intended to do as the next step in the general revision of the Local Government Act. On July 20, 1971, I received a reply stating that about 50 councils had replied directly to the Local Government office and that about 12 councils had asked the Local Government Association to act for them. Further, I was told that other replies were expected and that the councils had been asked to submit their views on the report by June 30, 1971. I was informed that the Minister of Local Government intended to collate and consider the views of local government throughout the State and that ultimately Cabinet would be consulted; the Government's intentions regarding the framing of appropriate legislation would then be made known. As more than 12 months has elapsed since June 30, 1971, for those views to be considered and collated, can the Minister say what is the current position regarding the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee and what is the position regarding proposed legislation resulting from that report? On August 14, 1972, a report in the Adelaide

press said that the Minister of Local Government wanted to set up a local government boundaries commission to examine the need for amalgamating councils in this State; the journalist who wrote that report estimated that there might be a reduction of about 40 councils in South Australia as a result of such a commission. Can the Minister say whether the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee included a recommendation that such a boundaries commission be set up?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall refer the honourable member's second reading speech to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

STOCK FOODS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page 474.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to give general support to this Bill, the main purpose of which is to bring the Stock Foods Act into line with what is occurring in all other States and, indeed, in many parts of the world, namely, to include under the Act certain herbicides and insecticides used in the preparation of pre-emergence sprays in the general matter of seed grain; this is important, as no doubt all honourable members realize. In a recent publication I read that, as a result of people eating what appeared to be ordinary types of grain (which many people in southern America do, in the form of porridge), many of them had died because it had been treated with mercury; this is common practice in treating some types of seed grain.

I think we have heard enough about mercury in the last 24 hours to realize how emotional a subject it can become, although I am not denying it is a dangerous chemical in the way it is used in some parts of the world. What we are doing, under the Bill, is merely precautionary, and I think it is essential that we should have his legislation on the Statute Book, because there will always be people who will contravene the Act in order to dispose of a commodity that they could not otherwise sell or who are out to make a quick dollar.

The clauses in the Bill are interesting. Again, the reverse onus of proof appears in this legislation, but, on this occasion, it has been notified to some extent later in the order of the Bill. No doubt, the teeth of the legislation is contained in clause 6, which in part provides:

The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 8 thereof:

8a. (1) A person shall not feed seed grain to stock or suffer or permit any seed grain to be fed to stock.

Penalty: One hundred dollars.

(2) A person shall not sell or deliver any seed grain for use for a purpose other than as seed.

Penalty: One hundred dollars.

The third new subsection, which is the important one, provides:

(3) Subject to subsection (5) of this section in proceedings for an offence that is a contravention of subsection (2) of this section it shall lie upon the defendant to prove that he had reasonable grounds for believing and did in fact believe that after the sale or delivery in question the seed grain would be used as seed.

New subsection (4) provides:

Except for the purposes of using the resultant mixture as seed, a person shall not mix seed grain with any grain that is not seed grain.

Penalty: Fifty dollars.

The escape provision is contained in new subsection (5), which provides:

In proceedings for an offence that is a contravention of a provision of this section it shall be a defence for the defendant to prove that he did not know and that he could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have been expected to know, that the grain in question was seed grain.

Clause 3 amends the definition of "seed grain" in section 3 of the Act as follows:

"seed grain" means any grain that has been treated with a prescribed substance or treated in a prescribed manner for the purposes of enhancing its use as seed.

If the seed wheat, barley or oats, or any other grain, has not been treated with a prescribed substance (and the Agriculture Department will prescribe the various substances which are not to be readily transmitted) or treated in a prescribed manner, which will also cover the position, no problem exists as regards people selling seed grain as such. Provided that they have ascertained that the grain has not been treated, they are free to sell wheat, barley, oats and other cereals.

The rest of the Bill is mainly consequential on the passing of clause 6, which is the most important clause. The penalties have been increased throughout those sections of the Act that have been amended; some penalties have merely been brought into decimal currency whereas others have been increased. By and large, I see nothing wrong with the measure. It is terribly important that we maintain a standard that is acceptable to the United

Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Many of these standards are laid down in other countries. We must therefore ensure that we do not contaminate stock that may be fed with treated seed and that it does not fall into the hands of persons who export grain in the form of made-up commodities, as this could prove disastrous for us. It is only in the most extraordinary circumstances that we are using commodities such as D.D.T., where there are cattle-resistant tick and a few other such pests that exist in this State. However, its use has been kept within safe limits and, if we continue in this vein, the situation should be kept under control. South Australia has an extremely able department, which will not impose penalties unless one steps completely out of line. If one does this, certain penalties are prescribed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Power to prescribe standards."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: As nearly all seed grain treated within this State is done by contract, will the Minister say who will be responsible if, say, fungicides other than those prescribed in the regulations are used by a contractor? In nearly all instances, the owner of the grain would not know what substance was being used. My second question refers also to the prescribed substance. The legislation appears to contain no provision to stop a person using a fungicide that is not included in the prescribed list and selling his seed as stock food.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I suppose it all depends on what one reads into the provision now before the Committee. Any regulations along these lines must come before both Houses of Parliament, and that should answer the first part of the honourable member's question. Regarding the second part of his question, if an un-prescribed fungicide was used I should think that the contractor would take the blame because he would be the person who had contracted to do the job. If he did not use a prescribed substance, he would contravene the provision and the onus would be on him. I am afraid I did not understand the last part of the honourable member's question.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I am not suggesting that the regulations go too far: I am concerned that power is not given under the regulation-making provision to deal with fungicides that are not prescribed.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I understand the position, one cannot use a substance unless it is prescribed. Certain substances will never be prescribed because they will be classified as detrimental to human health, whether they be used as seed grain or fed to stock by someone who did not know what was happening. Those substances can be transferred to humans who eat that meat, and this is an aspect about which we must be careful. Indeed, this is where we return to the mercurial content in substances that are used today. We have now made a deadline of March, 1973, for the complete phasing out of these mercurial compounds in the treatment of seed wheat. Other products on the market, which, unfortunately, are manufactured solely in America, will substitute for these mercurial compounds.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think the fundamental point may lie in the definition of "seed grain". If a substance is prescribed, it is treated in a prescribed manner for the purpose of enhancing its use.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This clause says "prescribed".

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The grain still could be treated under the provisions of this Bill and sold as stock feed. I realize that the regulations, as they stand now under the Stock Foods Act, prescribe substances which contain foreign ingredients relative to any stock feed. A regulation-making power to cover the circumstances appears to me to be still lacking in this Act.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think the Hon. Mr. Story covered the situation in his remarks. The Stock Foods Act has nothing to do with any Act relating to chemicals; it is entirely separate. Our concern with this Bill is that if grain is treated as seed wheat it cannot be fed to stock. The two measures eventually will be combined, but this measure deals specifically with the fact that treated seed wheat cannot be fed to stock.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 10) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SAFETY)

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to give effect to some of the recommendations made by the Government Committee on Road Safety, and also to give effect to some of the decisions recently made by the Australian Transport Advisory Council. The Bill contains many of the proposals of the Bill previously introduced into Parliament earlier this year. However, it does contain new amendments relating to axle weights for buses, and temporary parking zones. The amendments relating to drinking drivers have been left in temporary abeyance pending a report from a Committee which has been established by the Government for the purpose of considering the most effective methods of implementing the Government's policy in this area. It is expected that a Bill will be introduced later this year dealing with this important subject.

The Bill establishes a completely new approach in relation to the installation of traffic control devices. Honourable members will recall that in the committee's report, which was circulated to all members, great emphasis was laid on the fact that a crash programme of installation of traffic signals would have an immediate effect in the field of road safety. However, there has not been, up to this stage, what could be regarded as an entirely satisfactory response to the problem. The Bill invests the Road Traffic Board with overall responsibility for the installation of traffic control devices. It confers upon the board necessary powers to enable the board, if necessary, to insist upon the installation of traffic control devices in dangerous locations.

This Bill lays down the criteria on how cost is to be shared, not only in relation to the installation of traffic control devices but also in relation to the subsequent maintenance and operation costs and, if need be, the cost of removing traffic control devices. It deals also with pedestrian crossings and, of course, this includes school crossings. Accordingly, although in the past these have not been paid for at all by the Government, the same cost-sharing arrangement will in future apply to these crossings as to other kinds of traffic control devices.

The Bill provides that the Commissioner of Highways will meet two-thirds of the cost and that the remaining one-third of the cost will be met by the local governing body concerned on those roads over which the Commissioner of Highways has assumed responsibility. Where the care, control and management of a road is vested in the coun-

cil and the Commissioner has not assumed responsibility for the road, then the council will be required to pay the two-thirds and the Commissioner of Highways the one-third.

The Bill enables the Road Traffic Board to grant permits authorizing the holder of the permit to establish a temporary parking zone. This power is to be exercised only where it is in the public interest to do so. The amendment arises from doubts and difficulties that have arisen regarding the legality of the practice of the Municipal Tramways Trust in establishing such parking zones for public convenience. There are other conceivable circumstances where the power to establish these zones would be necessary or useful. The Bill is sufficiently flexible to enable suitable action to be taken in these circumstances, but at the same time provides reasonable safeguards to prevent a proliferation of temporary parking zones which might possibly lead to public confusion.

The power to exempt buses from the axle weight provisions of the principal Act will be exercised subject to strict safeguards contained in the Bill. Before a permit is granted the Minister will consider reports on the desirability of the proposed exemption. If granted, the permit will define the route that the vehicle is authorized to traverse in pursuance of the permit. Thus road damage will be kept to a minimum. The M.T.T., which is expected to be the principal beneficiary under the amendment, will be required by a complementary amendment to the Highways Act to make an increased contribution to the Highways Fund to provide compensation for road damage.

The Bill also seeks to clarify several matters. In particular, it seeks to clarify the provisions relating to signalling. At the moment the requirements are partly in the Act and partly in the regulations. The Bill also makes provision to enable symbolic signs to be erected. This is in keeping with world trends. There are also amendments to enable several of the more recent design rules approved by the Australian Transport Advisory Council to become effective, and provision is also made for the Road Traffic Board to exempt vehicles from compliance with various aspects of the design rules where the need can be adequately shown.

I now deal with the Clauses of the Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing a definition of "installation" and broadening the previous definition of "traffic control device".

The term "installation" is used in the principal Act and is consequential on the widened definition of "traffic control device" in section 5. The definition of "traffic control device" has been broadened to cover all those devices, signs and marks whereby the movement of traffic can be regulated or guided. Additionally, devices to regulate or guide the standing of vehicles are now classed as traffic control devices. Doubt has existed in the past in relation to the legal effect of parking bays and the use of special island kerbing at intersections to provide for one-way entry; the new definition overcomes this doubt.

Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts sections 16 to 19 of the principal Act. Section 16 provides a definition of those "authorities" empowered to install, maintain, or operate traffic control devices, and this definition is applicable to all provisions of Part II of the principal Act. Section 17 provides the machinery whereby the authorities mentioned in section 16 may apply to the Road Traffic Board for approval to install, maintain, operate, or remove traffic control devices, and provides a right of appeal against a decision of the board. This section is largely a consolidation of existing provisions. Section 18 is a new provision designed to implementing the findings of the Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety. The Road Traffic Board (as the appropriate central authority) is vested with responsibility for the general oversight of traffic problems and is given the power to direct the installation, maintenance, and operation of necessary traffic control devices. An authority to which a direction is given may appeal to the Minister on the grounds of financial hardship.

Section 19 concerns the manner in which costs shall be borne on the installation, maintenance, and operation of traffic control devices, and provides for the sharing of the cost of traffic signals and pedestrian crossings (including pedestrian overpasses) between the Highways Department and councils on a two to one basis. The proportion to be borne by each authority depends on which body has the responsibility for the management of the road. The cost of other traffic control devices is to be borne by the authority installing, maintaining or operating the particular device. This new legislation does not, however, interfere with existing arrangements relating to traffic control devices within the area of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. Clause 5 repeals sections 21 and 22 of the principal Act as the provisions of these sections are now covered by new section 17. Clause 6

amends section 23 of the principal Act by deleting subsection (1); the provision of pedestrian crossings is now dealt with under new section 17. Subsections (2) and (3) of section 23 are amended by deleting the references to the use of flags at pedestrian crossings; hand signs bearing the word "Stop" are currently in use and the amendment reflects this position.

Clause 7 repeals sections 23a and 24 of the principal Act. The enactment of new section 17 will render these sections redundant. Clause 8 amends section 25 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on new section 19 (3) to ensure that the responsibility for maintenance is defined. Clauses 9 and 10 repeal sections 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31a of the principal Act, and clause 11 amends section 32 by deleting subsections (3a), (3b), (3c), (3d), and (4) as the former requirements of these sections and subsections are now embodied in new section 17. Clause 12 amends section 61 of the principal Act to enable incapacitated persons to operate motorized wheelchairs on footpaths. This is an amendment that all honourable members will, I am sure, warmly support.

Clause 13 repeals and re-enacts section 74 of the principal Act. The terms of the original enactment prescribed the duty of drivers to give signals when stopping, turning or diverging, and the method of giving those signals is laid down under regulation 6-01 of the principal Act. However, certain portions of the existing section 74 were regulatory in nature and it is desirable that those subsections be removed from the Act and transferred to the regulations in order to consolidate the regulatory details and specifications within the same area of legislation. The new section 74 now prescribes the obligations of drivers to give signals, and regulatory detail has been removed. Clause 14 amends section 76 of the principal Act. This section at present prescribes the form of the signs prohibiting turns. However, symbolic signs of a regulatory nature are incorporated in the United Nations Convention on Road Signs, and their use will be progressively introduced throughout Australia. In order that those symbolic signs currently agreed to on a national basis may be legally installed in South Australia, amendment of the principal Act is necessary. Section 76 now permits the use of verbal signs only.

Clause 15 amends section 82 of the principal Act. The amendment provides that, where it is in the public interest to do so, the board

may grant a permit authorizing the establishment of temporary parking zones. Where such a zone is established and properly marked out, it will be unlawful for anyone except an authorized person to park in the zone. Clause 16 repeals and re-enacts section 91 of the principal Act. Following the sinking of a Murray River ferry at Wellington in 1969, the Commissioner of Highways set up a committee to report on legislative changes necessary to improve the safety of these craft. Arising from this investigation, it was found that at dual crossings problems arise in traffic control as vehicles are not always loaded in strict order of arrival. It is difficult for the ferryman to exercise control over this matter from his position on the ferry, and provision has been made under the ferry lease agreements for the employment of an assistant ferryman to control this traffic movement. However, under the existing provisions of the principal Act, a motor vehicle driver is required to obey only the directions of the person in charge of the ferry, and the proposed amendment extends the authority for traffic control to the assistant ferryman. A further matter arising from the committee's report concerned the load limits applicable to Murray River ferries. The ferries are designed to carry an overall load of 48 tons under normal operating conditions. However, drivers of vehicles are not required to carry weighbridge notes under the Road Traffic Act and, as a consequence, the assessment of a vehicle's load is based on the operator's experience. New section 91 now provides that the driver shall inform the ferryman of the vehicle's laden weight or supply sufficient information to permit an estimation of that weight.

Clause 17 repeals certain sections and enacts new sections 136 and 137. The requirements for windscreen wipers and washers to ensure reasonable visibility through the windscreen are now covered by an Australian design rule for motor vehicle safety. The existing section 136 conflicts with the requirements of this Australian design rule and it is essential that it be amended to permit the promulgation of regulations incorporating these requirements. The Australian Design Rules for Motor Vehicle Safety also prescribe standards for the fitting of rear vision mirrors, which are incompatible with the present requirements of the existing section 137 of the principal Act. In order that South Australia can adopt the nationally accepted standards, it is necessary that new section 137 be enacted.

Clause 18 enacts new section 138b of the principal Act. There are a number of road construction and earthmoving vehicles operated by various Government departments, local authorities and contractors which technically must comply with the provisions of sections 111-124 of the principal Act with respect to head lamps and rear lamps. The majority of these are not operated during the hours of darkness or periods of low visibility, and it is considered that it is unnecessary and uneconomical for them to be so fitted as they would soon become covered by dirt, dust or mud and, in the case of certain equipment—for example, soil stabilizers—would soon work loose. If these vehicles were used in emergency situations—flooding, land slides, falling trees—after sunset or during periods of low visibility, they would still be required to be fitted with the necessary lights. This could be achieved by the use of portable equipment. There are also instances where vehicles of a "special nature" (for example, fork lifts, not equipped with electrical wiring, such as those used in conjunction with the handling of flammable liquids where insulation is costly) should also be given an exemption. Under existing legislation, the board has no power to grant exemptions from the fitting of this equipment, and, to enable it to do so, where in the opinion of the board it is unnecessary to fit the equipment, amendment to the Act is necessary; and new section 138b incorporates these exempting powers and the provisions of section 137a of the principal Act, which is repealed by clause 32 of this Bill.

Clause 19 empowers the Minister, after consideration of reports from the Commissioner of Highways and the board, to grant a permit for the operation of a motor omnibus notwithstanding that it does not comply with the axle-weight requirements. The permit must define the route on which the bus may be operated and may be subject to any other conditions or restrictions. Clause 20 amends section 160 of the principal Act. The existing section of the Act provides that only a member of the Police Force may issue a defect notice for a motor vehicle and approve the removal of such notice. The new section 160 allows for the appointment of inspectors to issue, and approve the removal of, such notices. Clause 21 amends section 161a of the principal Act. The existing provisions of section 161a require Road Traffic Board approval before a hovercraft can be driven on a road. With the construction of other special vehicles such as land yachts,

it is necessary to broaden this control section to include these vehicles. The amendment provides for regulations to be made to bring special classes of vehicle within the scope of this section.

Clause 22 repeals and re-enacts section 162a of the principal Act. It has been said in Parliament and by members of the public that the wording of existing section 162a of the principal Act is too complex and that the intent is not clear. From time to time section 162a of the principal Act has been amended and there is now a need to consolidate the original section; new section 162a effects this consolidation. Clause 23 amends section 176 of the principal Act. Paragraph (n) is amended as a consequence of the provision of exempting powers in regard to lighting equipment on vehicles as detailed in clause 33 of this Bill. With the adoption by South Australia of regulations under the Road Traffic Act in accordance with design rules endorsed by the Australian Transport Advisory Council, it has been seen fit to allow the Road Traffic Board to exercise discretionary power to exempt certain vehicles from compliance with these rules. The functions of the board as described in section 15 of the principal Act are mainly of an advisory nature and the Crown Solicitor has indicated that, in present circumstances, this discretionary power could be construed as an authorized delegation of power. To eliminate this doubt, new subsection (4) of section 176 of the principal Act has been enacted.

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

TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The need for this short Bill, which amends the Textile Products Description Act, 1953, as amended, arises from a view taken, in connection with certain proposed proceedings in another State, as to the true meaning of the definition of "textile product" in section 4 of the Act. For convenience, I set out that definition in full:

"textile product" means—

- (a) woven, knitted or felted materials manufactured from fibre;
- (b) tops, yarns, threads and lace;

(c) articles of wearing apparel manufactured in whole or in part of such materials, but not including linings, interlinings or trimmings forming part of such articles;

(d) carpets of all kinds; but does not include any article which is for the time being declared by regulation not to be a textile product for the purposes of this Act.

For a number of years the authorities administering the legislation, which is essentially similar in all States, have assumed that all articles manufactured of materials specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of the definition were textile products within the meaning of the definition, unless specially exempted by regulation. In fact, some such articles have been exempted from the provisions of the Acts of all States on the basis that they fall within one or other limbs of the definition. To put the matter beyond doubt the responsible Ministers in the States propose that a common amendment should be made to the definition contained in each relevant State Act. The amendment proposed is to remove the words "of wearing apparel" from paragraph (c) of the definition and this amendment has been effected by clause 4 of this Bill.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (OATH)

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

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the second reading of this Bill to be moved forthwith.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): On a point of order, Mr. President, I point out that this is the third suspension for this purpose that has been requested this afternoon. The relevant Standing Order states that in case of urgent necessity Standing Orders can be suspended without notice. I would like to know what the urgent necessity is and whether this is in accordance with Standing Orders, as, indeed, I would like to know whether the other suspensions were in accordance with Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: It is a matter for the Council itself to decide.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have no objection. I moved the motion only to assist the Council. If honourable members do not want

the second reading of the Bill to be moved today, it can be done tomorrow.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I like to see the proceedings of the Council carried out in a regular manner.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

All I try to do is, in a humble way, to assist in getting the work done. If any exception is taken, it does not matter. This short Bill, which is, in terms, self-explanatory, seeks to change the form of the oath, prescribed by section 42 of the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, to a somewhat shorter and less archaic one. A report of the House of Assembly Standing Orders Committee, 1970-72, in dealing with the present form of oath stated:

The oath has been in the same form since the first House of Assembly met in 1857 and appears to be an adaptation of the House of Commons oath of the 1850's; it reflected the storm and stress in religious and political thought and sought to safeguard the throne against the machinations of its suspected foes. Its historical background has no relevance to the South Australian House of Assembly of 1972.

In the Government's view, this oath which is to be sworn by members of both Houses has, in the words of the report, "no relevance" to either House of Parliament in 1972. The form of oath recommended by the Standing Orders Committee and approved of by the House of Assembly and now proposed is essentially the same in nature and length as the oath now taken by members of the House of Commons and the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth and in fact is the usual oath of allegiance provided for by section 8 of the Oaths Act, 1936-1969. To consider the Bill in some detail:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the fixing of a day as the day on which the amending Act shall come into operation. It is the intention of the Government that a day that occurs after the expiration of the term of the present Parliament should be so fixed. Clause 3 inserts two new subsections in section 42 of the principal Act. The first provides for the taking of the oath in its new form by members elected on or after the day of commencement of the amending Act. The second should ensure that those honourable members of the Legislative Council whose term of office continues beyond the life of the present Parliament will not be obliged to take

the oath in its new form with respect to the balance of their term of office.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held in June last the Commonwealth agreed to support a total programme of \$982,000,000 for all State works and services, including housing. This sum is an increase of \$90,000,000, or about 10 per cent, above the 1971-72 total of \$892,000,000 which was made up of \$860,000,000 arranged in June, 1971, and a supplementary \$32,000,000 arranged in February, 1972. The increase of 10 per cent is the most liberal increase supported by the Commonwealth for many years. Having regard to the continuing demands on State Governments to provide more and improved facilities for the community, to the ready availability of physical resources, to the need to generate employment, and accordingly to the necessity to try to sustain the higher level of activity in State Government capital works reached in the latter part of 1971-72, such an increase is no more than the minimum justified. South Australia's share of the total determined is \$134,628,000, which is \$12,338,000 above the final allocation of \$122,290,000 for 1971-72. The latter aggregate was made up of the \$117,900,000 initially approved and reported to Parliament 12 months ago and a supplementary \$4,390,000 arranged in February. The total new funds of \$134,628,000 to be advanced in 1972-73 are to comprise \$100,554,000 by way of loan, subject to payment of interest and sinking fund, and \$34,074,000 by way of grant, free of interest and repayment.

In addition to the new funds amounting to \$134,628,000 known to be available to finance the programme, the Government expects to receive repayments and recoveries of about \$24,600,000. Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our loan programme and are expected to amount to some \$300,000, will not have to be paid by us in cash, as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$159,528,000 becoming available during the course of the year.

The total of payments proposed is \$159,560,000, and this would result in a nominal deficit of \$32,000 for the year 1972-73. This is virtually a balance proposed for the year and is in line with the Government's judgment that it would be reasonable to disburse all funds becoming available currently. This judgment has been made after considering recent movements, the current situation, and future prospects for Revenue Account. The main points relevant to a consideration of Loan programmes are as follows. At the beginning of 1971-72, the State had accumulated revenue deficits of \$4,558,000, and during 1971-72 recorded a further deficit of \$1,066,000, thus taking the aggregate of outstanding deficits on Revenue Account to \$5,624,000. The Commonwealth Grants Commission has now recommended a completion grant of \$7,500,000 in respect of the period to June 30, 1971, and this will suffice to eliminate the whole of our outstanding deficits and still leave a small balance available to offset any future revenue deficit.

For 1972-73, it seems that if we plan on a continued expansion of services at recent rates, and at the same time make reasonable allowance for the cost of wage and salary awards that may become effective during the course of the year, the Government will still be faced with the prospect of a considerable revenue deficit in the year, even after taking into account a special grant of \$13,500,000 as recommended by the commission. In attempting to look further forward into 1973-74 and beyond, we must conclude that, while such special grants may be expected to increase steadily from year to year, we cannot expect them to continue to increase at the recent rate. South Australia is now approaching the situation of having caught up to the standard of the larger Eastern States in its overall Budget provisions, and a maintenance of the recent rate of improvement of social services beyond 1972-73 will carry with it the virtual certainty of revenue deficits. Therefore, the Government believes it would be prudent, where practicable, to continue to hold some measure of funds in reserve against an uncertain future beyond the current year. However, the knowledge that the State's past revenue deficits are to be covered by a completion grant has influenced the Government to a decision not to attempt at this stage to build up Loan balances further. Accordingly, we now plan to use on capital projects the whole of the funds, both new funds and

recoveries, expected to become available in 1972-73.

The programme of semi-governmental borrowing approved by the Australian Loan Council in June last for all States totalled \$488,000,000, an increase of about \$49,000,000 above the total allocations for 1971-72. Excluding special allocations, the increase in the basic programme was from \$432,000,000 to \$466,000,000, that is, \$34,000,000, or about 8 per cent. In line with that programme South Australia has an allocation of \$23,696,000 of borrowing authority, an increase of \$1,729,000 above last year. Because of a slowing in the rate of increase in demand for electric power, probably temporary, it is practicable this year to reduce the semi-governmental borrowing allocation to the Electricity Trust of South Australia from almost \$9,000,000 to \$6,000,000. This will enable the Government to increase the allocation to the Housing Trust from just over \$8,000,000 to \$8,746,000 to meet the requirements of the larger local government bodies, and to allocate borrowing authority of \$3,000,000 to the newly-formed Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. I shall comment on this matter later when dealing with the Loan provision for the festival theatre.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$1,750,000—It is proposed to make available a total of about \$2,450,000 in 1972-73 to finance capital extensions by primary producers co-operatives. Loan Account will provide \$1,750,000, new semi-governmental borrowing \$400,000, and funds in hand from earlier borrowings some \$300,000.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$1,000,000—Advances of State Loan funds are required by the bank from time to time to provide additional capital for its expanding trading bank activities. A further advance of \$1,000,000 is proposed this year to assist the bank to meet the requirements of its existing customers in rural areas, in secondary industry, and in commerce.

ROADS AND BRIDGES, \$800,000—It is estimated that there remains about \$7,500,000 of work to complete the sealing of the Eyre Highway in South Australia and, as in normal circumstances it would not be possible to set aside from the Highways Fund more than about \$600,000 a year towards this project, the indications are that it could be 12 to 15 years before completion could be expected. A two-thirds special contribution from the Commonwealth would have made it possible to complete the project in about four years, but repeated requests for this assistance by

various South Australian Administrations have not yet been successful. The Government regards the alternative of a 12 to 15-year wait as quite unacceptable and some months ago approached the Commonwealth with a proposal which, although it would place a heavy burden on State resources, would ensure that the highway is sealed in the minimum time that is physically practicable.

Under this proposal the Commonwealth Government would provide a grant of \$2,500,000 over the four years to June, 1976, the Highways Fund would provide a similar amount from roads moneys, and there would be a temporary diversion of a further \$2,500,000 of developmental funds from the Electricity Trust to the Highways Department. Some portion of the trust's semi-governmental funds would be deposited with the Treasurer in each of the four years to June, 1976, at the rate of interest actually being paid by the trust, and the Treasurer would lend corresponding amounts at the same interest rate to the Highways Fund to finance the deficiency in its cash funds caused by the accelerated rate of progress on the Eyre Highway. In the subsequent four years the fund should be able to repay these advances to the Treasurer, who would in turn repay the Electricity Trust, and the effect would be to seal the highway in four years by setting aside road funds to the extent of \$5,000,000 over eight years. As yet no reply has been received from the Commonwealth, but the Government has determined to push ahead with the work in the hope that that Government will appreciate the importance of this vital link with the west and agree to assist in its construction. Accordingly, a provision of \$800,000 has been made this year for a transfer to the Highways Fund, which will supplement \$600,000 to be provided for the Eyre Highway out of current moneys of the fund.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE, \$1,300,000—Stage IV of the Sturt River realignment between Oaklands Road and Sturt Road is now complete except for minor items of fencing and clearing up, and Stage V at Sturt Road is nearing completion. Much of the preparatory work at the Patawalonga Basin has been carried out and the widening of the basin itself will proceed this year. The sum of \$870,000 is provided for these purposes. An amount of \$430,000 is proposed for the continuation of work on drains in various stages of progress and for the commencement of construction work on certain other drains.

OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$1,500,000—An appropriation of \$1,350,000 is provided this year so that work may continue on schemes for disposal of floodwaters already approved and for such new schemes as may be accepted for subsidy during the year. The sum of \$150,000 is also provided for subsidies for effluent drainage schemes as may be recommended by a special committee and approved by the Government.

PUBLIC PARKS, \$300,000—The Land Tax Amendment Act of 1970 imposed a surcharge of 1c for every \$20 of unimproved value of all metropolitan land in order that funds of about \$600,000 a year should be available to assist in the provision of parks, reserves and open space areas. Last year, \$300,000 was transferred from Revenue Account to the Planning and Development Fund to be used for acquisition of open space areas, while a further \$300,000 of revenue moneys was appropriated for grants to councils towards the cost of public parks. At the end of 1971-72 the unspent balance in the Public Parks Deposit Account was reduced to \$78,000, while subsidies approved and payable from the account but not yet claimed by councils amounted to \$333,000.

Since the Government introduced, in 1970-71, subsidies for the development of land purchased after July 1, 1970, in addition to the longstanding subsidies on the purchase of land, the value of approvals has considerably exceeded the volume of new funds becoming available, and it is now apparent that that portion of the land tax surcharge which it has been recent practice to allocate to public parks will not by itself be sufficient to finance the present unusually high level of activity in this field. Accordingly, the Government has decided to make available \$300,000 of Loan funds this year which, together with a further allocation from the Revenue Budget, should ensure that the present peak in requirements is financed and the provision of public parks continues at a satisfactory rate.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$1,800,000—Emphasis will again be on a scheme for the replacement with pipe main of a number of old channels but other projects will be undertaken, including the final stage of domestic water supplies direct from the river at Cobdogla and Barmera.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$540,000—The Remark Irrigation Trust Act provides for the Government to finance, partly by grant and partly by loan, the cost of constructing a new

pumping station and ancillary works at Renmark up to a total of \$1,675,000. The Act also provides for Government grants not exceeding \$1,000,000 in total towards the cost of rehabilitation of the irrigation works and the provision of additional drainage. For 1972-73, \$165,000 is proposed for work on the pumping station and \$375,000 for channel rehabilitation and drainage. This will bring the total expended on the pumping station up to the maximum provided in the Act, while expenditure on channel rehabilitation will rise above the presently specified limit. The Government has agreed to finance the extra work, however, and intends to introduce amending legislation shortly.

NATIONAL RESERVES, \$400,000—Last year the Government spent \$363,000 on the acquisition of land for reserves and for improvements and this year it is intended to provide \$400,000 for these purposes. The Government has been assisted in the programme of land acquisition by a gift of \$190,000 from the Australian Conservation Foundation, of which \$23,000 was spent in 1970-71, \$101,000 was included in last year's expenditures, and the balance of \$66,000 is included in this year's proposals.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$3,200,000—For 1972-73 a total allocation of \$3,400,000 is proposed, of which \$200,000 is expected to be provided by the Commonwealth under the terms of the Softwood Forestry Agreement and the balance is to come from State Loan funds. The sum of \$575,000 is provided to enable established forests to be protected and maintained, while \$860,000 will be required for preparing land for planting, for the establishment of new plantations and for improvements to existing plantations. Some \$390,000 is to be made available for the purchase of land suitable for afforestation. The first two stages of the debarking and chipping installations at Mount Gambier have been completed, and \$30,000 is provided so that work may continue on the third stage. Work has commenced on the reorganization of the wood preservation plant at Mount Gambier, and the \$100,000 proposed this year should be sufficient to complete this project.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, \$7,900,000—For 1972-73, the Way and Works Branch is provided with \$3,640,000, of which just over half, \$1,881,000, is for such standard items as track re-laying, bridges and culverts, signalling and safety devices and minor buildings and improvements. Of the balance, \$496,000 is for work on the railway from Port Stanvac to Christie

Downs, \$210,000 is to provide housing for employees, \$500,000 is for continuation of a special programme of upgrading main lines, and \$553,000 is for plant and sundries. The sum of \$4,260,000 is proposed for the Rolling Stock branch, including \$1,970,000 for new freight vehicles, \$676,000 for improvements to existing freight vehicles, \$700,000 for new passenger vehicles, and \$74,000 to complete payments on six diesel-electric locomotives.

HARBOURS ACCOMMODATION, \$5,375,000—The sum of \$1,300,000 is provided this year so that work may continue on the navigation channel between the Inner and Outer Harbours at Port Adelaide. The deepening programme has been completed and this provision is now required to widen the river to a minimum width of 500ft. and to reclaim adjacent low-lying areas. An amount of \$800,000 is included for the passenger terminal at Outer Harbour while expenditure of \$700,000 is proposed this year for work on the roll-on-roll-off berthing facility at Port Adelaide which is designed for the interstate steel traffic. A further \$1,500,000 is provided for work on the Port Lincoln bulk loading facility and associated improvements. The existing shipping pier will be extended by about 1,950ft. to provide in deep water an inner berth for unloading phosphate rock and two outer berths for the loading of grain ships.

FISHING HAVENS AND FORESHORE IMPROVEMENTS, \$200,000—This year, \$200,000 is proposed for work on the Wallaroo jetty, the Port Wakefield wharf, the slipway at Beachport, and a number of other minor projects.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$31,925,000.
Metropolitan Waterworks, \$10,140,000—The Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main is about three-quarters complete with the majority of the main laid, the three pumping stations well advanced and parts of the storage capacity completed. For 1972-73 the sum of \$3,440,000 is provided, and it is intended to lay the final stages of the main, complete the storage facilities at the summit of the Mount Lofty Ranges, install pumps and motors in all pumping stations and build the control centre. A major new trunk water main is being laid from Darlington in the south of Adelaide to Port Adelaide in the north in order to balance the supply of water with demand for it and to supply the proposed West Lakes Scheme. During 1972-73, the laying of mains will continue and a 500,000gall. reinforced concrete tank will be constructed at Seaciff. This requires the provision of \$2,082,000, which is part of a total provision of \$2,432,000 for mains. The

sum of \$254,000 is provided for the purchase of land in catchment areas at Chain of Ponds, Hope Valley and Mount Bold, in order to protect metropolitan water supplies from possible pollution.

Country Waterworks, \$8,359,000—The sum of \$675,000 is proposed for continuation of work on the construction of a pipeline to connect the Tod trunk main near Lock with Kimba in order to provide a water supply for the township of Kimba and grazing land *en route*. A further \$463,000 is provided for improvements to the water supply at Murray Bridge. This year it is intended to make a start on the new mains, complete the pumping station buildings, install the pumping plant and complete the 2,000,000gall. tank. The sum of \$837,000 is required for the completion of the Taillem Bend to Keith main. Construction of the main, pumping stations and storage is now complete, and it is expected that the laying of 500 miles of branch mains will be completed in 1972. These mains will serve farmlands and townships within the proposed water reticulation area, which covers about 2,000,000 acres. A Commonwealth grant of two-thirds of the cost of this project incurred after February 26, 1969, subject to a maximum of \$6,000,000, is available under the National Water Resources Development Programme, but it now appears that the full amount will not be claimed as the cost has been kept within the original estimate. The most recent estimate is for a total cost of \$13,293,000 and a Commonwealth grant of \$5,541,000. A total of \$2,805,000 is included for the continuation of work on the enlargement and replacement of the old Tod trunk main, which has now deteriorated to the stage where considerable expenditure must be incurred annually for maintenance. The section from Knotts Hill to Minnipa should be completed during 1972-73 and further mains be replaced in the Minnipa to Thevenard section.

Metropolitan Sewerage, \$6,697,000—The sum of \$1,172,000 is provided for further work on the scheme to increase the capacity of the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works. These changes are planned to increase the capacity of the existing works by 75,000, to 250,000 persons. For the reconstruction of existing sewers an amount of \$1,336,000 is proposed. The major projects involved are in the south-western suburbs where the scheme is designed to provide relief from flooding and to provide an outlet for the Blackwood-Belair area; and in the north-eastern suburbs where a scheme is designed to eliminate flooding of private

property and overflows into the Torrens River. The sum of \$1,308,000 is provided for the sewerage of new areas. One of the projects included in this provision is the Christies Beach and Noarlunga district sewerage scheme. The Morphett Vale and West Reynella areas have been completed and work will continue at Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga.

Country Sewerage, \$2,167,000—Work will continue on the comprehensive sewerage scheme for Gawler where approach sewers have been laid and works in the Gawler West area completed. A sum of \$300,000 is proposed for this project, and the sum of \$760,000 is provided for further work on the Port Pirie sewerage scheme, and \$502,000 for a comprehensive sewerage scheme at Victor Harbour.

Other Works—An appropriation of \$800,000 is required for work on the provision of roads, stormwater drainage, water supply and sewerage facilities in that portion of the old Islington sewage farm area which is being developed for industrial use.

MURRAY RIVER WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$725,000—It is estimated that a South Australian contribution of \$725,000 will be required towards the cost of capital works, principally in connection with Dartmouth reservoir, to be undertaken under the terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement. The River Murray Commission has advised the Government that South Australia's contribution towards the cost of construction of the Dartmouth reservoir this year is expected to be \$1,250,000. The Commonwealth will advance to the State one-half of the contribution and the State must find the balance from its own funds. Each advance from the Commonwealth is repayable by the State in 30 equal half-yearly instalments with the first instalment due 10 years after the advance has been made.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$48,675,000.

Hospital Buildings, \$14,000,000—Some of the major proposals for 1972-73 are:

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—The sum of \$550,000 is included for work to continue on the construction of an additional floor to the new wing and \$315,000 for other works at the institute.

Flinders Medical Centre—The sum of \$3,650,000 is included for work to commence on the construction of stages IA and IB at Flinders Medical Centre. Stage IA provides for a six-storey building with two adjacent wings to house lecture theatres, library and services. The main block will provide accommodation for the pre-clinical medical school

and laboratory, workshops, lecture theatres, seminar rooms, a library, nurse-training facilities and service area. Stage IB provides for residential accommodation in the form of domestic three-bedroom flats, the construction of a boilerhouse, and maintenance workshops in a wing attached to the boilerhouse. The estimated cost of the whole project is \$36,000,000.

Glenside Hospital—The sum of \$550,000 is provided for work on the construction of a new psychogeriatric ward to replace the existing accommodation at the Glenside Hospital. The proposed unit is designed to cater for 40 inpatients and 40 outpatients.

Modbury Hospital—The sum of \$2,300,000 is provided for work on stage I of the new Modbury Hospital which is programmed for completion in the current financial year. The work comprises the nine-storey main hospital building, the nine-storey nurses' home, the resident medical officers' block, a workshop block and general siteworks.

Mount Gambier Hospital—The sum of \$500,000 is proposed for work to commence on extensions to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science laboratories, an additional wing to the existing staff block, and a new nurses' training school.

Port Pirie Hospital—The sum of \$800,000 is proposed for work on stages I and II of the re-development of Port Pirie Hospital. The work comprises a children's and maternity ward complex, administration accommodation, nurses' training centre, resident medical officers' quarters, bulk store and mortuary.

School Buildings, \$23,300,000—For 1972-73 the proposals for school buildings and associated works total \$23,300,000, and it is intended that these funds will be applied as follows:

	\$
Work under 68 projects with a total value of \$25,412,000 for new schools or major additions to schools, technical colleges, a teachers college and an adult education centre which were in progress at June 30, 1972 . . .	14,138,000
The commencement of 27 projects with a total value of \$10,591,000 for new schools or major additions to schools, and technical colleges . . .	906,000
Minor new buildings	526,000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	1,930,000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences for school purposes	950,000

	\$
Minor alterations, furniture and equipment, subsidized works and preliminary investigations and design	4,850,000
	\$23,300,000

Commonwealth grants of \$1,830,000 towards general school buildings and about \$4,000,000 towards specific projects are anticipated this year and the proposed expenditures include progress payments for works financed from these special funds.

Other Government Buildings, \$11,375,000—Some of the more important or interesting provisions for 1972-73 are:

Agricultural College Department—The sum of \$40,000 is provided to finalize the first stage of a scheme for major extensions at the college. The work comprises a new dormitory block for 70 students, kitchen and dining-room facilities, a laundry and a stores building. A provision of \$15,000 has been made for preliminary work on the second stage of the development at the college. The work comprises a library, a teaching block, a biochemistry wing, and the upgrading of existing residential accommodation.

Department for Community Welfare—The sum of \$500,000 is included for an expanded programme of housing and other capital projects for Aborigines.

Department of Public Health—The sum of \$350,000 is required to commence construction of a new chest clinic building in North Terrace. The work includes the chest clinic itself, a special clinic, staff amenities and plant rooms.

Department of the Premier and of Development—The sum of \$250,000 is proposed for work to commence on alterations to Ayers House, which is being developed as a headquarters for the National Trust, and \$40,000 is required to commence construction of a new first-class restaurant at Windy Point.

Government Printing Department—The sum of \$2,500,000 is proposed for work on the new printing office and mapping branch at Netley. The project incorporates a mapping branch building comprising photogrammetry and cartography production areas together with ancillary training facilities.

ADVANCES FOR HOUSING, \$29,500,000—Last year, following the expiry of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, new arrangements were made for the provision of State Loan funds for housing. Where previously these funds had been made available by the Commonwealth at concessional interest rates

and handled through special accounts, they were now to be made available as part of the normal Loan programme and handled through Loan Account with Commonwealth grants replacing the direct concession in interest rates. The one unchanged procedure was to be in respect of funds advanced from the Home Builders Account and financed from repayments of previous borrowings made from that account by the State Bank and the building societies.

In 1971-72 total allocations of \$14,600,000 for the State Bank through the Home Builders Account and \$13,100,000 for the South Australian Housing Trust, together with \$2,100,000 of advances to building societies from recoveries into the Home Builders Account, meant that a total of \$29,800,000 was made available for housing purposes. In 1972-73 the Government intends to allocate \$29,500,000 of new Loan funds to housing with \$15,500,000 going to the Home Builders Account No. 2 and \$14,000,000 to the Housing Trust. The Home Builders Accounts will also have available recoveries and balances in hand sufficient to permit total advances of about \$16,800,000 to the State Bank and about \$2,250,000 to the building societies. When to these figures the lending institutions add their own net recoveries, a total lending programme approaching \$23,500,000 is anticipated.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST—In 1971-72 the trust used \$13,100,000 of State Loan funds, \$8,025,000 of semi-governmental borrowing \$9,175,000 of internal funds to finance a capital programme of \$30,300,000. House construction, including land and site development, accounted for \$24,900,000, industrial and commercial building for \$4,900,000, and plant and equipment for \$500,000. Proposals for 1972-73 involve a total capital programme of \$34,200,000, comprising \$14,000,000 from Loan Account, \$8,746,000 of semi-governmental borrowing, and \$11,454,000 from internal funds. Finance from these sources will permit work to continue on the 1,606 units under construction at June 30 last and should enable the trust to commence a further 2,161 houses and flats so that progress will be made on a total of 3,767 dwellings during the year. It should also enable the expanded industrial and commercial programme to be continued at about the same rate as last year.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA—**LOAN TO**, \$3,000,000—The capital works programme of the trust in 1971-72 amounted to \$21,236,000 and is expected to be \$29,650,000,

or \$8,414,000 greater in 1972-73. This increase in expenditure relates mainly to progress payments for the first stage of section "B" of the Torrens Island power station and for the Dry Creek power station. At Dry Creek it is expected that two gas turbines will be installed during the year and substantial payments made in respect of a third, while at Torrens Island large payments are expected on boilers and turbo-generators. A total of nearly \$16,000,000 will be spent on these two power stations. Apart from power stations the anticipated expenditure in 1972-73 is much the same as actual expenditure in the year just past. Development of the 275,000-volt metropolitan transmission system will continue with the construction of an additional circuit between Para and Magill substations, and work associated with the turning into Para substation of the 132,000-volt transmission line running between Northfield and Waterloo will proceed. Work will also proceed on a 132,000-volt transmission line from Hummocks substation to a terminal station to be built at Ardrossan.

There will be further progress in respect of the reinforcement of supply to the South-East and Yorke Peninsula, and extensions will be made to the Keith, Tailem Bend and Mount Gambier substations. A 275,000-volt transmission line will be built between Para and Tailem Bend substations. Of the trust's total programme of \$29,650,000, only \$3,000,000 is to be provided from State Loan funds, a further \$6,000,000 is to be raised by borrowings from financial institutions and the public, and the balance of \$20,650,000 is to be met from the trust's internal funds.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST—**LOAN TO**, \$400,000—It was earlier intended to advance \$3,000,000 over three years to the trust to finance the replacement of its older diesel bus fleet with modern diesel vehicles designed for one-man operation. Sums of \$1,000,000 were advanced in each of the last two years but a recent review of the trust's capital programme and cash flows indicates that \$400,000 will probably suffice for 1972-73. Further advances will need to be made in 1973-74, by which time the trust's programme and cash situation will have been reviewed again.

STATE PLANNING AUTHORITY—**LOAN TO**, \$500,000—This provision is a broad estimate of the amount which may be required in 1972-73 to finance acquisitions for the Hackney Redevelopment Scheme and Murray New Town. The former project is designed to replace existing substandard dwellings with a mixed density housing development while the

latter is being planned carefully by the Government to provide an attractive alternative to the continued rapid expansion of Adelaide with all the problems associated with such growth.

FESTIVAL THEATRE, \$880,000—Under arrangements with the Adelaide City Council, the Government is responsible for a contribution of about \$4,280,000 towards the festival theatre estimated to cost \$6,250,000. To June 30 last a total of \$3,400,000 had been set aside in a special account and advances made to the council from that account for progress payments to the constructing authority. The provision of \$880,000 included in the Loan Estimates this year is the amount estimated to be required to complete the Government's contribution and it will be paid into the account in the normal way. Payments from the account to the end of June last totalled \$2,140,000, and it is likely that the balance of a further \$2,140,000 will be paid to the council this year. The cultural complex associated with the festival theatre, and comprising a drama theatre, an experimental theatre, an amphitheatre, office accommodation and a restaurant, is being financed by loans mainly from banks and life insurance companies to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust under semi-government borrowing arrangements this year. So far, the response from these finance houses has been excellent and the Government is grateful for the co-operation, which is likely to provide about \$3,000,000 this year. It is hoped that a similar amount will be forthcoming in 1973-74.

TRANSPORT RESEARCH, \$500,000—A contribution of \$500,000 is proposed in 1972-73 towards a programme of research and development relating to public passenger transport. The types of research to be undertaken include feasibility studies into new modes of public transport, operational studies into methods of improving existing services, a review of the transport implications of a number of current projects, investigation into possible new policy initiatives in the field of public transport, analysis of the effects of technological change, and an examination of environmental factors associated with the transport of people and goods.

FORESHORE PROTECTION, \$450,000—The sum of \$450,000 is proposed for work on protective measures along the foreshore. This amount is for work of a true betterment nature designed to prevent damage from future heavy winds and tides, and costs of repair and restoration of past damage are to be a charge against

Revenue Account. Some \$250,000 of the provision for 1972-73 is for work arising from the 1971 storm at North Glenelg and Brighton, and for a study into the best method of replenishing sand on metropolitan beaches. The balance is for an extended programme largely consequential upon the heavy tides at the end of June last, for which details have not yet been finalized.

UNIVERSITY AND ADVANCED EDUCATION BUILDINGS, \$7,500,000—A capital programme of \$20,062,000 was agreed to by the Commonwealth and the South Australian Governments for the two universities and the South Australian Institute of Technology in the 1970-1972 triennium. Of this total, \$20,000,000 is being provided by way of State and Commonwealth grants, with \$62,000 being provided by residential colleges from their own resources. To June 30, 1972, a total of \$19,037,000 had been paid as grants to these institutions, and the balance of \$963,000 is included in the 1972-73 provision. Recommendations made by the Australian Universities Commission and the Commonwealth Commission on Advanced Education for the 1973-1975 period have not yet been published, but the Government has been given advance notice of them and so has been able to make some assessment of the volume of work likely to take place in the first six months of 1973. Progress in this initial period is difficult to estimate, but provision is included for work on projects of high priority, including the purchase of land for the new Torrens College of Advanced Education, which is planned to incorporate Western Teachers College and the School of Art from the beginning of 1973. In accordance with established practice, the gross amount of grants will be appropriated and the Commonwealth contribution of half the approved cost will be credited to Loan Account as received.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$6,000,000—The major building projects for non-government hospitals and institutions for which grants are proposed this year are as follows:

Barmera Hospital—The sum of \$100,000 is required in 1972-73 to complete this 44-bed hospital and nurses quarters which are to replace the existing Government hospital at Barmera. The Government is meeting the capital cost of this project in full, and to June 30, 1972, had paid about \$1,120,000.

Home for Incurables—Construction commenced in 1971-72 on an expansion programme estimated to cost \$11,000,000. It is planned

that the existing accommodation of 400 beds will be doubled and the cost is to be met in full by the Government. The \$1,400,000 provided in 1972-73 will permit the continuation of the second stage of the project.

Karoonda Hospital—This new 14-bed hospital is currently under construction and, of the \$330,000 Government subsidy approved, \$226,000 is required in 1972-73 to complete the project.

Lyell McEwin Hospital—The Government is meeting the full cost of extensions to provide additional bed accommodation, facilities for nurse training, and minor up-grading. An amount of \$300,000 is proposed to continue this project in 1972-73.

Naracoorte Hospital—Extensions to provide increased bed accommodation, a new maternity section, and a nursing home section are expected to attract a Government subsidy of \$400,000. It is proposed to provide \$270,000 of this amount in 1972-73.

North-Eastern Community Hospital—A Government subsidy of \$1,053,000 is being provided towards the cost of this complex, which is to provide a 40-bed general hospital, a 44-bed nursing home, and domiciliary services; \$800,000 is being provided in 1972-73.

Pinnaroo Hospital—Proposed extensions and alterations estimated to attract a subsidy of \$270,000 have been approved, and \$240,000 is set aside in 1972-73 for this work.

Western Community Hospital—Tenders have been accepted for the erection of a new 56-bed hospital estimated to cost the Government about \$900,000 by way of subsidy. Of this amount, \$800,000 is proposed for 1972-73.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BUSES, \$450,000—In 1972-73 it is proposed to make available \$450,000 for the purchase of additional and replacement buses for the transport of schoolchildren in country areas.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, \$1,050,000—Development of the Automatic Data Processing Centre will continue with the purchase of new equipment and the phasing out of the original equipment at the end of its economic life. The sum of \$205,000 was provided for these purposes from Loan Account last year, and the considerably larger sum of \$1,050,000 is proposed for this year.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES—BOATS AND EQUIPMENT, \$50,000—The Government proposes to purchase a patrol vessel so that the department may better carry out its responsibilities of controlling and developing the State's resources of sea food.

Before dealing with the clauses of the Bill in order, I wish to point out some variations from the words and form of presentation used last year. The variations arise from four factors, which are:

- (1) the new procedures of the House of Assembly;
- (2) suggestions by the Parliamentary Counsel for improved wording and better presentation;
- (3) the necessity to validate certain borrowings in 1971-72 and to cover this matter if similar circumstances should arise in future; and
- (4) the elimination of certain provisions which follow from action under point (3).

The variation caused by the new procedures of the House of Assembly is quite simple. It is merely the presentation of the financial provisions in the first schedule in two columns instead of one, with sub-totals of groups of lines extended into the second column of figures, to correspond with the sub-totals shown in the Loan Estimates and thereby to facilitate discussion in Committee.

As to improvements suggested last year by Mr. Ludovici, the previous Parliamentary Counsel, and now adopted, honourable members will note that the clause dealing with the date of operation, which was clause 13 last year, has been brought forward to be clause 2 in this Bill, while the limitation in time expressed in clause 11 last year has now been incorporated into the opening words of clauses 5 and 6 in this Bill. Whereas previously the words "purpose", "work or purpose" and "undertaking" had been used in various places to describe what is essentially the same thing, the single word "purpose" has now been adopted throughout this Bill.

As to the validation of certain borrowings in 1971-72 for which clause 8 has been inserted in this Bill, honourable members may recall that in February last there was a special Premiers' Conference and meeting of the Australian Loan Council. As in some recent years, the States secured supplementary grants to assist in meeting their Revenue Budget problems. In addition, for the first time for many years, they were successful in securing Commonwealth support for supplements to their capital programme arranged under the procedures of the Australian Loan Council. South Australia secured an additional \$4,390,000, of which \$3,120,000 was by way of further borrowings and \$1,270,000 by way of capital grant.

The Government took immediate action to utilize the additional funds, and the necessary appropriation was arranged in accordance with the provisions of section 32b of the Public Finance Act. The latter provisions require that Parliament be informed of transactions in the next Public Purposes Loan Bill, and the Government is complying with this provision in the Bill before you by virtue of clause 7 and the second schedule, both in the normal form. However, while the Public Finance Act and clause 7 of this Bill refer to borrowing as well as to advances for the purpose of making expenditures, the wording is somewhat obscure. Governments have invariably taken the view that the borrowing referred to is to be in the year following the special expenditures and is to form part of the authorized borrowing programme for that following year. Therefore, clause 8 has been included in this Bill specially to validate the additional borrowing of \$3,120,000 arranged in February last and actually undertaken during the financial year 1971-72.

To avoid a repetition of this problem in future years, if similar circumstances should recur, the Government proposes that each annual Public Purposes Loan Bill should authorize the borrowing of the specified amount of Loan moneys approved by the Australian Loan Council for South Australia at the beginning of each financial year and, in addition, "such other sums as may be approved by the Australian Loan Council". Clause 5 in this Bill has been extended accordingly. In recent years a clause has been included to authorize the borrowing and payment of an unspecified sum in respect of the costs of discounts, charges and expenses that might occur during the course of the year. Last year clause 7 gave that authority. With the special addition to clause 5 of this Bill to give authority for borrowing "such other sums as may be approved by the Australian Loan Council", a clause such as clause 7 in last year's Bill becomes redundant and will no longer appear. The payments in respect of the discounts are covered by the first schedule and clause 6. All of the variations I have mentioned are incorporated in this Bill and have been discussed fully between the Under Treasurer, the Auditor-General, the acting Parliamentary Counsel, and the Clerk of the House of Assembly.

The explanations of the clauses in order are now: Clause 1 gives the short title in the usual way. Clause 2, specifying the operative date of the Bill, appears earlier than in previous Bills. Clause 3 gives definitions as in the past. Clause 4 sets out in the normal way the moneys that make up the Loan Fund. Clause 5 provides for the borrowing of South Australia's known allocation for 1972-73 of \$100,554,000 and now has the additional authority in general terms, as I have explained, to cover a possible supplementary allocation and also any increased indebtedness because of discounts.

Clause 6 provides for the expenditure of \$159,560,000 on the purposes set out in the first schedule. Clause 7 authorizes those advances made during 1971-72 by way of warrant pursuant to section 32b of the Public Finance Act. Clause 8, as I have explained, validates the additional borrowings made last year. Clause 9 makes the usual provision for temporary finance, if required. On present expectations, this authority will not be called on in 1972-73. Clause 10 gives the normal authority for borrowing and expenditure of Loan moneys in the early months of 1973-74. Clause 11 gives the normal authority for the Treasurer to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft, if necessary. Clause 12, unchanged from that of previous Bills, directs that all moneys received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of that Act. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1971, to include in that Act provisions relating to the election of members of the Legislative Council, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.38 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 16, at 2.15 p.m.