

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, June 21, 1973

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

QUESTIONS**FISHING**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: For several months much discussion has occurred among interested people on Kangaroo Island with regard to the extensive netting that is taking place in many of the island's bays and inlets. Can the Minister say what is the Government's policy or whether there is any proposed Government policy in relation to this area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that the Director of Fisheries is studying this very problem, and regulations will be promulgated to protect some of the island's fishing activities and those in other parts of the State. I believe that netting restrictions different from those that have operated in the past should be imposed. I hope that these regulations will be forthcoming soon.

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: Will the Minister inform the Council of the total catch of prawns in the two gulfs and in the adjacent waters of South Australia as recorded in the Department of Fisheries during the period in which prawns have been taken?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to supply that information to the Council.

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: My question concerns the fishermen in the Coorong, where there are now, I believe, only about 20 fishermen left (there used to be about 100). Over the last few years fishing regulations have been applied, although these fishermen have been exempted from some of them. The regulations include the placing of markings on the end of nets to ensure that people can see where the nets are situated. In the past, it has been the fishermen's practice to sink the nets, because the pelican tends to fly down over that area and rob fish from the nets. The pelican is a very nice and attractive bird that used to work for his living, but now these somewhat large markings act like beacons, so that the pelican knows exactly where to go. The pelican is probably getting fat and lazy by not having to work hard and is making the fishermen irate. Will the Minister consider exempting the fishermen from some of these regulations, after discussions with them, to ensure that once again the pelican will work for a living? I might add that fishing in that area has become difficult as a result of the deterioration in the quality of water in the Coorong.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will take up this matter with my Director, ascertain the present situation, and discuss it with fishermen in that area soon. I thought the

honourable member was going to say that the pelican was getting so fat that he would not be able to fly again, in which case there would be no need for any action to be taken.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In July, 1967, I asked a question about flammable clothing, and several members in both Houses have asked similar questions over the years (I have been asking such questions steadily since 1967). We now know that something is being done as a result of the combined efforts of all State Ministers of Labour. However, can the Minister say whether anything is being done regarding clothing other than children's nightwear?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I appreciate the concern of the honourable member and I shall refer his question to my colleague in another place and bring back a report.

WHEAT CROPS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Has his department prepared any estimates on the wheat crop in South Australia this season; secondly, will the Minister make a statement on seasonal prospects for South Australia as a whole?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I know that every honourable member in this Chamber is most concerned, as are members in another place, about seasonal conditions, because agriculture is still a major export earner for this State as well as for the Commonwealth as a whole. I shall perhaps relate this question to the finish of last season and I will begin by saying that the spring of 1972 was one of the driest on record. This followed a very late break to the season. As a result cereal crops were poor with yields 30 per cent to 40 per cent below average and critical feed shortages for stock occurred. The total harvest produced 55,000,000bush. of cereals compared with 106,000,000bush. in the previous year. Excellent summer rains occurred throughout the State early in 1973 and these were followed by above-average falls in March which eased the feed situation. This also enabled farmers to prepare large acreages, particularly for wheat, greatly encouraged by promised increased prices and strong export demands which had enabled wheat quotas to be lifted by 25 per cent, thereby opening the door for production exceeding 70,000,000bush.

In the middle of April State-wide opening rains occurred which enabled seeding to commence. A few delays have occurred in some areas because of dry conditions in May, but otherwise seeding has progressed well and it is expected that it will be largely completed by the end of June when 3,400,000 acres of wheat will have been sown together with 1,800,000 acres of barley and 1,000,000 acres of oats. The opening rains in April were followed by mild to warm conditions which created excellent early pasture growth, particularly in the Adelaide Hills and the South-East. Conditions have since been ideal for livestock health, and in particular for lambing. Pastures are now meeting the needs of most classes of stock, although in parts of the Adelaide Hills and in the South-East cockchafers have caused shortages in some paddocks where protection has been neglected.

Large orders for pasture seeds have recently been received from Mediterranean countries. With supplies on

hand it will be difficult to fill these and growers have responded with extra sowings of grasses, medics and clovers for seed. During the recent rural recession farmers began to turn to crops other than the cereals. Oil seed rape, field peas, lupins, sunflowers and linseed have been given increasing attention and last year more substantial acreages of all these crops were sown. Unfortunately, the adverse season did not help and this season, with good prices for the cereals and wool and considerably increased wheat quotas, interest has fallen away. This is causing concern because South Australian growers need to have these alternatives in years when other enterprises are less profitable.

Just generalizing, I would say that South Australia is rather fortunate this year. Most of the State has enjoyed wonderful opening rains, particularly the Far North and parts of the North-East, North-West and also the South-East. I think that country has never looked better in its history.

SUPER BUG

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In the *Australian* this morning there is an article concerning what is described as a super bug which has supposedly been taken to France from Australia to attack French wine grapes and vines. It is stated in the newspaper article that in fact this bug has been developed by scientists in Australia—not scientists at any particular establishment, but scientists working in their own time. It prints a statement from the scientists themselves, who say:

We have worked on it mostly after hours and at weekends and have kept them (the C.S.I.R.O. and the universities) completely in the dark.

It is stated to be a form of bug that is related to a member of the common or garden aphid and can carry phylloxera, which is a serious disease in grapes. Can the Minister indicate whether he has read this article and, if not, will his department look into this matter to see whether it is a fact that it has been developed in Australia? Also, will he take all adequate steps to ensure that his colleagues in other States are notified and that action is taken to apprehend those men who have developed this super bug and to see that it is not also released in Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am prepared to do that, if the honourable member wishes. I think the position is particularly good in these matters because, as regards phylloxera, if the honourable member does not already know it, we are probably in a unique place in the world, in South Australia, where we do not have this problem of phylloxera. The Phylloxera Board is to be commended for the work it has done over the years in maintaining this freedom we have in South Australia. Other States are not in quite such a happy position as we are, and I sincerely hope we shall not reach the position that the other States are in. I will certainly pass on the honourable member's question to see what information we can get.

ELECTRIC BLANKETS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A recent press report stated that electric blankets could be a fire hazard, and in certain cases possibly injurious to health. As the market

for these blankets in this State is very high at this time of the year, this statement caused great alarm. I assume the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry is concerned for the safety of the community, so I ask him to take up this matter with his colleague to see whether a statement can be made to the effect that the type of electric blanket manufactured in Australia and commonly sold in the shops of this State is not, in fact, a fire hazard.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A statement has already been made that electric blankets sold in South Australia are fully tested before they are sold. I am assured by the Minister of Agriculture that these blankets are not a fire hazard if they are covered with wool. However, I will direct the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the new building, which all honourable members will agree is well overdue, for the Agriculture Department, which has been functioning for a considerable time in what is today a substandard building for that purpose in Gawler Place. I believe the Minister did inform the Council last year of the plan to provide a new building in the suburbs—I think, in the suburb of Northfield. We have noted the long-term plan to shift some departments or parts of departments to the new town of Monarto, and I believe the Agriculture Department will be affected in this way. I hope that the transfer of some staff to Monarto will not further delay the projected building at Northfield, which is so overdue. Can the Minister state what progress has been made towards erecting new headquarters for the department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Submissions have been made to the Department of the Premier and of Development by the Director of Agriculture regarding the possibility of transferring the Agriculture Department to a new site at Monarto. The information is being collated; it will be processed and presented to Cabinet, which will discuss it.

STATES' RIGHTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently the Attorney-General travelled to Great Britain together with Premiers of other States and their legal advisers to make submissions to the British Government or to seek a ruling from the Privy Council on recent Commonwealth approaches to the British Government to repeal, I assume, certain British legislation that is vitally important to the future of the Australian States. I believe that, among other matters, the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) and the Senate Leader (Senator Murphy) may have asked the British Government, for example, to repeal the Colonial Laws Validity Act, on which the identity of the States at present depends. I do not know whether I have explained my question fully; one could deal with many other matters in this explanation. I am certain that the overall question is vitally important to all honourable members and every resident of South Australia. Can the Chief Secretary say whether a report can be made to the Council on the Attorney-General's visit to Great Britain and whether we

can be supplied with any other information on matters pertaining to my question and on any other relevant matters of interest to honourable members and the public?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall convey the Leader's request to my colleague and see whether he will make a Ministerial statement available for me to use in this Council.

UNDERGROUND WATER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question concerns the Premier's announcement that regulations have been drawn up and tabled in this place concerning the underground water in the South-East. There is widespread support for many of the regulations that have been introduced concerning the control of drainage bores and the control of pollution of underground water, but there is also a widespread belief that, in fact, the regulations go too far and contain what are described as unnecessary restrictions. I do not desire to move for the disallowance of the regulations, because there are so many areas in which the Government must act. Nevertheless, I would ask the Government to consider establishing a board to replace the present bodies that are associated both with drainage and underground water in the South-East in order to get rid of what seems a conflict of interests between them. One body is concerned with taking water off the land; the other is concerned with conserving it under the ground. Will the Government look at these regulations with a view to allowing the drilling of stock bores to a depth of 100ft. without permits? I understand there is no objection to the requirement for drillers to provide the Government with all the necessary information concerning each bore put down, and also to construct the bore in a manner laid down by the department. However, there is a possibility of considerable delay, as has already occurred in parts of Victoria where the drillers are waiting for permits. In the case of stock bores, delays are quite often serious. Will the Government ensure that any water conservation board set up will be predominantly manned by people associated with the area using the water?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This question concerns one of my Ministerial colleagues in another place and I will consult him and bring back an answer as soon as I am able.

PINE PLANTATIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will the Minister inform me of the area of pines which has been planted in the last four years in South Australia, including in that area, the South-East, the Adelaide Hills and the southern areas, such as Myponga and Kuitpo Colony. Also, will the Minister inform me of any progress that has been made in the rehabilitation of the genuine red gum in the River areas?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain the information and bring it down as soon as I can.

MOTOR MECHANICS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: My question relates to the statement attributed to the member for Florey in Tuesday's *Advertiser* in which he referred to the incompetency of some motor mechanics in metropolitan service stations. I entirely agree with his statement, which went on to say that a system of apprenticeship should be instigated to correct the present situation. I believe this would be slow and unwieldy, although I agree with the apprenticeship system generally. I believe a standard of competency should be required immediately to correct the present situation. Will the Minister consider a standard of mechanical competency?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

SMOKING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: About a year ago this Parliament passed legislation concerning the labelling of cigarette packets with the warning that the contents were dangerous to health, and this legislation comes into effect on July 1. Can the Minister say whether consideration is being given to extending the marking to packets of tobacco, as distinct from packets of cigarettes? Also, will he consider the question of labelling packets of cigarettes with the percentage of tar content contained in the cigarettes, because the dangerous part of cigarettes is believed to be in the tar content?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The reply to the first question is, "No, we have not considered the question of tobacco." Regarding the second question, the Ministers of Health are studying this matter in regard to the labelling of the tar content on packets of cigarettes but, as yet, we have not come to a decision.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The *News* of June 4 contained an article headed "Ban Smoking on Buses—Council Bid". The article stated that some Adelaide City Council members believed that smoking on public transport should be banned. The council's Legislative and General Committee recommended that council suggest the ban in a letter to the Director of Environment and Conservation (Dr. W. G. Inglis). Perhaps this question should be directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation, although I believe that it has something to do with health. Can the Minister say whether such a letter has been received by Dr. Inglis and whether it is the Government's intention to take any action on this matter?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Smoking is a health hazard, and I wish to make that clear. However, I do not know whether Dr. Inglis has received any such letter, but I shall inquire and inform the honourable member of the position.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Some months ago when the weather was rather warmer than it is now honourable

members were privileged to witness the opening of the new Modbury Hospital. I was one of those who queried whether it was necessary to have such a large hospital. However, I must say that the hospital is a great asset. Nevertheless, I was informed that it was not possible to make full use of the hospital, as then constructed, and I believe that only part of the hospital was in use at the time, and it seemed it might be some time before the facility could be put into full use. Can the Minister say whether the hospital is now being fully used?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think that the section of the hospital to which the honourable member refers is the midwifery section. We are taking steps to recruit extra staff for that section, which at present is being used.

TEACHER'S SALARY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the case of Mr. Geoffrey Norman Pearce, who is a department teacher and whose staff identity number is 274941. I have his approval to mention this matter in this place. Earlier this year when Mr. Pearce was a teacher at the Glengowrie High School he received a demand from the Education Department to repay, over a period, a sum of about \$440 a year. Because of an error that was made in his salary and allowances over a period, the department claimed that this sum had been paid to him incorrectly and that he was not entitled to it. The reason was that it was a degree allowance, and Mr. Pearce did not hold a degree. It appears that there was another person by the same name who held a degree and whose name was given to or obtained by the Teachers Classification Board, and the department assumed that the teacher in question was a degree holder. The need to repay the money caused considerable embarrassment to Mr. Pearce, which is understandable. I raise the matter here to try to ascertain whether any measures have been taken so that the same unfortunate situation cannot arise with anyone else in the department in the future. Will the Minister ascertain whether the department has made any further or alternative arrangements whereby this situation cannot recur and, if so, what the arrangements are?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report.

ROAD TRAFFIC

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I direct my question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport. In the press recently the new President of the Royal Automobile Association (Sir Keith Angas) suggested that the give-way-to-the-right rule for vehicles on the road was obsolete. Can the Minister say whether the Minister of Transport intends to investigate this problem, which has been a growing one for many years, in an effort to achieve better safety on the road by not having the give-way-to-the-right rule?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

THEATRE PARKING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Government to contact the necessary authorities to see whether it is possible for the Torrens Parade Ground to be made available for parking for patrons of the Festival Theatre a little more frequently and as a

temporary measure until permanent parking arrangements beneath the plaza area are completed?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will make some inquiries. I understand that not only does this matter affect the military authorities in South Australia but that it must go to Canberra for a decision and that, therefore, it may take some time. However, I will get some information for the honourable member on what progress is being made.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON (Midland) moved:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Midland) seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I shall ascertain from His Excellency the Governor at what time he will receive the Council for the presentation of the Address in Reply.

Later:

The PRESIDENT: His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive honourable members to present the Address in Reply on Tuesday, June 26, at 2.30 p.m.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which is in the same form as a measure introduced into this Council in 1971 and which then failed to become law, is also in the same form as a Bill which was introduced into this Council last year having been, in another place, passed by the majority as required by the Constitution of this State and which was then defeated in this Council on the last day of the last session of Parliament. Since that time a general election has intervened, and this Government considers it has the clearest possible mandate for its introduction once more. It is, as honourable members will be well aware, intended to widen the field from which Legislative Council electors may be drawn from the narrow confines of land and leaseholders and their spouses to the broad field of House of Assembly electors. In short, it is to provide for full adult franchise in Legislative Council elections.

Since its inception, the Constitution Act has provided that, notwithstanding the vastly wider provisions of that Act embracing House of Assembly electors, no person shall be entitled to vote at a Legislative Council election unless he or she owns or leases land in this State or is the tenant of a dwellinghouse in this State. Apart from the addition, in 1943, of servicemen actively engaged in war, and the addition, in 1969, of electors' spouses, the field of Legislative Council electors has not been altered. It is still the opinion of this Government that property

qualifications are artificial and outmoded as conditions attaching to any franchise and that it is desirable to amend the Constitution Act so as to entitle all House of Assembly electors to vote at a Legislative Council election.

As was said each time the earlier measure was introduced, I believe that, in this day and age, it is scarcely necessary to address to this Council argument in favour of the proposition that all of the adult residents of this State should have an equal say in the Government of the State and in the election of their Parliamentary representatives. This restricted franchise for the Legislative Council has its origin in a society in which there was a notion that ownership and occupancy of property gave to the owner and, in some limited instances, to the occupier a special stake in the country, so that those persons, it was said, had the right to exercise political control over policies of Government. As the years have passed, the emphasis has shifted from property to persons. The tone and outlook of society have gradually altered and become more democratic.

That being the case, at this point in history it is quite remarkable that we still have a franchise for one of the Houses of Parliament of this State that is restricted to persons who qualify in one way or another in relation to property (that is, whether they be owners or occupiers of property, or the spouses of the owners or occupiers of property) and to those who qualify as servicemen and ex-servicemen. Therefore, it is again submitted that the only proper franchise and the only proper method of electing members of Parliament is the vote of all the people of the State expressed in a way that gives to them an equal say in the make-up of the Parliament that makes the laws for them.

For this reason I look forward, when the vote is taken on the Bill, to a degree of unanimity in this Council, for I find it difficult to believe that any member of this Council who professes faith in democracy, which is at the very basis of the society in which we live, could possibly support the continuance of a restricted and privileged franchise that has the effect of giving one section of citizens of the State political privileges that the rest do not enjoy. The people of this State have spoken; it now remains for this Council to give effect to their clearly expressed desires.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 fixes the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 repeals section 20 of the principal Act which deals with the qualifications of Legislative Council electors. New section 20 enacted by this clause provides that a person who is entitled to vote at a House of Assembly election shall be qualified to have his name placed on the Legislative Council electoral roll and shall be entitled to vote at a Legislative Council election.

Clause 4 repeals sections 20a, 21 and 22 of the principal Act. Section 20a includes servicemen on active service as Council electors. Sections 21 and 22 set out various disqualifications for Council voting. These three sections are redundant, as they appear in almost identical form in sections 33 and 33a relating to House of Assembly elections.

The Hon. R. C. DEGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Government has indicated quite clearly to the Council by its repeated statements to the press that it requires the measures now before this Parliament to be dealt with as expeditiously as possible. I assure the Government that this will be facilitated by me, and I know that this sentiment is supported by other members in this Chamber whom I have the honour to lead.

This Bill will pass unanimously, but I point out to the Chief Secretary that its passage is dependent on the passage of a second Bill, which, in the opinion of members of this Council, must grant without any reservations that every vote cast for an election in South Australia for members of the Legislative Council will have equal value. That is the present position in the simplest terms I can use. There are several matters in the second reading explanation just given by the Chief Secretary on which one could comment, but most of these matters have been covered in previous debates and, during my few remarks, I will touch on merely one or two of them. First, the Chief Secretary said:

... all of the adult residents of this State should have an equal say in the Government of the State and in the election of their Parliamentary representatives.

I ask the Chief Secretary and the Government to bear that statement in mind when we are discussing the second Bill. Secondly, the Chief Secretary said:

The tone and outlook of society have gradually altered and become more democratic.

That may be so, but one may ask: where is the democracy in a system that compels a person to cast his vote in an election? We have a long way to go yet before we achieve democracy in South Australia. The Chief Secretary also said:

... the vote of all the people of the State expressed in a way that gives to them an equal say in the make-up of the Parliament that makes the laws for them.

We know that this Bill deals only with the franchise: it does not in any way achieve a situation where every vote has equal value. I now come to the question that I believe the Government at this stage must answer for members of this Council. We agree at the present time on the same franchise for the Legislative Council as that existing for the House of Assembly, but we insist on the proviso that every vote cast shall have equal value, without any reservations or evasions: in other words, that under a voting system to be adopted for election to the Legislative Council there will be no second-class, free citizens in South Australia. There arises, of course, the problem of procedures in respect of the two Bills at present before this Parliament. The objectives can be achieved in several ways, which would be as well known to the Leader of the Government in this Chamber as they are to me. The Government, in not a very subtle way, has sought the co-operation of this Council in handling these matters as expeditiously as possible, and I have given the Chief Secretary an undertaking that they will be handled as expeditiously as possible; and that goes for the members of this Council whom I have the honour of leading.

In similar vein, I seek the co-operation of the Government and ask that in his reply to the second reading debate the Chief Secretary will indicate to the Council the method the Government would prefer so that both Bills can proceed as expeditiously as possible. I am sure the Chief Secretary understands the position quite clearly without any further explanation from me. I reiterate the desire of the members of this Council to achieve the objective of everyone having the right to vote (not necessarily being compelled to vote but having the right to vote) for the election of membership of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Does this Bill compel them to vote?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We are talking of democracy, which applies to both Houses; and, in practical terms, one must admit that, once the same franchise is achieved, one of the cornerstones of democracy (voluntary voting) is

effectively ensured. That is the practical situation, and I think the Minister knows that as well as I do.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I do not necessarily agree with that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Let me reiterate and drive home this point to this Chamber. There is a desire of members of this Council to achieve the objective of everyone having the right to vote for the membership of this Council on the basis (and this is the only proviso) that every vote cast freely shall as near as mathematically possible (and I suppose it is confined somewhat by the draftsman's skill) have an equal value.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: And be counted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: And be counted. That is the only stipulation on which this Council will insist in this matter; but I ask the Chief Secretary in his reply to indicate to the Council the means that he would recommend or ask the Council to follow to achieve the necessary procedures so that both Bills can be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): It gives me much pleasure to support this Bill, the principle of which, of course, is one that has over a number of years affected my position in politics. In fact, I entered this Chamber, as I recall, as a candidate who was supposed to support this terrible policy of full adult franchise. I have, over the period I have been in this Chamber, remained, for me, remarkably silent on the issue, apart from supporting the issue when it was brought before Parliament. It has been a real pleasure to me to hear that at last the people who claim to be Liberals in this State have got around to supporting a measure that should have been supported in 1873, not 1973.

We cannot, in this day and age, with people who are now politically educated sustain any argument that can stand up to the pressure of politics to deny people the right to vote. Although the Government has obviously compromised (and I give it much credit for that) by bringing in another matter that has triggered off acceptance of this Bill, it is unfortunate in the eyes of the public of this State that this side of the Council will be seen to have given in with qualifications.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Which side of the Council?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: This side of the Council.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I do not quite know what you mean; you are on the cross-bench, aren't you?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It could be this side of the Council or the other side, because there are Opposition members on the other side, too, so perhaps I should include both sides. Qualifications should not be put on a matter such as this. Nevertheless, I will support this Bill in order to trigger off the acceptance by this Council of a measure that is most important to those citizens of this State who have been denied the right to vote. I shall not delve into the past. I could relate many incidents that would no doubt embarrass members of the Party to which I formerly belonged, but I give them qualified approval for what they have done, because of their qualified support for this measure. However, I trust that this Council will not take the suicidal step of going back to the people and trying to say, "Support us again on the restricted franchise. We want to get what we need to save ourselves." I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary) : This is the first time since I have been a member of this Council that I have been asked to give in advance in regard to a particular Bill an undertaking that I am willing to accept amendments to another Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Leader said (and I thought he was completely out of order—I apologize to you, Mr. President, if I am casting an aspersion—in talking about a Bill that we expect to debate later) that that other Bill did not provide certain conditions that he desired, and he wanted me to say that I was willing to undertake that the things he desired would come about.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Not at all. The Chief Secretary has got the wrong approach altogether.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think I am out of order in saying this, but I believe that the other Bill provides all the things that the Leader is seeking. That is all I can say in regard to what the Leader said to me.

The PRESIDENT: As this Bill seeks to amend the Constitution Act and to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council, the motion for the second reading must be carried by an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Council. In accordance with Standing Order 282 I have counted the Council and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Council, I now put the question "That this Bill be now read a second time." For the question say "Aye". Against the question say "No". I think the Ayes have it. I declare the second reading carried by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the Council.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): As the Chief Secretary has not given me any lead whatsoever as to what the Government would like in regard to these measures being passed expeditiously, I ask whether the Chief Secretary will report progress. The Chief Secretary now appears to have put the ball back in my court to make what recommendations I can to achieve a situation that allows the question of the Government's mandate, which it has; that is, to introduce adult franchise for the Legislative Council on a basis of one man one vote one value. What I am seeking is to make certain that these two measures are tied together, as was promised the people of South Australia. We are faced with the problem that this Bill in itself does not provide for equality of vote value; that is the important question. This can be achieved if the Government co-operates with us and says, "Yes, we see your point. There is no need to go into a series of amendments. We are co-operating with you and you are co-operating with us. Let us do it in a sensible way." I shall now have to consider what approach I should make. It would be easier if the Government said, "We understand your situation. We will offer you our co-operation, as you are offering us your co-operation, to expedite the passage of this legislation." I therefore ask the Chief Secretary to report progress.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): Yes; I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CONSTITUTION AND ELECTORAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (COUNCIL ELECTIONS)

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The matter encompassed by this Bill which proposes the amendment of the Constitution Act and the Electoral Act may be summarized as follows: (a) it proposes the constitution of the whole State as a single Legislative Council

electoral district; (b) it proposes that this electoral district shall, eventually, return 22 members; (c) it proposes that elections for members for this single electoral district will be conducted on a system of proportional representation known as the list system; (d) it proposes that Legislative Council by-elections will not be held to fill casual vacancies in that House but those vacancies will be filled in a manner similar to the manner of filling casual vacancies in the Australian Senate; and (e) it proposes some further changes which will be outlined in my comments on the clauses of the Bill.

Quite aside from the signal importance to the people of this State of the substantial changes proposed by this measure, it has another unusual characteristic in that, in other circumstances, the changes proposed here would be encompassed by two separate pieces of legislation. The reason for combining the amendments into one single Bill is to ensure that honourable members will have an opportunity of considering the changes as a whole, untrammelled by the restrictions that might otherwise be placed upon them in the application of the relevant Standing Orders of this House.

Clauses 1 to 4 are formal. Clause 5 repeals section 11 of the Constitution Act and enacts a new section in its place. Section 11 of that Act is the section which provides for the composition of the Legislative Council and proposed new section 11 provides, in effect, that until the next periodical election (as defined) of members of the Legislative Council, the House will consist of 20 members. After that election the House will consist of 21 members and after the second periodical election the House will consist of 22 members. The reason for this "stepped" increase in the number of members in the House is to ensure that the terms of office of the present sitting members of the Legislative Council are not disturbed; that is, every member of that House will be entitled to serve out his present term in full. However, this graduated increase in the number of members of the Legislative Council is subject to the possibility that the Legislative Council may be dissolved on a double dissolution, in which case the new Legislative Council will consist of 22 members on and from that dissolution.

Clause 6 amends section 12 of the Constitution Act and has the effect of reducing the minimum age at which a person can become a member of the Legislative Council. At present this age is 30 years and the amendment proposes that this minimum age will, in effect, become 18 years, this being the age at which persons are entitled to vote at an election for a member of the House of Assembly.

Clause 7 amends section 13 of the Constitution Act and provides for a changed method of filling casual vacancies that may occur in the Legislative Council. The method proposed is not dissimilar to that provided for by section 15 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act for the filling of casual vacancies in the Australian Senate. However, a member chosen to fill a casual vacancy under the scheme will serve out the full portion of the unexpired term of his predecessor. In the case of the filling of casual vacancies in the Senate the member chosen only holds office until the next election for the House of Representatives. Members who have studied the various systems of proportional representation will no doubt be aware that some scheme for the filling of casual vacancies of the kind here proposed is an almost essential element in the operation of the system. If casual vacancies were filled by by-election, proportional representation just simply could not be applied, since proportional representation

requires more than one candidate to be elected and by-elections on the occurrence of a casual vacancy, in the nature of things, provide for the election of only one candidate. Finally, it is assumed that in relation to the choosing of members to fill casual vacancies the long observed convention in relation to the choosing of members of the Senate will be observed, so that the person chosen to fill the casual vacancy will, so far as possible, be a person of the same political complexion as his predecessor.

Clause 8 amends section 14 of the Constitution Act which provides for the periodic retirement of the members of the Legislative Council. The amendment proposed here does not alter the principle expressed in section 14 but merely recognizes the fact that under the changes now proposed one-half of the members of the Council shall retire at each general election assuming, of course, that they have completed the minimum term of service set out in section 13 of the Constitution Act. Clause 9 repeals and re-enacts section 15 of the Constitution Act which appeared to be originally inserted to guard against the somewhat remote possibility that more than half the number of members of the Legislative Council would have completed a period of service greater than the minimum term. The effect of this provision is to provide for an order of retirement as between members, and the provision has been re-enacted from an abundance of caution.

Clause 10 repeals section 18 of the Constitution Act which deals with the issue of writs for casual vacancies in the Legislative Council and is consequential upon the adoption of the proposed new method of filling casual vacancies in that House. Clause 11 repeals section 19 of the Constitution Act and enacts a new section in its place. The effect of this new section is to constitute the State as a single Legislative Council electoral district. I would draw honourable members' attention to proposed subclauses (3) and (4) of this clause which are intended to make it clear that the present members of the Legislative Council will continue in office until the expiration of their minimum term of service.

Clause 12 amends section 26 of the Constitution Act, and the reason for it will be found in an examination of section 8 of that Act. This is the section that deals with the so called constitutional majority. For convenience I set out this section in full:

8. The Parliament may, from time to time, by any Act, repeal, alter, or vary all or any of the provisions of this Act, and substitute others in lieu thereof: Provided that—

- (a) it shall not be lawful to present to the Governor, for His Majesty's assent, any Bill by which an alteration in the constitution of the Legislative Council or House of Assembly is made, unless the second and third readings of that Bill have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly respectively;
- (b) every such Bill which has been so passed shall be reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure thereon.

Members will be aware that the effect of this provision has been considerably modified by the enactment of section 10a of the Constitution Act which, in its terms, entrenches many of the provisions of the Constitution Act. The words in this section I have just quoted in full to which I invite honourable members' particular attention are:

Unless the second and third readings of that Bill have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly respectively.

When one turns to section 26 of the Constitution Act one finds that whenever the votes cast on a matter in the Legislative Council are not equal, one member, the President or member presiding, is by operation of section 26 deprived of his right to express his concurrence or, as the case may be, his non-concurrence in the passing of the second or third reading of a Bill. This seems fundamentally wrong, since it can be hardly argued that by reason of holding office as President, the President is no less a member of the Legislative Council. Accordingly, it is proposed that the President or member presiding will be afforded an opportunity, if he wishes, to express his concurrence or non-concurrence in the passing of a second or third reading of a Bill in any case where he is not called on to exercise his casting vote.

I would make it clear to members that this right will not affect the power of the Council to pass or reject the measure since that power is clearly set out in section 26 (2) of the Constitution Act. It will have effect only where the concurrence of the President, or member presiding, is necessary to enable the lawful presentation of the kind of Bill referred to in section 8 of the Constitution Act to the Governor for reservation. Clause 13 effects the same kind of amendment in relation to the Speaker of the House of Assembly as is provided for in relation to the President of the Legislative Council by clause 12.

Clause 14 inserts the second schedule to the Constitution Act in place of the present second schedule and is intended to cover the situation that will occur until the next periodical election of the Legislative Council. The somewhat cryptic passage in Part II of the proposed new second schedule is intended to give full effect to section 41 (3) of the Constitution Act which contains a reference to the proper number of members representing an electoral district. The proper number in this case will be 22. Clause 15 is formal. Clause 16 amends section 19 of the Electoral Act by striking out two redundant subsections. Clause 17 amends section 50 of the Electoral Act and is consequential on the proposal to fill casual vacancies in the membership of the Legislative Council in the manner adverted to above.

Clause 18 amends section 65 of the Electoral Act and is the first clause that relates directly to the proposed new method of electing candidates to the Legislative Council. It may be of some assistance to honourable members if I outline these proposals. A candidate may, if he wishes, be included in a group of two or more candidates, but a candidate who does not wish to be included in a group will be deemed to be a group comprised of himself alone. Voting under the proposed scheme will be by groups and not by individual candidates. Amongst the reasons for this is that, in an election that requires 11 persons to be elected, a plethora of candidates may be expected, and it is likely that the requirement that an elector shall mark a number in the square beside the name of each candidate, when we may expect, say, 30 such candidates, will result in an unacceptably high proportion of informal ballot-papers.

Clause 19 amends section 71 of the Electoral Act and provides, in effect, that a candidate included in or comprising a group that does not obtain about 4 per cent of the total votes cast will lose his deposit. Clause 20 amends section 96 of the Electoral Act which deals with the printing of ballot-papers and provides that each group will be identified by a letter and that the order of groups printed on the ballot-papers from left to right will be determined by lot, but that groups including two or more persons will be placed in order on the left of those groups comprising a single candidate.

Clause 21 amends section 113 of the Electoral Act and provides for the method of voting at an election for the Legislative Council. At this stage, I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that, although on the face of it, it appears that a system of preferential voting is to be used, it is really a system of allotting proportions, that is, quotas without preferences, since preference counting will be pointless. It is not the winner-take-all system, which is what the preferential guise of present voting for this House really is. I make no apology for the provision in this form, since it appears to the Government that the marking of ballot-papers for the Legislative Council by a cross would serve only to confuse the electors who, in this State, are well used to voting by numbers.

Clause 22, which amends section 123 of the Electoral Act, serves to reinforce the remarks I have just made, in that a Legislative Council ballot-paper will be informal if it has no vote indicated on it or it does not indicate a voter's first preference for one group. Clause 23 amends section 125 of the Electoral Act and deals with the scrutiny of votes.

Paragraphs (a) to (h) of this clause are amendments consequential on the proposal that voting in the Legislative Council elections will be for groups rather than for individual candidates. Paragraph (i) of this clause merely sets out in substantially similar form to that which already exists the method of filling a vacancy for a House of Assembly seat. Paragraph (j) inserts a number of new paragraphs in section 126, and it may be convenient if I deal with these new paragraphs *seriatim*. Proposed paragraph (6) enables ties between candidates for election for the House of Assembly to be resolved, and is in the same form as already exists in the principal Act.

Paragraph (7) provides for the exclusion of two or more candidates in the House of Assembly scrutiny at the same time and again merely re-enacts an existing provision. Paragraph (8) provides for the convenient resolution of elections for the House of Assembly where one candidate has a clear absolute majority and again re-enacts an existing provision. Paragraph (9) provides for the election of members of the Legislative Council by groups, and the scrutiny is there to be carried out in the following manner:

- (a) the votes for any group that does not obtain "the prescribed number of votes" are totally excluded from further scrutiny. With 11 candidates to be elected, the prescribed number of votes would be about 4 per cent of the total formal votes cast;
- (b) from the ballot-papers remaining, the returning officer for the district determines the quota, and with 11 candidates to be elected this quota would be about 8 per cent of the total of the votes remaining after the exclusion referred to in paragraph (a);
- (c) the number of first preference votes received by each group is then expressed as whole quotas and, if necessary, a fraction of a quota;
- (d) the number of members to be elected from a group shall be determined in the first instance by the number of whole quotas obtained by that group, and the order of election as between members of a group shall be determined by their position on the ballot-paper in that group;
- (e) if the application of this principle does not result in the required number of members being elected, a group that has the largest fraction of a quota shall have a member elected from it and, if necessary, the group with the next largest fraction of a quota shall have a member elected from it and so on.

It is conceded that there is a very remote possibility that a group may obtain more quotas or more quotas and a fraction than there are members to be elected from that group. In this unlikely event the extra quotas or fraction will be disregarded for the purposes of electing a member. Paragraphs (10) and (11) provide for the resolution of ties as between groups. Paragraph (12) is formal and paragraph (13) is a definition provision. Clause 24 amends the fourth schedule to the Electoral Act and is, I feel, self-explanatory.

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

[Sitting suspended from 3.38 to 5.40 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks an appropriation of \$3,020,000. In seeking supplementary appropriation during November of last year, the Government indicated that it was too early for trends on Revenue Account to have become established, and for this reason refrained from predicting a possible result for the full year. I am now able to provide some information about these matters and, while I must caution honourable members that fairly large fluctuations are quite possible even at this late stage of the fiscal year, it may be helpful if I summarize the situation as it appears at present before dealing in detail with the provisions in this Bill.

REVENUE BUDGET, 1972-73

On August 31 last the Government presented a Revenue Budget which provided for a deficit of \$7,500,000. The costs associated with decisions taken subsequently on over-award and service pay increases, metropolitan employment-producing works and drought relief led to the possibility that, in the absence of other factors, the full year's deficit could be as high as \$13,500,000. All departments were directed to implement stringent economies, consistent with continued efficient operation, and to defer expenditures where possible, and during the latter part of the year the results of these measures have become apparent. Indications are presently that savings in general departmental operation may total more than \$3,000,000.

The previously worrying situation has also been relieved by some unexpected increases in receipts, particularly in stamp duties and water rates. A complete analysis of the reasons for the higher returns from stamp duty is not yet available, but it is known that a very high volume of property conveyance transactions has had a major effect, and this may produce some \$5,000,000 more than the amount anticipated when the Budget was compiled. The long summer season contributed to significant excess water consumption, and rate revenues now seem likely to be about \$2,000,000 higher than the estimate presented previously. These, together with other smaller increases, are expected to bring total receipts to a figure some \$8,500,000 above the original estimate.

I have mentioned only two major factors affecting the expenditure side of the Budget—that is to say, the additional commitments entered into last November and the general departmental economies which seem to have been achieved following Cabinet direction. There have been a number of other factors, including wage and salary decisions more costly than earlier expected and increased financial assistance to people suffering hardship. Part of the increased expenditure is now to be authorized by this

Bill and part in other ways. Overall, it seems that increased commitments, offset by some savings, may lead to a net increase of about \$6,500,000 above the original estimate of payments. An increase of about \$6,500,000 in expenditures and an increase of about \$8,500,000 in receipts would mean a reduction of some \$2,000,000 in the estimate of deficit, from \$7,500,000 expected in August last to some \$5,500,000 expected now. It is possible that this latest estimate could be bettered.

APPROPRIATION

It is some time since explanations were given in relation to the appropriation authorities available to the Government and it may be useful if I repeat these now, particularly as this year it has been necessary to seek supplementary appropriations twice despite an anticipated overall improvement on the original Budget. Early in each financial year, Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act. If these allocations should prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a supplementary Appropriation Bill.

Appropriation Act—Special Section 3 (2) and (3): The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs due to any award, order, or determination of a wage-fixing body, and to meet any unforeseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water through the four major pipelines. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations, with a small part of these wage increases being met from within the original appropriations. It appears at this time that a small excess may be incurred in respect of pumping costs and this will be covered in full by the special authority contained in section 3 of the Act.

Governor's Appropriation Fund: Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a particular year. Of this amount one-third is available, if required, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. As the amount appropriated by the main Appropriation Act rises from year to year, so the extra authority provided by the Governor's Appropriation Fund rises but, even after allowing for the automatic increase inherent in this provision, it is still to be expected that there will be the necessity for a supplementary Appropriation Bill from time to time to cover the larger departmental excesses.

The main explanation for this recurrent requirement lies in the fact that, whilst additional expenditures may be financed out of additional revenues with no net adverse impact on the Budget, authority is required, none the less, to appropriate these revenues. Also, the appropriation procedures do not permit variations in payments above and below departmental estimates to be offset against one another. If one department appears likely to spend more than the amount provided at the beginning of the year, the Government must rely on other courses of appropriation authority irrespective of the fact that another department may be under-spent by the same or a greater amount. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations, but on the present outlook the total so available is unlikely to be sufficient to

provide for all the larger excesses, particularly those involving grants in respect of academic salary increases.

Supplementary Appropriation Bill: Accordingly, the Government has decided to introduce a supplementary Application Bill to cover estimated excess expenditure in three major areas of the Budget, and so to ensure that sufficient appropriation authority remains within the fund to meet any unforeseen expenditures during the remainder of the year. The proposals for additional appropriation are:

	\$
Public Buildings Department.....	500,000
Minister of Education (Miscellaneous).....	1,620,000
Community Welfare Department.....	900,000
	\$3,020,000

DETAILS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Public Buildings Department—Maintenance of buildings: The major factor contributing to over-expenditure on maintenance and other costs associated with school and hospital buildings appears to have been rises in the price levels of materials. The volume of work carried out in the maintenance programme has also been greater than originally expected. The Bill includes provision for additional appropriation of \$500,000.

Minister of Education (Miscellaneous)—Academic salaries: The recent report to the Commonwealth Minister for Education of the Inquiry into Academic Salaries in Universities (commonly known as “the Campbell report”) has now been accepted by both the Commonwealth and this Government. The report proposes increases in the salaries of academic staff ranging from 21 per cent to 24 per cent, to be implemented with retrospectivity to January 1, 1973. The increases are to flow on to staff of colleges of advanced education, including teachers colleges, some from January 1, 1973, and some from July 1, 1973. The annual gross impact of the proposals upon the Revenue Budget is likely to be more than \$4,000,000. The major part of this sum will be attributable to the University of Adelaide, Flinders University of South Australia, and the South Australian Institute of Technology, and it is the increase in the recurrent grants to these institutions to cover the proposed additional salary payments for the six months to June, 1973, and the effect of the recent national wage decision, for which the Government is seeking appropriation authority totalling \$1,620,000 in this Bill. The Commonwealth will make its normal contribution of just over one-third of the costs, and this contribution will be taken to the credit of Revenue Account when received.

Community Welfare Department—Financial assistance: An upward trend in the number of applications for assistance under various welfare arrangements has been observed over a period of several years and is probably due in part to the Government’s policy of decentralizing the welfare function, thus bringing this type of help within the reach of a larger number of people. The cost of financial assistance has been further increased in the current year, however, by increases in Commonwealth pension entitlements which, as a matter of policy, the South Australian Government follows where comparability exists between Commonwealth and State assistance schemes. Part of these costs is recouped from the Commonwealth. Over-expenditure in this area of the Budget is expected to be about \$900,000 in 1972-73 and this amount is provided in the Bill.

As to the clauses of the Bill, they give the same kind of authority as in the past. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$3,020,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum for the purposes set out in the

schedule. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made. Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to the first day of July, 1972. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): In our usual co-operative manner with the Government, we will not delay the passage of this Bill. It is the normal Appropriation Bill for this time of the year, but [should like to express a few thoughts on the document just presented by the Chief Secretary. In presenting its Revenue Budget in August, 1972, the Government anticipated a deficit of \$7,500,000, and during the debate in this Chamber on the Bill I remember clearly that honourable members predicted that this appeared to them a somewhat conservative estimate of what the deficit would be towards the end of the year. At that time there was no indication of the other revenue Bills that would come before the Council and which were dealt with at that time. I refer particularly to that mentioned in the second reading explanation today and the question of stamp duty.

Going back to that Bill, I recall that an amendment was moved in this Chamber and was very strongly opposed by the Government. We claimed there and then that the Bill would raise far more revenue than was indicated in the second reading explanation. I am pleased to see in this document that even though this Chamber achieved quite a number of important amendments, at the present time it is known that a very high volume of property conveyance transactions has had a major effect and may produce about \$5,000,000 more than the amount expected when the Budget was compiled.

At that time we stated very strongly that the increase in stamp duties would exceed the amount set out in the Bill then before us, and this more than justifies the attitude of this Chamber that the second reading explanation did not state accurately what the Bill actually did. It is important that extra revenue is raised by these measures and I believe this Chamber is justified in its attitude when the Government claims it wants a certain amount of revenue and the Bill before us will result in a considerable increase in the stated amount.

The increase in revenue in the Budget during the year will be \$8,500,000 above the original estimate. Most of that is accounted for by the increase in the volume of business in the real estate area, but also by the rise in the level of taxation imposed in South Australia. In August last year the estimated deficit was \$7,500,000; it is estimated now that the overall deficit will be about \$5,500,000, which means probably that increases in taxation have accounted for the improving position to the extent of about \$8,500,000.

As to the other explanations in the Bill, we appreciate the information that has been given regarding the means by which appropriations can be made where excesses can be met. We know a little about the Governor’s Appropriation Fund. It is mentioned in the second reading explanation that, in terms of the Public Finance Act, the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Act for a particular year may be made

available. The explanation also gives the areas in which this money can be spent. However, a point has been missed, and I believe this is where the money would have come from to meet the payment of court expenses for a certain gentleman, a payment not included in any Budget. I would think it would come from the Governor's Appropriation Fund. The increased appropriations include \$500,000 for the Public Buildings Department, \$1,620,000 for the Minister of Education, and \$900,000 for the Community Welfare Department.

Going back to the Budget debate of last year, one thing drawn to the attention of the Government was the decline in the amount of money being appropriated for the productive departments—Agriculture, Marine and Harbors, and Works. The increase on these items was lower than the total increase of money available to the State. This was pointed out very strongly to the Government at the time.

These areas appeared to be declining in importance in the eyes of the Government, and the more non-productive departments, the service departments, were achieving higher priority. In this Bill we see once again that there has been no further appropriation for the Agriculture Department, the Marine and Harbors Department, and the Department of the Minister of Works; in fact, once again, the most important productive departments are not receiving their fair share of the Budget moneys of the State. With those few comments I support the second reading of the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.4 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, June 26, at 2.15 p.m.