

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 22, 1973

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

QUESTIONS**SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Actually, I do not know whether this is a question or not, but we shall see. Yesterday Parliamentary approval was given for the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation to take evidence in places other than Parliament House. Evidence will be taken by the committee in the form of almost a public meeting in Millicent at 1.30 p.m. tomorrow in connection with regulations under the Underground Waters Preservation Act. I point out to the Chief Secretary that in such a situation it is impossible for honourable members interested in the regulations to be present at the meeting, because the Council will be sitting. Further, as three honourable members here are members of the committee and as this Council has only 20 members, it is very difficult for the Council to operate effectively when honourable members are not in attendance. Will the Chief Secretary take note of the points I have made when the question again arises of meetings of the committee in places other than Parliament House?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In view of the difficulties the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has outlined about the meeting of the committee tomorrow in Millicent, will the Chief Secretary consider adjourning tomorrow's sitting of the Council to enable Southern District honourable members to attend this very important meeting?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In the first day or two of this session of Parliament I made a statement regarding Council sittings. I said that when we had work to do we would sit, but that when we had no work to do we would adjourn, and this is what we have done until now. I do not intend to adjourn the Council tomorrow, because we have plenty of work to do and it is my earnest endeavour to see that we get it done, so that we do not, if possible (and I can say no more than that), arrive at the situation we have reached on every occasion since I have been in this Council where in the last week in which Parliament is sitting, we are frantically busy—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It has not been the fault, though, of the Council, has it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, but it would be our fault if we did not sit when we had work to do. In that event we could be blamed for contributing to the situation. As far as I am concerned, I intend to sit tomorrow.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In view of the Minister's reply to my request for an adjournment of the Council tomorrow, and since I understand that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has not met previously on a sitting day, will the Minister approach the Chairman of the committee, asking him to suspend the taking of evidence in Millicent until a non-sitting day to enable members representing that district to be present?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I can pass on to the Chairman the honourable member's request but I think it is a bit late now.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It is never too late.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Where was the honourable member last week and this week? If he were perturbed he would have been here every sitting day. What is he belly-aching about?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not think I need add anything to what has been said.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I trust the Hon. Mr. Shard always has good health.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member's place is here, but on the one day when we want to go on it does not suit him.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

UNDERGROUND WATER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: About a month ago I asked the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Development and Mines, a question about underground water restrictions in the Virginia area. I have since had further complaints from my constituents about the situation there. In my question I pointed out that the Minister had undertaken that any further limitations would be on the existing restrictions then in force, not on water usage. Unfortunately, the Mines Department is now in the process of revising quotas on the basis of the amount of water used. This penalizes growers who have endeavoured to save water. Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my earlier question, which is of great importance to the people of Adelaide and particularly to my constituents?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The original statement referred to by the honourable member was contained in a press release in 1971 and set out the intentions at that time. Since that time investigations have continued and the more accurate information available has required a more equitable approach. During 1971 and 1972 the usage of underground water from all irrigation wells in the Northern Adelaide Plains was metered for the first time. The records thus available in early 1973 showed that the average annual usage of underground water in the area was about 4 500 000 gallons (20 357 Ml.) The total permitted withdrawal, under the then restrictions, was however in excess of 8 000 000 000 gallons (36 368 Ml), while the annual natural recharge of the basin was about 1 100 000 000 gallons (5000.6 Ml). Despite the fact that usage was about half the withdrawal permitted, during 1971 and 1972 the water levels of the area continued to fall by as much as three feet (.91 m) a year. When determining the action required for the 1973-74 period the facts to be considered were:

- (a) that the rate of total withdrawal was in excess of four times the rate of recharge and should be reduced if the resource is to be conserved for continuing use.
- (b) that the then permitted withdrawal enabled, overall, increased production which could almost double water usage.

While awaiting the results of investigations in the fields of alternative water supplies, the real value of the irrigated production and the socio-economic effects of restrictions, it was necessary to devise an approach that would prevent an increased use of underground water but enable the existing level of production to be maintained for the time being. The approach envisaged in 1971, of basing any new restrictions solely on existing quotas, would have achieved the former but not the latter, as a reduction of all allocations by a minimum of 40 per cent would have

been necessary. This action would have been disastrous to hundreds of small growers. Acting on the recommendations of the Underground Waters Advisory Committee the Minister of Development and Mines approved the action taken to base the new restrictions for 1973-74 on the average of two years usage as well as on the previous quotas. This has been shown to give growers a better deal, as all individual allocations are in excess of their average annual usage during 1971 and 1972. The adoption of this approach should also ensure that no grower has been penalized for any saving effected by him during that period.

ROAD WIDENING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of July 31 about the widening of Military Road in the Largs Bay area?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: When the inquiries were answered in March, 1973, the Highways Department considered that it would eventually be necessary, to widen Military Road between Semaphore Road and Strathfield Terrace by 7ft. (2.13 m) on each side of the road. Since that time investigations have been undertaken by the department into the adequacy of the road network on LeFevre Peninsula, having regard to the present and future land use and the expected traffic generation. As these investigations have revealed that the width of this section of Military Road is adequate, it is not now intended to carry out any road widening.

NATIONAL SONG

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Last week I made some comments about a national song and asked a question of the Chief Secretary. Has he a reply to my question?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Premier has taken up the matter of a national song with the Australian Government and has drawn its attention to local support for the *Song of Australia*.

ABORIGINES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question concerning assistance given to Aborigines by welfare officers in filling out forms?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The following reply has been supplied:

The policy of the Community Welfare Department is to provide assistance as part of a learning process to Aboriginal people who need help to complete medical and hospital claim forms, taxation returns and similar forms. If the person is literate he is expected to fill out his own forms with any necessary assistance from the department's officers. If he is illiterate the Aboriginal is required to provide the information needed to complete the form. In some district offices of the department, including Port Augusta, most of the above work has been done by community welfare workers. Recently staffing shortages at Port Augusta have created problems, including problems of the type mentioned. However, arrangements are now well advanced for a clerk to be located at the district office. This person will then be available to help Aborigines as part of the duties of the position.

WORKERS' COMPLAINTS

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my question asked on August 14 concerning the job "complaints" service and the report as published concerning the South Australian Committee of Discrimination in Employment and Occupation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The South Australian Committee of Discrimination in Employment and Occupation is a committee appointed by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour. The permanent head of the State

Department of Labour and Industry is a member. I understand that similar committees have been appointed in other States.

SALE OF PIPES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: What is the intention of the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding the scrap pipes that are dumped at Lyndoch and several other places? I think these pipes were first sold to a scrap dealer and subsequently the Engineering and Water Supply Department collected them and put them in dumps. Some members of the local council have requested me to ask whether the department intends to sell these pipes and, if so, whether they will be sold in lots small enough for councils to be able to purchase them.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer that question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

CARPENTER ROCKS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my recent question about a school bus shelter at Carpenter Rocks?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is not the policy of the Education Department to provide bus shelters. Apart from the initial expense, there are problems associated with variation of bus stops and changes of numbers using the bus. If a bus shelter is required, the usual procedure is for parents to seek permission from local councils to erect a structure either from their own resources or with council or service organization, help.

FESTIVAL THEATRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Constituents have drawn my attention to the fact that some exit doors in the new festival theatre are locked during performances and apparently they can be unlocked only by members of the staff. Exit doors are a safety measure and, as I recall, the old-fashioned type of exit door could at least always be opened from the inside by patrons in an emergency when escape was necessary because of fire or something like that. If it is a fact that the exit doors are locked and can be unlocked only by members of the staff, it appears to me that the matter should be examined further from the point of view of public safety. Will the Chief Secretary, therefore, ascertain whether or not the information supplied to me is correct and, if so, do these exit doors comply with the relevant regulations under the Places of Public Entertainment Act? Also, is the Government satisfied with the maximum safety precautions in the new theatre?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I saw a reference to this matter in the newspaper and also a reply by Mr. Steel. I cannot comment on it now but will get a reply for the honourable member on all the points he has raised which, I think, can be satisfactorily answered, from what I saw in the newspaper.

TRANSPORT FINANCE

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Has the Chief Secretary, acting for the Minister of Transport, any information on the allocation of moneys for transport from the Australian Government?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, I have.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The Chief Secretary just happens to have it with him?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, I do. I knew that at least one honourable member would be interested in the amount of money allotted in the Commonwealth Budget for this purpose and, for that reason, I have something prepared that will give the honourable member the information he seeks. It happens there is some information I can give him in regard to transport but I do not have information about other departments. The statement is as follows:

The Commonwealth Government has allocated more than \$4,000,000 for urban public transport projects in South Australia in the Budget. I have been informed today by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. C. K. Jones) that the money has been approved for three projects being undertaken by the State Government. The projects are: the Christies Downs railway extension; the Glenelg tram route upgrading; and the Municipal Tramways Trust programme.

The Commonwealth Government had allocated \$2,600,000 for the extension and duplication of the Christies Downs railway line. When completed, the line will be electrified and new rolling stock for high-speed operation provided. An allocation of \$200,000 has been made for upgrading the Glenelg tram route. This included the provision of level crossing protection, relocation of stops and the provision of car parks for park and ride operation. The speed of the Glenelg tram will be increased once these works are carried out.

The Budget has also provided \$1,240,000 towards the Metropolitan Tramways Trust bus replacement programme and other capital works. These allocations of moneys for transport projects in the State represents a two-thirds contribution to the projects approved by the Commonwealth Government. The State Government will provide the remaining one-third of the finance. This will amount to more than \$2,000,000.

Mr. Jones has told me that before funds can be paid to the States it will be necessary for legislation to be passed by the Commonwealth and State Parliaments. In the field of road safety, the Commonwealth Government has provided \$300,000 for a traffic management programme in South Australia. The Highways department can now accelerate its programme to improve traffic flows and protection at troublesome intersections and on sections of highways. The Road Traffic Board had undertaken studies and submitted proposals for improvements to the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Following the reply the Chief Secretary has just given, can he say whether the Commonwealth Government has given any indication that there is an allocation in the 1973-74 Commonwealth Budget for the new standard gauge railway line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I cannot give the honourable member that information, as I have not studied the matter: it is a matter for the Commonwealth Government.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

The House of Assembly intimated that it had appointed Mr. R. R. Millhouse in lieu of Mr. E. R. Goldsworthy as a member of the South Australian delegation.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

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.

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held at the end of June, the Australian Government agreed to support a total programme of \$867,000,000 for State works and services and a total programme of \$218,700,000 for welfare

housing. The arrangements in previous years had been for a total programme to be determined for works and housing together, for that total programme to be allocated among the States, and for each State then to determine what sum it wished to devote to housing out of the amount available to it. The present Australian Government wishes to influence in a direct way the volume of funds going to house construction and finance, the conditions under which the funds are employed, and the kinds of people to be assisted by these special funds. I will give some detail of housing provisions as the first item in the departmental details. Suffice it to say at this stage that out of the total programme of \$218,700,000 for housing, South Australia was allocated \$32,750,000.

In 1972-73 the State apportioned \$29,500,000 of its normal capital moneys to the Housing Trust for housing construction and the State Bank for housing finance. The Housing Trust also had available \$500,000 of a special loan from the Australian Government; so, a total of \$30,000,000 of new funds was employed. The allocation of \$32,750,000 for 1973-74 is about 9.2 per cent above last year's figure. South Australia has had a long standing practice of allocating a large proportion of its capital funds to housing and, accordingly, the Australian Government, in its efforts to increase activity in this field, did not determine for us an increase as great as that for the other States. The overall increase for the States is about 26 per cent. However, the Australian Government did support a greater than normal increase in our works programme.

The first offer by that Government of support for a works programme was on the basis that the new funds allocated to works by each State in 1972-73 should be increased by 8.3 per cent. This would have meant an allocation to South Australia of about \$113,812,000. However, South Australia was able to sustain the point that the State's allocation for works in recent years had been limited because of our policy of allocating very large sums for housing. It would be unreasonable for us to receive only a small increase in housing on the grounds that we had already achieved a high level of State support in this area and, at the same time, to be held to a low base figure for works, a base which was low because of that very policy of extensive housing support. New South Wales was in much the same situation as was South Australia, and the Australian Government recognized this fact by offering to support a higher base allocation for the two States. As a result, South Australia secured an additional \$7,200,000, to give a total allocation of \$121,012,000 for works.

The Australian Government had also offered to take over responsibility for financing tertiary education from January 1, 1974, on condition that reductions be made to State general purpose revenue grants and loan allocations corresponding to the relief given to Revenue and Loan Budgets from the take-over. It had been calculated that the relief to the South Australian Loan Budget in 1973-74 would be \$3,800,000 and, therefore, the gross Loan allocation of \$121,012,000 for works was adjusted to \$117,212,000. For purposes of comparison between 1972-73 and 1973-74 it is appropriate to think of the South Australian allocations been increased as follows: housing—a programme of \$30,000,000 last year increased by \$2,750,000 (or 9.2 per cent) to \$32,750,000 this year; works—a programme of \$105,128,000 last year increased by \$15,884,000 (or 15.1 per cent) to \$121,012,000 this year.

While our housing increase was not as great as in some other States and our works increase was greater than in some other States, our share of aggregate funds was very close to the share we have had in recent years. Needless to say, South Australia cannot expect in future

years an increase in new moneys for works programmes as great as the increase of over 15 per cent secured this year. The new funds of \$32,750,000 for housing are to be made available to the State as loans, subject to repayment and to payment of interest at concessional rates, while the new funds of \$117,212,000 for works are to be made available to the extent of \$37,625,000 as capital grants and to the extent of \$79,587,000 as loans subject to normal interest and sinking fund.

In addition to the new funds of \$117,212,000 for works, the Government expects to receive repayments and recoveries of about \$42,880,000, which will be available towards financing the 1973-74 capital programme. Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our Loan programme and are expected to amount to \$318,000, will not have to be paid in cash by us, as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$160,410,000, becoming available during the course of the year. The total of payments proposed is \$157,480,000, and this would lead to a small estimated surplus of about \$2,930,000. It is the Government's judgment that, in striking a balance between the need to meet the urgent requirements of the community on the one hand and the desirability of holding a reserve of Loan funds towards financing possible revenue deficits on the other hand, it is appropriate to plan the use of all but \$2,930,000 of the increased Loan moneys expected to become available during the year, and to hold in reserve that \$2,930,000 together with the balance of \$8,523,000, which remained at June 30 last.

Honourable members may find some of the bigger departmental provisions to be of interest. I shall deal with housing first. Prior to the financial year 1971-72, there was a Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement under which the States received advances at concessional rates of interest. South Australia passed those advances on to the Housing Trust, the State Bank and building societies. In 1971-72 and 1972-73 new arrangements operated. Under these arrangements, the States no longer received separate advances. The allocations for housing were made from the normal State Loan works programmes and the concession in interest was given to the States by way of a separate special Commonwealth grant. South Australia continued to apply housing funds in the service of the community through advances to the Housing Trust, the State Bank and building societies. Now arrangements have been changed again, and under the new housing agreement the Australian Government is to make special advances to the States outside the programmes determined by Loan Council. The new agreement does not provide for permanent building societies to participate in the distribution of the special funds and, accordingly, South Australia proposes to employ housing funds henceforth by way of advances to the State Bank and the Housing Trust.

In 1972-73 the advances made from Loan Account were \$15,500,000 to the bank and \$14,000,000 to the trust, a total of \$29,500,000. The trust also had the use of a special loan of \$500,000 from the Australian Government; so, the total of new moneys available was \$30,000,000. For 1973-74 we have secured a promise of advances of \$32,750,000, of which \$17,250,000 is to be used by the State Bank for financing home ownership and \$15,500,000 is to be used by the Housing Trust for financing the construction of houses, the purchase of land and the purchase and upgrading of existing dwellings. Under the agreement the trust may also use the funds to provide bridging finance for community amenities.

The funds are to be made available to the State at a rate of interest of 4½ per cent in respect of advances to the State Bank and 4 per cent in respect of advances to the Housing Trust. In each case the agreement provides for the funds to be used for welfare housing, which means that assistance by way of either approval of loan or allocation of house is to be only to an applicant who falls within the limits of a defined means test on income. The State Bank will continue to make advances to persons who do not comply with the means test, and for this purpose will use circulating funds derived from interest margins and repayments of earlier advances and, as necessary, allocations of State Loan funds.

In the early days of the new arrangements it is difficult to assess the probable requirement of funds in the two areas of welfare housing and of general housing. To give the bank some flexibility in making loans in the change-over period of early 1973-74, a special allocation of \$1,000,000 was made late last year on the line "Advances to the State Bank". The appropriation on that line for 1973-74 includes a further \$1,000,000 to be used, if necessary, for loans other than for welfare housing. The rate of interest to be charged on loans from the special low-interest moneys to persons who comply with the means test is to be 5½ per cent, while the rate on other loans is to be 6½ per cent. Loans available after June 30, 1973, for both classes of applicant are subject to a maximum of \$12,500, compared to limits of \$10,000 for new dwellings and \$9,000 for established dwellings prior to that date.

As to the programme of the Housing Trust, the new agreement lays emphasis on rental housing, and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings built with the special funds that may be sold. In the trust's activities, too, the Australian Government is concerned particularly with the needs of low-income families, and the agreement provides that the trust will allocate to persons eligible under a defined means test a high proportion of the rental dwellings available. The trust will continue its normal activities, which include the provision of houses for people who do not meet the means test, the building of houses for sale as well as for rental, and the construction of factories. In carrying out these activities the trust will have available in 1973-74 some \$8,500,000 of circulating funds and \$10,000,000 of semi-government borrowing to supplement the special funds under the new agreement.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$2,250,000—To allow the bank to meet commitments already made and to enable it to continue assisting producer co-operatives in financing their capital projects, a provision of \$2,250,000 is proposed from State Loan funds, and an allocation of \$400,000 from semi-governmental borrowing is available.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$2,000,000—Advances from Loan Account have been made to the State Bank in past years to provide additional capital for the expansion of its general banking functions. The allocation of \$1,000,000 voted in 1972-73 was supplemented later in that year by a further \$1,000,000 to enable the bank to finance loans for housing early in 1973-74 in cases where applicants fell outside the means test under the new housing agreement. It is desirable in the early days of the new agreement to provide further funds for this purpose, in addition to the amount that would be advanced in normal circumstances. Consequently, it is intended that a total of \$2,000,000 be made available to the bank this year.

ROADS AND BRIDGES, \$4,000,000—I reported last year that the estimated cost of work remaining to complete the

sealing of the Eyre Highway was about \$7,500,000. Having regard to limits imposed on rural expenditure under the existing Commonwealth legislation and other pressing road needs in the State, it was obvious that, in the normal course of events, it would take between 12 and 15 years to finance the remaining construction. The Government regarded this prospect as unacceptable and it was resolved that the highway be sealed in the minimum time physically practicable. Alternative proposals, based on a four-year programme, were adopted. In August last year, the Australian Government agreed to make a grant of one-third of the then estimated cost. The grant, extending over four years, was to total \$2,500,000 payable at the rate of up to \$625,000 a year. The Highways Department proceeded with the project. An amount of \$1,087,000 was spent in 1972-73, and work was in progress on a length of some 140 miles (225.27 m). Construction of the remaining part of the highway is planned to begin in 1973-74.

The original estimate of the cost of this project was taken out prior to detailed location and design of the highway. With more accurate information now available, and in view of the price and wage increases that have taken place, it is evident that the total cost may reach about \$9,300,000. The construction programme has been re-examined recently with the result that it is now expected that the work could be completed in 1975; that is, in three instead of four years as previously envisaged. Early completion of the highway and opening it to traffic offers advantages and it is now intended to provide \$4,000,000 from Loan funds in 1973-74 to enable the desirable progress and expenditure of about \$5,000,000 to be achieved. Loan funds advanced for this project are planned to be repaid from road moneys over five years commencing in 1975-76. We requested the Australian Government to increase its contribution to the scheme and to make grants available over a shorter period of three years. The reply, received recently, is that the total of \$2,500,000 is to stand, but the shorter period is acceptable.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE, \$900,000—A provision of \$900,000 is needed to bring the scheme to completion in 1973-74.

OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$1,500,000—It is intended to make \$1,500,000 available in 1973-74, \$1,350,000 by way of \$1 for \$1 subsidies to assist councils in the disposal of floodwaters, and \$150,000 for effluent drainage works as may be recommended by a special committee and approved by the Government.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$1,840,000—A sum of \$1,840,000 is proposed for 1973-74 to continue the channel rehabilitation programme and for other projects, including stock and domestic water supply to several areas, and certain investigation and design works.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$525,000—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 Remark up to a total of \$1,675,000. The Act also provides for grants and loans not exceeding \$3,250,000 in total towards the cost of rehabilitation of the irrigation works and the provision of additional drainage. An amendment of the Act in 1972 authorized loans of up to \$313,000 towards the cost of reticulated water supply within the trust area. A provision of \$525,000 is proposed for 1973-74.

LYRUP VILLAGE ASSOCIATION, \$205,000—An amendment to the Crown Lands Act in 1972 authorized payments to the association by way of grants and loan of up to \$138,000 for the purpose of rehabilitation of the irrigation

and drainage facilities at Lyrup. Negotiations of the contract for these works have reached the stage where it is obvious that the amount needed will be about \$205,000. It is intended to make this amount available in 1973-74. A further amendment to the Crown Lands Act is required now to increase the amount authorized.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$3,300,000—The main items proposed to be financed from Loan funds in 1973-74 include \$850,000 for maintenance of the existing forests, \$965,000 for preparation of land and planting, and \$200,000 for land purchases. Loan Account will provide \$3,300,000, and a further \$300,000 is expected to be spent from special funds advanced by the Australian Government; so a total programme of \$3,600,000 is planned.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, \$9,900,000—Of this amount, \$2,908,000 is for the project that envisages duplication of the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac and the extension of the railway from Port Stanvac to Christie Downs. An amount of \$2,119,000 is for normal development, such as re-laying railway lines, construction of bridges, culverts, buildings, signalling and safety devices and minor works, and \$763,000 is for continuation of a special programme of upgrading main lines. Provision for rolling stock includes \$313,000 for new passenger vehicles, \$1,460,000 for new freight vehicles and \$858,000 for improvements to the existing stock. The Government has made a submission to the Australian Government for special grants towards improving urban transport. We understand that such grants are to be provided in 1973-74 up to two-thirds of the cost of approved projects, and the Budget presented yesterday includes a provision of \$32,000,000 for all States. The distribution between States has not been given in the Budget papers. For the purposes of this Bill we have assumed that we will receive about \$2,000,000 towards the cost of the Christie Downs extension, and that amount has been included in the estimate of repayments. Needless to say, we wish to push on as rapidly as practicable with improvements to urban transport. We believe that we will get more than \$2,000,000 from the Australian Government and, if those additional funds are forthcoming, the railways programme will be reviewed immediately to see what extra work can be done this year. We expect negotiations to proceed very shortly.

HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$5,500,000—Work is well advanced on the deepening and widening of the navigation channel between the Inner and Outer Harbors at Port Adelaide, and \$720,000 is provided for the continuation of this programme in 1973-74. A sum of \$450,000 is provided for the passenger terminal at Outer Harbor, which is scheduled for completion in September this year. Also nearing completion is a special berth at Port Adelaide designed for the handling of the interstate steel traffic, and \$80,000 is provided for this project. Last year the department commenced construction of a container ship terminal at Outer Harbor, and an amount of \$1,180,000 is provided for this work. A further \$2,550,000 is proposed for the bulk loading facilities at Port Lincoln.

FISHING HAVENS, \$300,000—Provision of \$80,000 is made in 1973-74 to continue work on the fishing jetty at Wallaroo. New works planned for 1973-74 include reconstruction of the fishing jetty at Franklin Harbor, improvements to the slipway at Port Lincoln, and construction of a slipway at Kingscote. An appropriation of \$300,000 in total is proposed for 1973-74.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$33,120,000.

Metropolitan Waterworks, \$8,907,000—An amount of \$1,638,000 is provided to continue work on the new trunk main from Darlington to Port Adelaide. Over five miles

(8.05 km) of large-diameter pipe has been laid and a reinforced concrete surface tank has been built at Seacliff. The scheme, when completed, is intended to balance water supply in the metropolitan water region and to serve the West Lakes area. A total of \$1,275,000 is to be made available so that work on the Murray Bridge-Onkaparinga main may proceed to completion this financial year. Pipeline, pumping stations and water storage have already been completed. The remaining work includes testing pumps, installation of the telemetry control, and tiling of the pumping stations and surrounds.

Country Waterworks, \$8,160,000—A total of \$700,000 is proposed for further work on the construction of a 67-mile (107.83 km) main to connect the Tod trunk main near Lock with Kimba. The main will supply water not only to the township of Kimba but also to an extensive area of farming and grazing lands. About 100 miles (160.9 km) of the Tod trunk main between Minnipa and Thevenard is being replaced due to deterioration beyond the economic maintenance level of the existing main. A sum of \$2,234,000 is provided this year for the continuation of this project.

Metropolitan Sewerage, \$8,097,000—A further \$1,009,000 is proposed for extensions to the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works. The scheme will increase the capacity of the treatment works by an additional 75 000 persons to a total volume adequate for a population of 250 000. Work began in January last on a major reconstruction scheme which will replace overloaded sewers, prevent flooding and provide for full development of the north-eastern suburbs; \$1,120,000 is provided for this work. Work will continue on the comprehensive sewerage scheme at Blackwood and Belair, necessary to overcome a health hazard due to difficulties in the disposal of septic tank effluent in those areas, and a sum of \$493,000 is provided. A sewerage scheme for the well developed area at Braeview was commenced last year and is expected to be completed in 1974. An amount of \$348,000 is provided for this purpose. Several other schemes, mainly in the Morphett Vale, Christies Beach, and Athelstone areas, have been included in the programme this year. The Government drew up the programme on the assumption that a grant of at least \$2,000,000 would be received from the Australian Government in 1973-74 towards a speeding up of the sewerage programme. The Commonwealth Budget presented yesterday includes a provision of \$30,000,000 for all States, of which South Australia's share is \$1,600,000. We must now consider the extent to which the sewerage programme should be revised.

Country Sewerage, \$2,269,000—Work will continue on the construction of sewers at Gawler. The approach sewers have been completed and sewers have been laid at Gawler West, in part of Evanston, in the town centre, in the hospital area and in a portion of Gawler South. An amount of \$200,000 is proposed to be made available this year. Good progress has been made on the Port Pirie sewerage scheme. Sewers in the areas of highest priority have been laid and a further \$756,000 is proposed for 1973-74 to continue work in residential areas. An extensive sewerage scheme for Victor Harbor has reached an advanced stage. Sewers for the hospital and for a portion of the residential areas have been laid. The treatment works were commissioned in August last. The target date for completion of the entire scheme is late 1974, and \$550,000 is provided this year.

Other Works—An amount of \$920,000 is required for roads, stormwater drainage, water supply and sewers in

the part of the old Islington sewage farm that is being developed for industrial use.

MURRAY RIVER WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$1,100,000—The State contribution from Loan Account towards the cost of capital works being undertaken in terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement is estimated to be \$1,100,000 in 1973-74. This State's contribution to the cost of construction of the Dartmouth reservoir this year is expected to be about \$1,600,000 but, as one-half of this will be advanced by the Australian Government, only \$800,000 is to be financed from Loan Account. Our contribution towards expenditure on other works is expected to reach \$300,000.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$60,100,000.

Hospital Buildings, \$18,500,000—Some of the major proposals for 1973-74 are as follows:

Queen Elizabeth Hospital—A sum of \$244,000 is provided for the establishment of the nuclear medicine department and \$183,000 for the provision of radiology equipment and accommodation. Other works at the hospital require \$290,000.

Flinders Medical Centre—The sum of \$11,000,000 is included for continuation of work on the main building with two adjacent wings which will house lecture theatres, library and services. Work will also proceed on phase 2 of the project, which provides for the construction of a six-storey ward block comprising various medical and surgical wards, clinical sciences and radiology blocks, an operating theatre and outpatient facilities.

Hillcrest Hospital—The sum of \$408,000 is required to complete work on the upgrading of various wards and day rooms for severely retarded adult patients, to begin construction of a new admission ward and outpatient department, and to carry out major alterations to the existing administration building.

Modbury Hospital—A sum of \$423,000 is proposed to establish laboratories for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

Mount Gambier Hospital—A sum of \$800,000 is provided for work to continue on extensions to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science laboratories, an additional wing to the staff block, and a new nurses training school.

Northfield Security Hospital—An amount of \$368,000 is included for further work on construction of a three-storey bedroom block linked to administration and therapeutic block.

Port Pirie Hospital—The sum of \$299,000 is required to complete Stage I of redevelopment of the hospital.

Group Laundry and Central Linen Service—A sum of \$1,410,000 is proposed to finalize the second stage of expansion of facilities at Dudley Park and to augment the existing linen stocks.

Certain Other Projects—There are two other projects that the Government considers urgent. One is the redevelopment of Glenside Hospital at an estimated total cost of \$4,000,000. The first stage of the scheme, the replacement of psychiatric subacute wards, would require an expenditure of \$360,000. The other project is a major redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Northfield Wards in three stages, estimated to cost some \$17,000,000 at current prices. The first stage would include erection of a 200-bed nursing home. These projects have not yet been referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and no provision has been made in the programme for their financing. When they are reported on by the committee, it is the Government's plan to proceed with them urgently. This may mean rearrangement of the

programme listed and possible diversion of funds from other less urgent projects.

School Buildings, \$28,500,000—For 1973-74 the proposals for school buildings and associated works total \$28,500,000. It is intended that these funds be applied as follows:

	\$
Work under 30 projects with a total value of \$17,952,000 for new schools or major additions to schools, technical colleges and a further education centre which were in progress at June 30, 1973	6,703,000
The commencement of 43 projects with a total value of \$22,612,000 for new schools or major additions to schools, and a technical college	8,245,000
Minor new buildings.....	2,202,000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	2,000,000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences for school purposes.....	2,200,000
Minor alterations, furniture and equipment, subsidized works and preliminary investigations and design.....	7,150,000
	<u>\$28,500,000</u>

Grants from the Australian Government of about \$6,120,000 towards general school buildings and about \$2,830,000 towards specific projects are expected this year and the proposed expenditures include progress payments for works financed from these special funds. Buildings for teachers colleges, which were financed from this line in 1972-73, are now to be financed from the line dealing with grants to universities and colleges of advanced education. Accordingly, the figures I have just quoted for estimated payments for school buildings and for special grants for 1973-74 exclude those for teachers colleges. The estimate of \$28,500,000 is in excess of the record expenditure last year for comparable purposes.

Other Government Buildings, \$13,100,000—Some of the bigger provisions for 1973-74 are:

Agricultural College Department—The sum of \$387,000 is proposed to finish construction of a new biochemistry wing at the college. The cost is being shared by this State and the Australian Government under advanced education arrangements.

Attorney-General's Department—The sum of \$200,000 is provided for work on a new forensic science building. The new building will house the Department of Chemistry, the Coroner's Department and the forensic pathology section of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

Department of Public Health—The sum of \$405,000 is included for completion of the new chest clinic building in North Terrace. The Australian Government is meeting most of the cost of this project. An amount of \$335,000 is provided for the construction of six dental clinics. Two clinics are to be located at Whyalla, a further two in the Port Adelaide area, and one at each of Berri and Taillem Bend. The cost will be met by the Australian Government.

Government Printing Department—The sum of \$1,128,000 is proposed to continue construction of a new printing office and mapping branch at Netley.

Local and District Criminal Courts Department—The sum of \$200,000 is required to commence work on a new building for the Adelaide Juvenile Court. A further \$380,000 is provided to continue construction of a new courthouse at Mount Gambier.

Motor Vehicles Department—The sum of \$20,000 is provided to commence building an office block to cost \$3,500,000.

Parliament House—The sum of \$1,200,000 is proposed for work to proceed on redevelopment of Parliament House. Most of the proposed work will be carried out

progressively but major disruptive activities will be carried out in the summer adjournments over the next two years.

Prisons Department—The sum of \$500,000 is provided to complete construction of a gaol at Port Lincoln.

New Administration Building—The Government has approved plans for a multi-storey office block in Flinders Street and Gawler Place. Estimated cost of this project is about \$7,000,000. The plans have been referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for investigation. When the Committee reports on this project, it is planned to commence its erection. As no provision has been made for this purpose it may be necessary to rearrange the programme to allow the building to proceed.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD, \$450,000—The sum of \$450,000 is proposed this year for continuation of work on the reconstruction of foreshore at Marino, Brighton, Glenelg North and Henley South, and for removal of sand from the Taperoo area for placement on beaches at Henley, Glenelg and Brighton. The Coast Protection Board has engaged consultants to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the Metropolitan Coast Protection District, which extends from Sellicks Beach to the Gawler River. It will take nine to 12 months to complete the study and formulate recommendations for a long-term foreshore protection plan.

STATE PLANNING AUTHORITY, \$1,500,000—The Loan programme for 1972-73 provided \$500,000 for land acquisition as necessary and it was intended that this sum be used for acquisitions under the Hackney redevelopment scheme and in the Monarto area. Late in the year, when the Government decided to acquire suitable land in the metropolitan area for the purposes of subdivision into residential lots to assist in stabilizing land prices, a further appropriation of \$1,000,000 was authorized. The total sum of \$1,500,000 was transferred to the authority. Only \$76,000 was actually spent in 1972-73, comprising \$55,000 for Hackney and \$21,000 for Monarto. The balance remained available to the authority to finance any urgently required acquisitions early in 1973-74. The programme for 1973-74 provides for a further \$1,500,000 to be transferred to the authority for similar purposes.

The Budget of the Australian Government, presented yesterday, includes a provision of \$33,000,000 for expenditure on growth centres. This includes \$1,200,000 for South Australia for the development of Monarto. It is not clear yet as to what extent of State funds may be necessary to supplement that provision. The Budget also includes a provision of \$30,000,000 for all States for land commissions but the Budget papers do not give a distribution between States. We expect negotiations to go ahead without delay and will then be in a better position to assess the extent of State funds which may be required in addition.

The Government proposes to introduce legislation very soon to provide for a land commission and for a statutory body to develop Monarto. In the meantime we have set up a land development unit under the control of the Minister of Lands to perform the functions which will be the responsibility of the land commission, when formed. As a temporary measure we have continued to group the reserve of funds for land acquisition for price stabilization and for Monarto with the provision of funds for Hackney redevelopment. The latter will remain with the State Planning Authority, and the former will be transferred elsewhere in due course.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA—Loan to, \$3,000,000—About half of the trust's total capital expenditure of \$36,350,000 will be incurred on the first stage of station "B" at Torrens Island. Progress payments for

turbo-generators and boilers are expected to reach a total of \$14,520,000, while expenditure on civil works and electrical equipment is planned to be \$4,360,000. Work will continue on the installation of three gas turbines at Dry Creek. The first unit has come into service and the second and third units will follow later this financial year. Development of the 275 000-volt metropolitan transmission system and reinforcement of supply to the Mid North areas is expected to be completed during 1973-74.

There will be further progress in respect of reinforcement of supply to the South-East. Work will commence on a 275 000-volt transmission line between Para and Taillem Bend substations. A 33 000-volt line will be built from Lucindale to Kingston and provision has been made to purchase the existing undertaking at Kingston. Construction of a 132 000-volt sub-station at Kincaig will also begin this year. General expansion of the metropolitan distribution system will include a significant increase in underground residential distribution work. Of the trust's estimated capital programme totalling \$36,350,000 only \$3,000,000 is to be provided from State Loan funds. A further \$6,000,000 is to be raised by borrowing from financial institutions and the public, and the balance of \$27,350,000 is to be met from the trust's internal funds, including funds on hand.

INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE CORPORATION, \$800,000—The normal method of finance for the corporation has been and will remain semi-government borrowing of about \$400,000 a year. However, a review of possible future requirements for loans for approved industries indicates that there is likely to be a temporary peak this year and, accordingly, an allocation of \$800,000 from Loan Account is proposed.

FESTIVAL THEATRE, \$320,000—The Government proposes to introduce amending legislation to define the shares of the cost of the festival theatre to be borne by the Adelaide City Council on the one hand and by the Government on the other. Now that we are in a position to make a reasonable assessment of the cost of variations and of changes in price and wage levels, we have agreed with the council that its share should be a fixed figure, no longer subject to variation. On the basis of a recent review it seems that the total cost of the theatre, apart from certain associated expenditures being met by the Railways Department, is likely to be close to \$6,800,000. Of this, the council is to meet a fixed amount of \$1,800,000, while \$300,000 is available from a public appeal and a Commonwealth contribution. The balance to be borne by the State is estimated to be about \$4,700,000. As \$4,380,000 had been appropriated to June 30, 1973, a further sum of the order of \$320,000 will be required this year.

The cultural complex associated with the festival theatre is being financed by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust under semi-government borrowing arrangements. To June 30 last the trust had borrowed \$4,500,000 and it has been allocated borrowing authority of \$2,400,000 this year. As the total cost of the complex is now estimated at about \$7,250,000, a further borrowing of some \$350,000 may be required in 1974-75.

TRANSPORT RESEARCH, \$500,000—The Government proposes that an allocation of \$500,000 should be available in 1973-74 for approved research work.

UNIVERSITY AND ADVANCED EDUCATION BUILDINGS, \$14,000,000—For the 1973-1975 triennium the Australian Universities Commission recommended a capital programme of \$20,865,000 for the University of Adelaide and the Flinders University of South Australia. For the same period the Australian Commission on Advanced Education

recommended a capital programme of \$20,000,000 for the four South Australian Colleges of Advanced Education. At the time of the recommendation these were the South Australian Institute of Technology, Roseworthy Agricultural College, the School for Dental Therapists and the proposed Torrens College of Advanced Education. From January 1, 1973, the latter college came into being as a result of the amalgamation of the previous Western Teachers College and South Australian School of Art. The recommendations of the two commissions were accepted by both the Australian and State Governments and arrangements were made for the costs of the programmes to be shared equally.

The South Australian Government determined that the other four teachers colleges should be autonomous from January 1, 1973, and they became the Adelaide, Murray Park, Salisbury and Sturt Colleges of Advanced Education. The Kindergarten Training College became a separate tertiary institution from that date. Then early in 1973 a special committee of the Australian Commission on Advanced Education recommended that certain autonomous teachers colleges be recognized by the Australian Government as colleges of advanced education, and that costs of operation and development be shared between the Australian Government and State Governments in the same way as applied to universities and existing colleges of advanced education. Among other things, the special committee recommended a capital programme of \$4,326,000 for the five South Australian colleges in the two and a half years from July 1, 1973; this recommendation was accepted by both Governments involved. For all universities and colleges, then, the proposals were for a total capital programme to cost \$45,191,000 in 1973, 1974 and 1975. The Australian Government then proposed that it should take over from the States the financial responsibility for universities and colleges and that there should be reductions in general purpose revenue and Loan funds corresponding to the relief that would be given to State Budgets.

On the basis that the transfer of financial responsibility should take place as from January 1, 1974, and that the States should share in the normal way in 1973 the grants and expenditures applicable to that year, it was estimated that the relief to South Australia's Loan Budget would be about \$3,800,000 in 1973-74 and about \$7,700,000 in 1974-75. I have explained how the estimated \$3,800,000 was deducted from our Loan allocation as otherwise determined at the recent meeting of the Australian Loan Council. The estimate of repayments is correspondingly increased as the Australian Government will pay to us in full the grants and expenditures applicable to the first half of 1974. The estimate of \$14,000,000 for gross payments in 1973-74 to the institutions concerned is derived by estimating the amount required to June 30, 1974, on the assumption of a smooth flow of work through the triennium and deducting from that figure the grants or expenditures already made in the six months to June 30, 1973. I have given a full explanation of the changes that will affect all tertiary institutions. Most of the institutions, being autonomous, are in receipt of grants appropriated under this line but, because Roseworthy Agricultural College and the School for Dental Therapists are not autonomous, their capital expenditures and recoveries are dealt with in "Other Government buildings". Therefore, while the changes described have their major impact on "University and Advanced Education Buildings" they also have a minor impact on "Other Government Buildings".

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$5,500,000—The major building projects for

non-government hospitals and institutions for which grants are proposed this year are as follows:

Crippled Children's Association—This State and the Australian Government are participating in the erection of a multi-diagnostic centre for physically handicapped children at Islington. The State commitment over a three-year period is expected to be \$400,000, with a provision, of \$230,000 in 1973-74.

Helping Hand Centre—Construction of a day care centre and hostel accommodation has commenced recently; this project will attract a total State subsidy in excess of \$500,000. Of this amount, \$200,000 is proposed for 1973-74. The Australian Government is also participating.

Home for Incurables—Construction began in 1971-72 on an expansion programme. A provision of \$880,000 will permit completion of the south block project and commencement of stage 3 of the scheme, which incorporates the east block, a hall and a chapel. The cost is being met in full by the Government.

Western Community Hospital—Construction of a new 61-bed hospital began in September, 1972. State subsidy is expected to exceed \$1,400,000, and \$550,000 is proposed this year for continuation of this project.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, \$1,000,000—Purchase and installation of new equipment will continue in 1973-74 so that increasing demand for data processing services may be met and so that the original equipment may be phased out. A sum of \$1,000,000 is proposed.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES—BOATS AND FACILITIES, \$146,000—A sum of \$66,000 is included for the purchase of a patrol vessel for the department, and a further \$80,000 for the provision of a wharf and other essential facilities for the vessel at North Arm.

The clauses of the Bill are in the normal form. Clause 1 gives the short title in the usual way. Clause 2 specifies the operative date of the Bill. Clause 3 gives definitions as in the past. Clause 4 sets out the moneys that make up the Loan Fund. Clause 5 provides for the borrowing of South Australia's known allocation for 1973-74 of \$79,587,000, has additional authority in general terms to cover a possible supplementary allocation, and also any increased indebtedness due to discounts.

Clause 6 provides for the expenditure of \$157,480,000 on the purposes set out in the first schedule. Clause 7 authorizes those advances made during 1972-73 by way of warrant pursuant to section 32b of the Public Finance Act. Clause 8 makes the usual provision for temporary finance, if required. Clause 9 gives the normal authority for borrowing and expenditure of Loan moneys in the early months of 1974-75. Clause 10 gives the normal authority for the Treasurer to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft, if necessary. Clause 11 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.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT PIRIE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 396.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, which amends the 1918 Act, which was amended in 1951. The Act fixes a limit of \$6,000 which the Young

Men's Christian Association of Port Pirie may borrow. At present, the association has plans for a building project, the cost of which is likely to be about \$34,000. Although the association has raised \$9,000 towards the cost of the project, it will obviously need to borrow additional money to complete the project. In the light of the value of today's money, the limit of \$6,000 is indeed low. Even on that ground alone, the association would be justified in seeking an increase in the sum it may borrow. The association has shown conclusively that it is a responsible organization, which has existed since 1918 and which has flourished to the extent that it now shows a \$9,000 profit.

I believe that any restriction on the association's borrowing is unnecessary in view of its capacity for responsibility, particularly as lending authorities do not lend money in excess of what they believe a borrower can repay. For that reason, there is every justification for the Bill. As it is a hybrid Bill, it was referred to a House of Assembly Select Committee. As the committee's findings were most favourable, I believe that we can accept the Bill at its face value. In his second reading explanation the Chief Secretary said that, although the association had \$9,000 in hand, the indications were that it would receive a grant from the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee towards the cost of its building project.

Will the Chief Secretary, in replying to the debate, for the information of honourable members and anyone interested who may read this debate in *Hansard* explain what the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee is? If he has information on the likely amount of the grant, that, too, would be appreciated because much of the Government help for the various organizations comes by way of subsidy, either on a \$1 for \$1 or on a \$2 for \$1 basis; but in this instance it is by way of grant, and the second reading explanation does not indicate how much money will be made available for this purpose. I appreciate that that is a question at fairly short notice but, if the Chief Secretary does have that information, I am sure the Council will appreciate receiving it. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I, too, support this Bill. It was about two years ago that the President of the Young Men's Christian Association at Port Pirie asked me how the association could overcome the problem placed on it by the Act which limited borrowing to a maximum of \$6,000, so I have a sense of fulfilment in supporting this Bill today, having set down the guide lines and having appreciated that the Government recognizes the need and has acted accordingly.

The need for extra money is that the committee of the Y.M.C.A. at Port Pirie at this moment is very active. About one citizen in every 12 in that city uses the facilities available there. It is now necessary to increase the area available so that the association can cater for more than one citizen in every 12. It is estimated that one-third of the people using the facilities are under 21 years of age and, if not daily at least weekly, use in some way the facilities that the Y.M.C.A. has to offer in Port Pirie. The enthusiasm of the committee has affected the public to such an extent that many people who wish to use the many facilities available have to be turned away because they cannot be accommodated.

Without criticizing the speech of the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, I understand that the Y.M.C.A. has \$14,000 in hand right now for building; and it has had a promise of \$5,000 as a community welfare grant from the Government. This \$5,000 has been promised by the Government, and it is called a community welfare grant for that purpose. It

is estimated that the Y.M.C.A. will have to borrow more money, naturally enough, to build an interesting complex that will provide two volleyball courts with room for spectators; also, meeting rooms to cater for such functions as fashion parades, keep-fit exercises, and weight-watchers. There is to be a "drop-in" centre with separate partitions for a pool table area, television, films, gramophone records, "hi-fi", and reading, and there will be discussion and lecture rooms. There will be additional space for office and supervisory areas; and there is to be a new canteen.

At the moment the Y.M.C.A. daily has seven main activities going on simultaneously at Port Pirie. It is expected that, when the improvements have been completed, about 350 people will be using these facilities each day. The President of the Y.M.C.A. at Port Pirie (the Rev. Ian Hardy) is a man who has worked very hard over many years, always with the knowledge that his committee could borrow only up to \$6,000. He has done an amazing amount of work so far and he sees the need for improvements. The Y.M.C.A. at Port Pirie has a committee of 16, representative of the citizens of that city. I am sure that the splendid service of these enthusiastic people will receive the wholehearted commendation of all honourable members. I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I rise only to answer the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, who wanted to know what the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee was. It is a committee under the administration of the Minister of Community Welfare. From the docket I have with me, I find that the Y.M.C.A. has already been notified that a recommendation has been made by that advisory committee that \$5,500 be provided by the Government through the committee. I thank honourable members for the expedition with which they have dealt with the Bill in the second reading stage.

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

MONEY-LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 396.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is consequential on amendments, which are before the Council, to two other Bills—the Consumer Transactions Act Amendment Bill and the Consumer Credit Act Amendment Bill. Therefore, some comments made about this Bill will refer also to those other two Bills, as is only to be expected. It seems to me that the Government has an over-zealous approach to introduce legislation on every conceivable matter, not only to introduce legislation in this way, but also to make sure that it is the first cab off the rank in this type of legislation. This process does not allow sufficient time for the public to understand the impact of legislation, nor does it allow Parliament sufficient time to consider the changes the Government is introducing.

Since the production of the Rogerson report, a report of which every honourable member would have some knowledge, people who are involved in the consumer credit industry, legal people, and academics who have an interest in this matter have been engaged in examining that report and considering its practical application to the community. I believe that the Government, in introducing the legislation it introduced last session, was unable to wait for the facts to be known concerning the practical application of the legislation.

I believe we now understand the need for close scrutiny and more detailed advice before we, as a Parliament, place on the Statute books the recommendations that certain

academic researchers make in any field. The same process is seen at the Commonwealth level with the Commonwealth Government adhering at present to the Scottton and Deeble report on medical services in Australia. These two economists, with their political philosophies, have produced a document in relation to Australian health services and, almost immediately, the document has become the blueprint or the health Bible of the Commonwealth Government. Irrespective of what the people wish and irrespective of any critical examination being made of that report, the Commonwealth Government believes that the philosophy contained in that report must be implemented.

Last session matters relating to consumer transactions came before the Council in three Bills; the Money-lenders Act Amendment Bill, the Consumer Credit Bill and the Consumer Transactions Bill. I shall now quote what the Hon. Mr. Potter said last year when debating the Consumer Credit Bill, reported at page 2897 of *Hansard*:

This fairly lengthy Bill is an important measure and another link in the whole chain that the Government is forging in connection with its policy of consumer protection. The Bill repeals the Money-lenders Act and deals comprehensively with the whole matter of consumer credit and the existing law regarding consumer credit transactions. As it is recodified, it deserves much attention by honourable members. Unfortunately, as honourable members know, the Council has been actively engaged over the last few days on other important legislation. Consequently, I have not had an opportunity to examine in detail the Bill's provisions. However, on the face of it, the Bill seems largely to be a Committee Bill, because it is necessary for one carefully to examine its various clauses and decide whether they are adequate for the purposes envisaged.

One can start off with a certain amount of confidence in the measure because it arises, first of all, out of a long examination into the whole problem by the Rogerson committee (as it was then known), which was set up from the Adelaide Law School in 1966. Following that, the committee set up by the Law Council of Australia, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Molomby, submitted a report. That committee examined the practical applications of the problems that had been ferreted out by the Rogerson committee. It is therefore true that a deep examination of the whole problem has been undertaken from two different aspects. In this Bill we see largely the result of the practical inquiry by Mr. Molomby's committee. I do not know yet whether or not a similar Bill has been introduced in other Parliaments of Australia, but certainly the idea behind the setting up of the Molomby committee was that eventually some kind of uniform Bill would be achieved for introduction throughout the Commonwealth.

The Minister said nothing about this in his second reading explanation but I suppose that even if, as usual, we in South Australia are being the first in the field, we can expect that something like this Bill will be repeated elsewhere soon. Some important factors must be considered. First, the Bill does not deal with consumer credit supplied to corporations: it deals only with individuals, from the consumers' point of view. It is presumed that corporations needing to raise money of one kind or another are able to look after their own affairs, so there is a limit to certain provisions of the Bill. Also its provisions do not apply to what may be called large credit transactions exceeding \$10,000. The Bill deals only with credit transactions of less than \$10,000, except where that credit is made available for house purchase purposes.

I ask the Council to note what the Hon. Mr. Potter said, as I believe that is the position now. Following further investigations I now believe that the legislation is unsatisfactory.

All honourable members here know what pressure can be like in this Council at the end of a session: I remember the pressure at the close of the last session when these Bills were before us. I am sure that honourable members can recall that several important matters were raised, matters that had not been considered either by the Rogerson committee or by the Molomby committee. I

believe I am correct in saying that in the legislation introduced into this Council at the end of last session about 60 amendments were moved, and the Government accepted 59 of them. Also, the Bill was recommitted three or four times as further problems arose in the debate. The point I am making is that, in all new legislation, this Council must guard against haste, because time and again we have seen almost theatrical performances by some members demanding that the Council pass legislation without consideration, or with little consideration. I am not saying it happened on this Bill however.

The Council, when these three Bills went through last year, did its work to the best of its ability. However, I do not believe that any member was totally satisfied that the Bills had received sufficient consideration. With Bills such as this before the House, we find that we are often pressured by what I have termed theatrical performances by some members when insisting that legislation pass, and pass quickly. Usually this is done when there is a heavy and complex legislative programme before us. From reading the Minister's second reading speech and from what I have heard from within the legal profession on much of the legislation that has been passed, I believe even the legal profession does not fully understand what the legislation really does, and this is also correct in relation to the range of Bills passed in relation to consumer credit and consumer transactions in South Australia.

Other matters in the principal Act deserve consideration apart from the matters that have been included in the three Bills before the Council at present and to understand the full implications of these amendments and to understand how they affect the principal Act it is necessary that considerable legal advice be taken. Little need be said about this Bill except that it is consequential to the other two Bills before us. All it does is allow the principal Act to continue in operation until the new Consumer Transactions Bill and Consumer Credit Bill are proclaimed: so it does not do much. However, as it is consequential on the other two Bills, I believe that this Council should hold it until it is completely satisfied with the other two Bills. I will listen with interest to the contributions that will be made by other members relating to the other Bills tied to this measure. I support the second reading.

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

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 397.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): This Bill is the second of three Bills to which the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred. It has been introduced to alter the Consumer Transactions Act, 1972, which was assented to on December 7, 1972, but which has not yet come into operation. I understand it is proposed that it will come into operation on September 3 next. It is rather a strange situation in which the Government has found it necessary to amend an Act passed only in the latter stages of last year and not yet put into operation. Obviously the Government has good reason to seek the change, but I stress most strongly that, in explaining the Bill, the Minister did not say why the Government was seeking the respective changes to be brought about by the Bill.

They were explained in that he endeavoured to say what the clauses meant, but we should have been told why the Government was introducing the Bill. If the Council knows these reasons it is much easier, in my view, for it to review the measure, but if honourable members are not

told they must endeavour to find out for themselves. The Government must know why it is seeking the changes introduced by each clause, and it is only right and proper that we should be told. The clauses I shall mention centre mainly on the one general approach, that it is most difficult to review legislation unless we know why the Government wishes to alter it.

As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, last year's Bill was an extremely complex and lengthy measure, bringing great change to the whole area of consumer transactions. Everyone who had some knowledge of the Bill realized at the time that it would not be easy legislation to put into effect, especially in the early stages. Despite that, we have the Bill before us, and my approach is that each of us should endeavour to be as fair as possible to all parties involved in these transactions. One must be as fair as possible not only to the consumer but to the supplier of goods and not only to the borrower of money but also to the lender. It is possible to strike a fair and just balance between all the parties affected by the Bill.

Some clauses are merely formal and I shall not mention those, but I draw the attention of honourable members to clause 3, which gives the Government the right to suspend by proclamation specified provisions of the Act. One can only assume that the Government is foreseeing trouble looming regarding the operation of the legislation, because no reason has been given for the insertion of this clause.

If the Government foresees serious difficulties either before or after September 3, and if it explained what they might be, this would be a wise provision to be contained within the Bill, because those who are endeavouring to administer the 1972 Act will thus not be bound to introduce the whole of the Act on September 3.

While it would appear to be a more prudent provision to be inserted, I hope the Minister will tell us why the Government is seeking this provision so that it need not introduce all the provisions of the Act at the one time, as was contemplated in the measure passed last year. Clause 4 deals with the question of the relief of some consumers where transactions were entered into before the Act came into effect. As I understand it, the question of retrospectivity did not occur in the parent Act. Honourable members have on many occasions expressed their dislike for retrospectivity of any kind incorporated in legislation, and it is easy to understand that attitude. When people enter into transactions under the law pertaining at the time those people, if they become ensnared in any legislation passed at a future date but made retrospective, could be treated most unfairly.

Clause 4 contemplates the possibility of the tribunal giving relief to people in connection with contracts, agreements, and mortgages. I wonder whether the Government has had brought before it some cases in which the need for retrospective legislation has been made clear. If that has not been the case, I should like to know why this clause appears in the Bill. I should like further explanation about the need for retrospectivity of this kind.

Clause 5 deals with the question of consumer credit contracts being included in the principal Act when those contracts are mortgages on houses. When the original Bill was passed last year, mortgages on house properties of up to \$20,000 were not included. Mortgages are often granted to people who purchase houses; such mortgages come from wellknown institutions such as the State Bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia, the South Australian Superannuation Fund and various building societies.

I cannot see why real property transactions should come within the ambit of this legislation. As I recall, although I have not checked *Hansard*, the question of mortgages

was raised last year, and it was specifically mentioned that real property mortgages of that kind were not to be included in the legislation dealing with consumer transactions. Now, only a short time after the passage of that legislation, we have this Bill, which affects people who borrow money for houses from reputable semi-government institutions and other institutions.

I do not see why mortgages of that kind should come under the legislation. Here again, the Government must have its reasons for changing its mind. Will the Chief Secretary say why mortgages of that kind are to be included in the Bill? Clause 6 amends section 6 of the principal Act, which provides:

This Act shall apply to every consumer contract, consumer credit contract and consumer mortgage . . . that relates to goods or services that are delivered or rendered within this State.

When the original Bill was dealt with, I thought that the meaning of that provision was plain, but honourable members will see that the meaning is widened by striking out the passage I just read and inserting three subparagraphs covering the same point. Again, there must be some reason for the Government's change of policy on this point. Some matter must have been brought to the Government's notice that caused a change of mind and caused a much more specific provision regarding transactions occurring within the State, as distinct from transactions occurring outside the State. Will the Chief Secretary say why clause 6 has been included in the Bill?

Clause 7 deals with the question of any variation in any consumer lease or consumer contract having to be notified to the consumer within 14 days; the penalty for an offence is \$500. It seems reasonable that a person transacting business should have to inform the consumer of any change, so I do not have any serious argument about this clause. However, in connection with the period of 14 days notice, a party acting in good faith but being a little behind in its records may not inform the consumer within that period.

If a notice is a few days late, a serious penalty is involved. So, it may be fair to increase the period. Clause 8 provides that there shall be no appeal from a decision of the tribunal fixing the place at which a consumer may return goods subject to a consumer lease. One is naturally cautious when a right of appeal is removed from legislation. However, it would seem to be practical that there be no appeal here, because in many cases the party with whom the consumer is dealing will want to get the goods back as quickly as possible.

Clause 12 amends section 50 of the principal Act, dealing with the regulation-making powers of the legislation. In his second reading explanation the Chief Secretary said that this was the most significant provision in the Bill; its purpose is ultimately to achieve much greater simplicity and uniformity of expression in consumer contracts. I understand from my reading of the Bill that the guidelines for such simplicity are to be laid down by regulation. Although some regulations have been laid on the table and printed in regard to the original legislation, this regulation was not included. So, we must wait and see what is involved in regard to clause 12; then, I am sure we will conduct a very careful examination.

Clause 12 also removes the opportunity for the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs to arbitrate between parties involved in disputes arising from transactions. I wonder whether this is a retrograde step. It always seems to me, in connection with problems between consumers and sellers, that the opportunity to arbitrate should be left

open. It is a means by which settlement of differences between parties to transactions can be arrived at. It is interesting to see that section 12 which, as I have already said, provides the opportunity to arbitrate, is being removed by the Bill. I draw honourable members' attention to that provision. I wonder whether the Government would give its reasons for removing this power to arbitrate?

As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, the Bill is closely involved with two other Bills on the Notice Paper, and I believe that honourable members should be given ample time to review this measure thoroughly. We did not have ample time when the long and complex legislation was before us last year, but we should have the opportunity now at least to look carefully at the amendments before us. I feel sure that this will be the course and that the Minister will not object to giving us ample opportunity.

I ask the Minister, when replying to the debate, to give the reasons why the Government is seeking the various changes outlined in the Bill. The same request applies to the other two Bills, because honourable members cannot be expected to review measures adequately unless their approach to the amendments is based on the reasons why the Government is seeking these various changes. Subject to further consideration in Committee, I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 398.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the amendments to the Consumer Credit Act, 1972. The legislation introduced in the Council on November 7, 1972, has not been operating in the consumer credit field, yet already amendments have had to be introduced in order hopefully to make the legislation work. This indicates hasty legislation that was introduced in the Council in order that South Australia would be first off the taxi rank in the control of consumer credit, as the Leader has said. The Hon. Mr. Potter last year said that this legislation would be the forerunner in the control of consumer credit and hire-purchase transactions throughout the Commonwealth. The inquiries I have made of members of the legal profession and of business firms involved in this problem demonstrate that heavy costs and confusion have occurred because of this legislation. This leads me to suggest that the advice which hire-purchase companies will give to their fellow companies in the Eastern States will be to steer clear of any legislation that is similar to ours. Our legislation is unworkable.

I know of a ridiculous case of a firm of solicitors that wrote to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs asking for advice. The Commissioner replied that he could not give the advice, and suggested that the firm consult its solicitors. This is what is happening in Adelaide in 1973 as the result of legislation that was introduced last November. Furthermore, as other honourable members have said, the idea behind the legislation was to repeal the Money-lenders Act which, in the words of the then Chief Secretary (Hon. Mr. Shard), "had been influenced to a considerable degree by old attitudes that regarded most money-lenders as rapacious users and most borrowers as necessitous paupers". To repeat the comments I have heard from members of Adelaide hire-purchase companies in the last two days, the cost of licensing these companies under the new Act and the difficulty of interpreting the complex legislation and its regulations will make hay for the legal profession and turn the tables on the remarks of the

former Chief Secretary: some small credit companies could become the necessitous paupers! Naturally, as usual, the Government will become the rapacious userer.

I know of one small credit provider company, small in capital structure, that was formed with the idea of lending money to the worker who owned a house but who possibly needed to borrow money to build a carport or garage, to paint his house, or to finance an additional room because of the growing needs of his family. This company's average individual loan is between \$200 and \$250. The cost of licensing the company under the Money-lenders Act was \$30 a year, whereas its licence fee is now \$250 a year, so the smaller companies could indeed become the necessitous paupers and the Government could become the rapacious userer. All other credit companies I have contacted have complained of the complexity of the regulations, and of the mass of legal questions that need to be interpreted so that they may continue to act as money-lenders who cater to people in our modern society. This indicates the problems that exist. The Government has had to introduce three Bills to amend two Acts in order to keep the wheels of finance turning.

I understand that all credit provider companies previously licensed under the Money-lenders Act must have their applications for new licences before the tribunal between September 3 and 17 and that all other companies not previously licensed must have their applications for licences before the tribunal by September 30. Those remarks are not applicable to the Bill under consideration, but the number of companies that are not money-lenders in the strictest sense but that provide a service to their customers will be caught in the net by these three principal Bills. The regulations imposed on these companies will make it extremely difficult for them to act correctly in accordance with the law.

Clause 2 is my first complaint. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Hill have also referred to the provisions of this clause. The Government finds it necessary to make several amendments to the Consumer Credit Act because, as some credit providers affected by the legislation have not completed the necessary requirements, it is necessary to introduce new legislation in stages.

I know of the Government's traditional way of advising industry what will and will not be necessary. However, as a matter of urgency I point out to the Government that it should not dally in advising industry before the end of September what requirements are necessary. Confusion exists because people in industry and the legal profession are unable to interpret the legislation and the regulations that apply to it. Clause 8 deals with the establishment of the tribunal. It states that two members of the tribunal shall be "persons for whose protection this Act and the Consumer Transactions Act were enacted". That is all it says about two people who shall sit on the tribunal. The tribunal shall have the power of accepting or rejecting a company's licence or of accepting or rejecting the type of manager to control that company. The tribunal will have a lot of responsibility, yet two of its principal members "shall be persons for whose protection this Act and the Consumer Transactions Act were enacted". In other words, there is no spelling out of the type or quality of person that those representatives should be. Does this mean "jobs for the boys" again? Does it mean that possibly a person who is so burdened with hire-purchase contracts as to be unable to keep up his hire-purchase payments will be the type of man who, because of his intimate knowledge of hire-purchase, will be one of those members of the tribunal?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Experience will always help.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes; but there should be members of the Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures on the tribunal. That body should be asked to nominate people to this tribunal, as an important role and responsibility are involved, instead of there being merely a vague definition of people who will be representatives on the tribunal—who need to be protected.

Clause 12 raises an interesting point. It amends section 23 of the principal Act, the new section being:

Where a party to any proceedings before the tribunal has, within seven days after the tribunal has made a decision or order in those proceedings, requested the tribunal to give reasons in writing for the decision or order, the tribunal shall give reasons in writing for its decision or order.

The present section 23 reads:

The tribunal shall, within seven days after making any decision or order in any proceedings, give reasons in writing for its decision . . .

Section 25 of the principal Act provides that any person aggrieved by a decision or order of the tribunal may appeal to the Supreme Court, but that appeal to the Supreme Court must be instituted within one month of the making of the decision or order against which he is appealing—that is, the decision made by the tribunal. That seems fair enough in the principal Act where the tribunal shall, within seven days, give notice to the defendant why it has made its decision, and the defendant has a further 30 days in which to appeal to the Supreme Court.

However, this amendment means that the party to proceedings before the tribunal must give notice within seven days to the tribunal, but there is no saying how long the tribunal will take to give its decision. So, if the tribunal was tardy in giving its decision or fearful of having the Supreme Court rule it out of order, it could, I suggest, leave its decision until it was too late—in other words, to more than 30 days later, thus making it impossible for the defendant to appeal to the Supreme Court. I put this point to the Government for sensible consideration because the Bill amends the method of decision-making as far as days are concerned. Clause 13 raises a query in my mind. The second reading explanation states:

The major amendments relate to the procedures and administration of the tribunal. It is now proposed that the Registrar of the tribunal should be a special magistrate. He will be empowered under the provisions of the Bill to exercise the jurisdiction of the tribunal in various minor matters. This will greatly facilitate the disposal of business by the tribunal.

The Registrar will be given powers in various minor matters; but clause 13 states, in new subsection (6), new subsections (4) and (5) having said that there shall be a registrar:

The Attorney-General may, by instrument in writing, authorize any special magistrate to exercise the powers, discretions and functions of the Registrar in respect of any matters arising in a part of the State specified in the instrument.

This special magistrate shall have the powers, discretions and functions of the Registrar. The second reading explanation does not say why there should be a special magistrate, why he should need to operate in a part of the State, or why he should have similar powers to a Registrar domiciled in Adelaide. Will the Government explain that? Possibly, there is reason and justification for it—to speed up the operation of this Act, especially as I know there are some consumer credit companies in Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie that have little

affiliation with companies in Adelaide; so I see the need for a special magistrate to be able to go there and advise, help or control those companies. Why cannot the second reading explanation spell out the reason?

I support the Hon. Mr. Hill in his reference to the Bill with which he was dealing:

Where the terms and conditions of a credit contract are varied in any manner, the credit provider shall, within 14 days after the date of the variation, serve the consumer a notice.

This means that within 14 days, if there are any variations in the policy of the company or the terms of the contract of any nature whatsoever, the company must advise the consumer or the client of those variations. It seems to be a short time to give the company that opportunity, particularly remembering that there is a \$500 fine if the company is found guilty.

My last comments and criticisms of the Bill relate to clause 17, which deals with advertisements—the fact that a money-lender or credit provider must conform to certain conditions. I understand what a money-lender or a hire-purchaser is, but the term “credit provider” causes confusion. Clause 17 deals with advertising: any company wanting to lend or borrow money may advertise, but the advertisement must conform to certain requirements stipulated by the Commissioner, and his instructions shall appear in the *Gazette*.

Clause 17 (5) says that this section applies in respect of any person whether or not he is a credit provider and whether or not any other provisions of this Act are applicable to him. What exactly does that mean? It may be that I am looking too deeply into the problems of advertising, because we already have restrictions relating to fair and unfair advertising in our Statutes. Will this measure restrict the type of advertising that our major stores delight in by using gimmicks to entice the public in and to enable them to operate profitably; or will it be of benefit to the State? The clause seems to be restrictive, and again, there is no explanation whatever in the Minister's second reading explanation. Without drawing red herrings across the trail, I ask the Minister whether he can give me an explanation, because I wish to know what clause 17 (5) means, and to whom it will apply. If I find the clause is unfair I shall endeavour to amend it; however, I support the second reading of the Bill.

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

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 399.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the measure brought forward by the Minister of Agriculture. When I was Minister of Agriculture I had some experience of this matter, as I carried a draft Bill in my bag for some time, hoping that I could get the numbers to get it through; unfortunately, I was thwarted by another place. However, what the Minister is doing at present conforms with what all Ministers of Agriculture throughout the Commonwealth have in mind. Although our quota rises from 528 tons (536 tonnes) to 700 tons (711.2 tonnes), that increase does not seem much to me. Some of the more rapacious States of the Commonwealth in the early stages did not conform with the agreement of Ministers and took a much higher quota than we had in this State. However, it is to the credit of the producers of margarine in this State that they have kept within the quota set. What we are actually doing here is providing for a poly-unsaturated margarine.

This State's quota in the early stages was 468 tons (475.4 tonnes), and it has not really been increased by anything like the amount it has in New South Wales, which has been sending and selling margarine to South Australia for several years while using its own labour and materials. It now seems to me that we are entitled to produce our own table margarine, which is not the axle grease type that is often seen advertised in the newspaper: this is a total margarine and is a much different commodity from that which contains animal fat of up to 90 per cent of its weight. When margarine is advertised on television many wonderful things are said about it: that “it spreads better, looks like and almost is”. However, the advertisements do not quite say “butter”, because that would put the advertisers within the ambit of the law. We are talking about pure poly-unsaturated margarine.

There are many people who are advised by their doctors to use margarine instead of products obtained from cows, goats or whatever animal produces milk. Doctors know the problem. It seems that we have kept our levels low at 700 tons (711.2 tonnes). I studied this matter last night and I cannot see that the Minister is doing anything but the wisest thing for this State and, if I had the opportunity to do it when I was Minister I most certainly would have.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Not the opportunity, the numbers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is the same thing. There is no doubt that the total margarine is a good and edible product. At some stage however, we may build out too much of our arable land and may have to produce the necessary ingredients to make table margarine instead of having many broad acres on which to graze cows. I am not knocking the dairying industry, but I do believe I must be realistic. There are certain people in the community who need this product, and I can only compliment the Government on bringing the measure forward.

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 398.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): When I first heard that the Planning and Development Act was to be amended I thought that it was possibly a tidying up measure that we had foreseen would take place. Honourable members will recall that about two weeks ago His Honour the Chief Justice (Dr. J. Bray) made some severe criticism of the Planning and Development Act, and that I asked a question in this Council whether the Government intended to take any notice of that advice. I was told by the Chief Secretary that he was sure Cabinet would look very carefully at the matter. I read in the press that the Minister in charge of the department had called for a report as a result of His Honour's criticism and that he, too, would look closely at the matter. He said, however, that it was not as bad as one would imagine from reading the press report. However, this gave rise to certain comments in the public arena at the time.

I watched one evening with interest when Mr. Higbed, who apparently holds himself out to be an expert in town planning, dealt with the question of His Honour's criticism. Mr. Higbed said that he thought the Legislative Council was to blame for some of the problems in the planning and development legislation because of the manner in which the Legislative Council had amended the original Bill back in 1966 and 1967.

That was not so. The Council improved the legislation at that time, and whenever amendments have been before the Council since then we have played a worthy part in improving the legislation. The original Bill was a poor one, although it was held out at the time as being the leading and foremost planning legislation in Australia. However, over the years we have seen ample proof that it is not as good as it was claimed to be.

One example of this occurred when the city of Adelaide wanted to introduce interim development control and looked to the Planning and Development Act for power to do so. However, it decided, with the concurrence of the Premier, that the sections in the Act were not sufficient or appropriate, and a separate Bill was introduced to give the city the control it sought.

Whenever this Council has dealt with the legislation it has improved it, but it was bad from the start, not what it was held out to be, and the sooner the Government looks at South Australia's planning and development legislation and rehashes it completely, bringing it up to date, the better it will be in the interests of the people generally.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The Chief Justice would agree with those comments.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think so. This Bill is a simple measure introduced to enable consolidation and reprinting of the Act and subsequent amendments to be put in train. Before that can be done, minor adjustments are necessary in the legislation generally, and the Bill endeavours to make such adjustments. I wholeheartedly support it.

The main change in the Bill concerns the situation where changes are made by proclamation. That is now altered so that the change will be made by regulation. The principle of regulation was introduced into the legislation by this Council, which has always favoured regulation rather than proclamation, for the obvious reason that Parliament has a further opportunity to look at the change before it becomes law. Change by proclamation can be tremendously dangerous, irrespective of the Government of the day.

The Bill simply strikes out "proclamation" wherever it occurs in the Act and inserts "regulation". This tidying up process is necessary, and the sooner it takes place the sooner we will have a consolidated and reprinted Act, which will be far better than the present situation in which we have the parent Act and the various amending Acts, which are very awkward to handle when one wants to make a survey of some issue concerning planning and development.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank the Hon. Mr. Hill for his remarks and for his support. He said that the Legislative Council had made certain improvements to the previous Bill, but I believe it was as a result of certain amendments made by this Council that the word "regulation" was substituted for "proclamation" in only two places out of four. The Bill corrects the anomaly that came into being at that time.

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

STOCK MEDICINES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 399.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill. One cannot say much about it, although one or two things should be highlighted. Section 7 is being amended so that the registration period relating to stock medicines will be increased from one year to three years. That seems quite logical. There will be an increase in the fee, and that is quite common. The Government has been doing that ever since it has been in power, so there is nothing different about that. It has happened every time Labor has been in power.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Didn't it ever happen when your Government was in power?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No wonder you went broke!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We never did go broke; we were in a very sound financial position. This matter will have some influence on our export markets, and that is an important part of the measure. This is not something that the Minister of Agriculture has picked out of the air; the committee on veterinary drugs and the Commonwealth and State veterinary committees have approved it. New South Wales and Victoria have already agreed to this matter, and I can see no reason why we should not agree. I am convinced that our export markets should be guarded in every possible way, and the Bill will make them much more secure. It places an embargo on animal products affected by certain chemicals; this is very important.

No State has shown the necessary prudence to check what is being put into the ordinary type of cooking margarine. If one goes to a knackery, one realizes that the offal there can be put into margarine. This Bill will be effective if it is properly implemented. I have pictures that indicate what is happening in New South Wales with regard to the breaking down of offal that is used in margarine. The Bill will also help in connection with controls over chemicals and inedible types of meat. We should consider most carefully the general regulation-making power, under which the Minister will be able to make much better regulations. The Bill can do nothing but good in connection with the principal Act. I pay a compliment to Dr. Stephen Smith, the Chief Inspector of Stock, who retired recently. He played a very important part in bringing this sort of legislation forward, and I know that his successor will be just as conscientious.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 23, at 2.15 p.m.