

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 29, 1973

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

QUESTIONS**UNION BAN**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In this morning's press there was a report of a ban imposed by the South Australian Storemen and Packers Union which could result in the loss of large quantities of perishable foodstuffs. The ban could also have a serious effect on exports, particularly meat exports. No doubt the Government has examined the situation. Can the Chief Secretary inform the Council of the action the Government contemplates to prevent the senseless loss of perishable foodstuffs?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The matter has been put in the hands of the Minister of Labour and Industry to see whether he can bring about a settlement of the dispute. I agree with the Leader that the ban could have a bad effect on some sections of the community but I hope that, as a result of the Minister's negotiations, something can be achieved.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The strike by the storemen and packers is, I think, about 10 days old and we are now approaching the peak season for lamb marketing. Most housewives are concerned about the price of meat at the present time and are looking forward to some slight relief when greater quantities come on the market. Is there sufficient cold storage space to ensure continuity of the work of the abattoirs in disposing of this stock?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have not had any adverse reports from the board about this, and no doubt if this had been the situation I would have heard from it. Nevertheless, I shall look into the matter raised by the honourable member and inform him as soon as possible of the situation regarding cold storage.

AEROSOL SPRAYS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: A report, headed "New 'thalidomide-type' disaster", in today's *News* states:

The spectre of a new thalidomide-type tragedy confronted thousands of pregnant American women today. They had just been officially told a mass-selling aerosol spray had caused the birth of deformed babies. "Postpone having a baby if you have been exposed to these sprays," the official warning said. "If you are already pregnant, see your doctor at once." The spray is an adhesive widely used by hobbyists. It is also popular for sealing packages . . . The specialists said two babies, their parents, and four other adults had suffered chromosome damage . . . The big danger was that chromosomal damage could go undetected in normal pre-natal examinations . . . The first three adhesives banned are: Krylon spray adhesive, made by Borden Company of Columbus, Ohio; Scotch brand Spra-ment from the 3M Company; and Foil art spray adhesive, also from 3M.

Another nine brands were banned yesterday, but I do not have the names of those brands. Can the Minister of

Health say whether these aerosol spray adhesives are on sale in South Australia and, if they are, whether the danger associated with using them has been drawn to his attention? Can he say whether he intends to issue a warning concerning these sprays to pregnant women and whether he has the power to ban the sale of these sprays pending an investigation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I know the answers to some of the honourable member's questions, but I do not know the answers to others. I will get a complete reply for him as soon as possible.

JAPANESE CARS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This morning's newspaper contained an article indicating that Japanese car makers were being asked to establish manufacturing works in Australia. The article said that the Australian Government had invited two large manufacturing concerns, Nissan and Toyota, to produce cars in Australia, and went on to say:

In top-level talks with the Government, the two Japanese companies have agreed to considerable Australian equity in their operations in this country. The Government is also seeking participation in the Japanese companies. The Cabinet has authorized the Minister for Secondary Industry (Dr. Cairns) to hold talks with the Japanese. The moves were announced yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) and Dr. Cairns. They are part of a major overhaul of the Government's policy on the motor industry in Australia.

I seek information as to the attitude of the State Government toward the encouragement of further vehicle manufacturers to come to Australia in view of the large number of workers in this State dependent on the vehicle building industry, and also the possibility of overproduction, resulting ultimately in unemployment. Does the Government believe there is any danger to employment in South Australia as a result of the Australian Government's plans; secondly, does the State Government intend making any representations to Canberra to protect the interests of South Australian workers?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Premier, and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

ANGLE VALE SCHOOL MEETING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have had given to me a copy of a circular which has been widely circulated in the Angle Vale area. In fact, I have been told that three copies of the circular were posted separately to one household. The circular, which invites people in the Angle Vale district to a meeting to be held at the Angle Vale school, is signed by the member for Elizabeth in another place. My questions to the Minister are as follows: is it the policy of the Education Department to make its schools available for the holding of political or semi-political meetings? If this is the department's policy, is a charge made for the use of the buildings? Again, if this is the department's policy and if no charge is made, does the department realize that a loss of revenue is suffered by local district halls as a result of such a policy?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If the honourable member will make available the circular I will forward it to my colleague and ask him for his department's policy in these circumstances. I will bring down a report when one is available.

INDUSTRIAL INSPECTORS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Health a reply from his colleague to my question of August 21 about industrial inspectors?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister of Labour and Industry informs me that his department has 17 industrial inspectors, including two females, under the supervision of one senior and one assistant senior industrial inspector, making a total of 19. Industrial inspectors are appointed by the same procedure that applies throughout the Public Service, pursuant to the Public Service Act and regulations. Applicants are expected to have a wide clerical background, with particular emphasis on experience in awards and conditions of employment. They are subject to intensive training for a period of about 12 months after appointment.

BEACHPORT MONUMENT

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of July 24 about Government assistance for a monument at Beachport?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Cabinet has considered the request of the Beachport and District Branch of the National Trust and has agreed to provide assistance for the erection of a monument to the memory of the people concerned.

PUBLIC SERVANTS' SUPERANNUATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: For some years now a review of the Public Service superannuation scheme has been under way. Indeed, election promises were made that the review would be expedited and that changes would be made as a matter of urgency. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the review has been completed and, if it has, when will legislation be introduced to make the necessary changes to the South Australian Superannuation Act?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I know that a committee has been working on this proposal. The last information I received was that its report was almost completed. The Premier has told me that a Bill will be prepared. However, because of the difficulties of drafting the Bill, it is not expected that it will be ready before Christmas. It is the Government's intention to resume Parliamentary sittings for a short period after Christmas, and it is my understanding that the Bill will be introduced then.

MANNUM PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the Minister of Education whether the Mannum Primary School has been placed in the design programme and, if it has not, when it will be placed in that programme?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply when it is available.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

STOCK MEDICINES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

PROHIBITED AREAS (APPLICATION OF STATE LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

POLICE ACT REPEAL BILL

Read a third time and passed.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will no doubt recall that towards the end of the last session of the last Parliament an amendment to the Crown Lands Act was made to provide certain funds for the Lyrup Village Association to improve irrigation works. At that time funds to the extent of \$138,000 were proposed to be made available, of which not more than \$55,000 was to be by way of grant, the remainder to be by way of loan repayable in 40 equal annual instalments. In the event, when tenders were sought by the association for this work it was found that, owing to rising costs, the total cost of the works should be about \$200,000. Accordingly, this short Bill seeks to amend the Crown Lands Act to increase the total sum available to \$215,000 and to increase that portion that will be available by way of grant to \$95,000. This Bill has been considered and approved by a Select Committee in another place.

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

FAIR PRICES ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill repeals the Fair Prices Act, 1924-1935, the complete text of which is set out at page 699, Volume 2, of the South Australian Statutes, as consolidated in 1936. The principal Act was aimed at preventing price fixing by agreements, trusts or monopolies, between various sections of trade or industry, to the detriment of the consumer. In its present form it is somewhat cumbersome and depends for existence on the continuation of the Board of Industry. The Board of Industry was abolished on the enactment of the Industrial Code, 1967, but with one exception even before that time the Act was not availed of by the public. The exception is referred to in the *South Australian State Reports*, 1961, page 33, under the title "In the matter of an Application under the Fair Prices Act, 1924-1935" and, in the event, even this application was not proceeded with. It is felt that all the powers that were available to the now defunct Board of Industry are available under the Prices Act, and can be invoked in a less cumbersome manner. Accordingly, it is proposed that the Fair Prices Act be repealed and this is accomplished by clause 2 of the Bill read together with the schedule to the Bill.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF COUNCIL ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill repeals the Unemployment Relief Council Act, 1930-1965. That Act constituted a council to advise the Government of the day on certain matters relating to unemployment relief, the powers of the council being more fully set out in section 7 of that Act. Since 1942 no appointments have been made to the council and hence from that time the council has effectively ceased to function. Until recently it has been necessary to keep the Act in operation pending the repayment of advances made under its provisions to establish certain settlers on Crown land. These advances have now been repaid. For some years two of its provisions, namely, sections 7 and 8, had some application in the distribution of relief by the then Social Welfare Department. However, it is not now the practice of the successor to that department to use them. For the foregoing reasons it seems appropriate that the Unemployment Relief Council Act, 1930-1965, should be repealed and clause 2 of this Bill achieves that object. It might be noted that the repeal effected by this clause only relates to the Unemployment Relief Council Act, 1930, since the Act that amended that Act in 1965, the Maintenance Act Amendment Act, 1965, has already been repealed.

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

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill amends the Art Gallery Act, 1939-1960, in two particulars and, as each amendment is contained in a single clause in the Bill, I propose to deal with them when I deal with the clauses. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 18 of the principal Act by providing that the Art Gallery Board may lease or make available any of its exhibits to persons as well as to institutions, loans to institutions being already provided for in the present section 18. The reason for this amendment is that it is sometimes possible for the board to receive by way of gift, valuable exhibits, although the donor may wish to have the exhibit in his own possession during his lifetime. By the use of this section it will be possible for the board to accept the gift and then, as it were, lend it back to the donor for a particular period on such terms and conditions as the board thinks fit.

Clause 4 amends the principal Act by inserting a new section 18a, which is intended to deal with the problem that is common to most art galleries. From time to time works of art are deposited with the gallery for valuation or authentication and, particularly, if the board determines that the works of art are of little or no value they are often just left with the gallery. Also, it is not unknown for persons depositing works of art for exhibitions simply not to take them back after the exhibition is finished. The legal relationship that then arises is that the board becomes the bailee of the exhibits or work of art so left with it and must assume the legal duties of a bailee. It is proposed by this section that if goods, as defined, remain in the possession of the board for at least two years and then the board takes such steps to require the owner to

take possession of the goods, as are set out in the proposed new provision, then if after a further period of 12 months the owner does not so take possession of the goods, the property in the goods will pass to the board. Although this provision is primarily intended to cover works of art, it will, in its terms, so cover small items of lost property such as walking sticks and umbrellas.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill effects two changes in the principal Act, the Prices Act, 1948, as amended. First, it slightly enlarges the class of "official persons" to whom the Commissioner can disclose information obtained in the course of the administration of the Prices Act. Section 7 of the Prices Act, quite properly, enjoins strict secrecy on the part of the Commissioner and his officers. The exceptions to the restriction on the communication of information are set out in subsection (4) of that section. These exceptions generally are intended to facilitate the administration of the Act and to enable offenders against the provisions of the Act to be prosecuted. However, at paragraph (c) of that subsection an exception is provided to enable information to be communicated to the authorities of other States involved in price control for the benefit of the administration of schemes of price control extant in those States.

At the time of the enactment of the principal Act in 1948 the Commonwealth Government had relinquished price control and hence was not mentioned in the exception contained in that paragraph. Now that the Commonwealth has again, to some extent, entered the field, with its Prices Justification Tribunal, it appears proper that it should be brought within the scope of the exemption. Accordingly, clause 2 of the Bill provides that appropriate information may be communicated to Commonwealth as well as State authorities. Secondly, it repeals section 53 of the principal Act. This section, amongst other things, provides that the principal Act will have an effective "life" only until January 1, 1974.

All honourable members will be aware that, since its enactment in 1948, this measure has been renewed from year to year by a series of measures in substantially the same form. However, by the Prices Act Amendment Acts of 1970 and 1971, quite significant amendments were made to the principal Act. The purpose of these amendments was to give the then Prices Commissioner a rather more formal role as the guardian of interests of the consumers of this State. This changed role was recognized in 1971, when the title of the Commissioner was changed to "The South Australian Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs".

All in all, there seems little doubt that there is something quite wrong in a situation where a fundamental part of the legislative framework of consumer protection in this State depends for its very existence on what is in effect an "annual Act". This is, of course, quite aside from the fact that certain of the Commissioner's "price fixing" functions are likely to be with us for some time to come.

Accordingly, clause 3 repeals the provision limiting the life of the principal Act and replaces it by a provision suspending the operation of sections 34 to 42 inclusive of the principal Act. The operation of these sections, which imposed certain controls on dealings in land, has in fact

been suspended since January 1, 1962. The effect of the substituted section is merely to continue this suspension.

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

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

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

GIFT DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 514.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I should like to commend the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr. Hill for covering the ambit of the Loan Estimates fairly comprehensively, and I do not desire to traverse the same ground, although I may refer to some of the points they raised. The question of housing should be stressed. I think it was the Leader who indicated that the increase in the limit for housing loans from \$10,000 to \$12,500 could result in fewer houses being built in this financial year than in the previous year. The reason is that, although the allocation for housing has been increased by about 9 per cent, it is generally recognized that the inflationary spiral at the moment is running at about 13 per cent. The increase of \$2,500 a unit will mean that there will be no increase in Government-financed house building, but probably a decrease. When I look at the whole document, I see other parts that will probably bring the same sort of result: a little more money may be available, but it is likely that rising costs will mean less activity.

The sum of \$4,000,000 has been allocated for roads and bridges. Considerable activity has gone on in relation to the Eyre Highway and the South-Eastern Freeway. I agree on the necessity (I think every honourable member does) for the Eyre Highway to be constructed as soon as possible, and also on the necessity for the South-Eastern Freeway. Whilst I am pleased to see that these works are being carried on, apparently with all possible speed, I am concerned that, as a result (and this does not perhaps bear directly on this document), local government areas throughout the State are suffering from a shortage of funds.

I remember that, about five years ago, I went through the District of Midland and called on most of the councils in the area inquiring about the situation regarding available funds, and in almost every case I found that councils had as much money as they could handle. District clerks

were wondering how they would manage to use the money in a proper way in the time in which they were required to use it. If one were to inquire now from the councils or to attend Local Government Association meetings, as I did last Friday, one would find that the reverse is the case, as our local government areas are suffering because of the extra money put into other projects.

The Chief Secretary said that the Australian Government had been requested to increase its contribution to the construction of the Eyre Highway and to make amounts available over a shorter period. I understand a reply has indicated that the shorter period is acceptable but that there will be no increase in the amount. We have heard all about the lousy deals the former Commonwealth Government gave the State. The perennial excuse given was the "lousy deal" we got from the Commonwealth Government when it was a Liberal and Country Party Government, but no more money is being received from the Government now in office.

Throughout the document we see references to "the Australian Government". In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a letter with which I could not agree more and which said that there was no such thing as the Australian Government. There are seven Australian Governments: the Commonwealth Government is an Australian Government and the South Australian Government is an Australian Government. All this talk about the Australian Government may be a matter of persuasion, but there is no real basis for it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But it is elected by the whole of the Australian population.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is the Federal Government and may also be known as the Commonwealth Government; it is not the Australian Government, because there are seven Australian Governments.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I thought the others were State Governments.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is so, but they are still Australian Governments, Governments within the Commonwealth of Australia. I shall refer briefly to the sum of nearly \$10,000,000 for railway accommodation. This was mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Hill and therefore I shall not speak about it at length. I am concerned, however, about the possible take-over by the Commonwealth of part of the State railway system. I believe there is no extra generosity in this move by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth wants to take control, and that is the sort of thing that will go on under a Socialist Government, because it believes not in a federal system but in centralism. We will get similar control of the railway system to that which we will get from the setting up of regions of local government: these latter bodies will be handed money if they do what they are told. Under a Socialist Government, pledged to centralism and unification, we will get this sort of unhealthy control. I do not know that the word "unification" is often used nowadays, but it refers to unification of Australia under one Government, which is the policy of the A.L.P. As I said a month or so ago, anyone who wants to know about unification should go to the Northern Territory to see how it is controlled while being 2 000 miles (3 219 km) from the base.

I am interested in the sum set aside for harbor accommodation, and the work to be done on it. I appreciate that work is well advanced on deepening and widening the navigation channel between the Inner and Outer Harbors at Port Adelaide. This is most essential work, and we can be thankful that it is well advanced. I notice a provision of \$450,000 for the completion of the passenger

terminal at Outer Harbor. I mentioned this matter in the Chamber about 10 years ago, after seeing the excellent facilities in use at Fremantle. I am pleased that at last we will have proper facilities, but perhaps the only doubtful note is that we have, at long last, provided passenger facilities at the Outer Harbor in time to see most people travelling by air and fewer people coming in through cur front door by sea. It may be unfortunate that we did not have these facilities when they were more needed.

In the past I have spoken about the Keith main and also the Kimba main, and I have apologized to my honourable friends from Northern and Southern for getting into their districts, as it were. I do not think I will have to make any more apology about that, because we understand that shortly every member of this Council will be representing the whole State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And you think there will be some statesmen then?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I hope there will be, but I do not know whether the honourable member will qualify. I am pleased to see the progress being made on the Kimba main, and I commend the Hon. Arthur Whyte and the member for Eyre (Mr. Gunn) in another place on their efforts last year to gain greater consideration for this facility so vital to Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What about the Minister of Works? Doesn't he come into it?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No doubt the Minister has done his part, but I do not think the Government has been anxious or ready to give due credit to the gentlemen I have just named for going to Canberra and putting the position clearly and forcibly to the Commonwealth Government of the day. I commend them for the work they did. The present Government in this State was inclined to wash its hands of it and say it had done its best, but those two members went privately to Canberra and did their best. They came back with results for which the Government should be thankful and which I would be pleased to see the Government acknowledge.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: It was a closed case, and we reopened it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I agree with the honourable member, and I commend him for what he and the member for Eyre did. I know that the total cost of this main is nearly \$6,000,000, of which only \$3,000,000 had been expended to the end of June, 1972, and that the financial assistance of two-thirds of the expenditure incurred after November, 1972, (\$2,100,000) is available from the Commonwealth Government. The sum of \$420,000 was received in 1972-73 once again. I commend the honourable members who went to Canberra and got the case reopened.

Returning to the parish pump (before I become a member for the whole State), I point out that other mains need replacement. No doubt other honourable members can think of some such mains. I know that the main between Gawler and Two Wells is overloaded and overdue for replacement. I bring that to the Government's attention. The sum of \$2,269,000 is allocated for country sewerage, and work will continue on the construction of sewers at Gawler. I note with disappointment that only \$200,000 is proposed to be made available this year for work in Gawler. If my memory serves me correctly, about \$600,000 was made available the year before last and between \$300,000 and \$400,000 was made available last year. As a result of increases in wages, the allocation of \$200,000 will probably not be worth much more than one-quarter of the sum made available about two years ago.

I draw to the Government's attention that the \$200,000 allocation is insufficient.

I remember hearing not so long ago a prominent member of the Australian Labor Party saying, "We are still waiting for sewerage in Gawler." I remind the A.L.P. that it is over eight years since it had the chance to reverse that trend. I cannot understand why the Government is slowing down its activities in sewerage Gawler. I shall be interested to hear the Hon. Mr. Creedon, who is the Mayor of Gawler, speak on this matter. No doubt he has made representations on this matter, but it appears that he has not been successful. I hope that when he speaks he will express his disappointment at the meagre allocation the Government has made for this work.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You realize that South Australia is the best seweraged State in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am aware of that. We had an L.C.L. Government for about 27 years, and that had something to do with it. Regarding the Dartmouth dam, \$1,100,000 is allocated towards the cost of capital works being undertaken in terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement, and the State's contribution towards the Dartmouth reservoir is expected to be \$1,600,000. I only hope that the Government will stand fast in its determination and see that the dam is built.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What do you mean by "will"?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I hope that the Government will stand fast, for the simple reason that the Premier has received a letter from the Prime Minister suggesting that the building of the dam be postponed.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The Premier replied to the Prime Minister.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Premier is only the Premier, whereas the Prime Minister is the Prime Minister. I was pleased that the Premier replied to the Prime Minister, and I hope that the Premier will stick by his reply.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have no worries.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am pleased to hear that. I know that the honourable member, from the back bench, will have great influence on the Government and that he will see that the Government will persist in this matter. If that is done, I shall be pleased. We lost the Chowilla dam, on which this Government was elected three years ago. We were to get the Chowilla dam right or wrong, and now we are just about in the situation where we are going to lose Dartmouth.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But Hall was going to build it, wasn't he?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Some other people were going to build it. The situation now is that the Prime Minister does not want to build it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We're talking about Dartmouth, not Chowilla.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Prime Minister said that he would build both dams. If the Minister casts his mind back he will realize that the Prime Minister said that when he was Leader of the Opposition. We cannot lose the Dartmouth dam. I urge the Government to stand fast on that project, which is vital to the State.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You'll support the Government on this?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Of course, on anything that is sensible, but there are some things on which I will not support it. I now wish to say a few words about two or three projects that are no doubt very dear to the Hon. Mr. Shard's heart, namely, the allocation for buildings at two hospitals, for which I commend the Government. As the work of the Hillcrest Hospital is important, I am pleased to see that \$408,000 is allocated to complete work

on the upgrading of various wards. I am glad that the Government intends to do this work, because I am persuaded of the very great importance of the work being done at Hillcrest. At one time, we would have put away such people as are treated there and left it at that, whereas these days we rehabilitate them. We must not underestimate the importance of the rehabilitation of people in this category. As all honourable members know, the Glenside Hospital needs to be rebuilt or redeveloped. Work is also to be done at the Royal Adelaide Hospital Northfield Wards. I am interested to see that the Government intends to proceed with work on these two latter projects as soon as possible. These two projects have been referred to the Public Works Committee, and I believe that the Government intends to proceed with them as soon as the committee has reported on them. I commend that situation.

I am also pleased to see that the large sum of \$11,000,000 is allocated for the continuation of work on Flinders Medical Centre. I have always said that work on the centre should have preceded the building of the Modbury Hospital. Regarding the allocation for the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act provides for the Government to finance partly by grant and partly by loan the cost of constructing a new pumping station and ancillary works at Renmark, up to a total cost of \$1,675,000. I would be the last person to argue against the advisability of doing necessary improvement work in the Renmark, Berri, Loxton or Waikerie areas or in the Barossa Valley with regard to the horticultural and viticultural industries. However, I was concerned when I saw a report in the *Advertiser* last week of comments made by Mr. Tom Hardy, the Chairman of the Wine Board, part of which is as follows:

The wine and grape growing industry had been severely hit by the Federal Budget. The cost of growing grapes and the making of wine for distillation into brandy makes it a more expensive spirit than those made from grain or sugar products. Other spirits will become cheaper than brandy, with a disastrous effect on sales.

One realises that the viability of the Upper Murray towns of Renmark, Berri, Barmera, Loxton and Waikerie, as well as that of areas such as the Barossa Valley depends largely on the economic well-being of the wine and spirit industry. When one sees comments about the Commonwealth Budget such as those made by Mr. Hardy last week one hopes that, if the Government intends to allocate money for the upgrading of facilities in the Upper Murray and at the Nuriootpa Research Centre, it will make the strongest possible representations to the Commonwealth Government against the imposts that have been placed on the wine and spirit industry. I believe the Commonwealth Government has treated South Australia unfairly, in view of the importance of that industry to this State, and I urge the Government to do all in its power to see that these unjust imposts are removed or at least reduced.

I commend the allocation of \$28,500,000 for school buildings. Although it allocated only \$23,000,000 for this purpose last year, the Government spent about \$29,000,000. I referred to this matter a month ago, when I said that the overspending on school buildings was justifiable.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What do you mean by "overspending"?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If one spends \$6,000,000 more than one has allocated or more than one intended to spend, I would call that overspending. I am saying that \$28,500,000 has been allocated this year and that actual payments last year amounted to \$29,770,000, as the Hon. Mr. Shard would see if he referred to the

second reading explanation. Having regard to cost increases, unless the Government is able to spend more than this year's allocation, it will be doing less work on upgrading schools than was done last year.

I am concerned about schools in Midland District, which I have represented for 11 years. I noticed with pleasure that an open-type unit is to be erected at Nuriootpa at a cost of \$205,000. This school is placed in an excellent situation, and there should certainly be no thought of relocating it when the school is upgraded. It consists of the original solid construction building, one or two later solid construction buildings and many prefabricated buildings. The school is certainly overdue for replacement. Although I am pleased that \$205,000 has been allocated for this building, the school should certainly be replaced in its present location more quickly than is happening.

I have already asked a question regarding the Yorketown High School, for which there is no allocation. I am concerned, too, about the Nuriootpa Primary School and other primary schools located in areas where there are narrow streets and no room for expansion or adequate playing fields. I commend the Government for the \$28,500,000 it has allocated. However, I bring to its notice the urgency regarding some of the schools to which I have referred.

I notice, too, that \$20,000 (a small sum) is provided to commence building an office block costing \$3,500,000 for the Motor Vehicles Department. The Hon. Mr. Hill referred to this matter yesterday. Although I do not wish to speak on this subject in detail I concede that this department certainly needs new facilities. However, I am concerned that we are commencing construction on new accommodation for the Motor Vehicles Department when nothing is in sight for an agricultural administration centre which has been put off and which, I believe, was a grievous mistake by the previous Government, which is being made worse by this Government.

I am sure the previous Minister of Agriculture would agree with me, although he may not wish to say so, that the previous Government made a grievous mistake when it decided that tourism was more important than agriculture. I am persuaded of the importance of tourism, but I do not believe the old Tourist Bureau building was any worse, having regard to the size of the department, than the Gawler Place rabbit warren in which the Agriculture Department is now housed. With due respect to tourism, I believe it is more important to set up our Agriculture Department in a proper and adequate administration centre than it was to erect a new building for the Tourist Bureau.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Where do you think it should go?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think it should go on the Agriculture Department's site at Northfield. I certainly do not think it should go to Monarto. There has been talk of such a transfer and, although I believe it may be wise in due course to have a regional office there or at Murray Bridge, I certainly do not think it is wise to consider building a new complex for the Agriculture Department at Monarto. For one reason, it will be 10 years before this could happen, and it is overdue by at least that much time now. Secondly, if it is done at Monarto, we would lose some valuable officers from the Agriculture Department. Considering the Government that is in office at present, I doubt very much whether these officers will be replaced, because all honourable members know that, as much as the Minister may disagree, the Agriculture Department is the Cinderella department as far as this Government is concerned.

Before I conclude, I should like briefly to refer to non-Government hospital and institution buildings. I am pleased to see that the Government intends to do something for the Crippled Children's Association. I understand that the commitment is expected to be \$400,000 over three years, more than half of this being provided in this financial year. I also commend the Government's action in assisting the Helping Hand Centre, which is doing really worthwhile work. It is doing a splendid job in caring for elderly people, and what can be said about it can also be said of 10 to 12 similar institutions of varying sizes in South Australia. Some are large, and others are small, but most of them are doing a splendid job in caring for elderly people.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think South Australia has a good record in this regard?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, I do. I am quite aware that there is room for improvement and I am sure the Minister will agree with me that there is always room for improvement in the provision of these facilities.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You mean improvement from the point of view of numbers, not quality?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think the quality, generally, is quite good. There are some private places the honourable member knows about which left room for improvement and which, I think he would agree, caused him some concern when he was a Minister. I have no doubt that there are some places like this that cause concern to the present Minister.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But there are many dedicated people who work in them.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes; a lot of dedicated people work in such places as the Helping Hand Centre, and much valuable work is done. This centre will attract a total State subsidy in excess of \$500,000, of which about \$200,000 is proposed for this financial year, and the Commonwealth Government is also participating.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: The Commonwealth Government will not help matters if it does away with taxation concessions for gifts to these institutions.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I agree. We shall probably find that the Commonwealth Government, having made so many promises, will run out of money.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It may run out of promises, too!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: But the Commonwealth Government is already known to have run out of money, because the State Government Treasurer returned from Canberra saying he was \$20,000,000 short of his requirement. I express my approval of another item here for the expansion programme of the Home for Incurables. This is estimated to cost about \$12,000,000, and a provision of \$880,000 will permit the completion of the south block project and the 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. I have mentioned previously in this Chamber that I do not like the name "Home for Incurables". We should be able to think of a better name for that institution. No doubt, the present name reflects the function of that place—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Does it lose any support because it has that name?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No, but it is a hopeless title for people who know they have to go and live in a home for incurables. A place in Western Australia doing a similar job is known as the Home of Peace. We could well find a better name for the Home for Incurables. No doubt, the job being done there is excellent but I do

not like the title or the thought of people having to go to that place thinking "Well, that is what it means: I am going there because I am incurable and have a terminal condition." It is most distressing for a person who has to go into that place to feel that that is why he is going there. If he knows he is going to a home with a decent name, he will feel better. Consideration should be given to this suggestion and I ask the Minister to give his full attention and, I know, his sympathetic support to that proposal.

There are several other important matters to which I could refer but most of them have been covered by the previous speakers or may be covered by other speakers or in Committee. At this stage I content myself with the remarks I have made and support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I have listened with interest to what honourable members have said about this Bill and its proposals. I know they do not want answers now to everything that has been said in the debate. We go through this procedure every year. Honourable members take the opportunity to criticize the Government and also make suggestions about the expenditure of Loan money. The Leader of the Opposition and each of the speakers in this debate criticized strongly the fact that the second reading explanation referred to the Australian Government instead of the Commonwealth Government. After all is said and done, it is the Australian Government, anyway. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said that all the Governments in Australia were Australian Governments. I think that is a small point to criticize.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Will the honourable member want to change the name of another set-up? He should be consistent.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The trouble about the term "the Australian Government" is that it is all trying to lead in only one direction.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We on this side have been able to accept the fact that it is an Australian Government. The Leader did not criticize greatly any of the matters in the Bill but, of course, as we have come to expect of him, the Hon. Mr. Hill did. He is generally a prophet of doom in these matters, and his speech in this debate was in that vein. I want to correct him about the cost of dial-a-bus. I should think he would have seen the recent figures published and the answers given by the Minister in another place or by me as Acting Minister, when I had an investigation made and the figures brought up to date in regard to the overall cost of dial-a-bus—\$31,473. For Infoplan Proprietary Limited (public relations and advertising consultants) for planning the publicity, the cost was \$2,352. For Dial-a-bus Proprietary Limited for conducting a field trial on a charter basis, the cost was \$3,712. For P. G. Pak-Poy and Associates for reports on various dial-a-bus systems, the cost was \$25,408, and not \$27,000 as the honourable member said.

Another comment from the Hon. Mr. Hill was about the overseas trips of the Minister of Transport, and he referred to the previous one as being the occasion on which the only thing he brought back was the dial-a-bus system; but that was not, by a long way, the only thing he looked at or the only information he received overseas. The Minister is now overseas again. I can understand the Hon. Mr. Hill objecting, because he has a thing about overseas trips: he was the only Minister in the Hall Government who did not have at least one trip overseas.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not miss out at all; I did not apply for an overseas trip while I was a Minister.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That comment illustrates what I said—the honourable member has a thing about oversea trips. I was pleased that the three honourable members who spoke on this Bill praised the Government for various matters, commending it on this, that, and something else, which I accept as fair enough. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins spoke well in commending the Government. He is a fair member.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: He was not over-fulsome, though.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: He did not have to be over-fulsome. He criticized the Government in some respects but he also commended it in other respects, and that we have come to expect from the honourable member.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

First schedule.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to page 5 of the first schedule and to the item of transport research under the heading Other Capital Advances and Provisions. Will the Chief Secretary confirm the figures he just gave concerning the expenditure the Government has incurred because of dial-a-bus? I noted that the figures totalled \$31,472. Will the Minister confirm that figure and that it was the total Government expenditure for the whole dial-a-bus project? Also, can he say whether compensation has been fully agreed and paid between the Government and all the private operators who were involved with the Government in the dial-a-bus project?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): The figures that I gave were figures that were given in another place with regard to a question as to the cost of the dial-a-bus system. I have no knowledge of compensation payments being made, or of any negotiations on the matter.

First schedule passed.

Second schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 515.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): Most of this Bill is clear. It transfers authority from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary with regard to allotting days on which the totalizator can operate; there is no controversy whatever about that part of the Bill. The Bill also introduces a certain flexibility with regard to transferring venues of country races where clubs decide to race on a different day for economic or weather reasons, and there is no objection to that.

The Bill then deals with what I consider to be the only point of controversy, and how controversial it is, is hard to gauge. We received the Bill only yesterday, and today we are supposed to be able to speak with authority to it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It came up on August 23.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Fair go!

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You have had a week.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you acknowledge that or not?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I would not dispute it as I can see the Chief Secretary looking at *Hansard*; therefore it must be right. However, I still find it hard to gauge the general feeling of country trotting clubs. Although the South Australian Trotting Club has agreed to this legislation there still seem to be matters in the Bill that are both perplexing and controversial to the country trotting clubs.

The increase in trotting days for Globe Derby is the point in question. At present 12 meetings a year of country status are held there, and the fear is (and this was raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday when speaking to this Bill) that the number of country status dates for Globe Derby could easily be increased under the present legislation. The country clubs say that this is not good for country trotting or for metropolitan trotting, in as much as it would allow the club itself to race more often for less stake money and would also allow horses to race without incurring proper penalties. Country people are alarmed that a horse should be allowed this protection instead of having to qualify in the country before it can race or trot in the city, as a horse would be able to race at Globe Derby whenever there was a country meeting there. This policy is contrary to the wishes of country people and contrary, they believe, to the best interests of the industry. However, the Chief Secretary said it was essential that the Bill be passed today to allow the allocation of trotting and racing dates.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not trotting, galloping.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It has to be passed because of one racing date in particular, to enable a country club to transfer one of its meetings to the city. Whether it is necessary for this Bill to go through for that reason I do not know, but I am willing to assist the Chief Secretary when he says that it is necessary. However, I should like an undertaking from the Chief Secretary that an assurance be given to country people that the number of country status meetings to be held within the metropolitan area will not be increased. If he can do that, I will have no objection to the proposal. The trotting rules have required that a horse must qualify in the country, and it seems wrong that we should allow a horse to qualify in the city, thereby taking away from the country the benefit of having that horse at country meetings. As the Chief Secretary pointed out, the Totalizator Agency Board is probably the controlling force of both trotting and racing in South Australia, but I believe that it is a pity that this is so. I agree with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that there should be separate administrations for the various sports. The following is an extract from a letter that I recently received:

At the Strathalbyn races on June 27 last, the totalizator windows remained open for three minutes after the third race from Hawkesbury was run. There was no course broadcast of the race, and many people who had transistor radios naturally backed the winner after the race.

I told the writer of the letter that I had been waiting for someone to work out a system like that, but he did not seem to be amused.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can never control human errors.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It is not the sort of error that I would like to have repeated, if I was in charge. I hope the Chief Secretary will give an assurance to the people I have referred to that the number of country status meetings at Globe Derby Park will not be increased.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I thank honourable members for the manner in which they have dealt with the Bill, but I do not know how I can do some of the things that I have been asked to do. Regarding the question of separate control over the various sports, I shall be interested to see the report of the inquiry currently being conducted. After I have discussed the matter with the various sections of the industry, I will see what sort of legislation is necessary to implement those recommendations of the committee that the Government decides to adopt. The question of stake money is difficult; we do not tell horse-racing clubs what they should do

in connection with stakes and handicaps, nor do we tell the dog-racing clubs what they should do in those matters. So, why should we tell trotting clubs what they should do in regard to stakes and handicaps?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is a different situation.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Both the Leader and the Hon. Mr. Whyte asked for an assurance in regard to this matter. I agree with the points put forward in this connection, and I will have discussions with the Trotting Control Board and see what I can do. Because of the situation, eventually they will disappear without my taking action.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you mean that the Trotting Control Board will disappear?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No; I mean that the country status meetings will disappear. I will discuss the whole question of country status meetings with the Trotting Control Board and see what I can do.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Use of totalizator at trotting races."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Chief Secretary for his indication that he agrees with the views expressed by honourable members in connection with this clause, and I have confidence that he will do his best to see that the desires of honourable members are carried out, if possible. We all appreciate that, if there was an unspecified number of country status meetings in the metropolitan area, it could do considerable damage to the trotting industry as a whole. At one stage I had intended asking the Chief Secretary to report progress so that I could consider whether I should move an amendment to this clause, but I do not now intend to take that course. I thank the Chief Secretary for his understanding statement in relation to this clause.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The trotting authorities have complete agreement for 12 country status meetings at Globe Derby Park. In order to obtain permission for metropolitan clubs to run country status races, the authorities must get permission from the Interdominion Trotting Conference, which will soon take the stand and insist that all metropolitan trotting meetings must be conducted on metropolitan standards. I think the only reason the South Australian Trotting Club was given permission to conduct day-time meetings in the winter months was that it was in financial trouble. After another season (or two at the most, in my opinion) the permission to operate under country status will be taken away. If he wishes, the Chief Secretary can lay down the number of country status meetings. As I understand it, everyone is happy with the present position but the Chief Secretary can say that there will be no significant increase in the number of country status meetings to be held at Globe Derby Park. I agree wholeheartedly with the views expressed, and I think if attempts were made to go wholesale into country status meetings at Globe Derby Park, the Interdominion Trotting Conference would refuse permission.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on August 28. Page 517.)

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole Council on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause dealing with guarantees.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

New clause 11a—"Provisions as to guarantors."

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT moved to insert the following new clause:

11a. Section 43 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "No guarantor" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "Subject to subsection (2) of this section, no guarantor"; and

(b) by striking out from subsection (2) the passage "to the performance of any obligation to the credit provider that is independent of the guarantee" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "by an agreement that is independent of the guarantee to perform any contractual obligation".

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): The Government will accept the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clause 12 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MONEY-LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 446.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support this short Bill which is a measure consequential on the Consumer Credit Act Amendment Bill already passed in this Chamber. The passing of this Bill will avoid the inconvenience of dual licensing under the Money-lenders Act and the Consumer Credit Act. I understand it is proposed that the licensing provisions of the Consumer Credit Act should come into operation from September 3, and the Bill now before the Council provides that those who were previously licensed under the Money-lenders Act shall also be licensed under the Consumer Credit Act.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

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

That the Committee's report be adopted.

In so moving, I thank the Committee for allowing me to put the previous Bill through without delay, because this Bill is tied to the other Bill, and it comes into effect on September 1.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 522.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): As I have made extensive inquiries among the people who will be affected by the Bill and have found no objection to it (in fact, I have found much satisfaction with it), I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Exemption."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I spoke about the use of the terms "registered physiotherapist" and "licensed physiotherapist" in the second reading debate. I realize that the board is happy with these two terms, and I have tried without success to think of another term. Can the Minister say whether the matter of possible confusion arising between the meaning of the two terms has been considered?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): The Bill in general was discussed with all the people concerned and there was no disagreement about the terms, although this issue was not specifically raised. As I believe that all bodies are happy with the terms, I see no reason to amend them, because I doubt that any confusion will arise.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 30) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 479.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill allows that, in the calculation of the rate of pension, the salary received by the contributor immediately before his or her death or retirement shall be taken as an element in that calculation. As the procedure stands at present, a salary increase cannot be taken into account in the calculation of the pension payable at death or

retirement if the increase occurs after what is known as the review day. The review day takes place each year and, if a salary increase occurs after that, it cannot be taken into account in calculating the pension. The Bill will result in slightly higher pensions being paid to some members of the Police Force in certain cases.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In effect, it makes it fair to everyone.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, because some member might get a salary increase the day before the review day, whereas another member might get a salary increase the day after the review day.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We cannot be fairer than what the Bill provides.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. Clause 2 is the only operative clause in the Bill. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 30, at 2.15 p.m.