LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, March 14, 1974

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

QUESTIONS

FRUIT FLY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I was alarmed this morning, as I imagine most honourable members of this Chamber would be, to see that Victoria and New South Wales intend to take action to prohibit the importation of fruit from South Australia into those two markets because of the incidence of fruit fly in our metropolitan area. I think it is stated categorically, and probably correctly, that some $3 000 000 to $4 000 000 is the sum of money we are looking at if those two markets are closed to our tomato and capsicum growers in particular, and that an area extending to 20 miles (32 km) from Adelaide has been declared a quarantine area. Certain treatment is available for fruit being taken from one place to another. We have in this State regulations in respect of custard apples, mangoes, bananas, and pineapples, allowing them to come into this State in a green condition and ripen after they get here, after sterilization.

I understand that perhaps Victoria and New South Wales would accept a similar type of treatment (that is, sterilization) of fruit; but, as I understand the present position, very few growers would have the facilities to carry out that treatment, and it is most likely it would be necessary for the Government or some grower organization to set up a fairly costly plant in order that this sterilization of fruit could be carried out. Can the Minister say what plan, if any, the Government has formulated at this stage to enable the necessary treatment to be carried out so that the growers can export tomatoes and other types of fruit to Victoria and New South Wales?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I was interested to hear the honourable member's question, because, on the one hand, he said that there was a total embargo on fruit going to those two markets, and then he said that perhaps the fruit could be sterilized. Of course, there have been restrictions for many years on all fruit in South Australia, but they have never been rigidly applied by other States. It is only because we did not have an outbreak of Queensland fruit fly before this season. We have had six outbreaks in South Australia, basically relating to the Queensland fly. I think there have been four outbreaks of Queensland fruit fly and two of Mediterranean fruit fly; it could be three of each but that is beside the point, because it is the Queensland fruit fly that is causing the present concern in the other States. I assure the honourable member that we are studying this matter closely. It happened only yesterday that we heard that the authorities had decided to implement the restrictions in such a way that before fruit can be exported it must be sterilized. All fruit that comes into South Australia from the other States must be sterilized, anyway, and that has always been the practice

The Hon. R. A Geddes: In the State where it is grown or when it comes into South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Normally before it comes here, but the fruit is inspected when it comes into South Australia. This is the first time that these restrictions have been put into effect, even though they have existed for a long time.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I was interested to hear the Minister say that the restrictions have been in force for some time but have not been applied to any great extent in the past. As there must be a reason for this sudden change in attitude, I wonder whether it has been brought about by publicity associated with people who have refused entry to Agriculture Department personnel to strip or spray their fruit. Can the Minister say whether this is the reason for the imposition of the ban on our fruit and, if it is, does his department intend taking a stronger attitude towards people who resist treatment of their fruit that may be infected by Mediterranean or Queensland fruit fly?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am unable to give the specific reply the honourable member wishes me to give, namely, that I place the onus on the press for publicizing this matter adversely. I do not think that that would help the matter in any way as far as the fruitgrowers or the department is concerned. The fact remains that this matter has been brought to the attention of authorities in other States and, of course, they have acted accordingly. They could have acted in the same way in previous years. Possibly because this matter has been publicized in the way in which it has been publicized it has had some effect, but it is difficult to judge at this stage. These restrictions have existed for a long time; it was only a matter of implementing them. They could have been applied last year, but it has been done only on this occasion.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It's no coincidence?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I heard on the radio this morning, when travelling to Adelaide, a report by Mr. Tom Miller, Chief Horticulturist in the Agriculture Department, that he was very concerned about the current fruit fly outbreaks and that they were the worst we have had in South Australia for some time. If that radio report is correct the outbreaks are very serious indeed. Will the Minister therefore elaborate on Mr. Miller's statement and, also, will he endeavour to give honourable members some idea of how long his department expects to take to control the outbreaks?

The Hon T. M. CASEY: In replying to the last part of the honourable member's question I should like to say that that is the $64 question at this stage, because it is difficult to assess how long it will take to control the outbreaks. I was pleased to hear that the honourable member gets up early in the morning and listens to the early news when travelling to Adelaide in his car. Six outbreaks of fruit fly have ocurred; there have never been that many before.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: How many flies have been discovered in those outbreaks?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not know. Another serious problem caused by the outbreaks is the effect on commercial fruitgrowers' areas. Every step has been taken by my department to eliminate the possibility of an outbreak of fruit fly in these areas, so we are doing the best we possibly can. I assure honourable members that my department is also doing everything possible to minimize further outbreaks in South Australia, but it

cannot do the impossible. If people bring infected fruit in from other States, which has possibly happened this time because it has happened in the past, the fly is difficult to eliminate.

WHEAT STABILIZATION

The Hon. B A. CHATTERTON: It was announced in the press recently that agreement had been reached between the Australian Government and the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation on the new wheat stabilization legislation, which requires complementary legislation by the States. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what his attitude is to the agreement and when the necessary complementary legislation will be introduced?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It was only yesterday that I received a telegram from Senator Wriedt, Minister for Primary Industry, indicating that agreement had been reached between the Federal Government and the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation on a new five-year wheat stabilization scheme. I am delighted that the federation has agreed to the Australian Government's proposals, which I think will be in the best interests of the wheat industry throughout Australia. I have already indicated to the Senator by telegram this morning that South Australia is in full agreement and that we will introduce the necessary complementary legislation probably in the next session, because that will be the most appropriate time in which to do it. I take this opportunity of congratulating Senator Wriedt on the wonderful job he has done I understand that about 90 per cent of the farming community throughout Australia would share my attitude in this matter. He has had an unenviable task in arriving at this stabilization scheme. I must say, with all due respect to the knockers of the scheme (and there were many of them), that the Federal Government has at last come up with a proposition that will be advantageous to the wheatgrowers and the country as a whole.

COPIES OF ACTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act were amended in 1973 and assented to on December 13, 1973. Later, the amending legislation was proclaimed. A prominent city lawyer telephoned me this morning to say that he was responsible for representing the nominal defendant in a hit-and-run accident, but copies of the amending legislation were not available through the Government Tourist Bureau, which normally distributes such material for the Government Printing Office. He was told that he could get a copy by going to Netley. The legislation was proclaimed last week, and the service provided is hardly sufficient for the legal fraternity. If an Act is proclaimed, surely copies of it should be available to those who have to interpret the law. Either an Act should be available to all concerned when it is brought up to date or proclamation of the legislation should be delayed until copies of it are available. Will the Chief Secretary consider this matter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am interested to hear the honourable member's comments. I think most people who have had experience in Cabinet know that a clean print of a Bill has to be available before it can be assented to. So, printed Bills must have been prepared in connection with the legislation that the honourable member referred to. At present there is some confusion as a result of the removal of the Government Printing Office to Netley. I will look at the question of availability of material printed by the Government Printing Office. I had an idea that such material was available at the State Administration Centre, Victoria Square, but I would not be sure about this. I will have a look at the situation with the aim of ensuring that printed material is available to people without their needing to go to Netley; it should not be necessary for them to go there to get such material.

MONARTO

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Development and Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My question relates to the compensation of landholders in the area of the proposed new city of Monarto. My information is that these people have found that they will not be able to purchase comparable properties for the price they are being offered for their land at Monarto. These people have been mixed farmers, in many cases all their lives; at any rate, they have been mixed farmers for the period during which they have occupied land in the Monarto area. Part of their income has been derived from wheatgrowing. It is something they have relied on and in which they have a special expertise. When they try to purchase comparable properties elsewhere, in general there is a difficulty with supply (they cannot buy comparable properties at all).

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: A couple of years ago they could have got land.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: They cannot do so now when the money is just becoming available. In particular, in the traditional wheatgrowing areas they cannot buy at all. As they understand it, and as it appears to me, under the Wheat Quotas Act they will lose their own quotas and, when they purchase a property, they will get the quota of that property. They will have to change from their traditional expertise and go into a new field or manage on a small wheat quota which cannot satisfy them in the field in which they are expert. My questions are two: first, is the Government aware of the position that the landowners at Monarto will not be able to purchase comparable properties and is it prepared to accept responsibility for this; secondly, is the Government willing to consider an amendment to the Wheat Quotas Act to enable these people, with proper safeguards, to take their quotas with them and apply them to new properties they may purchase, in order to alleviate the situation?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE. The questions relate to the jurisdiction of two different Ministers. I will discuss them with the appropriate Ministers and bring down a reply when it is available. The Minister of Agriculture will look at the matter of quotas, and I will take up the other question with the Minister of Development and Mines.

PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A M. WHYTE: Over a period of weeks, members of Parliament have appeared on television or spoken through the media generally condemning the type of pornographic and undesirable literature being sold and distributed in South Australia. One general thought is quite often expressed by people in public places: why is there not sometimes co-operation between the two opposing Parties in Parliament, and why is it that on every occasion

they have to quarrel and never see eye to eye? I know that at least 80 per cent of the Labor Party members in Parliament today would agree that some of the literature being sold and distributed to the public is undesirable. Can the Chief Secretary say why at no time any member of his Party has been as outspoken on this matter as Liberal members have been?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No-one deplores more than I that members of the Opposition do not agree with us on every subject. This is why there is no co-operation between the Parties.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There is co-operation.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Hon. Mr. Whyte said there is no co-operation. I appreciate the co-operation I get, but I think the press uses us up in this regard. The people of the media know the differences between us on various matters. If we were to agree on every subject they would not have us on television It is only because our points of view differ on this, as on many other subjects I can think of, that people from the media want to see us. I can remember one occasion when many people in the South-East were most hostile at what they thought was a lack of action on my part. We had all the press coverage we wanted then. Reporters followed us around with cameras and tape recorders whenever there was any further development in the dispute. When we eventually made progress and came to some agreement the lessees invited me to a ceremonial signing of the leases, and I celebrated and had a drink with everyone (mum, dad and the children included). When I returned to Adelaide I told the press I would give them a statement, but they said they did not wish to see me.

SCHOOL BUSES

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from his colleague, the Minister of Education, to the question I asked recently about school buses?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Education Department operates school buses for eligible children under two categories: departmentally owned buses, and buses under hire from private contractors. It is the general policy of the department that all children be seated. No "standees" will be carried except in unusual circumstances, and then only for short runs. It sometimes happens, particularly in the beginning of a school year, that buses may be temporarily overcrowded, but this situation is remedied as soon as possible by allocating additional vehicles, double running, or altering bus routes. In accordance with the Road Traffic Act, contract operators are required to obtain a safety certificate from either the Police Department or the Government Motor Garage. The certificate states the number of children that may be carried. It is obvious that a bus capable of carrying 55 primary school children will not carry the same number of secondary school students. Therefore, despite the safety certificate authority many buses will carry less than the number stated. The Education Department is exempt, under section 159 of the Road Traffic Act, from the need to obtain a safety certificate. Departmental buses are of four standard types, all with special child seating which is longer than that found in town service type buses often used by private contractors. This enables more children of a given size to be carried. No "standees" are normally permitted. The capacity of departmental buses is based on 13in. (33 cm) of seating for each primary school child. This is considered adequate and can be generally achieved by the sensible seating of children. However, where there is a predominance of bigger children, particularly in the case of secondary school students, it is not expected that these numbers would be accommodated. The Education Department is fully aware of the loading problems, and as soon as advice is received remedial measures are taken. Nevertheless, there could be instances of overloading of which the department is not aware. Any referred case will be investigated.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT GRANTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Minister of Health has a reply to a question I asked recently about grants for public transport.

The Hon. D H. L. BANFIELD: Cabinet has approved in principle of an agreement being executed between the Australian Government and the South Australian Government which will provide for financial assistance to be granted to South Australia by way of a non-repayable grant equivalent to two-thirds of the expenditure incurred by the State Government for approved projects for improving the quality, capacity, efficiency, and frequency of the public transport system in Adelaide and the metropolitan area. Such assistance will apply over the five financial years commencing on July 1, 1973. The agreement will come into force when it has been executed by both Governments This is expected to be done shortly.

The Australian Government has announced that a total of $32 000 000 will be made available to the States in the first year. The answers to the specific questions asked are as follows: (1) The terms and conditions of the proposed agreement are acceptable to the South Australian Government. (2) Of the $32 000 000 to be granted to the States in this financial year, $4 040 000 has been allocated to South Australia. (3) Until the agreement is executed by both Governments, no money can be paid to South Australia. (4) This grant does not account for the total amount provided to the States for the upgrading of transport by the present Australian Government since coming into office.

VENEREAL DISEASE

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I understand the Minister of Health has a reply to a question I asked recently about venereal disease.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: During 1973 there were 27 cases of gonorrhoea notified as being homosexually acquired, which comprises 2·6 per cent of the total number of cases of gonorrhoea in males notified to the Department of Public Health.

FLOODING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: About 10 days ago, when I was in New South Wales, my attention was directed to the flooded state of the Darling River as a result of the torrential rains in northern New South Wales and in Queensland. What I would like to know in due course from the Minister of Works is when it is estimated that the flood peak will reach the areas of the upper Murray in South Australia and whether this further flooding, following the high river level in recent months, is likely to inundate any of the low-lying irrigation areas of this State.

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

LITTLE PARA DAM

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Little Para Dam and Ancillary Works.

SUPERANNUATION 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.

Honourable members will be aware that the Government, conscious of the increasing financial burdens imposed on contributors to the present superannuation scheme, commissioned a working party to put before it proposals for a new superannuation scheme. The working party's proposals were approved by the Government in the latter part of last year and the drafting of this measure giving effect to them was put in hand in early December of that year. At the outset, it must be made clear that this measure is an extremely complex one. For this complexity, the Government makes no apology since it arises from an attempt to do substantial justice to all classes of contributor. A less complex scheme, while superficially more attractive, would have resulted in some classes of contributor being disadvantaged *vis-a-vis* other classes of contributor. The choice between complexity and apparent simplicity was, in the Government's view, really a choice between justice and injustice.

Before an explanation of the proposed scheme is attempted, it may be worthwhile to outline, briefly, the workings of the present superannuation scheme since a clear understanding of that scheme is an essential prerequisite to an understanding of the proposed new scheme Under the present scheme, a contributor is, on joining, entitled to contribute for a number of units of pension appropriate to his salary. For present purposes, he may be regarded as being entitled to contribute for one unit of pension for each $87 of his annual salary. Once in each year during his service, on his entitlement day, his salary is examined and, if it has increased since his last entitlement day, he is entitled to take out one additional unit of pension for each $87 of the increase. If he does not wish to take out all the units which at any time he is entitled to take out, he is said to have neglected them and these units are referred to as "neglected units". In respect of neglected units he makes no contribution and, of course, derives no benefit by way of pension.

The contributions for a unit of pension must, over the contributor's service, amount with interest to about $200 if he is contributing for retirement at age 65 years, and about $227 if he is contributing for retirement at age 60 years. The reason for the higher amount for retirement at age 60 years is that a person retiring at that age will expect to enjoy a pension for a longer period than a person retiring at age 65 years. The capital sum so arrived at should be actuarially capable of providing 30 per cent of a pension of $2 a fortnight for each unit together with an appropriate widow's pension. When the pension emerges, the Government pays the remaining 70 per cent. Thus, the Government can be said to be subsidizing $7 for each $3 that the contributor contributes. Since the total sum that must be contributed for each unit of pension is fixed, it follows that, if the contributor contributes for that total over a long period, his fortnightly contributions will be relatively small whereas, if he contributes for that unit over a relatively short period, his fortnightly contributions will be correspondingly large. For example, a male contributing for retirement at age 60 years can, at age 16, buy a unit of pension for 8c a fortnight whereas, at age 59, a unit of pension will cost him $8.75 a fortnight. In each case his total contributions with interest would amount to $227.

In past years, when salaries remained relatively stable, the present scheme worked well and enabled contributors to make adequate provision for retirement by making payments spread fairly evenly over their working life. However, in these inflationary times, the present scheme has imposed a heavy financial burden on an older contributor whose salary increases are occurring relatively late in his working life. To take out the units of pension to which he is entitled by virtue of his increases in salary, he has to make a most substantial contribution since the period over which he is contributing is necessarily short. In many cases he has been simply unable to afford this contribution. To some extent, the present scheme provided some mitigation by permitting a contributor to take out up to 16 reserve units of pension at an early age when the contribution for each unit was low. Towards the end of his service the contributor could then apply some or all of those units towards his then entitlement and hence, to some extent, lessen the increase in his net payments at that time. However, even this arrangement could not keep pace with inflation.

The net result of the application of the present scheme was that contributors could not afford to make the contributions necessary for the full pension for which they were entitled to contribute and were, therefore, obliged to neglect units. The foregoing briefly outlines the economic climate in which the present scheme failed. Under the present scheme, for the reasons that I have outlined, contributions when expressed as a percentage of total salary were very low on entry at an early age and, in these times, excessively high at the later stage of the contributor's career (so high in many cases that they could not be met), with a result that the contributor suffered a reduced pension.

There was also provided in the existing scheme special provision for female contributors in two areas. First, they had the option of retiring at age 55 years by paying higher contributions and, secondly, they paid a rate different from that paid by men for retirement at age 60 years. The proposed new scheme abandons the "unit of pension" concept and is based on the concept of the contributor contributing a fixed percentage of his salary throughout his working life until he attains the age of about 60 years and receiving by way of pension a fixed percentage of his final salary, as defined, at the time he retires.

The contributor is required to choose whether he wishes to obtain the highest benefit under the scheme and contribute at the higher rate or contribute at half that rate and receive half that benefit. The percentage of his final salary that he receives by way of pension is determined by his years of service during which he makes contributions up to a maximum of 30 years which, in the case of a "higher benefit contributor", will yield a pension of 66⅔ per cent of that final salary. Further payments may be made by a contributor who will not have 30 years of service during which to make contributions, in order to increase his benefit. Provision is, of course, made for appropriate benefits for his spouse or children on his death whether it occurs while he is still a contributor or after he becomes a pensioner.

The foregoing explanation is necessarily an overly simplified one and will be elaborated on in the explanation of the clauses of the Bill. So far, the concepts that are given effect to in the measure are relatively straightforward. It now remains to outline the principles on

which the transitional provisions are based, that is, the provision to bring the present contributors into the new scheme in a manner that does reasonable justice to all.

Present contributors are required to make a choice whether or not to obtain the higher benefit under the scheme by electing under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, whether to be a higher-benefit contributor or a lower-benefit contributor. At the outset it should be pointed out that, while the percentage of his final salary that a new contributor receives is determined by the factor of his years of service during which he makes contributions and any further payments he makes, this factor does not apply to a present contributor, who is entitled to a pension of 66⅔ per cent of his final salary if he elects to be a higher-benefit contributor, subject to the two factors outlined below, which take account of his contributions to the present scheme.

Let us first consider the case of the contributor who is contributing for retirement at age 65 years and assume that on his last payment day he was contributing for all the units for which he was entitled to contribute, that is, that he had no neglected units The first step in determining his new rate of contribution is to estimate the amount that, pursuant to the old scheme, he would pay if he was contributing for retirement at age 60 years. This calculation is necessary because, under the proposed new scheme, all contributors will be entitled to retire at that age This calculation will give us a fixed amount, in the Bill called his "adjusted contribution".

If the amount of contribution required of him ascertained by reference to the eleventh schedule to this Bill is less than his adjusted contribution, he may either contribute the lesser amount and have his pension subject to a deduction of a fixed amount referred to as the "fund share reduction" or contribute at the rate determined by reference to the eleventh schedule, plus a fixed amount being the difference in absolute money terms between that rate and his adjusted contribution rate, in which case he will be entitled to his full pension. This choice is provided for by an election under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, to make "pension maintenance payments" by way of fortnightly contributions. If he elects not to make the additional fortnightly payments required of him to obtain his full pension, he may at any time during his service make that payment by means of a lump sum payment or he may obtain part benefit by paying a smaller lump sum. It may be that at the end of his service he will have some available capital to make these payments from his long service leave payments.

If, however, the amount of contributions he is required to make pursuant to the eleventh schedule of the Bill is greater than his adjusted contribution (and this may well be the case of a contributor who is under, say, 35 years of age), he will in his first year under the new scheme be required to contribute a percentage of his salary equivalent to his adjusted contribution or half of his rate ascertained by reference to that schedule, whichever is the higher, increasing each year by half of one per cent until he reaches the required rate. To this extent, the impact of the new scheme is somewhat softened in so far as it touches contributors who are at present contributing a relatively low proportion of their salary.

The same principles apply to the case of a contributor under the old scheme who was contributing for retirement at age 60 years, the only difference being that in his case his "adjusted contribution" would be the amount he was actually paying, since his contributions are already based on retirement at age 60 years. Where a contributor under the old scheme had neglected units of pension, he will be entitled to increase his contributions to receive the benefit of a pension for those units. This choice is provided for by an election under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, to make "neglected unit maintenance payments" by way of fortnightly contributions. If he does not desire to increase his contributions he may make a lump sum payment of an amount equal to those contributions and still receive the appropriate increase in pension, or he may pay a smaller lump sum for a portion of the benefit Again the foregoing explanation of the transitional arrangements is necessarily grossly over-simplified and will be elaborated on in the explanation of the clauses of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 is a fairly standard repeal and savings provision. Clause 5 has the dubious distinction of being one of the longest clauses ever to appear in a Bill presented to the Council, encompassing as it does some 14 pages. It sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this measure and it is commended to honourable members for their closest attention, since a clear appreciation of almost every definition is vital to an understanding of the measure. The complexity of some of these definitions is regretted but is unfortunately largely unavoidable, being related to the provision of adequate transitional provisions to bring present contributors under the new scheme.

However, it is only by a clear understanding of the concepts encompassed by the definitions that one can safely advise as to the provisions of the measure that will apply to a particular contributor. To assist honourable members in this regard, officers of the Public Actuary's office will be available to explain the application of the measure to individual cases. It should also be indicated that, under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, each present individual contributor will, in being asked to make an election, be given a clear statement of his position.

Clause 6 extends and elucidates the meaning of "employee" in clause 5. This definition is a crucial one, in that only persons who are employees may become contributors to the fund. In substance, though not entirely in form, the extension follows the corresponding provision of the Act proposed to be repealed. However, the term "employee" has in this Bill been extended to cover persons on the establishment of His Excellency the Governor who were not previously entitled to contribute to the fund. Clause 7 is self-explanatory.

Clause 8 is intended to ensure that contributors to the fund cannot receive the benefit of any other superannuation scheme in respect of which the Government is liable to contribute. Clause 9 provides for the absence of a Public Actuary and, again, substantially re-enacts the corresponding provision of the existing legislation. Clause 10, which provides for the cost of administration of the measure to be met by moneys provided by Parliament, is a re-enactment of an existing provision. Clause 11 provides for employees of public authorities to participate in the superannuation scheme, contributions equivalent to the contributions that the Government is required to make in relation to its employees being met, in relation to employees of public authorities, by the relevant public authority.

Clause 12 continues the present South Australian Superannuation Fund in existence. Clause 13, which sets out the investments to which the fund may be applied, is somewhat wider in application than was previously the case, and in this regard honourable members' attention is drawn to subclause (1) (*g*) of this clause. Clause 14 grants a specific borrowing power to the fund with a corresponding guarantee by the Treasurer. It is thought

that the provision of such a power may assist the fund to resolve certain cash flow problems, particularly in the early stages of the new scheme. Clause 15 provides for a formal triennial investigation by the Public Actuary, who in the course of his duties will exercise continuous oversight over the fund.

Clause 16 provides for a report to Parliament on the results of the Public Actuary's investigations. Clause 17 provides for an audit of the accounts of the fund. Clause 18 continues the present South Australian Superannuation Fund Board in existence but changes its name by omitting the word "fund" from its title. The reason for this omission will be dealt with in relation to the explanation of clause 33.

Clauses 19 to 32 are, it is felt, in their terms self-explanatory, and deal with certain formal matters connected with the functioning of the board They differ little, if at all, from the corresponding provisions of the Act proposed to be repealed. Clause 33 represents a substantial departure from the terms of the previous legislation, in that it provides for the establishment of a "South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust" to deal with the fund. This trust, the composition of which is set out in clause 34, will be responsible for the control and investment of the fund, and its establishment commends itself to the Government.

Clauses 35 to 42 again are, in their terms, self-explanatory, and deal with certain formal matters relating to the trust. However, I draw honourable members' special attention to clause 38, which is a new provision and which in its terms permits the trustees, under specified conditions, to borrow from the fund. Clause 43 provides for employees, as defined, to apply to become contributors to the fund. It also provides for the board to be satisfied as to the soundness of the applicant's health. If the board is not so satisfied the applicant may: (*a*) be permitted to contribute to the fund and receive certain limited benefits (as to which see the explanation to clause 65); or (*b*) be permitted to contribute to the provident account in the fund (as to which see clause 100 and the following clauses).

Clause 44 requires each new contributor to elect to be a higher or lower benefit contributor. In brief, the contributions required of a lower benefit contributor are half the contributions required of a higher benefit contributor, and the benefits available to him are also half the maximum benefit. All present contributors are required to make a similar election under section 4 of the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974.

Regarding clause 45, honourable members may recall that it has been indicated that the new scheme is a "years of service related scheme"; in short, the amount of pension that can be obtained is related to the years of service of the contributor, a full pension being obtained if the contributor has 30 years of service after attaining 30 years of age. It follows that anyone joining the fund after attaining the age of 30 years who wishes to retire at age 60 could not attain his full pension. This clause provides that such a person may in effect "buy" years of service or, as they are expressed in this provision, "contribution months", and this may be done by making increased fortnightly contributions or by the payment of a lump sum. Years so bought will count as years of service for the purpose of determining the purchaser's final pension. This provision will be particularly useful for contributors who are over the age of 30 years joining the scheme, having previously belonged to another superannuation scheme

The Public Actuary when setting the increased fortnightly contribution will ensure that it is sufficient to cover both the fund share of the prospective pension and the Government's share. This level of contribution is necessary, since the contributor will not be rendering any service to the Government during the years of service bought pursuant to this provision. Clause 46 limits the absolute right to buy years of service where that right is not exercised on joining the fund. Before a contributor can buy such years after he has commenced contributions he is required to satisfy the board as to the soundness of his health. The reason for this limitation is to prevent a person who anticipates invalid retirement from securing an undue advantage by electing to buy back service and thereby increasing his pension

Clause 47 sets out the level of contributions for a new contributor; this will be found in the twelfth schedule and, depending on his entry age, range from 5 per cent to 6 per cent of his salary as ascertained once in each 12 months of his working life. Clause 48 provides a concessional contribution rate of 3 per cent of salary, for those contributors who are under 19 years, until they attain that age, and is intended to make early entry into the fund more attractive. Clause 49 is intended to provide entry for and the obtaining of full benefits for older persons who for one reason or another are to be attracted to enter the service of the Government. For example, a person aged 50 or over on joining the fund would expect to receive about one-third or less of his full pension if he retired at 60 years. If his services as an employee are particularly required, it will be possible to attribute years of service (in this section referred to in contribution months) to him so as to increase the amount of pension that he may expect.

Clause 50, which is on the face of it somewhat obscure, is intended to enable a new contributor who has been an employee for at least 20 years before the commencement of this Act to join the new scheme on the same basis as he could have joined the old scheme. In short, it provides that in the purchase of his years of service he will pay no more for his entitlement than he would have paid if he had purchased units under the old scheme. He will not be obliged to pay for the Government's share of his pension.

Clause 51 provides that a new contributor is not required to continue paying contributions on attaining the age of 60 years if he became such a contributor before attaining the age of 30 years or if he became a contributor after that age when he has attained 30 years service, including any years he has bought or has had attributed to him. Clause 52 provides that a transferred contributor (that is, one who has been transferred from the existing scheme) will not be obliged to make any further payments to the fund after attaining the age of 60 years, or 55 years if the contributor was contributing for retirement at that age. At this stage I again draw honourable members' special attention to the fact that the "years of service" principle does not apply to transferred contributors. In general terms, the period of service of a transferred contibutor is not relevant to the determination of his pension.

Clause 53 sets out the method of calcuation of the contributions of a transferred contributor. Basically, these contributions are based on between 5 per cent and 6 per cent of the contributor's salary ascertained once in every 12 months, the actual base being ascertained by reference to the tenth or eleventh schedule to this Bill as is appropriate. In addition, the transferred contributor may elect to make certain additional payments by way of pension maintenance payments or neglected unit maintenance payments more particularly referred to in subclause (3). To determine the contribution rate of any contributor the definitions

of "adjusted contribution", "adjusted contribution percentage" and "contribution percentage" should be applied to the case of that contributor.

Clause 54 makes special provision for a transferred contributor whose contributions to the fund were, in effect, frozen by virtue of section 26 of the repealed Act. This section provided that any contributor who was also a contributor to any other scheme subsidized by the Government would not, after the coming into operation of the repealed Act, be entitled to contribute for any additional units of pension to which he might be entitled. The effect of this clause is to continue this situation in existence but to permit its application to be modified as circumstances and justice dictate. Clause 55 provides that contributions will cease to be payable immediately before a contributor attains the age of retirement, generally 60 years.

Clause 56 relates to the making of neglected unit maintenance payments, which will afford a transferred contributor an opportunity of "picking up" the benefit he has lost in the past by neglecting units of pension. Briefly, he may obtain all of the benefit by: (*a*) increasing his fortnightly contributions by a fixed sum; or (*b*) paying a lump sum equivalent to the amount by which his contributions would be increased. Or, he may obtain portion of the benefit by paying a somewhat smaller lump sum.

Clause 57 relates to the making of pension maintenance payments, which will enable a contributor, whose present fortnightly contributions will be reduced in the application of the new scheme, to avoid a pension reduction of a fixed amount consequent on his reduction in contributions. In essence, the same options are open to this contributor as are open to the contributor referred to in relation to clause 56. Clause 58 enables a contributor to continue contributions after his age of retirement and to discontinue those contributions at any time. Clause 59 is relatively self-explanatory and sets out the method of making contributions. Clause 60 provides that employees who cease to make contributions to the fund will be formally parted from the scheme.

Clause 61 is self-explanatory. Clause 62 deals with the matter of the relatively lowly paid contributor, who would well find contributing even at the minimum rate a financial hardship. For this class of contributor is provided a notional "contribution salary" which is less than his actual salary, and the application of his appropriate contribution percentage will give him a somewhat smaller (in money terms) obligation than he would otherwise be required to bear. I point out that this concession applies only to employees who work a "normal" working week. Thus, it will not extend to employees who work on, say, only one or two days a week.

Clause 63 provides for the case of a contributor whose salary has been reduced. Clause 64 enables a contributor whose salary has been reduced in circumstances not due to his own fault to pay his contributions at his old rate and as a result to receive a pension appropriate to that salary. Clause 65 has been already touched on in relation to clause 43 and in fact continues in existence the present scheme of limited benefits for contributors who are unable to satisfy the board as to their soundness of health.

Clause 66 formally authorizes the payments of the Government's share of pension. Clause 67 sets out the circumstances in which a contributor is entitled to a pension. Briefly, these circumstances are: (*a*) retirement on attaining the age of retirement normally 60 years; (*b*) premature retirement at or after age 55 years; (*c*) invalidity; and (*d*) retrenchment after age 45 years where the contributor has had not less than five years service.

Clause 68 enables an employee to have his retirement treated as his resignation and so obtain the lump sum resignation benefit rather than the pension on retirement. In certain circumstances some former contributors may find this provision to their advantage. Clause 69 sets out the precise method of calculation of the pension of a new contributor and in this regard the attention of honourable members is drawn particularly to the definition of "final salary" in clause 5. Clause 70 sets out the method of calculating the pension for a transferred contributor and here the definitions in clause 5 of "final salary" and "standard pension" deserve close consideration.

It is pointed out that both pensions are subject to increase if the contributor continues in his employment after the age of his retirement or in the case of a new contributor after attaining 30 years service after attaining the age of 30 years. Clause 71 sets out the method of calculating the pension that is payable on premature retirement at age 55 years or after. It is conceded that the pension offered here is perhaps not as generous as may be available in comparable schemes but it is pointed out that the purpose of this measure is to encourage employees to work until age 60 years and not to retire earlier than that age.

Clause 72 sets out the amount of pension payable on invalidity retirement and here the definition of "notional pension" in clause 5 should be referred to. This clause also provides for a minimum pension, as defined in that clause, should this prove necessary. Clause 73 provides for the determination of a pension on retrenchment. Clause 74 is self-explanatory. Clause 75 provides for commutation of portion of certain pensions and is, in this State, an innovation. Briefy the following pensions are commutable: (*a*) pensions which emerged after January 1, 1973; (*b*) pensions first payable under this measure; and (*c*) widow's or spouse pensions; but no invalid or retrenchment pension is commutable.

Up to 30 per cent of a commutable pension may be surrended for a lump sum payment fixed by the Public Actuary. However, if part of the commutable pension has been derived from a specified lump sum payment (as to which see the definition of "prescribed deduction" in clause 5), the amount of the pension that may be commuted will be reduced accordingly. Clause 76 sets out the circumstances in which an invalid pensioner may be recalled to duty and clause 77 sets out the circumstances in which a retrenched pensioner may be so recalled. Clause 78 limits the amount that an invalid pensioner or retrenched pensioner may earn before his pension is subject to reduction.

Clause 79 sets out the benefit payable under the Act to the contributor who ceases to be a contributor where no other benefit is payable. This kind of benefit may be characterized as a "withdrawal benefit". Clause 80 provides for a special retrenchment benefit where no retrenchment pension is payable. Clause 81 provides a general benefit where all other pension and benefits payable to or in relation to a contributor do not exceed his contributions plus interest.

Clause 82 provides a pension for the spouse of a deceased pensioner. This concept of "spouse" pension which differs from the former "widow's" pension has two innovations: (*a*) first, it is payable to the "spouse" of the pensioner, that is, to the widow or widower of the deceased pensioner; and (*b*) secondly, it is payable for the life of the spouse, that is, it does not cease on remarriage. The

amount of pension payable is two-thirds of the deceased pensioner's pension.

Clause 83 makes similar provisions for the spouse of a deceased contributor. Clause 84 provides for the commutation by a spouse of up to 30 per cent of his or her pension. This commutation is available only on the spouse attaining the age of 60 years. Clauses 85 to 90 set out an entirely new and considerably more generous method of providing benefits for children of whom one or both parents are deceased. The method of ascertaining these benefits is set out in detail in these clauses but it is sufficient here to say that on the death of a contributor or contributor pensioner, as defined, up to one-third of the amount of his pension will be available for distribution amongst his or his spouse's children. Should the spouse also die, then an amount up to the whole of the pension of the deceased contributor or deceased contributor pensioner will be available. Child benefit is payable in respect of a child up to the age of 25 years, who is attending full time at a recognized educational institution.

Clause 91 formally provides for the continuance of pensions payable under the repealed Act and ensures that widows' pensions under that Act will not cease on remarriage. Clause 92 is self-explanatory. Clause 93 is, to put it no higher, another extremely complex provision. It is to honour an undertaking given by the Government that, so far as is possible, pensioners who went on pension after January 1, 1973, will not be in any worse position than they would have been had the Act presaged by this Bill been in operation on that day.

The complex formulae as provided for in this clause are an endeavour to cast up the pension that would have been payable to such a pensioner had this measure been law on January 1, 1973. If the pension so cast up is higher than the pension they at present enjoy they will be entitled to the higher pension. Clauses 94 and 95 increase certain widows' pensions. Clause 96 gives an "across the board" 9 per cent increase in pensions that emerged before January 1, 1973. Clause 97 formally ceases certain children's pensions which will be replaced by the child benefit adverted to earlier.

Clause 98 provides for the automatic adjustment of pensions, annually, so as to reflect changes in the cost of living. Clause 99 establishes three accounts to be maintained as part of the fund. They are: (*a*) the Provident Account; (*b*) the Retirement Benefit Account; and (*c*) the Voluntary Savings Account. The Provident Account is established to provide a means by which employees, whose state of health is such as to not even entitle them to contribute for the limited benefits provided by clause 65, may still derive some benefit by way of a lump sum payment.

Briefly, employees of the class indicated may contribute to the Provident Account at the same rate they would contribute if they were accepted as contributors to the fund. However, on ceasing to be an employee in circumstances that would, if he were a contributor, entitle him to a pension the employee will, in lieu of that pension, be entitled to receive an amount equal to 3½ times his contributions plus interest. Provision is also made for an employee who is making payments to the Provident Account and whose health sufficiently improves to be, as it were, transferred to the fund and hence be entitled to full benefits under the proposed measure. The benefit payable on resignation or withdrawal from the Provident Account is the same as the benefit payable to the contributor.

The matters referred to are dealt with in clauses 100 to 103 of the Bill. The Retirement Benefit Account, which is covered by clauses 104 to 109 of the Bill, is established to take up certain lump sum amounts that are standing to the credit of contributors and which resulted from a distribution to contributors of a surplus of the fund some years ago. In addition, this account will be used to take up contributions voluntarily made by contributors after attaining the age of retirement. Further, moneys standing to the credit of contributors in the Reserve Unit Account under the present Act will also be taken up in this account. All moneys standing to the credit of the contributors in the account will attract interest compounded annually, and will be payable on retirement or withdrawal from the fund.

Clauses 110 to 116 continue in operation the Voluntary Savings Account which has existed for nearly 40 years. Part VIII comprising clauses 117 to 127 represents a new departure in that it establishes a specialized appeal tribunal constituted of a Local Court judge to determine appeals against decisions of the board. The Government considers that such specialized tribunals exercising judicial powers are the most effective method of reviewing administrative decisions of this nature and in time its operation should ensure a high degree of consistency and certainty in the board's decisions that will be of ultimate benefit to both contributors and pensioners. In one significant area the tribunal will have what may be characterized as an original jurisdiction, and this jurisdiction is set out at clause 121 to which honourable members' attention is particularly directed.

This clause gives a *de facto* spouse of a contributor or pensioner the right to apply to the tribunal to receive the pension and other benefits that, in the ordinary course of events, would go to the lawful spouse of the contributor or pensioner. It is indicated that the relationship between the contributor and *de facto* spouse must have existed to the exclusion of the lawful spouse for at least three years to grant an application under this provision. The other provisions of this Part are, it is suggested, reasonably self-explanatory Part IX sets out certain miscellaneous provisions of which only one, clause 133, seems to require comment. This clause gives a general power to the board to extend the time limits provided for the making of elections under the measure. This power, in its terms, extends to cover elections under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974.

There remain only then the schedules to the Bill which elaborate on matter contained in the Bill. In conclusion, it is pointed out that this Bill is presented as a legislative attempt to provide fair and reasonable solutions to matters and cases, which, while simple in themselves, in combination result in situations of extraordinary complexity. It may well be that in its passage through this Council, or in its early operation, anomalies will appear and within the framework of the philosophy of this measure the Government will be happy to try and correct them, but for the present it is presented as a measure which gives full effect to the undertakings given by the Government to those whose interests are vitally affected by it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In July, 1973, the Government appointed a committee to advise the Minister of Transport and Local Government on the means of establishing a single transport authority to

control the activities of certain existing bodies operating in this State. The Government has had an opportunity of considering the report of the committee, and this Bill goes some way towards giving effect to its recommendations. The term "goes some way" is used quite advisedly, since the ultimate intention of having a single authority actually operating all major forms of public transport in the State is just not capable of being realized at this stage. However, it should be clear that this is the ultimate aim.

For present purposes there are three bodies concerned in the operation of major forms of the public transport in this State. They are the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the Transport Control Board, and it is visualized that the proposed State Transport Authority will in the first instance be given the right to give directions to these bodies and to exercise a degree of control over their activities. At the same time the authority will be required to provide the Minister to whom it is responsible with a detailed recommendation as to how the operational function of each body in relation to its public transport activity may be assumed directly or indirectly by the authority. It is clear that the assumption by the authority of the operational responsibility for, say, railways will require enabling legislation, the terms of which will depend on the recommendation of the authority, and necessarily the enactment of this legislation must await the recommendation. The present Bill is then no more than the first step in providing for the people of this State a co-ordinated system of public transport.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions used in the Bill. I draw honourable members' attention to the definition of "prescribed body": while it specifies by name the bodies that I have mentioned, it does provide for other bodies to be included by the enactment of regulations under this measure. It goes without saying that such regulations are subject to the scrutiny of this Chamber. Clause 5 formally establishes the State Transport Authority Clause 6 provides that the authority shall consist of six members and a Chairman, and clause 7 sets out the terms and conditions of appointment of the Chairman and members. In this regard, it is indicated that the Chairman will be employed in a full-time capacity, and the other members will be part-time.

Clause 8 provides for the salary and allowances of the Chairman and members. Clause 9 provides for meetings of the authority. Clause 10 is a validating provision in the usual form and also provides usual protection for members of the authority in their personal capacity. Clause 11 provides for disclosure by a member of the authority of his interest in any contract with the authority and also prevents such a member from taking part in any decision in relation to that contract. Clause 12 sets out the proposed powers and functions of the authority, and this clause is commended to honourable members' close attention particularly in the light of the introductory remarks on this measure.

Clause 13 makes it clear that the authority is subject to the general control and direction of the Minister administering the measure. Clause 14 provides a power of delegation in the usual form. Clause 15 provides for staffing of the authority, and honourable members will note that it is likely that most officers will be employed under the Public Service Act, although at subclause (4) provision is made for the employment of persons otherwise than under that Act Clause 16 provides for the moneys required for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 17 provides for the audit of the accounts of the authority. Clause 18 provides for an annual report of the authority. Clause 19 is formal. Clause 20 is a general regulation-making power.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GOVERNOR)

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill which, in terms of instructions passed under the Royal Sign Manual and Signet to the Governor of South Australia, must be reserved for Her Majesty's assent, provides for an increase in the salary payable to His Excellency the Governor. It also makes an appropriate adjustment to the method of calculating the expenses allowance payable to His Excellency.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is a rather elaborate commencement provision intended to ensure that the effective date of operation of the measure is July 1, 1974. Clause 3 amends section 73 of the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, here referred to as the principal Act, by effectively increasing the salary of the Governor from $15 000 a year to $20 000 a year. I point out to honourable members that the last adjustment of His Excellency's salary was made in 1964. Clause 4 amends section 73a of the principal Act by recasting the provision that provides His Excellency with an expenses allowance that moves up or down with changes in the cost of living.

In 1966-67, the method of calculating the consumer price index, on which the variation in expenses allowance was based, was substantially changed and this has caused some difficulty in calculating the expenses allowance. The effect of this amendment is to adapt the method of calculation of the allowance to the changed base and, hopefully, to ensure that no difficulties will in future occur. Clause 5 repeals section 73c of the principal Act which made special provision for an allowance for certain salaries formerly met by the Governor. In fact, these salaries are now met from general revenue, and the amount provided by this section has been merely used to offset payments from general revenue. Accordingly, the need for this section disappears.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise to support this Bill, which, as the Minister outlined, increases the salary paid to His Excellency from $15 000 to $20 000, and also makes provision for an increase in his expenses allowance. The amounts involved are not unduly high when one considers that it is some time since an increase was last made. His Excellency is the No 1 citizen of this State and, therefore, has many duties to perform that are for the benefit of this State, and he should have the financial means to carry out those duties properly. It may seem, in comparison with other salaries we have dealt with recently, that His Excellency's salary is somewhat low; however, we must take into account that he receives a considerable expenses allowance and receives taxation relief, which makes a considerable difference to the net amount he receives. I have examined the Bill and it accords with the Minister's second reading explanation. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): This increase seems to me to be a case of the time-honoured phrase, "too little too late". A 30 per cent increase since 1964 (a period of 10 years) taken in isolation seems ridiculously low when one considers the rise in the cost of living during that time. True, it is, as the Hon. Mr.

Gilfillan said, that the Governor receives expense allowances, but I do not think that through these allowances he receives anything in excess of his direct expenses. Many people receive expense allowances. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan also mentioned that the Governor received certain taxation advantages. As I do not know what those advantages are, perhaps the Minister could tell us.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I think it is tax free.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Of course, that makes a vast difference. Perhaps the Minister can explain that when he replies

The Hon T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): As far as I know, the salaries and allowances paid to His Excellency are income tax free. I think that is the situation, but I agree with Sir Arthur that the increases in this case do not seem to be outlandish, because there has been no adjustment since 1963-64. I can understand the remarks made by the honourable member.

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

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PROPERTY)

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose is to overcome a difficulty that has arisen in the consolidation of the Harbors Act and its amendments in consequence of section 64 and the second schedule of that Act. Section 64 deals with the vesting and manner of vesting of property in the Minister and the "withdrawal" and manner of "withdrawal" from the Minister of property vested in him

Subsection (1) of section 64 deals with the granting or leasing to the Minister and the vesting in him of any property of the Crown. Subsection (2) provides that there shall also be vested in the Minister for the purposes of Part III of the Act (*a*) all lands and properties of the Crown mentioned in the second schedule, including the beds and shores to highwater mark of all waters situated within the boundaries of the lands and properties mentioned in the first part of that schedule, and also including the beds and shores mentioned in the second part of that schedule; (*b*) all harbor lights, etc. within any harbor in the State, (*c*) all wharves, etc. within any harbor in the State (excepting private property); (*d*) all properties by or by the operation of any provision of Part III of the Act vested in the Minister: and (*e*) all other property acquired by the Minister for the purposes of that Part.

It is to be noted that, while the lands and properties of the Crown referred to in subsection (2) (*a*) have to be mentioned in the second schedule in order that the "vesting in the Minister" under the section may become effective, there is no requirement that the properties, etc mentioned in paragraphs (*b*) to (*e*) have to be mentioned in that schedule for them to vest in the Minister. Moreover, subsection (4) of the section confers power on the Governor (subject to the other provisions of that subsection) to withdraw any land or other property of any kind from the Minister (whether they were mentioned in the second schedule or not) and vest or revest the same in the crown; and, pursuant to this power, lands and properties and portions of lands and properties have from time to time been withdrawn from the Minister. In the result, it has become extremely difficult, if not impossible, to identify by means of short descriptions expressed in a schedule to the Act what parts of the lands and properties originally mentioned in the second schedule are still vested in the Minister. Besides, whenever any land or property or portion of any land or property mentioned in the schedule is withdrawn from the Minister, the schedule becomes out of date and the difficulty would not be solved by embarking on the tedious process of preparing a new schedule to replace the existing one whenever the Minister acquired or became divested of any property.

In any event, it would be incumbent on the Minister to establish his title before dealing with any land or property, and no purpose would be served in perpetuating the second schedule so long as the Minister's title to the lands and properties presently vested in him is preserved and the power to withdraw land and property form the Minister is unaffected. Accordingly, clause 3 of the Bill repeals the second schedule, and paragraphs (*a*). (*b*) and (*c*) of clause 2 makes the necessary consequential amendments. Paragraph (*a*) inserts in section 64 a new subsection (1*a*) which will preserve the Minister's title to the lands and properties presently vested in him. Paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of clause 2 remove the references in that section to the second schedule.

When the Act was being examined for consolidation, it appeared that, when the references to the Minister were substituted for the references to the South Australian Harbors Board by the amending Act of 1966, no express provision was included for transferring to the Minister the title of the board in land and other property vested in it at that time. Although this may possibly be implied, the Bill puts the matter beyond doubt by including in paragraph (*d*) of clause 2 a new subsection (6) which provides that the Act is to have effect as if all lands and properties held by the board immediately before the commencement of the 1966 amending Act had become vested in the Minister as from the commencement of that Act This Bill, if passed, would also avoid the necessity of consolidating the Act and reprinting it with an out-of-date second schedule

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support this Bill. As stated in the second reading explanation, one of its purposes is to overcome the difficulty of the consolidation of the Harbors Act. No doubt the former Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Edward Ludovici, has noted this problem while consolidating legislation, which is so urgently needed. That is the germ of the idea in presenting this Bill to Parliament. The second reading explanation that has just been given is self-explanatory. There are certain powers that the Minister does not have under the existing Act. It is not clear in the Act what powers he has; therefore, it is necessary to clarify the situation.

The Bill touches on the problem of holiday shacks, which are situated on Crown land or Harbors Board land on many of the popular beaches of the State, and in particular on Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula and in the Port Augusta to Whyalla area at the head of Spencer Gulf.

Many people have spent considerable sums of money to establish these beach shacks to benefit their families during their holidays. However, recent announcements have been made that many of the shacks ought to be removed. Although this Bill makes it clear that the Minister has the authority to order their removal in appropriate circumstances, I hope that reason will prevail in the clearing up of these beach sites in cases where common sense is used by the people concerned.

Regarding the problem of Redcliff, last December the Government rushed through a Bill which gave considerable powers of acquisition in the Redcliff area and which denied certain people their privileges. Many beach shacks are located in the Redcliff area on a point within a few

miles of where this new complex may be built. Many of the shack owners in the Redcliff area come from the area that formed part of the district of the present Minister of Agriculture when he was a House of Assembly member. The shack owners in the Redcliff area are concerned about the future of their shacks. The Bill calls for little comment Its purposes are to consolidate the legislation, and all honourable members appreciate the need for the consolidation of these Bills as quickly as possible. I support the second reading.

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

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT 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.

In 1966, amendments were made to the Industrial and Provident Societies Act under which no new society could be registered if the rules provided for any member of the society to exercise more than one vote at meetings of the society. Additionally, no amendment could be made to the rules of a society existing at the time of the amendments, or of a society subsequently registered, expanding the voting rights of any member or class of members of the society. These amendments provided, however, that, in the case of any society registered after the commencement of the amending Act of 1966, the Minister could on application by the society approve a differential scale of voting. It appears that Parliament, in granting this power of exemption, may have overlooked the case of a society that was already registered at the time of the commencement of the 1966 amending Act. The present Bill seeks to overcome this deficiency by enabling the Minister to grant exemptions, in appropriate cases, in respect of societies registered before or after the commencement of the amending provisions.

The amendments are particularly important in view of a projected take-over of the Jon Preserving Co-operative Limited. If this take-over is to proceed there must be an amendment to the rules providing for differential voting. Such an amendment is, however, impossible as the law stands at present. I should point out that the Government has not at this stage decided to approve alterations to the rules of the Jon Preserving Co-operative, but this case points to the need for the Minister to have general powers of exemption

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals subsection (8) of section 12 and inserts new provisions in its place. The new subsection (8) provides that the rules of a society must provide for each member to have one vote at meetings of the society and that no amendment can be made to the rules under which the voting rights of any member are expanded. This largely follows existing provisions. New subsection (9), however, gives the Minister a general power of exemption in respect of the foregoing restrictions.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill, which amends legislation that was rushed through Parliament when insufficient time was given to study it thoroughly. In 1966, amendments were made to the principal Act, and it has now been found necessary to amend the Act in order to enable a nice marriage of convenience between the Jon Preserving Co-operative Limited and the Kyabram Preserving Company Limited, of Kyabram, Victoria.

The Jon co-operative has had a very chequered career: it operated for many years as Brookers, which, as many fruitgrowers know, ran into severe difficulties. Brookers not only left its shareholders lamenting but also many fruitgrowers were never paid for their fruit. In due course Brookers became a co-operative, which struggled along with a good deal of Government assistance provided under the Loans to Producers Act. The State Government, which makes funds available to the State Bank, through Parliament, under the Loans to Producers Act, has provided huge sums of money to this and other co-operatives. This is a most important Act to this State's primary producers.

What the Government is asking for in the amending legislation is merely to enable the Minister to have a discretionary power to deal with co-operatives, formed before the enabling legislation of 1966, and to give them the same powers as co-operatives which have been set up since 1966 in relation to voting rights. This Bill is necessary only because of an oversight at that time. It will give an opportunity for Jon Preserving Co-operative to meet the demands of Kyabram. I have ascertained from shareholders of both companies how keen they are that this merger should take place. I am sure that the South Australian Government must be very happy indeed to see this happening, particularly in view of the large sums invested. I believe that it will result in a viable proposition not only for the fruitgrowers of this State but also for the can makers, the carton manufacturers, the sugar producers of Queensland, and the people employed in the industry on a daily and a staff basis. I can see absolutely nothing objectionable in this Bill, and I am very pleased indeed to support it, because I know that only good can come from it.

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

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT 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.

The principal Act, the Monarto Development Commission Act, 1973, provided at section 17 in effect that persons employed by the Monarto Development Commission were to be employed outside the terms of the Public Service Act. The commission has come to the conclusion, with which the Government agrees, that there are considerable advantages both to the commission and to the officers involved if, in some cases at least, employment under the Public Service Act can be offered in the commission. From the commission's point of view it would mean that it could draw on some of the specialist skills already available in the Public Service and from the proposed appointee's point of view it would mean that his appointment for future promotion and advancement would not be diminished by accepting an appointment with the commission. At the same time it is realized that not all appointments to the service of the commission should necessarily involve appointment under the Public Service Act and this Bill makes appropriate provisions to cover such cases.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 merely makes it clear that the commission will hold its property for and on behalf of the Crown. This statement of intention will free the commission from liability for certain stamp duties. Clause 3 amends section 12 of the principal Act and is in standard form and relieves members of the commission

from personal liability for acts of the commission when those Acts are done in good faith.

Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 17 of the principal Act. The section proposed to be inserted follows closely the standard arrangements that have been worked out to meet circumstances such as this. Proposed subclause (1) provides for the creation of offices under the Public Service Act. Proposed subclauses (2) and (3) enable appropriate modifications to be made in the application of that Act to the officers involved. These modifications are necessary to meet the situation of employment with a statutory authority which is somewhat outside the usual departmental structure of the Public Service. Proposed subclauses (4) and (5) provide for employment with the commission outside the Public Service Act and are intended to cover the situation where employment under that Act is considered inappropriate by the commission. Clause 5 merely corrects a clerical error in section 22 (1) (*c*) of the principal Act; the word "by" first occurring in that provision should, obviously, be the word "to".

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern): I support the Bill, some of the clauses of which are merely formal. The only substantive provision is that relating to the Public Service Act. Under section 17 of the principal Act, the Public Service Act does not apply, and the employees of the commission are outside the provisions of the Public Service Act. It is contemplated that this situation will continue to apply in regard to many of the employees of the commission. The purpose of the Bill is very sensible: it is to make available to the Monarto Development Commission the services of some specialists within the Public Service. It is obvious that the experience and work of such specialists could be very beneficial to the commission, the new city, and the residents thereof.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Will they all be public servants?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I am talking about the residents.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Bill provides that some employees of the commission may be outside the Public Service and some may be within the Public Service. We should be thinking about assisting the residents of the new city. Some officers may want to retain their seniority and benefits in connection with the Public Service Act while making their services available to the commission. This flexibility is entirely beneficial, and I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Funds of commission."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The principal Act is rather difficult to get hold of because it was passed only in 1973, and I do not think it is in the bound Statutes. Clause 5 corrects a clerical error by altering "paid by" to "paid to". So, the provision means the exact antithesis of what it should have meant when it was passed by this place, as a House of Review, last year. It is a matter of some interest to me to know how we missed this, because generally we pick up such errors. What exactly does this passage relate to? It is strange that we should get a result in a Bill we have passed whereby moneys which should be paid to the commission seemingly have been provided to be paid by the commission.

The Hon. A F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): The amendment relates to section 22 (1) of the principal Act. The Parliamentary Counsel picked up the error, and the amendment is simply to cover the situation; the Act should refer, of course, to moneys paid to the commission.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Have any moneys been paid to the commission by the Treasurer? If so, under what authority?

The Hon. A F. KNEEBONE: I am informed that no money has yet been paid.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the Chief Secretary for his explanation, which completely satisfies me. I wonder, as the text is so clear, why this was not picked up when the Bill went through. I suppose it is because I am a marginal note expert rather than a content expert; I generally pick up mistakes in marginal notes. It is clear, however, that it is simply a mistake.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES BILL

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1974)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2432.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): This Bill permits a further sum of money to be appropriated to the Government for expenditure purposes for the period ending June 30, 1974. It is not unusual for some departments to require a little extra money as the financial year comes to a close However, one department concerned in these lines is seeking more than $2 000 000, and I think I should comment on it I refer, of course, to the South Australian Railways Department.

In his explanation, the Minister said that extra earnings by the department this year were expected to amount to about $2 500 000 through the handling of greater volumes of grain and better seasonal conditions generally throughout South Australia. That item in itself is most heartening. It does not mean, of course, that that sum is net revenue to the department, but nevertheless it is in times of better seasons that the department should show some improvement on its normal financial results. However, despite that rather heartening item we find that, later in the Minister's explanation, a sum of $1 465 000 is sought for the Railways Department to cover over-award payments, service increases and annual leave loadings.

Later in the Minister's explanation he stated that besides that amount a further $600 000 was being sought for unusually high salary loadings to be borne by the department this year. Those sums bring the total to $2 065 000, which is the sum the Government is seeking to bolster the outgoings of the Railways Department.

I know that in this Council we cannot do much about money Bills of this kind, but at least we can express, and should express, our concern about this department and the accumulating losses it is incurring. We should express, too, as strongly as we can, the need for action by the Minister of Transport, and the need for action by this Government to remedy the ever-increasing deficit that the Railways Department incurs each year.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: The Minister says he is going to co-ordinate the transport system.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: From time to time we have heard what he is going to do, but the public wants action in this matter now. Years are slipping by and the deficit is increasing all the time. It is past the time when the Government should be making announcements to improve the system; it should announce its plans to improve the situation now. The losses for this department since 1968 are referred to in the Auditor-General's Report of June 30

last year, and are as follows: 1968, a deficit of $12 800 000 (I am referring to the total losses including debt charges); 1969, $12 300 000; 1970, $12 800 000; 1971, $16 100 000; 1972, $19 500 000; and in 1973 it went to the astronomical sum of $25 900 000. At the same time, in the Appropriation Bill that was considered by this Council last year (but dealing with the current year's finance), the Government earmarked $30 000 000 to cover the outgoings of the Railways Department.

The Government is now asking us to appropriate a further sum in excess of $2 000 000 for Railways Department outgoings. The Auditor-General has voiced very serious concern about this matter. In his report (to which I have already referred) he stated that the total deficit of $25 884 000 represented more than twice the deficit of three years ago.

On page 185 of his report, in bold type, he stressed the seriousness of the situation and said that the continued and significant increase in losses on the South Australian Railways is most disturbing and some action is essential to reduce or at least hold these losses. That report was made by the guardian of this State's accounts.

I therefore ask the Government what it is doing to curb the ever-increasing losses mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report. I have a clear message from my district for the Government: they are asking what the Government is really doing to cope with these vast losses. The magnitude of the losses can be judged somewhat better by looking at the increases in State taxation in this financial year. When we see State taxes being increased in this time of inflation we can see that the total sum being sought does not even compensate for the losses in this one department

After considering that, we gain some impression of the size of the problem that the Government must tackle, but as yet it has not announced any major decisions to solve it. The figures I have quoted illustrate the seriousness and the size of the problem; they highlight what the Government is seeking in the Bill before us and that the situation is getting worse.

In one area of the department's activities there is a complete lack of action—that section dealing with country passenger services. We know that the State Government is at present doing its best to transfer these services to the Commonwealth Railways. That is this Government's apparent answer to the problem, because it seems it can find no other solution. Personally, I am opposed to the transfer. The seriousness of the downturn in country rail services is highlighted in the Auditor-General's Report when he refers to the Naracoorte-Kingston Bluebird service. On page 186 of his report he states that this service comprises three passenger services a week. He goes on and says that a six-month count showed the average number of passengers as 1·4 and that of the 156 trains over the period, 54 (35 per cent) had no passengers.

We know what staff and manpower are required to keep a service such as that running. Men have to maintain the right of way, others have to maintain the railway vehicles themselves and yet others are directly involved with the running of the vehicles. All these people were involved in that six-month period in the passenger train service that ran 54 times over this line in the South-East without any passengers whatever, and they have to be paid over-award payments, service payments, and leave loadings. It is for those payments that we are being asked to appropriate more money under the Bill now before us.

That is just one small example of the uneconomic services being conducted by this Government year after year. Now the Government comes before us with this Bill and says that despite this inefficiency extra money is needed to meet commitments in regard to labour involved in that operation. It is ironical that I looked back and found a press cutting (dated May 8, 1968) in which Mr. Corcoran (the member through whose district this line runs) was reported to have said that it was rather ridiculous to run uneconomic passenger services when people were just not using them. That was his view in 1968 and I presume that is still his view today. Yet the Government will not come to any decision to put the matter in order.

If the Government does not take action on this matter, it must stand condemned in the eyes of the people, because it is the people's money we are appropriating today. The taxpayer must find the money for these losses, and he is fully and justly entitled to say, "The time has come when this expenditure should not continue."

That is merely an isolated example I have cited of one particular passenger service. We can look at the overall position of passenger services on the railways. On page 186, the Auditor-General, dealing with losses on passenger services, says this:

The loss per journey on passenger services was: suburban, 47c; country, $16.02; and inter-system, $8.

He was dealing with the 12 monthly period that ended on June 30, 1973. When we look at that overall position, we see just how ridiculous it is getting.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is your answer—to cut out all passenger services?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That is the line you are following.

The Hon. C M. HILL: Yes, that may be so with a particular line. With the line that I mentioned, it would appear to be so, on the facts and figures.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I mean on the line of your argument.

The Hon. C M. HILL: The line of my argument is that some passenger services must be closed—I am quite prepared to admit that.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We do not make money on any of them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It does not mean closing everything: it means a lot of upgrading, a businesslike approach to outgoings (about which this Government knows nothing at all) and generally modernizing the system so that better results will be achieved. I notice in today's *News* the announcement that a very heavy loss is expected on the New South Wales railway system but, at the same time as that is announced, I notice also that the Minister in that State comes forward with definite plans to have the situation changed. In today's *News*, the Minister is reported as follows.

He foreshadowed a substantial reduction in the railways work force and the acquisition of more modern equipment to solve problems.

That is something definite. The article goes on to report that a reduction in the labour force would not be achieved by retrenchments.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have read that over and over again during the last 12 years or so, and particularly in New South Wales.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Does the honourable member advocate wholesale retrenchments?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have never advocated that; I have never had any part in retrenchments. The Minister knows that, if a department wants to decrease its work force, it can do so by means of natural retirements; if

men want to transfer and indicate their willingness to transfer to other departments, considerable reductions can be made in that way, too. That was the policy adopted by the Government of which I was a member, when certain uneconomic lines were closed and changes were made. Incidentally, the deficit was checked to the extent that it went up by only ·3 of 1 per cent in the two years of that Government. The record of the present Government is that in its first three years of office the deficit increased by 100 per cent, so I suggest that the approach to the problem should be different today.

The Government can continue as it is at the moment if it wishes, at its own peril, but it is surprising, if one checks back further, to find that the present Premier had a charter for plans to improve the railways. On the hustings in Whyalla at the town hall on February 16, 1968, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) spoke to about 200 people and dealt with his attitude towards the South Australian Railways. A press cutting dated February 16, 1968, reported him as speaking in this way:

The Government has firmly declared that it would make the railway system efficient. It would not hesitate to undertake necessary economies where the need for those was clear and urgent.

That is the present Premier speaking; yet what has been done in their four years of Government that have passed since then? The point I make is that the people of this State do not want to hear comments like that, about charters and what the Government is going to do with the railways, and then, as the years go by, they see no, or very little, action being taken.

I will go through some of the record of the present Government in regard to railways I said a moment ago that in the first three years it doubled its deficit. Then it got rid of its Commissioner. It was a rather mysterious occurrence. Frankly, I still do not know what really occurred, but I have never known a Commissioner retire before his time.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Are you suggesting that pressure was put on him about his retirement?

The Hon C. M. HILL: I should like to know. I am not suggesting anything, but I am saying it is not usual for a Commissioner to retire before his time.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He told me when you were the Minister that he would retire before his normal time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Government could give me the real reason for his retirement, I should like to hear it. Then the Government appointed a board, and then discovered it did not have the power to appoint a board. It then called it an advisory board, and then discovered it could not carry on without a Commissioner, so it appointed a Commissioner. Some reports state that he was an Acting Commissioner; other reports state that he was appointed for 12 months. I am rather in the dark about the real position, and I should like to know it. Then the Government started a very worthwhile project—the extension of the passenger line to Christie Downs. I commend the Government for that. It is now in the course of extending that passenger line. It is rather ironical, because it was a major public transport recommendation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, a study and plan that the Government claims it has abolished

The Hon. D. H L. Banfield: I thought you would never get around to that!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The one worthwhile project, the extension of the passenger line to Christie Downs, was part of that very report. So this highlights the incredible situation in which the Railways Department now finds itself. Then the Government implemented, after the fiasco of the dial-a-bus scheme, which cost $31 673, the Bee-line bus system. It implemented that free bus service along North Terrace, in front of Parliament House, and along King William Street so that train travellers could be taken closer to their ultimate destination. I am told by those people observing that system, on good authority, that there are very few train passengers who use that bus service.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I believe I saw you using that service.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No; I have not had that pleasure yet. The Minister must have seen someone else who is my double stepping off the bus. The service is not being used by the railway passengers for the purpose for which I hope it was principally instituted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I used it one day and I saw half a dozen railway passengers using it.

The Hon C. M. HILL: I would like to know more about that matter. I am concerned only with railway passengers who use it, because that is its principal purpose. The free bus service was instituted (and I am somewhat amazed at this point) at a time when the Corporation of the City of Adelaide was spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on plans and proposals to make the city (and I quote from a Town Hall announcement) "a pleasant place in which to walk". So, we have the principal local government body making malls and planning the city to be a pleasant place in which to walk, whereas at the same time the Minister of Transport (whose other hat happens to be the Minister of Local Government) has introduced a free bus service along the city's principal thoroughfare.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you approve of the Bee-line bus?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Would you discontinue it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, but I would have a close look at its operations. I am waiting to hear what the subsidy is. The subsidy might be put to better use to assist bus services that come in from the suburbs and people who commute to the city, rather than bringing their cars into the city. If the Government wants to subsidize bus services, I suggest that that is the kind of bus service it should consider initially.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are they making malls or mauling up the streets?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will be interested to see what kind of "malls up" they might make. However, it is time I left the subject of the city and touched on the subject of the standard gauge line between Adelaide and a point near Crystal Brook. When the present Government came to office, arrangements for these plans, to be completed with the Commonwealth Government, were 99 per cent ready to go. There was no doubt about that; yet in four consecutive annual Governor's Opening Speeches, the Government indicated that agreement and commencement were close. To this day, about four years since the day when this Government came to office in 1970, four years of procrastination has taken place on this most important project from this State's viewpoint. However, no real announcement or decision has been made.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Can you tell me where the terminal of the proposed new line was in your time?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You've thrown him off balance.

The Hon. C. M HILL: Not at all, but it would take me some time to explain the situation. The principal terminal was out in the Islington area, where it was recommended to be by wellknown experts.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not at Dry Creek?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, that is where the train was to be assembled, but the terminal for the loading of plant and goods was to be in the Islington area. That scheme was thrown overboard immediately this Government came to office. The Government was going to establish it at the Mile End yards, but the experts who planned it told me months before that the congestion and costs of signalling in the Mile End yards made that site far inferior. Yet this Government, at the time it came to office, changed its mind. I understand now that the Government has gone back in favour of Islington, but I stand to be corrected on that point if I am wrong. No public announcement has been made on this matter.

The big argument of the day was the question of spur lines. The Government said that it would not have a bar of any railway plan in regard to this standard gauge link unless it connected all the State's major industries by spur lines to the new standard gauge line. This argument and false political propaganda went on for years. What happened when I asked whether Chrysler Australia Limited, at Tonsley Park, was to be connected to the standard gauge line? The reply came back "No". This showed the Government up for what it was doing: playing politics at the expense of industry and the real progress of the State

Also, in the whole area of delay, one could not seem to get a reply with regard to the line between Alice Springs and Tarcoola Time and time again negotiations take place and there is nearly a final agreement with the Commonwealth Government, but nothing concrete results. Time and time again the existing line is washed away. Producers and manufacturers in this State are losing trade to Queensland and the Eastern seaboard, where manufacturers find ways and means to get their produce into the Territory. It is the same old story and it highlights this Government's record of no decision. What is more (and I do not want to get too personal in this matter), the present Minister of Transport cannot even look after his railway employees.

I am receiving correspondence and pamphlets with regard to the discontent, indeed the bitterness, rife among the railway staff because of the complete mess about a permanent home for the Railways Institute. I remember that in 1970, when the Labor Government came to office, plans were under way for the institute to have a magnificent home on the banks of the Torrens River. I know that this will be denied by Government members but I clearly recall, for example, the architect who usually did the railways work coming to me and complaining that he had not been given the job. I had to admit that I was responsible for his not being given the job. The job was given to the architect who was designing the festival hall.

When conferences of this kind and the retention of professional people have taken place, the Minister of Transport cannot say, "That's rubbish. The previous Government did not intend building a permanent home for the institute on the Torrens Bank." I hope that the time is not far off when the Minister and the Government can tell the institute's officials quite definitely where their future accommodation will be

I now touch on another matter in regard to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report I have mentioned M.A.T.S from time to time because I know that it is of great interest to the Minister of Health. I will now deal with the proposed north-south underground railway, which was one of the most exciting and important facets of the public transport section of the M.A.T.S. Report. The Government has told us year in and year out that the plan has been scrapped, but I know that in the back room, and under wraps, plans are proceeding to bring the north-south underground railway to fruition. Of course, little publicity can be given to it; it does not suit the Government politically, because it was something to do with the M.A.T.S. Report.

When we are living in this kind of world it is little wonder that so much indecision can be mentioned in regard to sections of the railway operations. However, instead of being critical in this way, I want to inject some positive thinking into the debate. There must surely be some plans that the public would like to hear about. The implementation of a modern rail rapid transit system for metropolitan Adelaide is badly needed, and let us remember that many years will elapse between the basic planning and the implementation of such a system.

Is any consideration being given to a marriage between the Municipal Tramways Trust and the suburban services of the Railways Department, so that one authority, without duplication, can set about providing the metropolitan public with a transport system that it will be eager to use? These are surely positive matters about which the public is waiting to hear.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This may come about as a result of setting up the transport authority.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It may, if the authority is ultimately set up. The public also wants to hear about the Government's plans to improve efficiency and to act in accordance with the Auditor-General's warnings. Year after year the Auditor-General stresses the seriousness of the deficit that we are being asked to bolster in this Bill.

When is the Government going to put into effect the Treasurer's assertion that the Government will not hesitate to undertake necessary economies where the need for them is clear and urgent? The State Government wants to hand over country rail services to the Commonwealth Government; the challenge to put those services in order seems beyond this Government. If the country railways are handed over, it will be an admission that the State Government cannot do the job itself.

I know that, in connection with this money Bill, this Council cannot do very much, except to express the growing grounds well of public criticism in regard to these ever-increasing deficits. The public awaits leadership, action and decision from the Government. The public wants to see efficiency and economy as the yardsticks of that Government planning and action.

The Hon M. B. CAMERON (Southern): Although the dental branch of the Royal Adelaide Hospital is coping as well as it can with a patient-staff ratio that is quite unsatisfactory, it is obvious that something must be done to improve the situation. In reply to my recent question, the Minister of Health stated that people on the waiting list are guaranteed treatment. The Minister should ensure that the treatment is actually given On October 30, 1973, the Minister, in reply to a question from me, stated that 6 429 people were on the waiting list. I also asked how many people had been on the waiting list from the year 1965 onwards, I found that people had been waiting since 1965, and I guess that they are still guaranteed treatment. I asked how much further the list went back, but I have not had a reply; I will not press the matter because I do not want to depress the community about the situation. The Minister is obviously correct: treatment is guaranteed—provided the patient is still alive when his turn comes! Another reply from the Minister states that people are not called in chronological order.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you believe that chronological order is preferable to an order of priority based on necessity?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have no objection to necessity being a criterion What I am advocating is that more facilities should be provided so that necessity is not the only criterion used. Perhaps the waiting list could be curbed or closed altogether until the situation is rectified. The Minister said that, if the Government closed the waiting list altogether, some people who urgently needed treatment would be denied treatment; that statement is fair enough, but surely for the time being it would be wise to accept on the waiting list only those people who require treatment urgently. If there is no hope of people receiving treatment promptly, for practical purposes they are being fooled when they are told that their names have been added to the waiting list. I do not see how the Minister can get up and say that treatment is guaranteed when, in fact, patients have been waiting nine years; that is a very long time for a person on an age pension.

According to the Minister, consultants have been employed to review the use of staff and facilities and to give advice on increasing productivity Their preliminary report on October 30, 1973, suggested that, even with the maximum extension of the present site, the dental department could not hope to cope with the total demand for dental services for the indigent of the whole State. This very serious situation needs looking at, and I am certain that the Minister is examining it closely If we cannot supply the needs of all the indigents on the present site, something must be done, and the best that can be done is to provide an ancillary service In this connection I am thinking of the dental nurses who provide an excellent service in schools. Perhaps dental nurses could be used in country areas where they are already operating.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are in isolated areas.

The Hon M. B. CAMERON: Yes. Perhaps the supervising dentists could be used to treat many of the patients who until now have had to attend at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I understand that some patients from whom I have heard have been treated, but there is a much greater need for the use of these people in treating people from outside the metropolitan area. It is difficult for people from remote areas to travel to the city, and often their names are put on the rather unusual waiting list and remain there in most cases either until they have lost their teeth or until they are dead. The situation is disastrous.

On October 31 last the Minister told me that more names were being added to the waiting list each year. He also said that patients requiring dentures were not treated in chronological order I believe that practice is quite wrong, but if it is the case they should be told how long they are likely to wait. One person who contacted me recently had been told that there was no hope of getting treatment for up to five years. Perhaps that is more honest than the approach in the past.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You have been complaining because they were not told, and now you are complaining because they were. Make up your mind

The Hon M B. CAMERON: The only person I have heard of who has been told is an old lady, and five years would be a long time in her life. Obviously, the Minister has issued instructions that patients are not to be told, because that is what he told me recently in reply to a question.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I didn't say I had issued instructions.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not know whether the Minister said he had issued instructions, but on March 5, 1974, he gave me the following reply:

When a person is placed on the waiting list it does guarantee that treatment will be provided subject to the necessity to await his turn on the waiting list. Staff are instructed to inform eligible patients that there will be a delay before treatment can commence and that the length of the delay cannot be forecast. They are not advised to seek treatment privately. It is not considered that the present situation with regard to waiting lists could be described as "disgraceful", this term would be applicable only if no action had been taken to improve the position.

The Hon. D. H L. Banfield: That is contrary to what you just said that I said, you said that I issued instructions that they should not be told.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Certainly they are not told now long they will have to wait. It does not matter whether they are told; the important point is how long they must wait. From the figures given, they will wait at least nine years, and I hope there will be some improvement and that the Minister will be able to tell Parliament in the next year or so that some action has been taken I ask that the waiting list be closed to patients other than those requiring urgent treatment until the backlog has been caught up. The number is not just 6 700, because I understand there are special waiting lists, and so on I suggest it is closer to 10 000, and I am sure that further names have been added to the list since I asked the question. I support the Bill.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern): I support the Bill, but I must mention one or two matters contained in the Minister's second reading explanation. I firmly support the bonus payments made to police officers because of their extra work in helping reduce the road toll. This kind of reward for special services is most commendable. On the other hand, it is regrettable that the public must contribute still further towards the costs of the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Railways Department. I was interested to read what the Chief Secretary said about the metropolitan waterworks, as follows:

The quality of water pumped from the Murray River has been markedly lower than usual owing to the flood conditions on the river and this has necessitated additional water treatment. An abnormal incidence of algae blooms in metropolitan reservoirs has also contributed to treatment costs . .

I predict that the problems will be much more serious because of the presence in the river of European carp In reply to a recent question, the Minister of Agriculture stated:

The Government is well aware of the problems associated with the introduction of European carp into the Murray River eco-system. My colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, has informed me that the research section of the Fisheries Department has undertaken preliminary research resulting in an approach to the Australian Water Resources Council for funds to carry out an in-depth study in order that a plan can be produced to deal with the problem.

My suggestion is that that plan and that research should be expedited; otherwise, the amount of money that will have to be spent on the purification of water will be much more than that provided in the Bill

I listened with interest to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Cameron about the dental hospital, and I have also listened with interest to his questions on this same subject. I have wondered for some time just what is the purpose of the dental hospital. Is it fundamentally a training school or is it intended to provide free dental services for the whole State? I have made no study of this, but I understand it was originally and fundamentally intended to be a training school. If that is so, it is probably carrying

out that intention fairly adequately. If it is a training school, people are treated there because the training of dentists necessarily involves having people to treat, and as long as there are sufficient people to treat it is adequately carrying out its function.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is what it was set up for, of course. We have to train our dentists there.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I accept what the Minister has said. From his questions and from his speech today, I have wondered whether the honourable Mr. Cameron really understands the reason for the existence of the hospital. As I have said, if it is basically a training school it needs patients only because they are necessary in the training of dentists. If, on the other hand, its purpose was to provide a free dental service to the people of South Australia, something much more comprehensive would be required. It would not be sufficient to provide such a service at only one hospital; complete and adequate coverage would have to be provided throughout the whole State—rather like the medical scheme, or somthing along those lines.

If one is to continue to criticize an institution, one must know its basic purpose. One cannot properly criticize any institution without understanding why it is set up, because one cannot know whether it is succeeding or failing in its purpose. If it was set up for the training of dentists, it is fulfilling its purpose, and I have never heard any suggestion that it is not. I accept what the Minister has just said: the purpose of the hospital was originally and still is to train dentists. Had its purpose been to provide free dental treatment for the whole of South Australia, that would be a much more comprehensive matter, which would have to be investigated and introduced by separate legislation. I support the Bill.

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

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading

(Continued from March 13. Page 2432.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, which provides for the conditional registration of dentists. As the Minister stated in his second reading explanation, the Bill relates particularly to foreign graduates coming to live in South Australia about whom the board is unsatisfied regarding their qualifications fully to practise dentistry without supervision or restriction. The aim of this legislation is to allow what one might term conditional registration to enable these people to be registered but to place them under the supervision of a fully-qualified dentist.

Many training standards for dentists exist around the world. This applies particularly to American dental students: a tremendous variation exists between the standards in the universities and training establishments in America. I believe I am correct when I say that a dental association has been established in America that accepts the qualifications of about 33 training centres. Australia accepts the standards of that American dental association because it recognizes the same standards as those we require in this State. However, many other universities and establishments around the world do not meet the standard. It is a shame that a recognized standard cannot be reached throughout the world so that people can practise the profession of dentistry anywhere without restriction. I appreciate the problem the Government is facing, as some people are capable of taking their place in the dentistry profession but their qualifications do not enable them to meet the requirements for registration in this State.

In 1971, when the principal Act was amended, Dr. Springett led the debate and made an excellent speech. The remarks that he made then still apply today. Many changes have been made in the dental services provided in this State, one of which is the training of dental therapists. Everyone who has seen that operation is highly delighted with its success. However, we should look to the future and to the time when dental therapists move out into the private sector. Soon we shall have in South Australia many dental therapists who are well trained and have considerable experience working under the supervision of qualified dentists and who may marry and wish to move out to areas where there are no qualified dentists with whom they can work. At present these people are not recognized under the Act. The Minister should examine that problem in the same way as we are considering foreign graduates in this measure.

In his second reading explanation the Minister has stated that the Bill provides for the conditional registration of dentists and that it sometimes occurs, especially in the case of foreign graduates coming to live in South Australia, that the board is not satisfied that the applicant for registration is fully competent to practise dentistry without supervision or restriction. I hope that that provision will apply to locally trained and experienced dental therapists, because I believe they can play a most important part in the private sector of the community. Can the Minister therefore say whether this Bill applies to locally trained dental therapists as well as to foreign graduates who, in the opinion of the board, do not have a sufficient professional standard to allow them to practise in their own right but who will be permitted to practise under the supervision of a qualified dentist?

As a fee for registration is required under the Act (I do not know how much that fee is), can the Minister say whether the same fee will apply to a person who is conditionally registered? In other words, if it is to apply to dental therapists, how much will registration cost them? I support the Bill, because it is a step forward in providing better dental services for this State. We all appreciate that there is a lack of available people fully to service the dental needs of this State. Any steps that can be made in this direction to train more people to perform this function capably would be extremely welcome.

I hope that we do not move into a field where an untrained person is allowed to practise without the supervision of a fully-qualified dental practitioner, because I know that pressure has always existed along these lines for that to happen. I hope the Government does not have that in mind, because it is necessary for the protection of the patient and of the community that a professionally qualified person has the final responsibility. I support the second reading, and hope that the Minister will answer the questions I have asked.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.10 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, March 19, at 2.15 p.m.