

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 21, 1974

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

## PETITION: SODOMY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition from 5 661 electors and residents of South Australia objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalize sodomy between consenting adults until such time as the Parliament had a clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to do so.

Petition received and read.

## QUESTIONS

## INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands, as Leader of the Government in this Chamber.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yesterday I directed a question to the Minister concerning the Government's intention in connection with the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act relating to the removal of the right to take civil action in regard to certain disputes. The Minister replied that, to the best of his knowledge, the Government did not intend to proceed with the legislation. I should like to refer to some press statements made on this matter over the last two years. In the *Advertiser* of June, 1972, the Acting Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. G. R. Broomhill) was reported as saying that Cabinet had approved the principle, but the drafting of the legislation had yet to be completed. He indicated that the Government intended to proceed with the legislation in 1972. I quote now from the *Advertiser* of June 1, 1974, an article headed "Tort laws 'should be abolished'", which states:

The South Australian Trades and Labor Council decided last night to move immediately for the abolition of tort law in South Australian industrial disputes.

I now turn to a statement made by a number of members following the introduction of the Bill. A report in the *Advertiser* of November 8, 1972, states:

The Minister of Lands (Mr. Kneebone) told the House yesterday that "to leave this loophole open will only worsen industrial relations." . . . Mr. Kneebone said removing the clause would only lengthen and widen disputes in this State. He believed Opposition members were misguided. "If you take this clause out there will be people who think themselves clever and solicitors will be suggesting action by all sorts of people," Mr. Kneebone said. "If you have that sort of situation here, God help us." He said that without reasonable people in the trade union movement and kid-glove handling of the Kangaroo Island dispute, a serious dispute would have affected the whole of the State.

Next, I quote the remarks of the Premier as reported in the *Advertiser* at about the same time under the heading "Dunstan lashes at M.L.C.s". The article states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, today launched a scathing attack on the Legislative Council over its stand on the new Industrial Code. "The Legislative Council is determined to foment prolonged industrial disputes in South Australia in the hope that this will affect the State Government," Mr. Dunstan said. After a meeting of House managers, Legislative Council and the House of Assembly yesterday, a clause allowing Supreme Court action to be taken against trade union leaders had been

reincluded in the Bill. Mr. Dunstan said today: "The Council's action demonstrates once again how far remote it is from the problems facing the people of South Australia."

I could go on quoting many reports in the press and from *Hansard* in relation to the Government's attitude to the Legislative Council's handling of the Bill when it came up two years ago. In the *News* of August 20, 1974, an article states:

An angry Premier Dunstan said today he had warned the unions involved in the Port Adelaide steel dispute that they could face civil action "unless this senseless dispute is settled".

The decision not to proceed with the intention announced in His Excellency's Opening Speech to Parliament to remove the right to take civil action against a union or union officials to right a wrong was announced yesterday in this Chamber by the Acting Minister of Lands, as Leader of the Government. First, is not the Government's decision a justification of the actions taken in this Chamber 18 months ago; secondly, is the Government's decision a temporary decision only; thirdly, if it is not a temporary decision, does the announcement mark a fundamental change in policy of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member has posed quite a lengthy question. What was said yesterday was quite true, and I remind the Leader and other Opposition members that there have been times, when they have been in Government, when Cabinet decisions have been reversed in the light of subsequent events. That is what has happened on this occasion. I do not say this is necessarily a justification of what has been advocated by members in this Chamber. That is not necessarily the case at all. I think the matter was reviewed only in the enlightened—

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Hear, hear!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: —way in which it has come to fruition, and the Government was big enough to take the action it took in the circumstances. I do not think the Leader's claim, as he has indicated, that his Party was responsible for this type of action—

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not saying it was responsible. What I am asking is whether there is a fundamental change in A.L.P. policy.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The situation is that the Government has reversed the decision it made several years ago.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In the light of present-day circumstances.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is the prerogative of any Government. No doubt previous Governments made decisions at some time and changed them later.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Opposition should give credit to the Government for doing it.

## LEIGH CREEK AREA SCHOOL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the *Advertiser* of August 15 there appeared a letter expressing serious criticism of conditions at Leigh Creek Area School. It was signed by one person, and the newspaper stated there were 18 other signatories to it. I assume those people are members of the staff. Part of the letter read as follows:

We cannot obtain new chairs, desks, cupboards, filing cabinets and other basic equipment, despite the many "proper avenues" explored by our Headmaster. We, the

staff, feel that writing to you is one of the few ways open to us to try to get something done. The attitude seems to be that because we are isolated it is just too much bother to "have to send stuff up all that way". Besides, "We've got to look after the new schools, Leigh Creek's just an old 'trad' bush school." This is no plea for resplendent carpeted and curtained rooms full of A/V equipment—though many of our rooms, infants as well, have bare splintered boards ("sorry, no money"). We are weary of departmental "blockhead" attitudes, cul-de-sac corridors of red tape, of being treated as a second-grade, end-of-the-line school.

Will the Minister investigate these most serious complaints and say whether he believes they are justified; and, if so, what action does he propose to remedy the situation? Finally, will he give an assurance that there will be no recrimination whatsoever against staff members as a result of their complaints?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think I can answer those questions along these lines, and I hope it will satisfy the honourable member's curiosity. I thought for the moment he might have written that letter himself.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Why should you think that?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Because, when I was the member for that district many years ago, the Leigh Creek school was a very fine school indeed.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: But it has been under Labor for a long time now.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Of course, it is under a Government of a different political colour, but I assure the Hon. Mr. Hill that I spoke to the Minister of Education as late as yesterday and I know he is going to Leigh Creek soon, and will take with him the member for the district. That is something that was not even contemplated when I was the member for the district. I had to travel on my own and see what I could do myself. I assure the honourable member that the Minister of Education is fully aware of the problems at Leigh Creek and is putting that school on the first priority list.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: May I obtain an answer from the expert to whom I directed the question?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes; I shall be pleased to get an answer.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as the Acting Leader of the Government in the Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is reported in today's press that the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration, Mr. Cameron, is considering an emergency programme to counter rising unemployment, which programme is to include an injection of money into public works to provide employment in Commonwealth and State Government and local government spheres. Will the Minister ascertain whether the State Government has prepared a list of the sorts of project on which it will be asking the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance in order to help the Minister, who has now suddenly discovered this enormous problem, and has the Government asked councils for a list of projects on which they might require help from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have not yet seen the report to which the honourable member has referred. I do not know whether he is referring to a report in the *Advertiser* or the *Australian*.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It was in the *News*,

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will examine the matter and see whether I can furnish a reply to the honourable member.

#### STRATHALBYN SCHOOL

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Does the Minister of Agriculture know whether the Minister of Education is also going to visit the Strathalbyn Infants School to see the appalling conditions to which I referred in a question I asked some weeks ago, a reply to which I have not yet received?

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

#### WHEAT PAYMENTS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 14 regarding wheat payments?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answers to the honourable member's inquiry are contained in an open letter from the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board to Australian wheatgrowers in April of this year. I am sure the honourable member would have received a copy of that letter. If he did not, I shall be pleased to make it available to him now, as I have a copy of it in my bag. The position regarding future payments to growers from pools is as follows:

1969-70 pool	About 3.75c a bushel or \$1.40 a tonne
1970-71 pool	About 6c a bushel or \$2.25 a tonne
1971-72 pool	About 10c a bushel or \$3.77 a tonne
1972-73 pool	About 17c a bushel or \$6.20 a tonne
1973-74 pool	About 155c a bushel or \$57 a tonne

I emphasize that these figures are estimates only. The Australian Wheat Board reports that the 1969-70 pool payment should be made in mid-September, 1974. The earlier expected payment of \$7.35 a tonne (20c a bushel) from the 1973-74 pool in August, 1974, will not now be made.

The best that growers can now expect is about \$2.50 a tonne (about 7c a bushel) early in October. The deferment and reduction of this second payment from the 1973-74 pool was due to disruption to the board's shipping programme, mainly through industrial disputes in New South Wales and the inability of the railways in that State to haul sufficient wheat in the time required. It is considered too early to assess the times of payments from the other pools with any degree of accuracy. As the honourable member will see from the circular letter, the delay in finalizing wheat pools is attributable to the board's giving credit to oversea buyers for up to two or three years, because of fiercely competitive world wheat marketing conditions in those years.

#### METROPOLITAN BEACHES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Although this is perhaps not the time when we should be thinking of the beach, in a few months many thousands of people will be visiting metropolitan beaches and, unfortunately, it is almost inevitable that some young children will be killed

or injured by motor vehicles driven on the beaches. Traditionally, our beaches have been a place of enjoyment and recreation. However, with increased traffic on several metropolitan beaches the safe situation that previously applied will no longer apply. Will the Minister ask his colleague to take steps to ban the use of motor vehicles, beach buggies and trail bikes on metropolitan beaches?

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

#### DIRECTOR OF FISHERIES

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Fisheries in another place.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: During the last Parliamentary session I asked four questions reported on pages 2257, 2500, 2758 and 2813 of *Hansard*. All four questions dealt with the appointment of a new Director of Fisheries. Over a period up to 12 months this position has been vacant. This is an important position, and the last reply I received from the Government was as follows:

The Minister of Fisheries states that the position of Director of Fisheries was advertised and no suitable persons applied. The position was readvertised, and the present applications are being assessed by the Public Service Board. I received that reply on March 28, 1974. Since then, many waves have flipped up on to the beach, and no appointment seems to have yet been made. Will the Minister inquire of his colleague what the current position is?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Fisheries.

#### SPEED SIGNS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to the question I asked on August 7 concerning the removal of certain unconverted speed signs?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague reports as follows:

When converting advisory speed signs it was decided to retain the Imperial measurement signs for a period to assist motorists to readjust. Conversion has now been completed and all the old signs should have been removed by August 1, 1974. It was planned that all speed limit signs were to be converted on July 1, 1974. However, roads not maintained by the Highways Department were dealt with by the local councils and it appears that some conversions in the Salisbury area were not completed. The matter has now been rectified.

#### AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I refer to the reported address in the *Whyalla News* of the Minister of Agriculture when opening the Whyalla Show. It is headed "Market in Asia says Minister" and states:

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Casey), who officially opened the Whyalla Show on Saturday, said there was need for Australia to look more to South-East Asia as a market for its agricultural products. The European market was becoming difficult because of the tariffs being imposed. If Australia could give the people of South-East Asia meat and other agricultural products at the right price it would help itself and aid Asian countries. "I believe we have a very bright future in Australia as far as agriculture is concerned, but we have to concentrate on the basic com-

modities of cereals and wool," Mr. Casey said. The beef industry had had sufficient warning in the past two years that it was pricing itself out of the market. Beef producers, like other sections of agriculture, had to offer quality products at prices people could afford. He also said that many people did not stop to think about the problems involved in producing food . . .

I think that last point is the only part of the Minister's speech with which I agree. However, perhaps the Minister was misquoted, and perhaps the confusion in my mind and in the minds of many other people is not what he intended. Bearing in mind the fierce impositions placed on wheat production in 1969, I ask the Minister whether he advocates a further increase in the production of wheat, barley and oats. Further, in the light of current reduced prices to producers and the huge build-up of unsold stocks of wool, can the Minister substantiate his statement on wool production? I question, too, his statement on beef. The Minister said that the industry had had sufficient warning in the past two years that it was pricing itself out of the market, but I do not quite understand what he means by that. As late as six months ago, many of the experts were advocating a bright future for beef, although they could be wrong and the Minister could be right. But what does he mean by the statement that they were pricing themselves out of the market? The impression the Minister has given is that the primary producer controls the price of his product. Nothing could be further from the truth: as the Minister would know, most of the stock sold is held on mortgage by the selling agents, and—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is debating his question.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Mr. President, I think I have outlined what I wanted to say and have given the Minister a chance to clear up what I think was the mess he made at Whyalla.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If ever a person made a mess of asking a question, it was the Hon. Mr. Whyte.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: You answer, and we'll see!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Let me try to analyse the honourable member's question. Although it will be difficult, I will try to do the best I can in the circumstances. In the first place, he quoted a statement that we should be concentrating on our cereals.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: You did, not I.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: His question was so complicated that it has taken me quite a time to grasp what he was trying to get at. The honourable member was quoting reports in the *Whyalla News* of what I had said at the opening of the show, and he stated that I said we should be concentrating on our cereals in South-East Asia. That is exactly what I did say and have said since I returned from South-East Asia, where I think there is a good market for our cereals. The second question was whether I thought I was right in saying that beef producers were pricing themselves out of the market. This warning has been issued to the beef industry for the last two years not only by me but also by beef producers themselves, and even people in this State. Indeed, I think that what they and I have said has proved to be true. So, what the honourable member says about no-one else having said this is quite wrong. The third question related to woollen products. In the discussions I had in Japan with Japanese woollen textile manufacturers, they said they were concerned mainly about the continuity of supply. They were very concerned, as a result of reports they

had received, as to whether the production of wool in Australia would be adequate for their future needs. I am basing my remarks on what I was told by woollen textile manufacturers in Japan. If they could get guaranteed continuity of supply from Australia at reasonable prices, they would be quite happy. If the Japanese business men are not already in Australia, they will be coming here later this year.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The press report quotes the Minister as saying:

I believe we have a very bright future in Australia. Perhaps the Minister should have been quoted as referring to Asia. Would that satisfy him? The report quotes the Minister as follows:

We have a very bright future in Australia as far as agriculture is concerned, but we have to concentrate on the basic commodities of cereals and wool.

If we are to expand this market in Asia at prices that are suitable to Asian people and if we are to sell more wool to Japan, is the Minister willing to support a subsidy system for growers that would allow these products to be sold in expanding Asian markets?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: We have a bright future in Australia for agriculture; I will reiterate that for as long as the honourable member wants me to. I think the Asian people can pay the prices; they have been paying them all along the line. I do not favour in any circumstances subsidizing the matters to which the honourable member referred, and I do not think there is any need to do so. The Asian market can pay the world price, and that is what it is doing now. I do not think there is any need to go into it further.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I was interested when the Minister said, in reply to the Hon. Mr. Whyte, that beef producers had priced themselves out of the market. The pastoral industry, temporarily at least, is facing disaster as a result of the enormous drop in prices that has occurred. A neighbour of my little farming property who is an excellent dairyman sold two good cows at auction at a market yesterday for \$50—not \$50 each, but \$50 for the two of them. This is almost a disaster. Most cattle, as I understand it, are sold either by auction or by private treaty at a price agreeable to the purchaser. In the industry, there is no getting together that I know of, such as there is with the people that the Minister claims to represent in this Council, such as the unions. There is no ganging up to hold the public to ransom. I should like to know what the Minister means by his reference to beef producers pricing themselves out of the market.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This phraseology has not been used exclusively by me. I draw honourable members' attention to the fact that not only have I been saying this for two years, but other people in the industry have been saying it for two years in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I know that cattle prices have slumped dramatically in the last week, but I can draw honourable members' attention to other slumps in the cattle market over the years. It is unfortunate that it has happened at this juncture. I remind the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill that I do not represent only trade unions: I represent the agriculturists of this State, I hope. Hon-

ourable members are not the only primary producers in South Australia. I can remember sending two 8-month calves to the Adelaide market several years ago, and the price I received was equivalent to five cents for each 453 grams. In those days it should have been at least \$2.20 and it is just one of those things that happens.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Answer my question! Don't dodge it! Why do you say that the producers priced themselves out of the market?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am using phraseology that has been used not only by me but by other people in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What do you mean by it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I believe that prices have gone too high; that is the phraseology that is used. It has been the same with our wool prices. On many occasions when wool prices have become high, it has been said that those prices are too high and that we will be pricing ourselves out of the market.

#### SUPERPHOSPHATE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Acting Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about superphosphate?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have made further inquiries into this matter and now understand that industry organizations have made submissions to the Prime Minister for a reference to the Industries Assistance Commission of matters concerning costs and subsidies on superphosphate. Until such a reference is made, I also understand that the Industries Assistance Commission would be unable to receive submissions. Nevertheless, I have brought to the attention of the Australian Minister for Agriculture details of the situation as it affects war service settlers on Kangaroo Island.

#### RURAL SAFETY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Health ascertain whether the Minister of Labour and Industry has any plans to introduce regulations or legislation concerning rural safety and, if he has, what form such proposals take?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

#### MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about Memorial Hospital?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The provision of new or additional hospital beds throughout the metropolitan regions of Adelaide is based on a priority system which takes into account the following factors:

- (a) Submissions received for extensions of services by existing hospitals or submissions made by community representatives for new hospital facilities;
- (b) The present standards of existing hospital facilities in the particular area;
- (c) The overall ratios of beds available to the community in the area;
- (d) The specific type of bed accommodation being sought;
- (e) The potential for expansion or future development on the site under examination;
- (f) The potential of the facility for the education of various groups of students in the health professions;
- (g) The cost of the project in relation to the benefits to be gained.

In terms of general needs the highest priorities are accorded to those areas of the city of Adelaide and its surrounding suburbs which have the least number of beds available to those residing in these areas. The greatest deficiencies in hospital bed numbers are in the rapidly developing northern and southern metropolitan regions. In contrast, hospital bed numbers in relation to population numbers are highest in the inner city areas.

With the above issues in mind, it is true to say that the major redevelopment proposed by Memorial Hospital has been given a low priority ranking in relation to much needed hospital developments in the outer suburban areas (e.g., Flinders Medical Centre, Western Community Hospital, North-Eastern Community Hospital, extensions to Modbury Hospital and a redeveloping of hospital services for the Elizabeth-Salisbury region). While it is accepted that Memorial Hospital provides excellent services for people throughout the State, the same could also be said of Home for Incurables, Adelaide Children's Hospital, Northfield wards and the hospitals of the Mental Health Services (Glenside and Hillcrest). All of these last-mentioned institutions are long overdue for major redevelopment, and the age and condition of the bulk of these buildings warrant higher priority than does Memorial Hospital.

The question has also been raised whether Government support will be available if requested for Calvary Hospital and St. Andrews Hospital. As both these hospitals have excellent, relatively new, or recently remodernized service facilities, it is considered that requests for major rebuilding projects are not likely to be submitted from these two private hospitals in the city over the next several years. Any relatively minor improvement to the existing services in these hospitals would be supported in the same manner as in the past, always subject to funds being available.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question regarding Memorial Hospital?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The figures given on August 1 relating to hospital beds available were those applying to the inner city and eastern suburbs in 1970. The number of beds a thousand of population in the city of Adelaide area alone would, of course, have been much higher. The overall position regarding bed provision in 1970 in greater metropolitan Adelaide (extending from Gawler to Sellick Hill) was that 4 012 general hospital beds were available for an estimated population of 825 400 persons: that is, an average of 4.9 beds a thousand of population. The study was conducted in 1970 to assist in deciding the number of beds to be provided at the proposed Flinders Medical Centre, the relative details being as under:

Regions	Beds (1970)	Popu- lation estimate (1970)	Beds/ 1 000 popu- lation (1970)	Estimated annual increases over next five years (1970 on- wards)
Northern and north- eastern . . . . .	273	198 200	1.4	9 000
Inner city and eastern suburbs . . . . .	2 752	202 200	13.1	1 500
Western and north- western . . . . .	864	237 200	3.6	250
Southern and south- western . . . . .	193	187 800	1.03	6 000
Totals . . . . .	4 012	825 400	4.9	—

\*Does not include special hospitals (for example, for repatriation and tuberculosis patients).

#### DENTAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement explanatory of a question I propose to ask the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Last night I was looking at and listening to a programme called *This Day Tonight* on Australian Broadcasting Commission television, which I do, I might add, purely as a matter of duty. It referred to the dental hospital attached to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and featured people who said they had been waiting for nine years for dentures, and so on, but had not been able to get attention. It was also stated that the Minister (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield) was not available for comment—a statement I resent considerably, even in relation to a member of the other Party, because I think it carries implications that are totally unfair, and no doubt the Minister would have commented.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He may have been in another State when that show was recorded.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am sure he would have commented if he had been available.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is distinctly unfair, because he was in another State.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This goes on all the time. I do not care if it happens to members of the Labor Party or to members of the Liberal Party: I think the implication it carries is totally unfair. I thank the honourable member who has interjected for his help because he has always been helpful to me. I have understood from the Minister's predecessor in office as Minister of Health, namely, my revered Leader (I called him reluctantly the other day), that the dental hospital attached to the Royal Adelaide Hospital is a training hospital and not a service to the public. I am under the belief that this still seems to be totally misunderstood (if I am right in saying what I am saying) by members of the public and misrepresented to them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And you might add "by members of Parliament".

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is dead right.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think some members may be under a misapprehension, but I ask the Minister whether my understanding is right, that this is a training hospital and that it is not there for the purpose of giving free dental treatment to all and sundry, which, of course, would be impossible. Would the Minister care to make a statement on this matter? I hope, if he does, that it will be reported correctly by the media, because all the time we are getting statements to the effect that the dental hospital is not fulfilling its duty. It seems to me to be fulfilling it admirably within the terms of the things that have been assigned to it. Would the Minister care to comment?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I thank the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for the opportunity to reiterate that the dental hospital is set up in the main for teaching. That is its primary purpose. I have said that previously in this Chamber and I have said it publicly, but the media does not seem to want to give that impression outside. As the Hon. Mr. Shard has said, some members do not seem to want to be able to grasp the situation, as it has been stated to them rather clearly on previous occasions. True, the dental hospital is mainly a teaching hospital, although we give attention to as many people as possible. It is impossible at present for the State Government to take on a programme of providing free dental assistance to everyone in the State. Representations have been made to

the Australian Government for assistance along these lines, but until financial assistance is available from the Australian Government we are not in a position to carry out free dental treatment. I again stress that the dental section is set up primarily as a teaching hospital. Regarding the remark on the television programme that I was not available to comment on the programme last night, this happens all the time. It is unfair of the media to give the impression that Ministers do not want to comment. I would have been most anxious to comment had I been available. Frequently, representatives of the media will ring half an hour before they want a person to appear, and if the person is not available the media do not say that he was given only 10 minutes or half an hour in which to appear and that, possibly because of another appointment, he could not do so. The impression is given that we do not want to comment, and that is not true. If the media does not want to be controlled, it should report these matters fairly. I thank the Hon. Sir Arthur for the opportunity to make this statement.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If, as the Minister has said, the dental hospital is almost entirely a training hospital, will the Minister ask the hospital authorities to cease adding to waiting lists names of people who are unlikely to be required for training purposes? Would he now indicate to those people already on the waiting list (between 6 000 and 9 000 people, I understand) that they are unlikely to be required as the hospital is not providing a service but is basically a training hospital?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, I am not prepared to do that. Every person who goes to the hospital is given a letter—

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Now?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am saying what the position is now. I am not prepared to do as the honourable member asks me. Patients attending the hospital are informed of the position. If we stop people from going to the hospital we may find that we have insufficient patients to carry on the training programme. If people are willing to remain on the list and be called in when there is an opportunity to treat them, that is well and good. I am not prepared to ask them not to attend, but we ask them to bear with us until we get around to them.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You are misleading them.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not misleading them. They are informed of the position when they visit the hospital.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question, which is directed to the Minister of Health, relates to the present situation at Modbury Hospital. What is the present capacity of the hospital so far as construction of the building is concerned, and what is the capacity in relation to the necessary medical facilities provided? The answer to both questions may be the same; I do not know. Also, would the Minister be kind enough to obtain figures of the daily average over the past few months?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will get a reply to all questions at the one time. I have not got the daily average figure at present.

#### COMMONWEALTH AID ROADS GRANTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply from the Minister of Transport to my recent question about Commonwealth aid roads grants?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The South Australian Minister of Transport does not propose to comment on alleged interjections of the Australian Minister for Transport.

#### BUS SERVICES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport, say whether any interstate bus services are operated by the Municipal Tramways Trust? If so, what is the extent of the interstate operations, when were they commenced, and are there any plans for their expansion?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague.

#### PARLIAMENT HOUSE PICTURES

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: This may be regarded as a somewhat trivial matter, but I think it has something to do with public relations, which are always thought to be important. All honourable members are pleased to see the progress being made with the rehabilitation of Parliament House but, speaking personally (and other honourable members have spoken to me about the matter), I was disappointed to see that in the Legislative Council interviewing room, after the renovations had been completed, the same pictures were rehanging on the walls. These are sepia prints, which are very poor and probably the most depressing set of pictures that could grace any room. Would the Minister take up this matter with the Minister of Works to see whether perhaps the assistance of the Art Gallery could not be sought with a view to having those pictures replaced?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: The pictures referred to by the Hon. Mr. Potter are provided by the State Gallery, and arrangements regarding them are the prerogative of the Presiding Officer. If the honourable member has in mind any pictures in which he is interested and which he would like to see hung in any room in this building, if he will report the matter to me I will look into it.

#### ROADWORKS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport ask his colleague whether he is perfectly happy with the proposed financial arrangements regarding roadworks in South Australia in relation to Commonwealth assistance?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall be pleased to refer that question to my colleague in another place.

#### REGISTRAR OF MOTOR VEHICLES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yesterday's *Advertiser* contained a report that Mr. R. D. Elliott, SM, had been critical of the departmental procedures concerning the notices given by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to persons who had been disqualified from holding drivers licences through the points demerit system. The case in point was that of an offender who was a banned driver for three months, who was before the court, and who was sentenced to gaol. The magistrate said in strong terms that he thought that the

Registrar should have warned the motorist, when he disqualified her from holding a licence for three months, that if she drove a vehicle during the period she would face a gaol sentence. According to the newspaper report, that warning was not issued and, as a result, this publicity appeared in yesterday's press. Does the Registrar of Motor Vehicles give a warning of a possible gaol sentence to disqualified drivers in cases such as this? If not, will the Minister consider improving this departmental procedure so that such a warning can be given?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek the information the honourable member requires.

#### HILTON PROPERTY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I move:

That, in the opinion of this Council, the Ombudsman should be requested to investigate all matters in relation to the acquisition by the Highways Department of allotment 4 containing 480 square metres or thereabouts of subdivision of portion of block 24 and other land of section 49 laid out as Hilton from George Sydney Elston and Kathleen Annie Elston, his wife, and to report to Parliament upon the acquisition and the subsequent use of the above land.

I hope I shall get full support from this Council for my motion. I have believed for some time that, although there is probably no possibility of having the case reopened and any further remuneration given to the Elstons, they are now living on the pension and have a stake in the principle relating to this negotiation. They believe they were not treated fairly and that because of their ignorance of the law they were given a very raw deal.

They purchased the shop in 1939 and worked every day, including Christmas Day, for eight years non-stop to make that property freehold. After they had operated the business for 11 years, Mrs. Elston took ill and, on doctor's advice, the business was sold. However, they retained the freehold of the property despite their having passed on their interest in the business. Because land values were steadily increasing and because of the hard work they had done to obtain the property, these people thought that, if they had held on to it until they were ready to retire, the sale of the property would provide a substantial sum for them, as a result of which they would be able to live in reasonable comfort in their old age. However, this was not to be.

It seems that their decision to sell the property prematurely, or before they had originally intended to do so, was accentuated by the fact that their tenant was not a good tenant. Indeed, he was often six to eight weeks late with his rent payments, and he always had to be chased to make him pay up. Also, the residence had generally been neglected. The matter was brought to a head when the area was declared an industrial area and, because the council wanted higher rates for it, the Elstons approached the tenant, a Mr. Edmund, and told him that his rent would have to be adjusted. However, Mr. Edmund told them that he had no intention of paying a higher rent and that he would take up the matter with the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, who also had an interest in Theatre 62.

By this time, the Elstons thought that, because their property could easily deteriorate further, it should be sold. In this respect, they were aided by a man from another State who offered them \$24 000 for the property. This person, who was obviously an honest man, advised them that the property should be put up for sale by auction and that they should tell Mr. Edmund that this was what they intended to do. The property was then placed in the hands of an auctioneer (I believe a Mr. Tremaine) and

notices stating that the property was to be auctioned were placed thereon about five weeks before the auction date. Advertisements were also inserted in the daily press.

However, only 1½ hours before the sale was to take place, the Highways Department contacted the auctioneer by telephone and said that the sale could not proceed. I believe Highways Department officers then issued an acquisition order on the property, stating that about 12 metres of it was needed for road widening purposes. That was all right and, not being as conversant with the last letter of the law as people should be, the Elstons were not unduly worried about it, because there was in office a Government for which they had until then voted and which they thought was the champion of the small person. They did not think they were being misled or that their property would not bring a fair price.

However, after some weeks, during which they did not know what price would be paid for their property, the Elstons contacted their local member (the member for Stuart), who was kind enough to contact the Minister and, through him, ascertain that the department would pay not the \$24 000 that they had been offered when the place was to be put up for auction but a mere \$14 700. They refused to accept this and were told that the next course of action would be for them to place the matter in the hands of a private valuer, who eventually came up with a price of \$18 000. The Elstons knew of no other place to which they could turn, and it was not possible for them to take up the matter legally. Indeed, they were told that a certain case instigated by a doctor against the Highways Department had cost the former a fortune and had failed. They believed in their hearts that, although the \$18 000 was not nearly a fair price, it was the best they could do in the circumstances, and they therefore accepted it.

Although disappointed about this, the Elstons at about this stage faded out of the picture in relation to the consideration of money. There is little chance that they will be able to obtain a fair and equitable price for their land, but, because they are good Australians, they believe that they have not been given a fair go. We have heard so often from Government members that this is one of the Government's policies: to give the small man a fair go.

The Elstons believe that something should be done to highlight this matter. My interest in this matter is to make it possible for the Ombudsman to investigate it and to report to Parliament some of the facts regarding the transaction. I believe Mr. Elston has contacted the press, which was somewhat cautious because a libel suit could have arisen as a result of his statements. The press was never willing to print the story. Not only were the Elstons confused and disappointed with the price offered to them but also they were incensed when the Highways Department then had the audacity to relet the property. No road widening has occurred, and the property is still as it was when they sold it. However, it has been fully licensed and is operating as a restaurant.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: When was that licence granted?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am not sure; I do not think I have that information in my notes. At a rough guess, I would say that it was licensed about two years ago.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: After the acquisition by the Highways Department?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The licence was granted after the acquisition and after a new lease had been granted to the incoming tenants. There have been several subsequent tenants of the property. Apparently it is not such a famous and successful restaurant as one might be



led to believe. I hope that, if the motion is carried with the support of all honourable members, when the Ombudsman investigates this matter he carries his investigation through to the situation applying today.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are not satisfied about what has happened since the acquisition?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It is not that I am not satisfied, but I have heard reports that some of the other lessees have not been happy, either. I seek the support of all honourable members on this matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Your motion refers to "subsequent use".

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: True. I have asked a question on that matter, but I have not received a reply, although I had hoped to receive a reply before I spoke in this debate. The Elstons have indicated their willingness to make themselves available to answer questions concerning this matter; indeed, they will come to Parliament House for that purpose. They have provided documentation in respect of their various transactions, and I am sure that they would make that information available to anyone interested in their request for an investigation. The Ombudsman has already done some work on this case at the request of Mr. Elston. However, my motion seeks to go further: it seeks to have the Ombudsman report to Parliament on his findings.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. The Hon. Mr. Whyte has presented to this Council information on the acquisition by the Highways Department of this property in Burbridge Road, Hilton. I referred to this matter in debate on October 11, 1973, when, following a report in the *Sunday Mail*, I was written to by Mr. Elston, who told me what had happened to his property in Burbridge Road. I was perturbed about the course of events concerning the acquisition of that property. The letter I received from Mr. Elston in October, 1973, is as follows:

After reading your paragraph in the *Sunday Mail* regarding Mr. Dunstan's land prices I feel compelled to write to you and bring before you the position which my wife and I find ourselves in through the acquisition of our property in Rowland Road, Hilton, right opposite Theatre 62, which in our opinion was taken and then given to our tenant. We were told it was to widen the road to the airport. The house, double-fronted shops with four rooms and bathroom behind a long storeroom opening on to Rowland Road with double doors. The house is red brick and situated on the corner of Rowland Road and Clarence Street. My wife and I had our fill of our tenant. We tried to put his rent up, and was told by him he would see Mr. Dunstan, and we got a lawyer's letter.

We had been getting quite a number of inquiries asking if we would sell, but the wife and I had been hanging on to it, because the price was going up all the time, to have something when we retire. A chap came along and said he was asking for a property for his firm and asked would we sell. We told him the tenant had two months of his lease to run and we would be glad to sell if we could, so he said, "Put it up for auction. I will start the bidding off for you. If your tenant wants it he can bid." The tenant was told, and we duly put it in the hands of an auctioneer.

The tenant told us, "You can't sell." He told us that he would stop it, which, at the time, was just bluff. The sale was duly advertised, my wife and I were on our way down to Adelaide to attend the sale, to be told by the auctioneer that a Minister rang up 1½ hours before the time of the sale and told the auctioneer to stop the sale. It was not to go on. No reason was given. Eventually we were told it was wanted to widen the road. After considerable time I got our local M.P. on to it and he went straight to Mr. Virgo, who said it was a property opposite Theatre 62.

Eventually we were offered \$14 700, which was not the price we paid for it years before, to say nothing of the extensions we put on it. After a lot of wrangling, Barrett

and Barrett said, on valuing it, \$18 000 with expenses. We were told we could not get a penny more. I have had the Ombudsman on to it and the man I saw said that no doubt we were railroaded out of our property. I am enclosing photostats of his replies. All letters and everything is in writing. It would be too much to try and tell all now, but if ever I saw a shady deal this is one.

We know that the tenant never had the money to do the improvements, and our letter to our tenant was always chasing him for back rent. I find myself in agreement with what you and Mr. Mathwin had to say in last week's *Sunday Mail*. We would be very pleased to hear your comments on it and would come to Adelaide with our letters to talk it over with you. By way of interest, I was put on an invalid pension two years six months ago by the doctor.

I referred to this matter in this Council on October 11, 1973. For some time other honourable members and I have expressed concern about this Government's attitude to the acquisition of private property, and matters dealing with that attitude have been raised many times in this Chamber. I refer to the acquisition of 31 houses in the Bedford Park area and to other acquisitions.

I believe that this case represents the use of Government power not for the public benefit at all; the view can be taken that this acquisition was undertaken for individual gain. The Highways Department has now held this property for some time, yet it has not engaged in any road widening activity whatever. The subsequent history of the leasing of this property should also be examined. Although Mr. and Mrs. Elston approached the Ombudsman in respect of this matter, the Ombudsman's investigation was restricted by his power under the Act.

However, following the appointment of the Ombudsman to inquire into the full facts surrounding the expulsion of a girl from a high school, and the powers subsequently given the Ombudsman by the Government to make that inquiry, I believe he should now be given the task of inquiring into and reporting to Parliament on this acquisition. On examining the situation described by Mr. and Mrs. Elston, the Ombudsman reported as follows:

On looking at the information forwarded to me by the department I am satisfied that the first notice of acquisition that you received was, as you have stated, by means of a telephone communication conveyed to the auctioneer on the morning of the auction. On looking at various departmental records it would appear that the persons responsible were severely criticized for approaching you in this way and there were explicit recommendations made that this procedure not be repeated on future occasions. On October 11, 1973, I said that the situation did not provide much satisfaction for people such as those in the position of Mr. and Mrs. Elston. I also said that the situation was such that I believed grounds existed on which the acquisition could be challenged as being illegal. In 1973 I dealt with the case taken from volume 42 of the *Australian Law Journal*, which contains a decision of the High Court in the case *Kerr v. Shire of Werribee*, where a somewhat similar position existed. The Shire of Werribee wanted to acquire compulsorily a section of a property so that it could run a pipeline. In the acquisition, it tried to acquire the whole property (a great deal more than it required for the purpose) and it was held that the acquisition was illegal. When I apply that case to the case of Mr. and Mrs. Elston, I find that there is a parallel, because the South Australian Government has acquired the whole of their property. It is the only whole property that the Government has acquired in the street for road widening. Those facts alone deserve examining. Why was this the only whole property that the Government acquired in the street, whereas everywhere else in the street the Government acquired 2.4 metres for road widening? There is a parallel between the case *Kerr v. Shire of Werribee* and the case we are dealing with now.



I do not believe that anything can be done for the Elstons in relation to getting more money in connection with the acquisition of the property. The whole Government approach and the subsequent use of the property should be investigated, and a report should be made to this Parliament. We have been concerned and disturbed in this Council at the attitude of the Government to the whole question of compulsory acquisition of a private person's property. From the facts presented, I believe that this matter should be looked at, and a report should be made to Parliament. It is the only way in which the claims of the various parties can be satisfied. If this matter is left to rest where it is now, there will always be a grave suspicion that the Government has not acted in the best manner in relation to the acquisition. I therefore support the motion.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern): I listened with great interest to what the Hon. Mr. Whyte and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said. It is worth summarizing the facts of the matter. Leaving aside all other considerations, we are left with this basic situation: the Elstons had been in possession of at least part of the premises since 1939. In 1970 they put their premises up for auction. The auction was advertised by notice on the site for about five weeks and by press advertisement. About one and a half hours before the auction, notice was given to the auctioneer by the extraordinary method of telephone that the sale was not to proceed, because the land was to be acquired for the purpose of road widening. The sale was stopped. The land was subsequently acquired by the Minister of Transport by private treaty under threat of compulsory acquisition. The only other acquisitions have been to take 2.4 m, as far as can be discovered, yet the whole of the relevant premises was acquired. As far as can be discovered, no other entire premises on that road in that area have been acquired for the purpose. Neither the whole premises nor any part of them has been used for road widening purposes.

Although it is four years since acquisition was effected, the whole premises appear to be presently used, presumably by a private entrepreneur, for the purpose of running the Red Garter private restaurant and for some facilities for Theatre 62. The questions that need answering include the following: first, why was the sale stopped in such an extraordinary manner; secondly, was the whole of the land acquired for road widening; thirdly, if it was acquired for that purpose, why has the road widening not been proceeded with; fourthly, if it has not been proceeded with, why was the property acquired; and, fifthly, why have other nearby premises on the road not been acquired *in toto*? All that the Hon. Mr. Whyte has asked for is an investigation. I suggest that the bare facts that I have set out indicate that there is every justification for such an investigation, and I therefore support the motion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### KINGSCOTE PLANNING REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris:

That the regulations made on March 14, 1974, under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1973, in respect of interim development control, District Council of Kingscote, laid on the table of this Council on March 19, 1974, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 14. Page 440.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): The Hon. Mr. DeGaris spelt out in detail the reasons for this motion, which I support. The ratepayers and the councils of Kangaroo Island believe that, because of the nature of

the island and because of their understanding of it, they themselves, with the assistance of the planning authority, can do a better job than can the authority in planning for the future of their children, tourism, and development. This is the nub of the problem. The Government is saying, "We must plan, and to hell with the wishes of the residents and ratepayers and councils of Kangaroo Island."

I wish that many councils in other parts of the State had taken the initiative that these people have taken regarding interim development controls. It would have been better for councils in other parts of the State to take positive action than to allow the authority in the ivory tower in Gawler Place to ride roughshod over those councils, resulting in centralized Government instead of open Government. As it is, the authority can dictate where woolsheds will go and what colour the homesteads will be. This is ridiculous. Will the Government agree to delegating authority under the interim control powers? Further, will the Government indicate what it will do after the expiration of the interim controls in 1976?

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

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

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

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I remind honourable members that Parliamentary Papers Nos. 11 and 11a were distributed to all members of the Legislative Council on August 8, 1974, and appeared in *Hansard* for that day at pages 336 to 378. Parliamentary Paper No. 11a contains full details of the Treasurer's explanations of the Loan Estimates covered in Parliamentary Paper No. 11. A copy of the unamended House of Assembly Bill No. 7 has been circulated to all honourable members. In all the circumstances, I do not propose to reread the Treasurer's explanations, and I seek leave of the Council to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF BILL

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held in June, the Australian Government agreed to support a total programme of just under \$935 000 000 for State works and services. This comprised a basic programme of \$925 000 000 and a special temporary allocation of just under \$10 000 000 for Queensland, especially for flood restoration works. The basic programme of \$925 000 000 derives from a gross programme of \$990 400 000, from which has been deducted the sum of \$65 400 000, being the full year's effect in 1974-75 of the Australian Government's assuming financial responsibility for tertiary education. The gross programme of \$990 400 000 is a fraction over 10 per cent in excess of the 1973-74 gross programme. The increase of about 10 per cent is common to all States. South Australia's share of the net programme of \$925 000 000, after offsets for tertiary education, is \$125 498 000. Of this sum, an amount of \$85 213 000 is to become available by way of loan subject to repayment and to full interest and an amount of \$40 285 000 by way of capital grant.

In addition to the new funds of \$125 498 000, the Government expects to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$55 100 000. Certain discounts and premiums on Loan issues and redemptions, which form

part of our Loan programme and are expected to amount to some \$402 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$181 000 000 becoming available during the course of the year. The total of payments proposed is \$181 185 000. This would lead to a nominal run down of \$185 000 during the year and would give a balance of \$4 312 000 at June 30, 1975.

Honourable members may find some of the bigger departmental provisions to be of interest. I shall deal with housing first. For housing programmes under the 1973 Housing Agreement the Australian Government has approved total funds of \$235 000 000 in 1974-75, an increase of about 7½ per cent above the \$218 650 000 provided last year. The proportionate increases vary widely from State to State and they take account of the performances of the various States in using last year's allocations as well as an assessment of relative needs. At \$38 400 000, South Australia's allocation is a little more than 17 per cent above that of last year. The Australian Government is willing to consider submissions for increased funds if they can be used effectively in this area of high priority. The Treasurer has written to the Prime Minister to show that South Australia could use additional funds to very good effect.

In 1973-74 advances to the State under the agreement aggregated \$32 750 000, of which \$17 250 000 was allocated to the State Bank and \$15 500 000 to the Housing Trust. This year we intend to give more emphasis to the Housing Trust, which will be responsible for providing housing associated with the Redcliff development as well as for its normal programme. Therefore, the allocation to the trust has been increased sharply to \$20 340 000. The State Bank is to receive a small increase in its allocation so that it will have \$18 060 000 of new funds. The State Bank makes advances also to people who do not comply with the means test and, for this purpose, uses circulating funds derived from interest margins and repayments of earlier advances and, as necessary, allocations of State Loan funds. During 1973-74, the bank made individual loans to a total of about \$16 200 000 to applicants outside the means test provisions, and in 1974-75 expects to make such loans to a total of about \$17 000 000. Of the advances of \$16 200 000 last year, about \$3 050 000 was made available early in the year from the new Housing Agreement funds and the balance was then met from circulating funds.

The rate of interest being charged by the bank on loans from the special low interest moneys to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent, while the rate on other loans is now 6½ per cent. During 1973-74 the maximum loan available to both categories of applicants was \$12 500. The Government has approved an increase in that limit to a new maximum of \$15 000 for 1974-75. As to the programme of the Housing Trust, the new agreement lays emphasis on rental housing, and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings built with the special funds which may be sold. In the trust's activities, too, the Australian Government is concerned particularly with the needs of low-income families, and the agreement provides that the trust will allocate to persons eligible under a defined means test a high proportion of the rental dwellings available. The trust will continue its other activities which include the provision of houses for people who do not meet the means test, the building of houses for sale as well as for rental, and the construction of factories. In carrying out these activities, the trust will

have available in 1974-75 about \$7 000 000 of circulating funds and \$5 800 000 of semi-government borrowing to supplement the special funds under the new agreement.

**LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$2 450 000**—It is intended to make a provision of \$2 450 000 from Loan Account to enable the bank to assist producer co-operatives in financing their replacement and expansion programmes. A further \$500 000 is expected to be available from semi-governmental loans.

**ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$2 000 000**—Advances of Loan funds to the State Bank are made from time to time to provide additional capital for the expansion of its banking activities. An amount of \$2 000 000 was made available last year to enable the bank to expand in the normal way and to finance loans for housing in cases where applicants fell outside the means test under the new Housing Agreement. It is desirable this year to provide adequate funds for these purposes, and a further advance of \$2 000 000 is proposed.

**ROADS AND BRIDGES, \$1 000 000**—An advance of \$2 000 000 was made in 1973-74 towards financing the sealing of Eyre Highway. The Commonwealth Aid Roads Act expired on June 30 last, and new legislation is being arranged to grant assistance to States for roads and transportation purposes. The prospects now are that the remaining work on the Eyre Highway will be financed under the proposed National Highways Bill. However, until the necessary legislation is effective, funds may be required to continue work on this project and to cover other transitional arrangements. An advance of \$1 000 000 is proposed for these purposes.

**SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE, \$450 000**—A provision of \$450 000 is needed to bring this drainage scheme to completion in 1974-75.

**OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$1 800 000**—From the increasing number of requests for assistance in financing storm-water and effluent drainage schemes, it is apparent that councils are becoming conscious of the need for adequate drainage. Towards meeting this need, it is intended to provide \$1 800 000 for subsidies in 1974-75. Of this, \$800 000 is towards floodwater drainage and \$1 000 000 towards completion of effluent drainage schemes already approved and in progress, or schemes where pollution of water supply by effluent may create a health hazard to the community.

**IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$2 300 000**—An allocation of \$2 300 000 is intended for 1974-75 to continue urgent work on the rehabilitation of pumping and water distribution facilities mainly in the Waikerie and Berri areas.

**RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$500 000**—The Renmark Irrigation Trust Act provides for the Government to finance by loans and grants the cost of a new pumping station, rehabilitation of the irrigation works, and the provision of additional drainage and of reticulated water supply within the trust area. An allocation of \$500 000 is proposed for this purpose for 1974-75.

**AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$4 200 000**—The capital programme for 1974-75, including establishment and maintenance of forests and the purchase of machinery and vehicles, is estimated to require \$4 400 000. Of this amount, \$4 200 000 is to be provided from Loan Account and \$200 000 from softwoods agreement funds advanced by the Australian Government.

**RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, \$12 600 000**—For 1974-75, the Way and Works Branch of the South Australian Railways is to be allocated \$7 888 000, of which \$2 838 000 is

for such standard works as relaying and upgrading tracks, construction of bridges and culverts, installation of signalling and safety devices, and construction of buildings. An amount of \$5 050 000 is provided for the continuation of work on the duplication of a track from Brighton to Port Stanvac and the extension of the railway from Port Stanvac to Christie Downs. The sum of \$4 712 000 is to be made available to the Rolling Stock Branch, including \$2 050 000 for the new passenger vehicles for the Christie Downs electrified line. During the year the Government entered into an agreement with the Australian Government to undertake projects in connection with urban public transport, and financial assistance by way of grants is expected to the extent of two-thirds of the cost of those projects. In the \$12 600 000 programme, \$7 100 000 is included for urban transport. However, the world-wide demand for electrical equipment of the kind we need will make it difficult to achieve that target.

**HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$5 800 000**—A provision of \$5 800 000 is proposed for the financing of construction of the bulk grain and phosphate berth at Port Lincoln, container ship installations at Outer Harbor, deepening and widening of the Port Adelaide River, and other minor projects.

**WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$35 860 000**—A provision of \$35 860 000 is proposed for 1974-75. Loans from the Australian Government of about \$3 500 000 towards sewerage works are also expected. These funds are planned to be applied to works as follows:

**Metropolitan Waterworks, \$11 131 000**—A sum of \$1 650 000 is proposed for the continuation of work on the major trunk water main from Darlington to Port Adelaide, and for a large capacity tank at Seaclyff. An amount of \$1 665 000 is to be made available for continued work on the Little Para dam. The prime purpose of this reservoir will be to provide a balancing storage for the Mannum-Adelaide main system, so that the main can be operated safely at its maximum capacity. This project, when completed, will meet the increasing demand for water in the rapidly developing suburbs in the Northern Adelaide Plains. Expenditure of \$3 000 000 is planned for the Hope Valley water treatment plant. This project is the first stage of a programme to supply the metropolitan area with filtered and treated water. Representations have been made to the Australian Government for a specific grant for this purpose, and I am confident that our submission will be successful. A provision of \$200 000 is required for the purchase of land in water catchment areas in order to protect the metropolitan water supplies from pollution.

**Country Waterworks, \$8 663 000**—A further \$700 000 is proposed to continue construction of the water main connecting the Tod trunk main with Kimba. Financial assistance of two-thirds of expenditure on this project is available from the Australian Government. An amount of \$400 000 is required for the construction of three pumping stations on the Morgan-Whyalla main, and \$400 000 for further work on replacement of the old Tod trunk main between Minnipa and Thevenard. The need for an additional source of water on Eyre Peninsula is now becoming acute. A total of \$1 100 000 is proposed for the Uley South Basin scheme consisting of eight bores, a collecting tank, and a pumping station to augment supply. A scheme has been approved to supplement the water supply to the South Coast towns of Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, and

Goolwa by pumping from Myponga reservoir. An amount of \$710 000 is appropriated for this purpose. A sum of \$1 000 000 has been included for the replacement of portion of the existing water main of the Morgan-Whyalla main with a steel pipeline.

**Metropolitan Sewerage, \$8 536 000**—An amount of \$872 000 is proposed for further extensions to the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, and \$590 000 for additional facilities at Bolivar. An allocation of \$450 000 is planned for the reconstruction of sewers in the south-western suburbs, and \$750 000 for the north-eastern suburbs. A further amount of \$500 000 will be needed for similar work in other areas. About \$2 000 000 will be provided for the construction of sewers in new areas at Athelstone, Blackwood, Braeview, Christies Beach, and Morphett Vale. As already referred to, the Australian Government is expected to assist substantially in the financing of sewerage projects.

**Country Sewerage, \$3 470 000**—This provision is required for sewerage works at Gawler, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Victor Harbor, and the treatment works at Murray Bridge, Whyalla, and Woodside.

**RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS ETC., \$2 250 000**—A provision of \$2 250 000 is proposed for 1974-75. South Australia's share of the cost of construction of the Dartmouth reservoir this year is expected to be \$4 000 000. Half of this amount is expected to be advanced by the Australian Government, and \$2 000 000 is to be financed from Loan funds. Our contribution towards expenditure on other works is estimated to be about \$250 000.

**GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$83 500 000.**

**Hospital Buildings, \$21 000 000**—Some of the major proposals for 1974-75 are:

**Flinders Medical Centre**—A sum of \$14 522 000 is included for continuing work on a ward block comprising accommodation for 370 beds, basic clinical and out-patient departments, operating theatres, and radiology facilities. Work will also start on phase 3 of the project comprising further clinical departments and accommodation for an additional 120 beds.

**Glenside Hospital**—A sum of \$305 000 is proposed for redevelopment of the hospital, including the erection of a single-storey 64 bed sub-acute wards building.

**Hillcrest Hospital**—The amount of \$1 033 000 is provided for the new admission ward, consulting rooms, out-patient facilities, occupational therapy wing, administration building and other facilities.

**Mount Gambier**—A sum of \$1 100 000 is included for work to continue on extensions to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science laboratories, a new nurses' training school, and an additional wing to the staff block.

**Port Pirie Hospital**—A sum of \$365 000 is provided for construction of a new geriatric centre, a nurses' home and a surgical ward, and for remodelling of the administration building.

**School Buildings, \$42 700 000**—It is intended that these funds be applied as follows:

Pre-schools:	\$
Work in progress on conversion of four existing buildings to pre-schools at a total cost of \$271 000 . . . . .	254 000
The commencement of 13 new projects with a total value of \$1 052 000 . . . . .	896 000
Preliminary investigations and design . . . . .	50 000
	<hr/>
	\$1 200 000

Primary and Secondary Schools:	\$
Work in progress on 71 major projects at a total value of \$33 733 000 . . . . .	18 808 000
The commencement of 33 new major projects estimated to cost \$21 072 000 . . . . .	3 054 000
Emergency classroom accommodation . . . . .	2 000 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences . . . . .	2 350 000
Minor works and buildings . . . . .	4 288 000
Furniture . . . . .	1 300 000
Preliminary investigation and design . . . . .	1 300 000
	<hr/>
	\$33 100 000

Further Education:	\$
Work in progress on five major projects at a total value of \$3 347 000 . . . . .	1 770 000
The commencement of two new major projects estimated to cost \$17 339 000 . . . . .	5 575 000
Emergency classroom accommodation . . . . .	150 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences . . . . .	300 000
Minor works and buildings . . . . .	255 000
Furniture and equipment . . . . .	150 000
Preliminary investigations and design . . . . .	200 000
	<hr/>
	\$8 400 000

Grants of about \$20 800 000 are expected to be received from the Australian Government in 1974-75 comprising \$1 200 000 for pre-schools, about \$14 200 000 towards primary and secondary school buildings and \$5 400 000 towards further education projects. Of the latter, some \$200 000 may be re-allocated from buildings to equipment for which the financial transactions would be recorded through Revenue Account.

Other Government Buildings, \$19 800 000—The more important provisions for 1974-75 are as follows:

Attorney-General's Department—A sum of \$500 000 is included for a new forensic science building which will accommodate the Chemistry Department, the Coroners Department and the Forensic Pathology Section of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

Department for Community Welfare—A sum of \$272 000 is proposed for the construction of a Community Welfare Centre at Port Augusta.

Department of Correctional Services—The sum of \$230 000 is allocated for additions and safety installations at Yatala Labour Prison, \$280 000 for improvements at Port Lincoln gaol, and \$60 000 for Adelaide Gaol.

Department of Public Health—The sum of \$2 000 000 is planned for expenditure on the new Principal School of Dental Therapy at North Terrace, \$773 000 for continuation of work on the Dental Therapy Training Clinic at Somerton Park, and \$430 000 for the completion of 13 dental clinics already under construction. Australian Government grants are expected for these works.

Local and District Criminal Courts Department—The sum of \$372 000 is required to continue construction of the Adelaide Juvenile Court, \$430 000 for the Mt. Gambier Court, and \$400 000 to commence redevelopment of the western courts building.

Department of Transport—The sum of \$400 000 is provided to commence work on an office block for this department.

Parliament House—A sum of \$1 250 000 is proposed for continuation of the redevelopment of Parliament House.

New Administration Building—The sum of \$3 950 000 is included for the new office block being constructed on the corner of Flinders Street and Gawler Place.

STATE PLANNING AUTHORITY, \$100 000—In each of 1972-73 and 1973-74, advances of \$1 500 000 were made to the authority, whereas for 1974-75 the proposal is for an

advance of only \$100 000. The reason is that the Government had planned to use the authority as the vehicle for land acquisition pending the formal establishment of the Land Commission and the Monarto Development Commission. The authority has acquired land at Monarto and will continue to do so at the request of, and as financed by, the Monarto Development Commission. The Land Commission was established early enough to handle its own acquisition programme and therefore has not needed to call on the services of the State Planning Authority in this respect.

The funds now proposed for the State Planning Authority are to meet the requirements of the Hackney redevelopment scheme and similar projects as may be determined by the Government. As to the use of the funds made available in 1972-73 and 1973-74, I will deal with this in a moment in my comments about Monarto.

LOAN TO ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, \$2 000 000—The capital works programme of the trust in 1974-75 is expected to be \$34 900 000. Work will continue on the first stage of the Torrens Island Power Station "B", where expenditure is expected to total \$15 770 000. The first steam unit in this station is expected to be available for commercial use in June, 1975, and the second unit about 12 months later. The power station at Dry Creek is nearing completion. The second gas turbine unit began operating in May last, and the third unit is expected to begin commercial operation this month.

Expenditure on the transmission and distribution system is expected to be about \$15 340 000. Further progress will be made on the reinforcement of supply to the South-East. This work includes the construction of the Para to Tailem Bend 275 000-volt transmission line, the 132 000-volt substation at Kincaig, and additions to the substation at Tailem Bend. Reticulation to rural consumers will again be concentrated in the Lucindale-Kingston area. A provision has also been made to build the Sliding Rock to Nepabunna line. The general expansion of the distribution system in the metropolitan area is expected to continue at a normal rate of development. The trust's programme is to be financed mainly from its own internal funds. Only \$2 000 000 is to be provided from State Loan funds and \$4 000 000 is to be raised by borrowing under the semi-government loan programme.

LOAN TO LEIGH CREEK COALFIELD, \$1 000 000—In recent years, capital expenditure in connection with the Leigh Creek coalfield has been met from internal funds. The programme for 1974-75 has reached a level where an advance from Loan Account is necessary. Of the estimated requirements totalling \$2 324 000, \$1 324 000 can be made available internally and an allocation of \$1 000 000 from State funds is proposed. The largest single project planned for 1974-75 is the development of the Lobe "B" coal area. The proposed works will include diversion of a creek, construction of foundations, a rail siding, and provision of conveyors and bins.

LOAN TO NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY, \$5 000 000—The Government is prepared to allocate portion of its available Loan funds to finance capital services necessary to the operation of the petro-chemical complex at Red Cliff Point, although in this, as in some other major matters, we must rely on a heavy infusion of special grants or loans from the Australian Government. The details of the ways in which gas and liquids pipelines, water mains, harbor works and power facilities should be financed have not yet been determined. However, we have decided that an initial allocation of \$5 000 000 of Loan funds and almost

\$5 000 000 of semi-government borrowing authority should be reserved this year for these purposes. For convenience it has been nominated as for the pipelines authority.

**MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST, \$2 400 000**—For the four years 1973-74 to 1976-77 the capital programme of the trust envisages the net expenditure of about \$22 500 000 at present price levels for the transfer of licensed services, the purchase of new buses, the acquisition of land for depots, the construction of buildings and purchase of plant. If the whole of this programme were accepted by the Australian Government for support under the urban transport arrangements, then two-thirds of the cost, say \$15 000 000, would be covered by grants and one-third of the cost, say \$7 500 000, would be a charge to State funds. However, we have not been successful as yet in getting approval for the costs of transfer of licensed services to be financed under the special urban transport arrangements, and the net cost to the State over the four-year period could be as high as \$9 000 000. A contribution of \$2 400 000 towards the programme is proposed in 1974-75.

**UNIVERSITY AND ADVANCED EDUCATION BUILDINGS, \$500 000**—It had been the intention to have all payments in respect of the State's liability for tertiary education for the period up to December 31, 1973, brought to account during 1973-74. For 1974-75 onwards the proposal is that tertiary education, being entirely a financial responsibility of the Australian Government, shall be handled through a trust account. However, it was not possible for all the detailed calculations to be given effect in 1973-74 and, accordingly, it is necessary to appropriate a further sum of about \$500 000 this year to complete the previous arrangements for shared programmes.

**NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$6 000 000**—A provision of \$6 000 000 is proposed for 1974-75. The two main grants which are planned to be made available are as follows: A sum of \$1 970 000 for the Home for Incurables to continue the expansion programme which will provide an additional 400 beds when completed; and \$470 000 for the Adelaide Children's Hospital towards redevelopment of wards and theatres in the old portion of the hospital. In addition, subsidies are proposed to 34 other hospitals and institutions.

**LAND COMMISSION, \$1 000 000**—When the Bill was presented a year ago, the Land Commission had not been established and, for convenience, funds were included in the provision for the State Planning Authority. The Land Commission was established early enough to conduct its own affairs and, accordingly, did not call on the services of the State Planning Authority, nor did it use the funds allocated to that authority. The accounts record that amounts aggregating \$4 125 000 were advances to the Land Commission from Loan Account in 1973-74 and this was far above what the Government had intended at the beginning of the year. The reason was the late receipt of moneys from the Australian Government as a result of unforeseen delays in getting agreements signed and satisfactory administrative procedures set up. The State was then forced into the situation of having to make large temporary advances of working capital for the commission. In the event, the cash payments of the commission in 1973-74 were as follows:

	\$
Acquisition of land .. . . .	8 512 000
Administrative and establishment expenses .. . . .	102 000
	<hr/>
	\$8 614 000

The funds available to the commission were as follows:

	\$
Advances from the Australian Government .. . . .	8 000 000
Advances from Loan Account .. . . .	4 125 000
Semi-government borrowings .. . . .	200 000
Sundry income .. . . .	6 000
	<hr/>
	\$12 331 000

At June 30, 1974, the commission was holding a cash balance of \$3 717 000. The estimated repayments to Loan Account in 1974-75 included a proposed recovery of \$2 000 000 of the funds made available temporarily in 1973-74. The necessity for working capital, and hence the timing of this repayment, will depend on the arrangements made with the Australian Government for financing this year's programme of acquisition and development. It is essential that these programmes be planned on a long-term basis by both Governments and the Treasurer has suggested an early conference to try to achieve this. In the meantime, we are uncertain of the extent to which the Australian Government will provide financial assistance this year. The 1974-75 programme, which has been advised to that Government, has been drawn up to give a smooth and balanced expansion in the activities of the commission. It provides for the following:

	\$
Further acquisition of land .. . . .	16 000 000
Development of land—a minimum of .. . . .	3 000 000
Administration .. . . .	420 000
	<hr/>
	\$19 420 000

The Bill proposes an allocation of \$1 000 000 of State funds, and this may be supplemented by \$1 500 000 to be raised under semi-government borrowing arrangements. This is a rough measure of the extent to which the Government believes it can afford to divert funds from elsewhere to support the commission. It can function effectively only with the assistance of large advances from the Australian Government. As control of land prices is an essential part of the Australian Government's plan to curb inflation, I am confident that the necessary funds will be forthcoming.

**MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, \$1 000 000**—When the Bill was presented a year ago the Monarto Development Commission had not been established and, for convenience, funds were included in the provisions for the State Planning Authority. The authority had commenced the acquisition of land at Monarto in 1972-73 and, on the establishment of the commission, it was decided that the acquisition programme should be continued by the authority. This situation will continue into 1974-75, when the main programme of acquisitions will be completed. As with the Land Commission and for similar reasons, the State Government has found itself in the situation of having to provide much larger amounts of working capital than originally planned. To June 30, 1974, the cash payments made by the Monarto Development Commission or by the State Planning Authority on its behalf were as follows:

	\$
Acquisition of Land .. . . .	5 322 000
Establishment expenses .. . . .	225 000
Planning and research .. . . .	268 000
Development of nursery .. . . .	126 000
Administration .. . . .	415 000
	<hr/>
	\$6 356 000

The funds made available for the commission's purposes to June 30, 1974, were as follows:

	\$
Advances by the Australian Government ..	4 413 000
Advances from Loan Account—	
To State Planning Authority .....	2 800 000
To Monarto Development Commission ..	2 000 000
Semi-government borrowing .....	400 000
Sundry income .....	43 000
	<hr/>
	\$9 656 000

At June 30, 1974, the cash balance held by or on behalf of the commission was \$3 300 000.

The estimated repayments to Loan Account in 1974-75 include a proposed recovery of \$2 000 000 of the funds made available temporarily in 1973-74. The necessity for working capital, and hence the timing of this repayment, will depend on the arrangements made with the Australian Government for financing this year's programme. As with the Land Commission, it is essential that the Monarto programme be planned on a long-term basis by both Governments, and an early conference is required. In the meantime we are uncertain of the extent to which the Australian Government will provide financial assistance this year. The 1974-75 programme, which has been advised to that Government, provides for the following:

	\$
Further land acquisition .....	4 000 000
Planning and research .....	940 000
Design .....	1 010 000
Development .....	900 000
Site maintenance and operation .....	340 000
Administration .....	1 640 000
	<hr/>
	\$8 830 000

The Bill proposes an allocation of \$1 000 000 of State funds, and this may be supplemented by \$1 500 000 to be raised under semi-government borrowing arrangements. This is a rough measure of the amount which the Government believes can be set aside to support Monarto. The planned development can proceed only with the full and continued support of the Australian Government. In the event that this support is not forthcoming to the extent necessary to finance this programme the Government will have no alternative but to require the commission to drastically curtail its operations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, \$1 400 000—An allocation of \$1 400 000 is required for the purchase of new equipment to replace certain old units and to upgrade the present installation in order to meet increasing demands from departments for data processing services.

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT, \$800 000—An amount of \$800 000 is included this year to provide capital grants to councils and other organizations towards recreational and sporting facilities. This is an area in which the Australian Government is expected to make an increasing volume of grants.

The clauses of the Bill are in the normal form. Clause 1 gives the short title in the usual way. Clause 2 specifies the operative date of the Bill. Clause 3 gives definitions as in the past. Clause 4 sets out the moneys which make up the Loan Fund. Clause 5 provides for the borrowing of South Australia's known allocation for 1974-75 of \$85 213 000, has additional authority in general terms to cover a possible supplementary allocation, and also any increased indebtedness due to discounts. Clause 6 provides for the expenditure of \$181 185 000 on the purposes set out in the first schedule.

Clause 7 authorizes those advances made during 1973-74 by way of warrant pursuant to section 32b of the Public

Finance Act. Clause 8 makes the usual provision for temporary finance, if required. Clause 9 gives the normal authority for borrowing and expenditure of Loan moneys in the early months of 1975-76. Clause 10 gives the normal authority for the Treasurer to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft, if necessary. Clause 11 directs that all moneys received by way of grants under any Commonwealth Act relating to roads or transport shall be credited to special accounts to be paid out as required for the purposes of those Acts. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

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

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
Read a third time and passed.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
Read a third time and passed.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
Read a third time and passed.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 520.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): To have a clear understanding of the import of this Bill, it is necessary to go back to the original Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act of 1967 and to look clearly at the provisions of that Act which this Bill sets out to amend. The original Act was a great breakthrough for the State of South Australia, because it meant that, for the first time, we were able to be assured in Adelaide of a large supply of indigenous fuel, a matter I have always regarded as of tremendous importance to the State. I did at the time, and I have seen or heard nothing since that in any way alters my opinion on that matter.

The 1967 Act established an authority to create and control the pipeline, and the authority consisted of six members nominated by various people: two by the Minister, one by the Electricity Trust of South Australia and one by the South Australian Gas Company (the latter two being the major consumers), and two by the producers. Section 10 of the Act gave enormous powers to the authority subject, I think, to the control of the Minister. I shall refer to that in more detail a little later. Section 12 gave the power of acquisition of land for pipelines and for storage of natural gas as well, and section 13 virtually created the authority as a common carrier, a phase well known in the law for almost a century.

The emphasis I must place is on the fact that the authority was created solely in relation to natural gas. The Bill sets out to amend this important Act in several ways: first, it sets out to amend the constitution of the authority (that is, the constitution of the members of the authority) by making them all nominated by the Minister and cutting out the right of the consumers and the producers to nominate any members. The purpose of clause 8 is to substitute the word "petroleum" for "natural gas", and this is a massive change. Petroleum, in the Bill, is a defined word and includes liquids and solids as well as gas. It includes refined products and it includes mixtures of these substances with other substances. Here again, I emphasize that, when the Act was first passed, it related only to naturally occurring gas occurring in the State of South Australia. As I have said, the third thing is that section 13 established the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority

as a common carrier, which meant that anyone using gas within reach of the pipeline could, in effect, demand that it be carried on reasonable terms by the pipeline.

I should like to deal with those three things, and first of all the constitution of the authority. I query why the Government finds it necessary to nominate all members of the authority now instead of giving the producers and the consumers the right to nominate one-third of the authority each: in other words, giving them the right between them to nominate two-thirds of the authority and the Government the right to nominate the other one-third, or two members each out of six. I do not know what the motive of this is. I should have thought that the views of the consumers on this equation were more important than those of the Government. After all, the producers discovered the occurrence of natural gas and, if it had not been for their enterprise and ingenuity (I know much about the early days of Santos when Mr. Levorsen, the great geologist from America, displayed such wonderful perception) there would have been no pipeline at all. So one would have thought that the producers were the most important people in this matter—or, at least, I would have thought that. I would have thought then that the people who purchased and distributed the gas for the benefit of the State were the next most important people, and I would have rather thought that the Government should be trailing along in the shadows of these excellent people, but apparently it is demanding all power.

I can go back clearly to when this Act was passed, because it so happened that voluntarily I was one of the people who made it financially possible for this authority to get its funds so that it could operate. I remember going with Sir Norman Young, at my own expense, to Melbourne to see the then Prime Minister, Mr. Holt, and the then Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, to persuade them that South Australia should be allocated funds other than normal Loan Council funds so that it could use the money to build this pipeline, which was so important, without having to call upon its ordinary Loan Fund allocation. It was a big project and, if the money for it had had to come out of the ordinary allocation, it would have been very hard to get the project off the ground; also, other essential public works would have had to suffer. I also remember persuading the bank, of which I was Chairman for about 22 years, that it should make an enormous allocation of funds to the pipeline, much more proportionately than it had ever lent before to anyone, for the sake of South Australia at what I see the Minister then referred to as a "higher interest rate than he would have liked—5½ per cent", which is still the prevailing rate on that allocation! I also had the honour, as a director of a large life assurance company, to help rally those people to establish a big consortium to subscribe to this excellent project. With those people (I was not the only one in it, of course, but I did pull my weight strongly in it) we raised for the authority most of the \$25 000 000 odd that was needed to get the project going which, I suggest, it would have found it very difficult to raise without the co-operation and assistance of these people.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Mr. Walsh, who was Premier at that time, was very pleased with that.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes. He even said he would make a public acknowledgement of the assistance he had received from me but I understand certain people intervened because they thought that the Liberals should not get any credit for assisting a Labor Government—but that is another story. My first question is this. These people subscribed to this authority knowing that two of the

six members would be appointed by the consumers. Have they in any way been consulted on whether they agree to the whole nature of the authority being changed? As far as I know, they have not, and I should be in a position to know. I would not be told everything that goes on in these institutions, but I think I would have been told if this had been done, even as a matter of courtesy, because the commitments are guaranteed by the Government. Those people did not advance this money to a totally Government-nominated authority: they advanced it to an authority nominated by interested parties with which they were associated in business as well. I should like to know, too, whether these people have been consulted about the provision in this Bill to cut out the role of the pipeline as a common carrier, because I should have thought that that was an important factor when considering advancing money for the project—whether other people should be permitted to have their gas carried in that pipeline as of right. Now, for some reason that is not properly explained, this is being omitted. The only reference to this in the second reading explanation is as follows:

Clause 10 repeals section 13 of the principal Act which in the opinion of the Government places an unnecessary restriction on the powers of the authority in that it may deprive the authority of its discretion in making available its facilities.

A Government of the same colour as that in power now introduced this legislation in the first place and why it did not know that in the first place I do not know, or is it a fact at this stage—but I do not know that, either. I think it is proper that a pipeline of this nature should be a common carrier for other producers and not confined merely as a monopoly for one existing section of the producers. I am sure that the existing producers themselves would not necessarily want it, either, because it could well be that they would make other discoveries themselves and would want that gas transported.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would that have an effect on exploration—the fact that it was not a common carrier?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think it would, but there are other disastrous things having a much greater effect on exploration, things such as the withdrawal of any Commonwealth Government assistance for exploration. That is disastrous. The Australian Government's attitude on this matter has completely stopped all oil exploration. In fact, the present Australian Government, as it calls itself, has achieved the removal to other countries of rigs that were operating in this country, which is a disaster. However, that is by the way. One of the most serious aspects of the Bill was drawn to honourable members' attention yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. I am grateful to the honourable gentleman for drawing it to my attention, as I had not noticed it previously. Whether I would have done so when I studied the matter, I do not know. He pointed out the enormous powers that have been conferred on the authority by section 10 of the Act.

I emphasize that those powers were conferred solely in relation to natural gas, and in 1967, when the Act was passed, there were no natural gas installations of any sort in this State, except possibly for some extremely minor ones. The Act established all these installations, and it is only proper that full power should have been given to the authority regarding the establishment of natural gas installations. Natural gas is defined in the 1967 Act as meaning any substance of a gaseous nature referred to therein. When the Act was passed there were many important installations relating to liquid petroleum. I refer, for example, to the installation at Birkenhead, where the



refined product is stored. I refer also to the installation at Port Stanvac for the storage of natural liquid petroleum and refined products; there is also the refinery at Port Stanvac. When one comes to consider the legislation relating to natural gas which was introduced when there were no natural gas installations in this State but which also covers liquid petroleum as well as gaseous petroleum, in respect of the liquids, there having been in this State massive installations for possibly most of this century—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Are you afraid that the authority will take over these pipelines?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Minister is being extremely perceptive. I am not necessarily afraid that this may happen. However, in my opinion this Bill gives the authority power to take over these installations. We will hear more about that later. Indeed, honourable members will hear more about it from me immediately. Section 10 (1) has 11 paragraphs relating to the powers of the authority. I refer particularly to paragraph (e), which provides that the authority may purchase, take on lease, or otherwise by agreement acquire, hold, maintain, develop and operate any natural gas storages and the necessary facilities, apparatus and equipment for their operation. That provision was passed in 1967 when there were no natural gas storages (although there were liquid gas storages) in this State. It is intended to amend this paragraph so that all these things can be done in relation to petroleum, whether gaseous, liquid, solid, refined or a mixture. In other words, the authority has been given power to do these things in relation to any sort of petroleum product. Section 12 (1) provides as follows:

With the approval of the Governor, the authority may, either by agreement or compulsorily, acquire or take land for the purpose of constructing or operating a pipeline or natural gas storage facilities connected or to be connected with a pipeline and for any other purposes—  
and here is the rub—  
of this Act.

Of course, the Act includes section 10 (1) (e), to which I have already referred. My interpretation of it (and if the Minister disagrees with me, he will no doubt say so in reply) is that this Bill purports to give the proposed petroleum pipelines authority absolute powers over all petroleum products in South Australia. The authority is now to be a completely Government-appointed instrumentality. Is this a back-door way of doing the sorts of thing that honourable members were criticizing the other day in relation to the Emergency Powers Bill? It gives the Government the authority, without reference to Parliament, to acquire, for instance, the Port Stanvac refinery.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: I should not think it will give firms any confidence in investing in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think I am right in my interpretation. If the Minister thinks I am wrong he will, when he has studied what I have said, no doubt correct me. Because of the way in which the Bill has been drawn, one would almost think that it had been designed specifically to enable the authority to do just the things I have been saying, namely, to take over all existing oil installations in relation to all petroleum products, if it so desires.

These are questions that must be answered before the Bill can pass, certainly, anyhow, in its entirety. If this is what it means, there must be what my honourable Leader refers to as "surgery" applied to the Bill to remove these powers, because either the Government wants these powers or it does not want them. It has not said that it is seeking them. Therefore, if it wants them it should say so, at which time we will no doubt decide whether or not it is proper for the Government to have them. If the Government does not want these powers and this is not a proper interpretation (which is, in my opinion, more than a possibility), the Bill must be amended so that it is no longer capable of such an interpretation.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Don't some of the pipelines to which you have referred come under another Act—the Inflammable Liquids Act, I think?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: True, other Acts relate to such matters, but I do not think they in any way inhibit the powers that would be granted by this Bill if it became law. I therefore query three things: first, should not the producers and consumers (they are, after all, the important people in the equation) still have the right to appoint representatives to this authority with which they must be so vitally concerned; secondly, are the powers that are being given by this Bill as wide as I think they may be; and, thirdly, is it right and proper, only seven years after the principal Act was passed, to remove the requirement that the pipeline shall be a common carrier, especially without reference to the people who financed it?

I look forward to the Minister's answering those questions in reply. In the meantime, I should like very much to hear the opinion of other honourable members on these matters. I would certainly advocate, as the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan did yesterday, that this Bill be not dealt with hastily but that the Council should consider it deeply and fully understand its implications before it is given the status of legislation.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 22, at 2.15 p.m.