

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 17, 1974

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Art Gallery Act Amendment,
Evidence Act Amendment,
Evidence (Affidavits) Act Amendment,
Judges' Pensions Act Amendment,
Royal Institution for the Blind Act Amendment,
Wrongs Act Amendment.

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON present a petition from five elected representatives of the District Council of Barossa stating that the District Council of Barossa had received from 563 residents a request that the council oppose any move by the Government to force that council as presently constituted out of existence, and that 61 residents supported the findings of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. The petitioners prayed that the Legislative Council would have due regard to the expressed wish of the majority of these people and reject any legislation aimed at the dissolution of the District Council of Barossa as presently constituted.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

BUSH FIRES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have received information from the Lower South-Eastern Fire Fighting Association, and I quote part of a letter written by that association, as follows:

You will be aware that this area has particular fire fuel not common to other areas due to pine plantations, both governmental and private, together with extreme growth common to high rainfall locations such as ours. Having experienced a further season of daylight saving hours, the requirement of the Act for fires not to be lit prior to 12 noon, in effect now 11 a.m. standard time, is still a serious concern, there being an additional one hour of burning during day-time hours when weather variances may occur. Further, employees of forestry industries in effect complete their workshift in mid-afternoon or one hour earlier than standard time, when further hours of fire vigilance are required. Companies are unable to retain such employees on fire duty when in effect their presence is often essential. Naturally heavy overtime costs are therefore involved and this is associated with a deterioration of morale.

No doubt this matter has engaged the Minister's attention, and I ask whether the Government has adopted any policy on it.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I confess that this matter has been brought to my attention several times since daylight saving has been operating in this State. We have found that in the past this policy, as it concerns the operations of the Woods and Forests Department involving fire prevention, has worked quite well. However, now that the Leader has raised the matter here, I will certainly ascertain what exactly is the situation, although I assure him that there is no definite policy on this matter.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I know the concern with which the Minister views the bush fire situation in this State. Having heard on radio broadcasts and seen in press releases the warnings he has given on this matter, I ask the Minister, first, whether, as the Bush Fires Act has not been amended since 1972, he considers that it is adequate to meet any emergency that may arise as a result of the extremely dangerous situation that exists this year. Secondly, has he in mind any amendments to put before Parliament this session?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member is probably aware that the Bush Fires Act needs to be rewritten. I have set up a committee which is looking at this very matter at present. I hope that legislation will be ready reasonably soon, but I doubt whether we will be able to introduce it this session. The committee is working around the clock to consolidate the legislation so that it can be presented to Parliament for consideration. I will check to see what the situation is.

BEEF PRICES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question relates to the price of cattle, which is no doubt a matter of concern to the Minister as well as to every other person associated with primary industry. This morning I obtained details of yesterday's sale prices of cattle. My informant tells me that heavy bullocks that last year were bringing \$350 a head are now bringing \$110 a head; yearlings that brought \$190 last year are now bringing \$75; cows \$250 last year, now \$80; and vealers that brought a top price of \$170 last year are now bringing \$84.50. That represents a dramatic decrease in price, yet I understand the price of meat in butcher shops has not dropped to anywhere near that extent in the same period; my informant tells me that the price decrease in butcher shops is about 15 per cent. Last year we were looking for an export tax to prevent cattle from being sent out of the country, but this year we have a different problem. My informant tells me that one way of overcoming the over-supply is to create greater consumer demand in Australia, but that is not occurring at present because price decreases are not being passed on to the consumers. Will the Minister set up, through the appropriate Minister in another place or through the department, an investigation to ascertain why the decrease in stock prices is not being passed on to the consumer? If the decrease was passed on to the consumer, a greater demand would be created. Further, will the Minister take up the matter at a meeting of the Agricultural Council, or will he call a special meeting of the council, if possible, because the whole of Australia is affected, to discuss the problem and work out ways of overcoming it by seeking new markets or by some other method?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member knows that the meat industry is not under price control, and we are therefore unable to control the price of meat in butcher shops. Nevertheless, I will refer that part of the honourable member's question to my colleague and see whether something cannot be done to bring to the notice of the consuming public that it is not getting a fair deal as regards the price of beef, as compared with the price paid to beef producers. Regarding the honourable member's other question, it is

difficult for a State Minister to call a special meeting of the Agricultural Council. I can make overtures to the Australian Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) but I doubt whether that would accomplish anything in the present situation. The honourable member knows full well that the overseas markets for our beef are at present anything but good. The reasons for this situation have been given on the media. Consumer spending has been retarded somewhat in Japan, where there is a high rate of inflation, in excess of 20 per cent. I looked at this matter when I was in Japan, where the price of beef is so high. Indeed, the price can vary from \$5 a pound to \$25 a pound. Some friends with whom I had dinner two nights ago had been to Japan, and they told me that one can purchase meat in butcher shops there at that price.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That would be undercut, I suppose?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think it would be Kobe undercut beef. Nevertheless, that is the situation. The price of Australian beef in Japan can range from \$5 to \$10 a pound. If the Japanese authorities want to cut consumer spending, that is one way to do it. On the other hand, we have the Mid-West of the United States actively campaigning to restrict beef imports from Australia. If the honourable member reads the *Australian* or the *Advertiser* of a couple of days ago he will find that that is so; the beef industry in the United States is worried about imports, especially from Australia, and some move was to have been made to reintroduce quotas in the United States as they applied several years ago. We have increased the production of beef in Australia, and even in South Australia, where beef numbers have increased 200 per cent in the past 18 months. We have had a good season that has encouraged production, and we are a small nation of 13 000 000 people relying on exports. If we cannot export to our normal markets then new markets will have to be found. It is difficult to do that at this stage. I understand that the Department of Trade, through the Australian Meat Board, is attempting to do it. Most agricultural industries go through such periods at certain times and it appears that the wool and beef industries are doing that at the moment. Perhaps in the future, in 12 months or two years (although I hope it will not take so long), those industries may get out of the present position and find better world markets.

VIRGINIA WATER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question is one that has been asked on some occasions previously, and it refers to the potential use of recycled water in the Virginia area. I am grateful, as honourable members will be aware, to the Minister of Agriculture, for giving the late Hon. Harry Kemp and me an opportunity to view the trials that were in progress for a period of three years. I think all honourable members well know the urgency of the situation (even though it has been a very wet winter in Virginia) and the parlous condition of the underground water supplies. I understand that the three-year period of trials undertaken by the department has concluded and that a report has been completed. The Minister was kind enough to tell me on a previous occasion that he would endeavour to make this known as soon as possible. Has the Minister any information to give the Council about the report, whether in fact it has been completed and, if so, when he will be able to release the findings to this Council?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall look into the matter and see exactly what the situation is. I will advise the honourable member accordingly.

CAR INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Government in the Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the news of this morning that the union in New South Wales was imposing bans on the importation of new foreign motor cars. The headline in the newspaper read, "Union bans car imports—utter chaos likely". Closer to home, the Secretary of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce (Mr. G. L. Mill) was reported to have said last night that the ban threatened the jobs of people employed in the new car retail trade in South Australia. Other publicity followed, emphasising this threat to jobs in South Australian firms. As a result of this news, I ask the Minister: is the Government concerned about this development in South Australia and will it make representations to the Commonwealth Government stressing the concern being expressed by the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Government is naturally concerned at anything that causes unemployment in South Australia. I assure the honourable member that every step will be taken to ensure that the jobs of South Australians are protected. What can be done in this case I do not know. I do not know, either, what the Commonwealth Government will do. It is a matter that the State Government will look at to see what can be done. I will give the honourable member a reply to his question when we have thought out what can be done.

RACING

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question refers to the proposed amendments to the racing legislation to enable more money to become available for racing. My question refers to current and future situations. Currently, the metropolitan racing clubs make money available voluntarily to some country racing clubs on a selected basis for promotion and stake money. As country racing appears to be becoming more popular, will the Chief Secretary, when introducing the legislation, give attention to the importance of country racing and the suggestion that more money should be made available to it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: When the Bill is introduced here, I will look at the situation for the honourable member to see whether it will be possible to do something along the lines of his question.

WOOMERA

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question refers to the announcement this morning that the Commonwealth Government proposes to close the township of Woomera. I have been informed that this will have a direct effect on the Weapons Research Establishment at Salisbury, as I understand that most people involved at Salisbury are directly connected with Woomera, which is really an extension of the work done at the W.R.E. Therefore, at present

there is considerable disquiet among the people at the W.R.E. at Salisbury. Is the Chief Secretary aware that this decision will have a direct effect both on Woomera and on Salisbury and will cause a considerable degree of unemployment, even though the Commonwealth Government has offered alternative positions in the Public Service? Nevertheless, concern is expressed that there will be insufficient positions available of the type to fit the skills of the people who will be displaced. Will the Government take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government with a view to obtaining as soon as possible other outside work for the displaced people or to continue the establishments at Salisbury and Woomera?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Of course, both are Commonwealth establishments, but the South Australian Government has not had time so far to study the full implications of the decision announced this morning; but it will be looking at the effect of it, and what action can be taken will then be assessed as a result of these investigations. The honourable member can rest assured that the State Government will do all in its power to see that the effect is not to increase unemployment in South Australia to any great extent.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Honourable members have undoubtedly received from the South Australian Council for Civil Liberties a circular dealing with the operation of this State's Mental Health Act. If the Minister has not received a copy of the circular, I am willing to quote extracts of it to him. However, I do not think that will be necessary, as he has doubtless received a copy of it. Would the Minister care to comment on the points made in the circular regarding the operation of this Act?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have received a copy of the circular from the South Australian Council for Civil Liberties. I am concerned about the Mental Health Act. Indeed, I have raised the question of setting up a committee to examine the Act—

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Would it be an advisory committee?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: —with a view to having it amended. Some of the provisions in the Act are a little outmoded. However, all people concerned will have an opportunity to state their case, and I hope (probably not this session but next session) to introduce a Bill to amend the Act.

SUPERPHOSPHATE BOUNTY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: A recent press report stated that a subcommittee of the Federal Caucus was again examining the question of bounties on superphosphate. Has the Minister of Agriculture made any submissions to that subcommittee or to the Australian Government on this matter?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have made several statements regarding the superphosphate bounty since the Australian Government first announced that it was going to phase out the subsidy early in 1975. Indeed, to follow up my announcements on this matter, I have written to the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) and to members of the subcommittee in Canberra, explaining my views on it. I sincerely hope that, in the interests of this State's primary producers, my submissions will be considered when the matter is discussed in Canberra.

LIBRARIES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On September 24 I asked the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, a question regarding libraries. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Education reports as follows:

Before any community school libraries can be established, there are matters to be resolved by the Minister of Local Government and the Attorney-General. As soon as these are satisfactorily dealt with, we hope to be able to proceed to act on the report on this subject by the committee that was established. The Commonwealth Government grant to Cleve Area School was made under the Schools Commission's Innovative Projects Scheme in response to an application made by a group including Cleve Area School staff members. Such applications and the assessment of them are in no way controlled or regulated by the State Government. Whether the State Government should exercise control and oversight of such a project is a matter for consideration and possible submission to the Schools Commission. A decision cannot be made at this stage.

MURRAY RIVER FLOODING

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding Murray River flooding?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Cabinet has decided that, although assistance will be given by way of survey to indicate the likely level of flooding of each swamp and also to assist financially in the cost of dewatering those swamps that are flooded, it will not contribute towards the cost of flood protection. This is a matter for the owners or occupiers to tend to themselves and, in fact, to decide for themselves whether it is justified, having regard to the expected river levels and the physical possibility of being able to contain the flood.

PETROL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the supply of super-grade petrol in South Australia?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Stocks of motor spirit held in South Australia were depleted when production throughout Australia was affected by industrial disputes earlier this year. True, the South Australian oil refinery has not at times been able to operate at full production; nor has it been possible to supplement substantially local production from other States, principally because of the Australia-wide shortage of tankers. The Government is not aware of any serious difficulties experienced in maintaining adequate supplies of motor spirit to industry and the general public; nor are there any known cases of petrol retailers who have not been able to carry on their business.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Chief Secretary a further question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister, in his reply to my question, said:

The Government is not aware of any serious difficulties experienced in maintaining adequate supplies of motor spirit to industry and the general public; nor are there any known cases of petrol retailers who have not been able to carry on their business.

I have been given details of two examples involving a service station in an area that is vital in this context, that is, Salt Creek, which is a somewhat remote part of the South-East. This service station, which is often used by motorists, was without petrol for a full week during the last week of the September school holidays, and again was without petrol last weekend right from the early hours of the Monday holiday. The proprietor of that

service station has received no indication of when super-grade petrol would be available again. It has been strongly rumoured that, because of the shortage of super-grade petrol, some retailers are, in fact, selling standard-grade petrol from super-grade petrol pumps. Having now given this example to the Minister, I ask whether he will refer it to his colleague and ensure not only that distributors and retailers of petrol have adequate supplies but also that supplies are distributed on an equitable basis to all retailers. Also, will the Minister ask his colleague to take action to check that no retailer is, in fact, supplying standard-grade petrol in lieu of super-grade petrol?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I think it would make it easier for my colleague (perhaps the honourable member can give me the details afterwards) if he knew the exact areas where service stations have been denied petrol.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Conservationists have been seeking the retention of the old bluestone building known as the Allan Campbell Building, which has been a part of the Adelaide Children's Hospital complex. I understand that the building was named after one of the founding fathers of the hospital, Dr. Campbell. I understand, too, that the final plans for redevelopment of the hospital have now been approved. Can the Minister say whether the Allan Campbell Building is to be retained in the general hospital complex, or whether that structure will be demolished as part of the approved redevelopment?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Although the Government assists it financially, the Adelaide Children's Hospital is not a Government hospital. I cannot now tell the honourable member what he wants to know, but I will seek the relevant information for him.

DYSLEXIA

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health. Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: One of the areas of health care and education that I believe is at present being neglected is that of the diagnosis, treatment and remedying of dyslexia. So far, voluntary organisations in South Australia have carried the main burden in this field. The facilities available to persons requiring investigation and treatment for dyslexia are not sufficient to cope with the demand. Would the Minister care to make a statement on any plans the Government might be contemplating to improve the services available for the treatment and remedying of dyslexia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The whole question of various health services is being examined, but at present there are no immediate plans for improvement.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is there any argument between the education and health aspects of the matter?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There has been no discussion between the officers in that respect.

TRAFFIC CONTROL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Health ascertain whether the Minister of Transport intends to make any changes in the road traffic code in this State introducing a priority roads system of traffic control for metropolitan Adelaide along similar lines to changes introduced a few months ago in New South Wales?

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

LAND ACQUISITION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I recently asked about land acquisition?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Land Commission has purchased or acquired a total of about 785 hectares of land, which is zoned rural.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Health and Medical Services Act, 1949. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is one that is submitted to Parliament essentially by way of Statute revision to facilitate the preparation of the Act for consolidation under the Acts Republication Act. The Act was originally and mainly intended to provide for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services and for the appointment of a Director-General of Public Health and a Director of Tuberculosis. The advisory council has not met since 1965 and can no longer be constituted as provided by the Act, as the Act provides that the council be constituted by reference, in the case of some members, to the offices in the Public Service held by them at the time when the Act was passed in 1949. Some of those offices do not now exist in the Public Service and, as the provisions dealing with the council have been inoperative and incapable of application for such a long time, it would be misleading and serve no useful purpose to reprint the Act without removing the "dead wood" from it.

In view of the Government's decision to set up a working party and a project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee, there is no point in retaining the council as constituted in this Act. The Bill accordingly repeals the provisions of the principal Act which deal with the council, makes a consequential amendment to the long title, and updates a reference to the old Public Service Act, 1936 which has been repealed and superseded by the Public Service Act, 1967. The Bill's objects are given effect in clauses 2 to 5. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1498.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): We are dealing here with State legislation that is complementary to three Commonwealth measures controlling the stabilisation of the wheat industry. The other two measures involved are the Wheat Products Export Adjustment Bill and the Wheat Export Charge Bill, both of which measures deal with the processed products of wheat at home and for export and authorise the payment to the stabilisation fund of 15c a bushel (.067 tonnes), the same as would apply if that wheat was sold unprocessed. We believe that the scheme is a good and necessary one, and it will apply for five years. However, clause 6 provides that the commencement date shall be October 1, 1974, and

that this measure shall apply for the next six succeeding seasons. In explanation of clause 6, the Minister stated:

Clause 6 makes the temporal application of the Bill plain. When I looked at the dictionary meaning of "temporal" I could not see anything that it had to do with wheat or anything that plainly indicated how a five-year plan could apply for the six succeeding years. However, clause 17 explains what is intended by clause 6 and, indeed, the scheme is to operate for five years. The Commonwealth Government's attitude to the wheatgrowers of this country never ceases to amaze me. Although that Government may realise the significance of the wheat-growing industry to our economy, at no time has it been willing to accept that significance. The Commonwealth Government is not willing to back the industry, as was shown when the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation was attempting to negotiate with that Government. Indeed, last year the scheme was extended for only 12 months, because the Commonwealth Government was not willing to enter into a five-year contract at that time for fear that the industry would operate at a loss. When an industry has an oversea earning capacity of \$1 100 000 000 a year, surely it ought to be worth some form of Government guarantee.

The scheme has been operating since 1948 and, although it has been short in some years, it has generally averaged out as a viable scheme. When we take into account the subsidising of home consumption, we see that the scheme is more viable than is sometimes shown by figures. Now, the scheme is to be extended for five years at a guaranteed price of \$2 a bushel. However, just a guaranteed price is not an answer in itself. The wheat industry is not a "stop-go" industry: people cannot gear themselves for wheat production at a moment's notice. Further, having become geared for wheat production with an outlay of hundreds of thousands of dollars, they cannot leave their machinery idle for one year in anticipation of the season or prices. So, we are willing, of course, to accept stabilisation as outlined.

The Commonwealth Government refused to extend the previous scheme beyond one year because of uncertainties and because it was not willing to place any faith in a \$1 100 000 000 export industry. The Commonwealth Government refused to review realistically the owner-operator allowance. It tied that allowance to the 1968 wage of a top station hand (which was then \$3 181 a year) and it was not even willing to follow the formula through and bring the allowance up to date, although the corresponding wage is now about \$5 000.

The Commonwealth Government rejected the wheat federation's argument that the first advance should be increased from \$1.20 to \$1.80, with a guarantee of \$2.75 a bushel as the overall guarantee. I believe that the argument advanced by the federation was valid. The first advance was \$1.10 when the overall guarantee was \$1.40. Now that wheat on the oversea market is bringing above \$4. The Commonwealth Government still will not realistically review the situation in connection with the first advance, when the wheatgrowers were trying to negotiate a better deal. The average age of the 50 000 wheatgrowers in Australia is 55 years, and they make a plea that the Government should take a realistic view and create further incentives for the primary producer. The Government should try to stem the alarming flow of young people from the industry. Farmers work long hours in the paddocks, and then have to keep office records. Other people would need to work only a portion of those hours to bring in a similar income.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The PRESIDENT: Order! I notice in the gallery the members attending the Second Australasian Parliamentary Seminar being conducted by the Australian and New Zealand branches. I extend to them a very hearty welcome to the Legislative Council of South Australia. I know all honourable members will join with me in this welcome and in wishing our visitors a very pleasant and interesting sojourn in this Parliament. The Hon. Mr. Whyte.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Debate resumed:

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In the formula the Commonwealth Government did not pay attention to the need to provide some form of incentive for the younger person to continue in primary production, particularly wheat production. It tied the owner-operator allowance to a niggardly \$3 100 a year and did not take into consideration the escalation of taxes and rates, inflation, and the withdrawal of the superphosphate bounty at a time when the cost of superphosphate had increased by 200 per cent. Every other country has for some time realised that, whether or not the wheat producer is expecting sufficient wheat to make him a political target, it is necessary for Governments to keep these people producing.

The farmer in the European Economic Community receives \$4 a bushel within 48 hours of delivery, but the Australian farmer receives \$1.20 (less the cost of administration of the stabilisation fund, and less the freight, including the freight of home consumption wheat to Tasmania). There is a vast difference between the treatment of the E.E.C. farmer and the Australian farmer. Also, no consideration was given to the fact that money is still owing to the producer for wheat sold four years ago. It cost the wheat producer \$1 000 000 in demurrage fees this year because the unions denied shipping rights to Greek ships. It did not cost the Greek Government anything and it did not cost the unions anything, but it cost the farmers \$1 000 000 because these ships were tied up. This was \$1 000 000 less to be paid out at a time when the farmers are borrowing at exorbitant rates of interest to keep going.

There has never been any quibble in the mind of the wheatgrower about subsidising home consumption. He believes that that is part of his responsibility to the nation, but I often wonder how many bread eaters in Australia realise that, if it were not for this grower subsidy to them, they would be paying an additional 5c or 6c a loaf. We rarely read about this matter in the press, but we often see a backlash in regard to the superphosphate bounty. It is estimated that for home consumption this year it will be necessary to hold 80 000 000 bushels and that there should be, with an ounce of luck, 300 000 000 bushels exported. That figure will provide \$45 000 000 for the stabilisation fund at 15c a bushel. Since there is provision in the legislation that not more than \$30 000 000 will be paid in or out of the fund in one year, there will be a surplus of \$15 000 000 to be returned to the growers.

Last year, the one-year scheme provided \$47 000 000. We add to that the \$30 000 000, which is all we can provide this year, and that puts \$77 000 000 into the fund. As the fund must be brought up to the \$80 000 000 proposed in the Commonwealth Act, part of the interest on the \$47 000 000 will be used to bring the fund up to the required total. It is hoped that it will be a self-revolving fund and no burden on the Commonwealth Government. Every nation in the world is having trouble at present with

grain stocks, so it is predictable that wheat will stay at a reasonable price for a long time. I believe that, if inflation continues, \$2 will not be a reasonable price and many farmers will be forced to the wall unless it is increased.

The Australian Wheat Board has served the industry extremely well, and we have no quibbles with the board. Mr. Cass has been reappointed as Chairman for another three years; the industry has grown quite fond of his efforts. The board also has a financial adviser, a representative of the flour millers, a representative of employees, and two growers each from New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia. Despite Mr. Whitlam's claims of wheat sales he gained for us in Red China as a result of the ball he handed out, it did not cut much ice with the average wheatgrower. The Australian Wheat Board is poles closer to the requirements of the trade than is Mr. Whitlam. I want to refer, in conclusion, to clause 8 of the Bill which provides that the Commonwealth Minister may give direction to the board concerning the performance of its function and the exercise of its powers, and that the board shall comply with those directions. If that is what is intended, that would not be a stabilisation scheme but a nationalisation of the industry.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Perhaps that is what the Hon. Mr. Chatterton meant when he said it was a socialised industry.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Hon. Mr. Chatterton may have got the true import of the message. Section 18 of the Commonwealth Act, which is the comparable provision, states:

(1) The Minister may give directions to the board concerning the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers, and the board shall comply with those directions.

It goes on to state:

(2) If—

- (a) the Minister directs the board to make a sale of wheat on terms involving a longer period of credit in respect of payment of an amount, being the whole or a part of the purchase moneys, than the period of credit that the Minister is satisfied, after consultation with the board, is the period that the board would have been prepared to allow on a strictly commercial basis;
- (b) the board incurs loss by reason of failure of the purchaser to pay that amount, or interest in respect of that amount, within the extended period of credit applicable to that amount; and
- (c) the Minister is satisfied that the board has taken all reasonable steps to recover from the purchaser the amount of the loss,

the Treasurer shall, out of moneys appropriated by the Parliament for the purpose, pay the amount of the loss to the board and the amount so paid to the board shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be part of the proceeds of the sale of the wheat by the board.

Clause 8 was a provision in the original Act, but after the shemuzzle created by the Commonwealth Government regarding the sale of wheat to Egypt, the federation was successful in having a new section inserted in the Commonwealth Act. I do not see any explanation of it either in the State Act or in the Minister's second reading explanation. The Australian Wheat Board refused to renegotiate the sale of wheat to Egypt on credit because at that time Russia was supplying arms to Egypt and demanding payment in cash. Most wheatgrowers agreed with the view of the Australian Wheat Board that Egypt should pay cash for the wheat. The Commonwealth Government took over, under section 18, and the Minister directed the board that it must extend credit to Egypt, despite not knowing which way the war would go and whether Israel would over-run Egypt; most certainly Israel would not have been willing to stand the cost of wheat exported to Egypt. The

Australian Wheat Board acted most prudently and I believe it is prudent that this further provision of section 18 of the Commonwealth Act should be brought into the State legislation. Unless the Minister can give me an extremely good explanation of why it is not in the State legislation, I shall attempt to have it included in the State Act in Committee. I support the second reading.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate, in which they have stated quite categorically that this legislation is complementary to the Commonwealth legislation. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Whyte, let me say that there are matters which appear in the Commonwealth Act but which do not have to be written into the State legislation because Commonwealth legislation overrides State legislation. In this case, where there is a complementary Act, it is not necessary to write in everything in the State Wheat Stabilisation Act, so the provision referred to by the honourable member is covered by the Commonwealth Act.

We have heard a lot of noise about wheat stabilisation in general. This is the first time that the Australian Labor Party has negotiated a wheat stabilisation scheme with the Australian farming community. Many anomalies occurred in the previous scheme which I believe have been ironed out in this scheme. The wheat farmers of Australia are well protected under wheat stabilisation. They were the first primary producers in this country to be so protected. It is only recently that the woolgrowers of this country were protected by the floor price scheme in wool. Heaven knows where the woolgrowers would be today if that scheme had not been initiated by the A.L.P. The same applies to wheat stabilisation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What did you refer to?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The floor price on wool.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Initiated by whom?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: By the A.L.P. Does the honourable member agree with that? I think he had better agree because, if he says otherwise, he will reveal that he does not know what he is talking about, which is typical of the honourable member when it comes to agricultural matters. To continue in this vein, the A.L.P. realises it is important to stabilise a primary industry like the wheat industry, and I believe that this Bill covers every aspect, except that it probably could have gone a little further and cut out quotas; but quotas are being looked at closely and perhaps in the next season we may (I emphasise "may") see the elimination of quotas for some time. If that happens, the industry will be thrown open and anyone will be able to produce wheat who desires to.

Very little has been said about the payment to growers of \$1.20, which was initiated by the present A.L.P. Government. For a long time it was \$1.10, and it has been increased to \$1.20. Now, of course, the industry has put out feelers that it wants to increase the figure to \$1.80. There are certain reservations about that. The price could be increased, but here again we return to the Commonwealth Treasurer to see exactly how much money is available to cover all aspects under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government. One way in which it could be done would be perhaps to increase the first payment to all wheatgrowers, irrespective of how far away they lived from the silo, to, say, \$1.40, and that would take into consideration freight costs. Those would be absorbed by the first payment. That would bring everyone to the same level, irrespective of whether he lived close to the silo, 500 kilometres away, or at Timbuktu. That is one way in which we could get equality of payment for the individual farmers throughout the countryside. Frankly, I

believe the Bill is good. It has satisfied the industry, which was not at all satisfied initially, but that is only to be expected in the course of transacting a business proposition, when naturally everyone tries to get as much as he possibly can out of the deal that is being made.

I give full marks to Senator Wriedt for the way in which he has handled the industry up to the introduction of this measure. The Hon. Mr. Story said that this stabilisation legislation would go through until 1980. That was because the Wheat Board—

The Hon. C. R. Story: I'm sorry; I missed your point.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think the Hon. Mr. Whyte picked it up, so the honourable member can ask him. The situation is that, when the stabilisation scheme goes out, the Wheat Board must be kept in operation to be able to sell wheat that may be accumulated over the five-year period; so it is given extra years in which to wind up the organisation, if it has to do so. I think the Hon. Mr. Story appreciates that point. With those few remarks, I thank honourable members for their support of this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Directions by Minister."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Hon. Mr. Whyte raised the matter of the directions by the Minister. Clause 8 refers to section 18 of the new Commonwealth legislation passed recently. As the Hon. Mr. Whyte has pointed out, the wording of section 18 of the Commonwealth Act differs substantially from the wording of this clause, which will become section 8 of our new Act. We have been particularly careful in this debate and in debates on other legislation where there is complementary legislation and we are dealing with a Commonwealth Act, to try to get as close to a facsimile as possible. We should follow that principle in reference to the "directions by the Minister" (which is the marginal note for this clause) and print in full in our legislation what those powers are, because it will not be convenient to the South Australian wheat-grower to have to whip off to Canberra and get a copy of the Commonwealth Act every time he wants to know everything about our Act. The South Australian Act should, to all intents and purposes, be as close as possible to the Commonwealth Act. Therefore, I see no reason why these additional words are not included in our Act. These words appear in section 18 (2) of the Commonwealth Act:

(2) If—

- (a) the Minister directs the board to make a sale of wheat on terms involving a longer period of credit in respect of payment of an amount, being the whole or a part of the purchase moneys, than the period of credit that the Minister is satisfied, after consultation with the board, is the period that the board would have been prepared to allow on a strictly commercial basis:

Paragraphs (b) and (c) follow that. The important part is: the Treasurer shall, out of moneys appropriated by the Parliament for the purpose, pay the amount of the loss to the board and the amount so paid to the board shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be part of the proceeds of the sale of the wheat by the board.

It is all very well to say that but, if the Commonwealth Minister directs the board to adopt a certain policy in regard to one country, which may be a new customer, compared to an established customer, no-one can assess what sum of money is lost in goodwill. This is indeed difficult to assess in relation to countries that have a keen sense of facesaving. One cannot assess the damage done because Australia could not supply its older markets, and for the Minister merely to say that the Commonwealth

Treasury will make good these losses is really saying nothing. We ought to be more concerned that the Commonwealth Minister directs the Wheat Board in relation to finance but not in relation to serving various markets. What happened regarding Egypt was not good for Australia. This is typical of what can happen when there is too much interference by the Government.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: There could be a take-over by the Minister without the board's having any protection.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite so. Whether Senator Wriedt took the action unilaterally, I do not know. However, I should think he did, and that he was directed by the Commonwealth Department of Trade regarding this type of thing. It is all right for amateurs to play around and shift pawns on the international trade chess board, provided they are not playing with stakes provided by private enterprise.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did Egypt get the wheat?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, and enjoyed it. South Australian producers should be able to walk across the road to the Government Tourist Bureau and buy a copy of the Commonwealth Wheat Stabilisation Act, so that they can see what powers the Commonwealth Minister has. They should not have to go to a Commonwealth Government department to obtain a copy of that Act. It would indeed be good if the Minister would consider this aspect (he has probably taken some advice on it) and give me a reply on this matter.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I agree with the honourable member that this matter should be examined more thoroughly than it is at present being examined and, indeed, that the States should have some protection. I therefore ask that progress be reported, to enable honourable members to examine this matter and to see whether the States can be given the protection suggested by the honourable member. This would, I think, be in the interests of the State's wheatgrowers.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1504.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I had taken it for granted that, as the Liberal Government saw fit in 1968 to prescribe that half the profits of the State Bank of South Australia should go into the governmental purse, this rather complicated Bill would be equally in order. In 1968, we examined the then Government's requirement, and most honourable members considered, in the circumstances, that it was a perfectly proper thing. Until the Hon. Mr. Hill spoke rather damningly on the matter yesterday (and, of course, he was a member of that 1968 Government), I thought I would allow the Bill to go through without comment because I thought it was equally in order. However, having heard from him, I thought I should examine the matter further, as I have had some experience in banking. I asked the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan to obtain the adjournment for me yesterday so that I could examine the matter and speak today.

This is a fairly complicated piece of legislation. I will try briefly to go into all the complications, and I will then try to put the thing in the simple terms to which I have tried to reduce it so that I can understand it myself. There are three definitions in the Bill. I found it easier to understand them by inverting their order to that of, first, "the surplus amount", secondly "the prescribed deduction", and finally "the prescribed amount". The prescribed

deduction is \$250 000 a year, which, in certain circumstances, can be increased. The surplus amount is the surplus of income over expenditure (in other words, a profit) shown in the bank's balance sheet at the end of the financial year. In passing, I emphasise the term "balance sheet", because in the private sector that would normally be the profit and loss account. The third ingredient is the prescribed amount, which is half the surplus amount over the prescribed deduction.

There are also other matters which are complicated but which, I think, can be understood when one ponders them for a while. The prescribed amount, which is the amount that the Government can take from the Savings Bank in each financial year, is half the excess of the surplus amount over the prescribed deduction. The surplus amount is the gross profit for the year. The prescribed deduction is \$250 000 plus. As I understand the Bill, this means that the Savings Bank first tucks away \$250 000 into its reserve funds, and thereafter the Government can take half the surplus.

To put it in figures, so that it is more readily understood, if the Savings Bank makes a profit of \$750 000 in any year, \$250 000 is deducted for the reserve fund, which leaves a surplus amount of \$500 000 out of \$750 000, of which the Government can take half. That is a fairly simple example to understand because, as I have said, the notional profit is \$750 000. As the deduction for reserves is \$250 000, a net profit of \$500 000, of which the Government can take half, is left. That means the Government gets \$250 000 out of \$750 000 in the example to which I have referred, or one-third of the profits for that year. As I understand the definition in the legislation, in no circumstances can the Government take more than 50 per cent of the profit for the year. Indeed, it cannot take as much as 50 per cent of the profit for the year, because of the deduction of \$250 000 first. I want to compare this situation to the private sector of the economy, with which I am more familiar. The normal bank in the private sector pays, first of all, 47½ per cent of its profit before tax to the Commonwealth Government by way of company tax. This can be lessened by rebates on rebatable Commonwealth stock.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you have to pay unearned tax?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not know what that term means. However, the Commonwealth stock rebates are in the process of going out, so we need not deal with that complication. The normal bank in the private sector pays 47½ per cent of its profit before tax to the Commonwealth Government. Normally it would then pay between 50 per cent and 70 per cent of the remainder by way of dividend to its shareholders; that would be between 50 per cent and 70 per cent of the remaining 52½ per cent—that is, between 26½ per cent and 36¾ per cent. In other words, the normal private bank would pay a total of Commonwealth company tax and dividends to shareholders of between 73 per cent and 84 per cent of its total profit for the year. That means, of course, that it would retain between 16 per cent and 27 per cent of its total profit in the business.

What the Government is asking for here is that something under 50 per cent of the annual profit of the Savings Bank of South Australia shall be paid into the Government's coffers. I ask: what is wrong with that, in view of the comparison with the private sector? I stress that State banking institutions, under the Constitution, pay no Commonwealth company tax; they are exempt from it. So, the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank do not

pay out any more than 50 per cent of their profits, and they retain the balance. A normal bank in the private sector would, at best, probably retain only 25 per cent. Most of us preach competition between Government-owned banks and private banks, and one would therefore think that this Bill would put the private sector trading banks in a more competitive situation with the Government banks than they were in previously. As a person who preaches private enterprise, I think that this is a very good thing.

So, I cannot see anything wrong with this Bill, because it brings the Government banks more into line with the private banks. Further, it brings much needed revenue to the Government and, as a concept, I cannot see anything wrong with it at all. The only thing I have to add is what I said earlier: the surplus amount is the surplus of income over expenditure as disclosed in the balance sheet of the Savings Bank of South Australia, as opposed to the profit and loss account of the private sector companies. I do not think the Savings Bank of South Australia has a profit and loss account, because it is a different type of institution; no doubt that is the reason why the term "balance sheet" is used instead of "profit and loss account". The balance sheet surplus of income over expenditure would include capital profits which are not normally included in the pay-out of a private sector company. So, if a public company in the private sector (this is what I am really talking about) makes a capital profit, that capital profit is retained in the business whereas, as I read the Bill, any capital profit of the Savings Bank of South Australia would be subject to this payment to the Government as well as trading profits; in this context I cannot see anything wrong with that. So, having examined the Bill to the best of my ability, I give it my full support.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): Unlike the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, I know little about banking; I am a layman. I listened with great interest to what the honourable gentleman said. He said that the Savings Bank of South Australia is not a profit-making institution in the normal sense; if there is some concern about this Bill, that is where the concern lies. I do not oppose the State Bank Act Amendment Bill, because the State Bank is in competition with the private trading banks. I therefore believe that that Bill is logical and reasonable. However, I believe that this Government, in looking for every cent it can find, could be reducing to some extent the interest that people receive on their savings accounts at the Savings Bank of South Australia.

If I interpreted the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill's remarks correctly, I believe that he gave an example whereby the State could take 33½ per cent of the profit of the Savings Bank of South Australia in any one year and, by Statute, it would not be able to take more than 50 per cent, whereas trading banks would have a rather greater amount than 50 per cent taken from their profit. I would question whether that is a reasonable comparison, because of the great difference between the banks. I am a great supporter of the private trading banks. However, the Savings Bank of South Australia is a Government-guaranteed institution that has been set up largely for the "little" people of the State. If they can get another one-quarter or one-half per cent interest as a result of the Government not taking this proportion of the profit of the Savings Bank of South Australia, we should consider that they should be entitled to that. I am aware that perhaps a small percentage of people would have deposits with the bank who would not be regarded as "small" people.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Are not the interest rates determined by the Reserve Bank?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am not sure, but I know that the Savings Bank of South Australia has been able to provide a slightly higher interest rate than other private sector savings banks. Nevertheless, I believe that people depositing in the Savings Bank would be largely those who might be described (for want of a better term) as small people, and they should be entitled to receive the most favourable interest rate possible in the circumstances.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you find anything in the Bill that would stop that? I don't.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If the Government can take the amount of money suggested, that could possibly contribute to a reduction of interest.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: But the interest rates would be decided before the profit.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is only out of the surplus. If there is no surplus, the Government does not get it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I see that. I do not oppose the Bill at this stage, but I am concerned that the Government is endeavouring to grab every dollar and cent from the various sectors of the financial structure of the State. In this case also, this policy causes me concern.

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

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1413.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I am most concerned about this Bill; indeed, I am as much concerned about this as about the one with which we have just been dealing. The point concerning me is the proposal that there shall be inserted in the parent Bill a provision that the commission can make any investments from time to time approved of by the Treasurer. At present, the right of the commission to invest its funds is limited and somewhat restricted. I admit that. Opportunity should be given for a wider range of investments to be undertaken by the commission, but Parliament has a duty to retain some check on the forms of investment the commission is able to make within the law.

As the Bill reads, any investment that has the approval of the Treasurer can be utilised by the commission. I am not implying that the commission would want to invest in any wild-cat schemes or that the Treasurer might approve of any investments of that nature. Nevertheless, I am concerned that from time to time, probably in his eagerness to promote development of all kinds within the State, the Treasurer shows some enthusiasm towards promoting certain industries.

He is very keen on the promotion of first-class restaurants in South Australia and he is keen on the further promotion of the South Australian Film Corporation, an institution which has not yet proved a financially viable operation. That enthusiasm is indicated by the fact that in this year's Budget more than \$500 000 was proposed for further investment in the film corporation and at the same time the Budget expected a profit of about the same amount this year, whereas last year's revenue, as I recall, was about \$52 000.

Those are two areas in which I believe the Treasurer would show some interest in the general matter of investment, but they are areas which should not involve the State Government Insurance Commission. If the Bill passes in its present form, those investments I have mentioned, especially the film corporation, would be acceptable within the new Act. All that would be required would be the approval of the Treasurer.

Other insurance funds cannot invest in such projects; they are supervised by the Commonwealth insurance commissioner, who is most prudent and careful in his oversight of the investment portfolios of insurance company funds. That is quite correct and proper. I would have no objection if the Bill were worded to include investment in public companies by way of share purchase or purchase of debenture stock.

This clause should try to limit investment to such an outlet. It is much more restrictive and yet it is still fair. We are dealing with the funds of policyholders and with an institution which, like other insurance institutions, is not finding the going easy at present. I am being most moderate in that comment. We have a responsibility to ensure that minimal risk is involved when these moneys are invested. If the change to a more restrictive proposal, as I have suggested, does not meet with the approval of honourable members, I suggest some surveillance over this investment portfolio, as over the portfolios of other companies.

We have heard today of the consideration of institutions of a public nature compared with those in the private sector. Insurance companies in the private sector are under the surveillance of the commissioner in Canberra, but that check does not apply to the State Government Insurance Commission. It might be better legislation if this Bill was amended so that some authority, perhaps the Public Actuary in this State, was given an opportunity to report to Parliament on the investment portfolio of the State Government Insurance Commission. That would certainly act as some check and would tend to encourage, in my view, extremely prudent investments that the commission would be able to make if the intention in the Bill was approved in this Council.

I simply want to stress, therefore, my concern at the wide scope that will be permitted in this Bill, and that wide scope, of course, once enacted will remain, irrespective of who the State Treasurer may be. I also bring to the attention of the Council that possibly a wise check may be either that the investments are restricted to investments within, say, public companies (I say that because public companies come under public scrutiny; they certainly do if they are listed on the Stock Exchange, and they come under public scrutiny in other general areas as well) or, alternatively, that some means of surveillance of this investment fund by someone in authority on a somewhat comparable basis to the private sector, in which an insurance company may be involved, may be introduced.

As it is worded at the moment in the Bill, this provision is too wide. I think that better legislation than this can be achieved if the dangers I have pointed out are fully considered.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I rise briefly to support the Bill, which came to us last session containing a proposed franchise for the Government to enter the life assurance field. That provision was deleted in this Council, and we were left with this provision as the Bill. Our amendments were not agreed to by another place, we went into conference on the matter, no agreement could be reached, and the Bill lapsed. Now we have that clause back again this session. It would have been better for the Government to accept the amendment in the first place rather than wait another 12 months to have these changes made to the Statute. Also, in view of the ensuing period of about 18 months during which this matter was not being dealt with, I tend to agree with the point made by the Hon. Mr. Hill, that possibly some other safeguard should be included in the Bill.

We know that the Treasurer, whoever he may be, may have certain things he likes financing. The present tendency of the Government is to finance restaurants, film corporations, theatres, and that type of thing, and it may be wise to include some protection or some recourse to Parliament on the investments made where the approval of the Treasurer is required. I thank the Hon. Mr. Hill for raising that point, because it is valid and should be considered by the Government: the office of the Public Actuary should be used to report to Parliament on investments made with the approval of the Treasurer from funds held by the State Government Insurance Commission. With those few remarks, I support the second reading. I ask the Government to consider the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill.

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

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1418.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill and compliment the other honourable members who have spoken in this debate on the deep and earnest attention they have given to the Bill so far. Of course, the Bill is important, inasmuch as it defines the powers of the board and sets up for the first time a Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal. There has been a gap in this legislation that needed to be filled, and this Bill does that, but I agree with the Hon. Mr. Hill that the setting up of a disciplinary tribunal, which can see that the licence of a builder is cancelled, is an ineffective remedy from the point of view of the owner of land who is having a building erected on it, because in any case, of course, he has suffered loss and damage as a result of the inefficient work done on his premises. Indeed, as the Hon. Mr. Hill said, too, it may not be possible for him to recover damages from a builder who has gone into insolvency or, for some reason or other, is prepared to let his licence go by the board and take on again the humble job of a builder's labourer, or something like that.

Therefore, I am pleased that the Hon. Mr. Hill is tackling the problem and has proposed that some sort of fund be set up to provide money that could be made available to people who had suffered loss in the special circumstances he mentioned. This is a very good way of setting about solving the problem. The levy that he proposes of \$5 for each dwelling constructed by a builder is certainly not unreasonable in the circumstances. In process of time, it should provide a satisfactory and adequate fund that can be used by the board or on the board's instructions to compensate people who have suffered loss. The Bill seems to have resolved itself into a Committee Bill, honourable members having placed a number of amendments on file. I think just about everything concerning the principles on which the Bill has been prepared has been said already in the debate and, therefore, I do not intend to reiterate those matters. In Committee, I will examine carefully any amendments that are moved, and certainly the Hon. Mr. Hill's proposed amendment will have my complete support. I support the second reading.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1440.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): The Morphett Street bridge and its predecessors are closely associated with the history of Adelaide. I therefore intend

to treat this matter "a la Cooper" and deal, first, with the history of the matter, as they had much fun and many games over this part of Adelaide in the early days.

Originally, there was a ford in the Torrens River, after which the railway was built. Much trouble was experienced with that because of the difficulty of producing a suitable crossing over the line. I should like to read a passage, which I think is interesting, from the *History of the City of Adelaide*, by Thomas Worsnop, one of our early town clerks, as follows:

A long correspondence had been carried on between the corporation and the Government respecting the closing of the road across the railway at the end of Morphett Street. All the efforts made by and on behalf of the corporation had failed to induce the railway authorities to open out the road. It was determined therefore, to obtain by force that which could not be obtained by peaceful negotiation. On the 22nd of October the City Surveyor—
this was in 1864—

assisted by a number of labourers, came to the boundary of the railway line, and removed the fences and other obstructions which had shut the roadway off from the use of the public. The Manager of Railways brought down a strong body of men, turned away the assailants, and repaired the damage which had been done. The Town Clerk, later in the day, attended to negotiate with the Railway Manager, but he was unsuccessful. Fearing that a riot was not unlikely if matters were allowed to stand as they were, the Commissioner of Police sent several policemen to watch proceedings, and to prevent any breach of the peace if such a thing was attempted. No disturbance took place; but as the Manager of Railways would neither negotiate nor give way, he was summoned before the Police Magistrate, and fined 40s, for obstructing the road which led from Morphett street to North Adelaide.

A little further on, the book continues:

The dispute was eventually settled by the construction of a level crossing, furnished with proper gates and turnstiles, and the very unseemly contest between the Government of the Colony and the capital City came to an end.

That was near the beginning of a series of events that culminated in the building of the present, rather beautiful, Morphett Street bridge.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Who paid the 40s? Did it ever get paid?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Worsnop does not record that. In 1866, there was a proposal for a bridge to be built over the Torrens River at Morphett Street. This was completed in 1871 by the opening of the Victoria bridge, which was the predecessor of the present bridge. I have related its history, with perhaps irrelevant interpolations, because in 1870 the Victoria bridge cost a total of \$11 317 7s 1d. Although that was a City Council project, the Government gave £6 000, so that the council had to pay only about £5 300. In 1881, a railway bridge, which was partly an embankment and partly a bridge (again, a predecessor of the present bridge), was built by the Government at a cost of £40 000. The total cost of those two bridges, the predecessors of the present bridge, was about £51 300, of which the Government paid £46 000, leaving the City Council to pay only about £5 300.

It so happens that I was on the Adelaide City Council as an alderman when construction of the present bridge was negotiated with the then Government. The then Premier was a gentleman named Playford, and the Chief Secretary a gentleman named Sir Lyell McEwin. I think they gave us a fairly hard deal, as they made the City Council (if I remember correctly) liable for paying half the total cost of the new bridge. As the bridge was estimated to cost £1 500 000, the City Council was liable to pay £750 000, whereas for its predecessors a former City Council had to pay only £5 300 and the Government

£46 000. I think I may be correct in saying that the previous Government to which I have referred drove a fairly hard bargain with the City Council of which I was then a member.

However, we got the bridge, and that was fairly important, as it was a magnificent project. I must give the then Government credit for partly promoting the idea that the bridge should be built then, as it would have cost both parties infinitely more to build it now. It is a handsome bridge, and beautifully designed. I often stand by the Torrens River and look at it; it meets the eye well. From a traffic point of view, it serves the city very well because, instead of there being a terrible bottleneck there, the traffic flows excellently. It is an important main artery from the city, and even from the northern suburbs to the Adelaide Airport, which is another important factor. The reason why I have mentioned these things is that I welcome this Bill, which relieves the Adelaide City Council of portion of the money for which it was liable under what I referred to as a hard bargain. I still think the council has had to pay more than its fair share, but this Bill remedies the situation to some extent. I am therefore happy with the Bill. I know that the Adelaide City Council needs money.

The only respect in which I cannot sympathise with the council is that it seems that in its planning it is doing its best to limit its revenue by stopping people from building big buildings; city rates are based on improved value, not unimproved value. The city council cries poverty, but I think it has brought some of the poverty on itself by its terribly restrictive attitude to building in the city. I realise that there must be planning, but some ideas and ideals can be overdone, and they may not survive anyway. It is a pity that the city council needs this money partly because of its own actions. Of course, I am not involved in this matter any longer. I hope the finances were running better in my day. Although I do not think this is a great sum of money (it will not do anything substantial for the city's finances), it is a step in the right direction.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I commend the Government for the arrangement provided in this Bill. The Government has been reasonable and, indeed, generous in assisting the city's finances through the arrangement that has culminated in this Bill. The Bill waives a payment from the Adelaide City Council to the State of about \$122 000 annually for the next 27 years. About \$110 000 of the money was Highways Fund money, and the balance was Treasury money.

The financial predicament of the Adelaide City Council was very serious when it set about preparing its budget for the current year. This kind of situation has been common to local government throughout the State during the same period. However, the Adelaide City Council's programmes are so vast in comparison with those of most councils that the problem is proportionately greater.

It appeared that the Adelaide City Council was heading toward a deficit of about \$1 200 000. As the rate revenue for each cent in the dollar works out at about \$300 000, this would mean that, to cover the council's deficit, the rate would have had to be increased by 4c; that is, the rate would have had to be increased from last year's rate of 17c to a new rate of 21c, an enormous increase and an enormous rate.

Faced with this serious problem, the council apparently approached the Government, frankly laid its cards on the table, and sought Government aid. The Government was understanding in connection with the situation and, after discussions, arrangements were concluded, one of which

was that the council had to prune its proposed expenditure by about \$350 000. It was to increase its rate (and it has done this) to 19c in the dollar. Further, the Government agreed to relieve the council of its liability under the Morphett Street Bridge Act.

As the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has done, I should like to refer to the situation now facing the Adelaide City Council, which has struck the high rate of 19c in the dollar. This militates against development in the city. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill referred to the council's restrictive planning policy, and I hope that that will not remain for very long; I agree that it is very restrictive. Apart from that, the rate of 19c in the dollar militates against the kind of development one would like to see in the city. It certainly forbids great expansion in residential redevelopment, and it is that kind of expansion that is greatly needed. So, the council's problems are not over as a result of this Bill. The council has nevertheless been assisted to a degree.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I suppose that this Bill assists its loan situation, rather than the revenue situation.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What was the Hon. Sir Norman Jude's attitude when the money came out of the Highways Fund?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I always respected the opinions of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude in respect of the way he defended what he called his Highways Fund. He spoke on behalf of the motorists of the State, and he was very correct in saying that, if Governments relaxed their control over the Highways Fund, many departments and authorities would want to get their hands on it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: He did not like their spending money on road bridges.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He built all those narrow ones on the Broken Hill track.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. He planned an excellent road, the Barrier Highway.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: And I was instrumental in getting it sealed, and the honourable member was instrumental in opening it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, in the presence of the Minister of Agriculture. Whilst the Highways Fund will suffer to the extent of \$110 000 annually for the next 27 years as a result of this Bill, we have reached a stage where everyone must admit that very little money has ever been spent from the Highways Fund within the city of Adelaide. Most South Australian motorists use roads in the city of Adelaide at some stage or other. Those who use them very little might use them only at show time, but they serve the whole of the motoring population of the State. Personally, I do not think it unreasonable that the Highways Fund will suffer a little.

There may be further approaches to the Government regarding help for the City Council. One matter that might be considered is that the City Council might be relieved of the maintenance of the bridge and also of the City Bridge, both of which are and will be maintained by the City Council. Seldom do we find anywhere in the State bridges not maintained by the Highways Department. Apart from the two I have mentioned, the Hilton railway bridge is maintained by the South Australian Railways, but it is the normal responsibility and duty of the Highways Department to maintain the principal bridges throughout the State. If it took over that work in future, it would be a further help to the Adelaide City Council. I support the Bill, and I commend the Government for coming to this arrangement to assist the Adelaide City Council.

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

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES
ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1496.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which is primarily a Bill to give certain directions of a clarifying nature to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal. That tribunal was set up under the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act in 1965 and has functioned since that time; in fact, three or four determinations have been made by the tribunal since then. At most of the hearings, I appeared at least for some period of time before the tribunal, putting a case on behalf of members generally on this side of the Council, or of individual members. It became apparent to me, as a result of that experience, that some matters involving interpretation of the Act, which caused trouble to the tribunal, should not have caused such difficulties.

The Bill makes an attempt to clear up those difficulties. It should be emphasised that the measure itself does not provide for the payment of any remuneration or allowance by virtue of its provisions; in other words, it merely lays down certain guidelines for the tribunal if and when it is called on to consider the matter of Parliamentary salaries in the future. There is nothing in the Bill to give anything to anyone in this Parliament at present. Consequently, the measure should meet with the general approval of members.

It clarifies some of the definitions in the principal Act and gives power to the tribunal to make an additional salary payable to the person who holds the office of Deputy Premier; if that provision had not been included, no special provision could be made for any person who happened to hold that office. It states quite clearly that the remuneration payable to a member consists of a basic salary and an electorate allowance, and the criteria are established in new section 5b as to what considerations the tribunal should take into account in determining electorate allowances.

I think every honourable member would say the matters set out are eminently reasonable. They are as follows:

- (a) the area of the member's electoral district and dispersion of population therein;
 - (b) the effective means of travel available to the member within the member's electoral district and between that district and the city of Adelaide.
- and
- (c) the principal place of residence of the member and the extent to which it increases or decreases his expenses.

Now the tribunal clearly has those matters brought to its attention, and it also has the provisions of clause 7 specifying that the duties of a member include certain specific activities that the tribunal was inclined at times in the past to question, as to whether or not they could be strictly construed as part of the duties of a member; the combination of the two new clauses is very fair and reasonable.

Something should be done by the Government to look at the question of electorate allowances for members in this Chamber; we are not quite in the same category as members of the House of Assembly in regard to electoral districts. The Constitution Act now provides virtually that this Council, instead of being a Legislative Council, is somewhat more aptly to be described as being in the nature of a State Senate, similar to a State Senate as it is known in the various States of the United States of America. It is quite clear under the terms of the Constitution Act that honourable members represent the whole State and that we shall be elected for the whole State.

Both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party have already chosen their teams for the next State election, which we expect will be in 1976, on the basis that they will contest the whole State. Of course, the teams on both sides are now actively engaged in their electoral work on the basis that the electorate is the whole State. Some consideration should be given to that fact when electorate allowances are being considered. If it is not done now, it will have to be done soon. We do not often get amendments to this Act (in fact, this is the first one since 1965), so the time to do it is now.

The provisions in the Bill for the payment of special additional salaries and expense allowances to certain officers of Parliament follow completely the lines that the tribunal has already established. There is nothing new in the Bill, except that the Leader of the Opposition in another place is to be equated, for all purposes, with a junior Minister. That is eminently fair and right; in fact, it is the situation that exists in the Commonwealth Parliament and, from recollection, in one other State Parliament. It is only right and fair that the Leader of the Opposition in another place (who is, after all, the Leader of the alternative Government in this State) should be treated in all respects, from the point of view of salary and allowances, in the same way as a junior Minister of the Crown is treated. I say nothing more about the matter, as we can look at the individual clauses in Committee. The Bill has my support.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I would have liked the debate to be adjourned, and I am disappointed that the usual courtesy was not extended to me because I did not have a seconder. I do not support this Bill. It is part of what can best be described as a sweetheart agreement between the two major Parties in this Parliament. I have to refer, to some extent, to the three Bills (the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment Bill, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment Bill and the Statutes Amendment (Committee Salaries) Bill) in their entirety, because that is how they have come about. As the Hon. Mr. Potter has said, under this Bill no person receives a direct monetary increase at present, but it makes clear that there will be an increase, and the one person I will refer to as inevitably receiving an increase is the Leader of the Opposition in another place. New section 5d (2) makes clear that the Leader of the Opposition in another place will receive an increase in salary and allowances so that his salary will be equal to that of a Minister of the Crown. That is the story that will unfold when the other Bills are considered.

Most of my remarks can be reserved for the third Bill (the Statutes Amendment (Committee Salaries) Bill) in this series of measures, which have obviously been subject to some agreement between the Parties. My Party was approached by the Government to agree to these measures but, before we could indicate our agreement or disagreement, the Bills were introduced in another place. We were going to indicate our disagreement, but I am certain that another Party, the Liberal Party of Australia (South Australian Division), received much more notice than we did. I am sure it is an agreement of long standing and stems from a controversy of November last year when such a move was mooted by the Government and rejected by the Opposition. However, I will reserve my remarks on this first Bill, which is part of the pay-off on the agreement between the Parties on the three Bills; it is a direct pay-off for the Leader of the Opposition. I do not support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Central No. 1): I support the Bill. It surprises me that a minority group such as

the one to which the Hon. Mr. Cameron belongs should play politics on this matter, which gives justice to all members of Parliament. The honourable member will gain nothing by his opposition to this Bill. I have dealt with industrial matters for many years, although, admittedly, I have lost touch over the past few years, but it has been my experience that while an employer may oppose an application for better working conditions and increased wages, in the final decision he acknowledges the courageous efforts made by an employee representative to improve or maintain (I stress "maintain") conditions.

It is all very well for the Liberal Movement, which has three members overall in this Parliament who have other salaries over and above their Parliamentary salaries, to tell those members who have only their Parliamentary salaries to live on to use restraint and not to speak of what they are entitled to get: they are at least entitled to a cost of living increase.

Let me be personal for a moment. I retire at the end of this Parliament, along with at least another eight or nine members, apart from those who will be defeated. What is the position for them, their wives and their families if there is to be this restraint? We have heard a lot of gobbledegook about restraint in connection with wage increases. It means that, if we observe restraint, we shall retire in 1976 on a salary fixed in 1973, which is already at least 25 per cent, if not 30 per cent, out of date. The Hon. Mr. Cameron and his colleagues would have members who will be retiring at the end of this Parliament carry the effects of that restraint for life. Does the honourable member think that is fair, just or decent? If he does, my estimation of him goes down, but I do not think he really means that. All he wants to do is play politics and get a little out of it for himself.

However, it will not do him any good. He will not win, because everyone I have spoken to about this matter assures me that we are entitled to these increases. Let me cite yesterday's decision about the increased rates of pay for the Police Force. Would anyone have the temerity to go to the Police Force and say, "You should not have this additional money; you should have shown restraint"? I compliment Ralph Tremethick and his committee for doing a wonderful job in relation to police salaries. I do not care what they are paid, because, in 99.9 per cent of cases, they earn their money and are entitled to it. There may be one or two people who say to us, "You have no right to have these increases", but, when we put the case, as I have this afternoon, of what it means to most members of Parliament, most people will say, "You are entitled to it." I hope the Bill and the other two measures will now pass quickly.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that this Bill be now read a second time. For the question say "Aye"; against "No". I think the Ayes have it.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Divide.

The PRESIDENT: There must be two voices for a division. I heard only one voice.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short titles."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): To enable honourable members to examine amendments that are being prepared, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1496.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which, as the title explains, effects amendments to the Parliamentary Superannuation Act that was passed earlier this year. The amendments made by the Bill are in all respects fair and reasonable having regard to the provisions of the Superannuation Act relating to Government employees and because members of Parliament, who have contributed to this fund for a long time, deserve some real benefits. The period is now being extended. At present, the maximum availability of pension occurs only after a member has served for 20 years. This Bill gives a slightly increased pension to a member, who must serve an extra two years and a bit to be entitled to it. Therefore, that amendment is not departing in any way from the principles that were established in the previous measure. The additional 5 per cent must be earned by additional service, so there is nothing very remarkable about that.

The provisions for spouses are in no way different from those in the Superannuation Act. The provision in the Bill that enables the continuation of payments to be made by members who have elected to contribute at a higher rate because they enjoy additional salary is only logical. It seems to me to be silly that, if an officer of the Parliament or a member of a designated committee, having elected to contribute at a higher rate, has to leave that office or committee, he should not at least have the option to continue paying his superannuation instalments at the higher rate. This is entirely a matter for him, and the Bill gives him no gratuities in this respect.

The additional commutation percentage is allowed only at the top of the scale to members who have served for at least 20 years. I do not think this Bill departs in any way in principle from those that have already been established in the principal Act. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I ask that the debate be adjourned.

The PRESIDENT: Is that seconded? The debate must now proceed.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not believe that what the Hon. Mr. Potter has said really covers the full extent of the Bill. The truth is that it reduces to six years the period for which a member must serve in order to qualify for a pension. One wonders why this is so, or whether, because of the requirements of a certain political Party, some members are going to retire at the end of this session, having served for only two sessions.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is still an involuntary retirement. One has to suffer the axe before getting the benefit.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I think that will probably happen in some cases; I hope so, anyway. I do not support the Bill because I do not believe it is necessary. A member who enters Parliament does not do so for this reason but because he is willing to spend some time serving this State. I do not believe a period of six years in any way represents a sufficient qualifying time for a permanent life pension. I do not support the Bill in any way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I cannot understand the Hon. Mr. Cameron's attitude. He seems to have come into this place solely to make press headlines as a knight in shining armour against the rapacity of other honourable members! We all know that, in his own mind, the Hon. Mr. Cameron may not consider himself worthy of receiving superannuation benefits.

The only criticism the honourable member had related to the six-year qualifying period. If he is dissatisfied with that, he can support the Bill and move an amendment in Committee to change it back to eight years, as applies at present. This is an extremely reasonable Bill, the benefits

flowing from which are not excessive. After all, the Bill falls into almost the same category as the Commonwealth superannuation scheme and the schemes operating in other States. Members contribute 11½ per cent of their salary to the fund while serving as members. If one examines the position regarding public servants or that of people in private industry, one will see that the Bill in no way goes beyond what is reasonable in relation to superannuation generally.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMITTEE SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1497.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which grants increases to members of the Public Works Committee, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and the Public Accounts Committee. I believe that the amounts provided for in the Bill are not in any way out of line with the changes that have occurred in the value of money. In many cases the existing payments were fixed long ago. In fact, I think there has been no change in the remuneration paid to members of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation since 1936 or 1937, a very long time ago.

Speaking personally, I cannot really believe that, in principle, the determination of annual salaries for members serving on committees, whether they be Parliamentary committees or outside committees, is the best way of fixing the sums. Indeed, I know that the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, which looked at the question when it last considered the whole matter, ascertained that payments to members of annual salary rates are unique as a method of remuneration for people serving on committees. Accordingly, the tribunal said that the matter was outside its jurisdiction and was one for Parliament to determine. The tribunal expressed the view that the work done by Parliamentary committees was in the nature of honorary work. I do not know that I entirely agree with that latter concept. Indeed, it seems to me that nowadays it is hard to find anyone in any walk of life who is willing to do much honorary work. I noticed only the other day in the press that Meals on Wheels workers in New South Wales were all being paid instead of doing the work on an honorary basis.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You still find it in local government.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: In some cases, there is still honorary work, but unfortunately this ideal seems to be fading nowadays.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Many people work in an honorary capacity in the health field.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I realise that. I do not suggest for a moment that work on these committees should be on an honorary basis. However, I have always believed that a much better method of providing remuneration for this work would be by way of a sitting fee, which is the system used for paying members of Select Committees of this Chamber. I know that it is claimed that such a system is open to abuse, but I do not think that necessarily means that the system is bad. I believe that a proper method of remuneration not only for Parliamentary committees but also for all committees and boards (and we have many of them under the legislation this Government has introduced) is the payment of sitting fees.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Could you put an upper limit on that to prevent anyone from taking advantage of the circumstances?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I think the sitting fee should be reasonable and not \$1 an hour or anything like that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am talking about a maximum number of sittings.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: If responsible people are appointed to a committee, I do not believe that they will suddenly be irresponsible and cause the committee to meet every day of the week. If a person wanted to do that, he should not be on the committee. However, I recognise that the principle of payment for Parliamentary committees by means of annual salaries was established a long time ago. Consequently, I do not wish to interfere with it. All I say is that, if I had had any hand in the matter, I would not have adopted that method. I think it is true to say that the history of the matter shows that the present system was adopted back in the years when Parliamentary salaries were so low that it was a cheap way for the Government to solve the problem and give additional money to a few members, rather than deal with the matter properly.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are dead right.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Unfortunately, when something is done for that reason, we are stuck with it. I suppose we must have regard now to the change in the value of money that has occurred. If I had had the opportunity (and I think it is too late now, and it is certainly not for me as a private member to attempt to do anything about it), I would have established a sitting fee as a proper method of compensating members of committees. Having said that, I see no reason why the Bill should not be passed, and I support it.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I oppose the Bill. In looking at this matter, we must go back a little into the past. In a report in the *News* of November 1 last year, Mr. Rex Jory said:

State members of Parliament who were last week granted 30 per cent pay increases are planning to vote themselves another substantial rise almost immediately . . . They will be assessed tomorrow by the L.C.L. Parliamentary Party, which adjourned discussion last week. If the L.C.L. Parliamentary Party agrees to the recommended rises for members on four committees, it would pass through Parliament with a minimum of delay.

It would certainly seem that way now. The article goes on to quote figures, and states that the sum for the Chairman of the Public Works Committee will be \$3 000, whereas previously it was \$1 500. As I understand it, the Bill is now taking it up to \$2 500. The salary of the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee was to go from \$600 to \$1 900, but now it is to go to \$2 500.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: So he is wrong again.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: At least he was erring on the side of caution by comparison with what is happening now. The article goes on and on: members of the Public Accounts Committee were to have their allowances increased from \$1 000 to \$1 500 (this time it is up to \$1 400, but it is still fairly close to the mark). Going now to the *Advertiser* of November 21 last, after the Parliamentary branch of the L.C.L. had looked at this matter, Mr. Ian Steele stated:

The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Eastick) said his Party would oppose the idea and if members wanted more money they should go back to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal and ask for it.

He further stated:

Dr. Eastick labelled the proposed increases as "extreme". What is the difference now? There is not much difference between what was quoted at that stage as being the increase, on which those statements were based, and what is contained in the Bill. It is clear that what I said earlier is true: there has been some sort of arrangement or

sweetheart agreement on this matter between the two major Parties. The article further stated:

A Bill boosting politicians' salaries without unanimous Parliamentary approval would be too unpopular for any Government to fight for publicly.

Later, the article stated:

Dr. Eastick said the L.C.L. Parliamentary Party had told the Government last week it would not support the Government's plan to adopt the increases by a Parliamentary vote. Again, that has changed: The article continued:

I understand the L.C.L. has some reservations about the projected increases—

and I think that is the key to what is happening today—because some backbench committee members would receive more than the Deputy Opposition Leader, Mr. Coumbe (\$15 230) and the Opposition Whip, Mr. Evans (\$15 100). I think the position is that the leadership of the Opposition has been silenced. Opposition members have changed their original objection, expressed publicly, perhaps because of the advantages accruing to themselves. That is something I do not like to say. At a time when we should be showing restraint and setting an example to the rest of the community, we are failing to do so. I have no doubt that increases can be justified in terms of the rates of inflation. However, this goes for every section of the community and I think members will find it impossible to call for restraint in the community if they pass this legislation.

I say to Opposition members that they should forget whatever agreement they may have made or that their Leader in another place may have made with the Government, and reject this legislation. I say that to members of the Liberal Party (S.A. Division) (which means, I think, that they are only a small portion of the whole). They should curb their greed and face the problems of inflation in the full knowledge that they have not further aggravated the problem. It would be a good idea if this Chamber followed the example set by the Senate, which rejected pay increases this year. Opposition Senators were led by the Liberal Movement Senator in that place in rejecting the increases. I have some knowledge of what occurs in the Commonwealth Parliament, and I know that those members combined to defeat the move for increased salaries.

Let us show the same restraint, and let honourable members follow the example set by their colleagues. Let us heed the call made by the Prime Minister earlier this year when he asked for restraint in just these matters, no matter how hollow that call may have been; I do not believe it

was soundly based. It would be a good idea if we were to do a little bit ourselves towards solving the problem. I do not support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): Obviously, the honourable member who has just finished speaking has been sent his driving instructions and, in my opinion, has proved himself an "illiberal movement" member. The way he presented the case might make one think that the Bill was to increase Parliamentary salaries. However, nothing is further from the position. The Bill brings ancient salaries up to date. Members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee are working on 1937 salaries and members of the Public Works Committee are working on 1960 salaries. But the way in which the honourable member presented the case might suggest that there was something grasping and grabbing about the Bill. On the contrary, I think we should say that the members who serve on those anciently fixed salaries are doing a great service to this State by giving their services practically voluntarily.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Come on! That's not what the salaries tribunal said.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The money that members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee are receiving is \$500, and that was fixed in 1937; today's equivalent would be about \$100. The same applies to members of the Public Works Committee. I do not often speak to Bills of this kind for a reason that I will mention later. I agree with the thoughts the Hon. Mr. Shard expressed on an earlier Bill today. I am in the fortunate position, when increases come along, that I do not need them, but I have never objected to them, by the same token as the Hon. Mr. Shard has said, because I know that other honourable members need the money to live a reasonable existence and to be enabled to do their job properly. In my case, a higher rate of income tax takes care of the difference. I have always tried to be loyal to my colleagues. That is important, whether they are colleagues of my own Party or of other Parties. I have always tried to do the fair thing by them and have never tried to cheer chase at their expense. I query whether this is a quality for which Liberal Movement members are noted.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.21 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 22, at 2.15 p.m.