HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 13, 1974

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

NOXIOUS WEEDS

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (February 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has assured me that it is the general policy of his department that as much uniformity and co-operation as possible should exist between adjoining councils on matters of weed control. He has asked me to assure the honourable member that the authorized local weeds officers involved in the case raised by him are in close contact with each other and the Agriculture Department about the problem of soldier thistle control in the area. One of the weeds officers has been only recently appointed, but it is expected that he will give due regard to this problem and undertake appropriate action in the immediate future. In this case, there are scattered pockets of soldier thistle in the adjoining council area close to the boundary. However, far heavier infestations of this weed occur within the council area adjacent to the property in question. In fact, this property is actually the most heavily infested in the area, but it is pleasing to note that the landholder is actively co-operating with weed control authorities to check the weed.

LIGHT SHADES

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (February 28).

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN: The Australian Standards Association has recently issued a revised specification for lampholders that will be applied from July 1, 1974. This will mean that the material that chars and gives off an offensive odour will then be debarred from use in the manufacture of lampholders.

CATTLE TESTING

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (March 5).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has stated that herds are not tested regularly for brucellosis in South Australia at present However, many herds have been vaccinated with strain 19 brucellosis vaccine. Vaccinated animals are all clearly identified with a three-hole ear punch, and are thus readily recognized at sale and fetch a premium price over unvaccinated stock. With this ease of identification there would be little gam to the producer in introducing what could be a costly system of vaccination certification. Concerning the certification of brucellosis-free herds, my colleague informs me that brucellosis has different means of transmission, spread and behaviour from tuberculosis. The methods of control for the one disease are thus not necessarily applicable to the other. Because of the highly infectious nature of brucellosis the National Brucellosis-Tuberculosis Subcommittee has recommended an area approach to eradication, with concentration on infected herds in preference to an individual herd certification approach Individual herd eradication and certification has been tried in other countries but has proved more costly and less efficient than the method proposed for Australia. Because of these factors it is not planned to have certified brucella-free herds in South Australia.

TEACHER AIDE

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (March 5).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In November the appointment of a part-time teacher aide at Basket Range Primary School was authorized. An application form recommending a male appointee was received in mid-January from the head of the school. At that time equal pay was not in operation and there was no provision for the employment of a male in a teacher aide position. However, with the introduction of equal pay it is considered that, although teacher aide positions are more appropriate for mature adult females, it would be unreasonable to restrict the employment of teacher aides to females. Therefore, provided the appointment of a male is recommended by the head of a school and he satisfies normal departmental criteria, the appointment of a male may be confirmed On March 12 the head of the Basket Range Primary School was advised to advertise the position, and if the previous male applicant is still the most suitable person and is recommended by the head, he will be appointed

COOPER CROSSING

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (February 28).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: All available Highways Department manpower and other resources on the Birdsville track are required full time on repairs and preparations for the operation of the Cooper crossing ferry, which it is expected will commence towards the end of this month. It is not practicable to defer the normal leave periods but, as two separate gangs are involved, the work will be continuous. At present the Birdsville track in this area should only be traversed by high four-wheel drive vehicles on an essential trip basis. The Highways Department will assist in emergencies in any way possible, and the departmental office at Port Augusta should be contacted by people contemplating this trip and in any emergency. Unfortunately, men and equipment cannot be spared to remain at the main Cooper crossing on a stand-by basis to assist travellers.

NORTHERN ROADS

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (February 27).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The programming of reconstruction of the Horrocks Pass to Stirling North road and the Port Augusta to Stirling North road is now dependent on the outcome of investigations being carried out in connection with housing requirements for the Redcliff petrochemical project. The alignment of both these roads could be changed in the Stirling North locality, and designs have been held up pending a planning investigation It is doubtful whether construction work will commence before 1975-76.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

In reply to Mr MATHWIN (February 27).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As promised on November 21, 1973, when the honourable member first raised this matter, I called for a report and gave him a prompt reply by letter on December 5, 1973.

STANDING ORDERS

The SPEAKER: Before asking honourable members whether they wish to ask any Questions without Notice, I refer to a request made during the debate last evening, that the Standing Orders Committee further consider the present Standing Orders. It was pointed out that some members believed that not sufficient time was allowed in which to ask questions. I remind honourable members that, under Standing Orders referring to Questions without Notice, a member can ask a question and, with leave of the Speaker and every honourable member, make a brief

explanation. In order that the greatest time can be allowed in which to ask questions, I impress on all members that their explanation to the question should be brief, because that explanation can be withdrawn by the Speaker or by any other honourable member. Although this does not apply to Ministers, because they do not seek leave for the purpose of answering questions, I ask that, if a reply that they are to give is to be lengthy and will therefore take up much of the time allotted for questions, they bring down a written reply rather than give a lengthy verbal reply, as a lengthy reply reduces the time available for honourable members to ask questions. That principle will apply hereafter.

INFLATION

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what level of inflation he considers to be tolerable and at what level he considers that a serious situation would exist in relation to the South Australian economy? The Commonwealth Treasurer is reported as having said that he believes that Australia could survive an inflation rale of more than 14 per cent, and the distinct inference one can draw from that statement is that he believes that rate of inflation can be sustained constantly. When pressed for an opinion about what was a tolerable level of inflation, the Commonwealth Treasurer said that some countries had recently had inflation rates as high as several hundred per cent a year. He is also reported as having said that the existence of that rate of inflation had not brought economic ruin to everyone in those countries, and I stress the word "everyone". I hope that in answering this question the Premier will realize that the Opposition is interested in the total community and not in some arbitrary view such as that expressed by the Commonwealth Treasurer.

The Hon. D A. DUNSTAN: Inevitably, in a full employment economy there are inflationary pressures, which will be reflected in the movement of prices in the economy. It is impossible to deal with an economy in which the resources are fully used without some degree of inflation occurring Previously, the rale of inflation that it was considered could be coped with in Australia without major social dislocation, given our then method of adjustment within the community, was about 4 per cent. The problem at present facing Australia is that nearly all of the countries from which we are importing have inflation rates far in excess of that rate and, indeed, far in excess of our present inflation rate.

Dr. Eastick But you don't condone it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of condoning.

The SPEAKER: The interjection is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That question simply does not arise How on earth can a State Government in Australia condone an inflation rate in Japan? The inflation rate in Japan happens to be a fact of life, just as the inflation rate in Great Britain and the United States of America happens to be a fact of life that we must face In these circumstances, action has to be taken by the Australian Government to adapt the situation that arises in our economy to the fact that it is inevitable that a certain degree of inflation will arise not merely from the pressures of full use of our resources but also from the importation of inflation. That is all I can say to the Leader. It is not possible to go beyond what I have said in stating what things the Government must face in this regard in this country.

SALISBURY BUS SERVICE

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport say whether any decision has been made following representations made by other members and me regarding the bus service in the eastern suburbs catering for employees of the Weapons Research Establishment at Salisbury?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, a decision has been made on the matter. As was indicated at the commencement of this service, the arrangements then applying were temporary and would apply until the many problems associated with the transfer had settled down, and then the matter would be considered in an objective way to try to restore the services previously provided. I do not think it necessary to remind the House that the operator of those services abdicated rather hurriedly from the field and took his buses with him. However, I am pleased to say that we have been able to rearrange the operations to the extent that, from Monday week, the services that applied before the former operator withdrew them will all be restored on basically the same routes as applied previously, and the fare will be 35c each way.

MURRAY RIVER LEVELS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works give me information regarding the expected levels of the Murray River, especially adjacent to the State border? The recent heavy rams in Queensland and New South Wales have resulted in widespread flooding down through the Darling River, and these floods are now passing Lake Menindee and moving towards Wentworth, at the confluence of the Darling and Murray Rivers. This poses the question of what effect those floodwaters will have on the Murray River in South Australia. As many people have expressed concern to me about the matter, I should appreciate information from the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN. Yesterday I had with me a report on the latest forecast by departmental officers of the levels in the Murray River. There is no need for alarm at present about the level to which the river is likely to rise in this State, but I will not try to give the honourable member the details of that report off the cuff: I would prefer to have the docket returned. Each week I obtain from the department a report on the latest forecast. I think I have said previously in this House (I am sure the Deputy Leader appreciates this) that forecasts by departmental officers m this respect have been accurate, and I have no reason to think that that accuracy will be departed from now. I think I can say in general terms that there is no cause for alarm as a result of this flooding, although every downpour alters the situation I will obtain the latest information that I can get, and next Tuesday or Wednesday I will give the Deputy Leader a report on the latest forecast.

LOAD EXEMPTIONS

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he intends to extend the load exemptions, provided for in the Road Traffic Act for primary producers carting grain, to include the cartage of superphosphate?

The Hon G T. VIRGO: I assume that the honourable member is referring to the provisions of the Act as amended in the 1973 session of Parliament I am speaking from memory, but I think the administration of provisions regarding the granting of exemption was vested in the Road Traffic Board, not the Minister. If that is correct, the board would make the appropriate decision. However, I will check the matter and, if what I have said is not correct, I will tell the honourable member what is the position.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier obtain from the General Manager of the State Government Insurance Commission an estimate of the increased cost, because of the amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act passed in this Parliament last year, of a $20 000 house built for sale? On February 21, in this House the Premier said that, as a result of the alteration to the workmen's compensation provisions, the increased cost that could be justified in relation to a $20 000 house would be about $125. Last evening, on the *Newsbeat* television programme, the Minister of Labour and Industry said that the increase would be about $225. I am told by an insurance company that the rate has increased from $9 50 for each $100 to $19.02 for each $100. Using those figures in relation to a house whose selling price was $20 000, calculating that the cost for materials and labour would be $18 000. and allowing 50 per cent for labour, one arrives at an increase of $855. If one allows 30 per cent for labour, the increase is $570. Those figures do not take into account any effect of labour input with regard to the materials provided for the house. When that component filters through it can be conservatively estimated that at least 50 per cent can be added to the estimates I have given. Therefore, I ask my question, knowing that someone is being deceitful—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: —and not telling—

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the explanation of the honourable member for Goyder is out of order.

Mr. Hall: Who's telling the truth?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the outset of his explanation the honourable member has taken two figures that refer to different matters. Initially, I was asked about the cost of extra workmen's compensation arising out of section 8 (1a) of the Workmen's Compensation Act. and I gave an appropriate figure. An investigation by the department of the Minister of Labour and Industry has related to other matters in the Workmen's Compensation Act. Therefore, a different figure covering different bases was properly given in each case; there is no difference involved. Discussions have been held with the State Government Insurance Commission concerning forecasts of increases in premiums. An investigation in relation to this is also being conducted by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. In the next couple or days, I shall be making a comprehensive statement on the matter.

Mr. Hall: Was the Minister right or wrong last evening?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder is wrong today.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He's never been right.

The SPEAKER Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of die Premier, give the correct figures and calculations of the likely increase in the price of a $20 000 house as a result of amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act? In his question, the member for Goyder referred specifically to a discrepancy between the figure used by the Premier and another used by the Minister of Labour and Industry. The Premier was quoted as having said that the increase would be $125. In reply to the member for Goyder, the Premier said that that figure was in relation to section 8 (1a) of the Workmen's Compensation Act Evidence has been produced suggesting that the increase will be at least $500, probably $800, and possibly as great as $1 300. I believe it is time that an accurate calculation and figure was given in relation to this increase.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In replying to the member for Goyder, the Premier said that the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs was already investigating this matter. I think that I can go a little further than that by saying that the Attorney-General (who is the Minister responsible for the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs) has instituted an inquiry that will involve the Department of Labour and Industry and the State Government Insurance Commission, as well as the Commissioner. I think that the honourable member will appreciate that, whether the house in question is to cost $20 000, $30 000, or any other sum, the circumstances involved vary, depending on how many people a builder employs on the job that have to be actually covered by workmen's compensation.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's why I asked the question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I appreciate the question because we want to clear up the matter in the interests of builders and of people who are having houses built. I think that the honourable member will appreciate that a variety of methods can be employed in building a house. We hope that the committee to report to the Attorney-General will be able to give us a far better idea than we have now of the actual increase involved. At present, we are not certain whether builders or insurance companies are taking people for a ride, or of what the exact situation really is Let me assure the honourable member that we are doing all we can as quickly as possible to answer the question he has asked. As soon as we have the information we will let the honourable member, other honourable members, builders, and the public generally know what is the position. We want this matter cleared up once and for all; we want it on a proper basis.

DOG FENCE

Mr ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands whether adequate supplies of fencing material are available to repair sections of the dog fence that were washed away in the recent floods? My information is that landowners are having difficulty in obtaining supplies of fencing material to repair the fence. In fact, some landowners are borrowing material from neighbouring stations that are fortunate enough to have some supplies on hand. This problem, together with a serious outbreak of flystrike following the recent rains, is making it most difficult to control wild dogs in the area.

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN: I will draw the attention of my colleague to the honourable member's comments. As I appreciate that this is a serious problem, I am sure that the Minister of Lands will do what he can to help to solve it and I will bring down a report as soon as possible.

NURIOOTPA BY-PASS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report on progress being made in planning and constructing the Nuriootpa by-pass road? I have often been approached about this matter. Some time ago, I presented to the Minister a petition containing the signatures of most of the residents in this area. I have since been asked to find out just what progress has been made. I point out that I previously asked the Minister a question about an intersection in my district, but his reply did not indicate whether or not he intended to obtain a report. I am referring to a question I asked about the intersection of Main Road No. 211 and the Sanderston to Walker Flat district road, and I hope that the Minister will be good enough to bring something back to the House for me in

connection with that question also His answer to that question was rather churlish, indicating that he would have a look at the matter, but I did not understand that he would obtain a report. I should appreciate it if the Minister would look at both these matters and bring back a report to the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot ask two questions at once.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, I take it that you are indicating that the honourable member can ask only one question. In that case, I will obtain a reply to the first question asked.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier say when his Government approached the Commonwealth Minister for Transport with a request that Adelaide Airport be made an international airport? Also, will he say why such an approach was made and whether it is Government policy to have Adelaide Airport made an international airport? Last December, Senator Jessop asked Senator Cavanagh a question in the Australian Parliament concerning this matter, and the reply was as follows:

There have been negotiations over a period of some years on the question of Adelaide Airport. I do not know what stage they have reached or whether there has been any recent approach by the South Australian Government.

The Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) has now replied to Senator Cavanagh, who has forwarded the reply to Senator Jessop, as follows:

There has been an approach made by the South Australian Government for Adelaide to be made an international airport.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has not been an approach made by the South Australian Government to have Adelaide Airport made an international airport, and there never has been.

Mr. Becker: That's different from what the Commonwealth Minister said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not care what anyone said about this. There has been an approach to the Commonwealth Government concerning an international airport for South Australia which was specifically stated not to be Adelaide Airport. I have not seen the honourable member's material but that is the situation. There has never been an approach by the South Australian Government (certainly not by this Government) to make Adelaide Airport an international airport.

MINISTRY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say whether the Government is considering increasing the size of the South Australian Ministry from 11 to 12 and, if it is, from which House the new Minister will come?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, we are considering that, but no decision has yet been made.

OLD GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when it is intended to call tenders for the demolition of Old Government House in Belair Recreation Park? Over 12 months ago, when I referred to the poor condition of this building, I was assured that work would be carried out to restore it. Inside the building is much historic furniture, as well as clothing and firearms, including all types of weapon, and there really is much history attached to this building. Building materials such as bricks, mesh and tiles have been lying on the site for about two years and no work is being done at present. One can only assume from this that the Government intends to let the building deteriorate to such a stage that it will be necessary to demolish it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member is wrong again.

BOWKER STREET LAND

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say what stage has been leached in the negotiations being conducted by the Education Department, Brighton council and the Public Buildings Department regarding the Bowker Street land which is owned by the Education Department? An oval has been established in the area and it is now being used well, but the rest of the area is awaiting development. Many schoolchildren arc using the oval and it is also used by adults and children in the evenings and at weekends. Toilets have not yet been built at the oval and they are now needed urgently because of the number of people using it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter has been complicated by the number of applications we had to consider for the use of the remainder of the land. The applications, which showed a widespread interest in the land, required careful consideration by the Education Department. My understanding, which is not completely up to date in regard to negotiations, is that negotiations are at an advanced stage, but I will bring down a detailed report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

MURRAY RIVER SEWERAGE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say what progress is being made on the provision of sewerage discharge stations along the Murray River, where they will be situated, and when it is expected that they will be completed and in use? I believe that about two years ago the Minister introduced legislation to amend the appropriate Act to provide for the building of discharge stations along the river and also for the provision of holding tanks on certain types of river craft.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The legislation was amended to provide that vessels over a certain size using the Murray River would be required to have proper toilet facilities installed on them. At the same time the Government said it would provide holding tanks or sewage disposal works at certain points along the river so that sewage could be discharged into them rather than into the river as had been the practice in the past. I am not certain how many stations are to be established or exactly where they will be established. I think the requirement of the Act, from memory, is that from June this year vessels over a certain size will be required to be fitted with proper toilet facilities and to discharge sewage into the holding tanks or sewage works. If that is the case the work will be well under way. For the sake of the honourable member and of other honourable members, I will obtain a report stating the exact location and number of these facilities and when it is expected that the requirements under the Act will be in force.

MILK TANKS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to have an investigation made into the need to have milk tanks compulsorily tested every 18 months? It costs a considerable sum to have these tanks tested every 18 months, especially when many of them prove accurate every time. It would appear that, if occasional spot tests were conducted, the same result would be achieved without dairy farmers having to incur this great expense.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although this matter has been raised by the honourable member previously, I will again take it up with my colleague and see whether he will accept the honourable member's suggestion.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Premier agree that the future of the Redcliff project is vitally tied to the availability of raw gas and, if he does, will he say what positive steps the Government has taken to obtain from the Commonwealth Government, and more particularly from Mr. Connor (Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy), a stated price ex field for gas and its liquid petroleum gas component? Members would have seen in the *Advertiser* of Friday, March 8, a report from Santos Limited regarding the problems it is currently experiencing. Mr. J. O. Zehnder (Managing Director) is reported to have said that it cannot be demonstrated beyond doubt that natural gas production is a sound and viable proposition until it is known what price will be received for the product The further development of the area is therefore being prevented by the inability of this producer and other producers to obtain a stated price from the Commonwealth Government. Copies of questions asked on February 20 and 21 regarding this matter were, as a matter of courtesy, forwarded to the Managing Director of Santos Limited, who said in reply that he accepted the basis of the question and the factual comments made by the Premier in reply to questions asked by other members and by me. Mr Zehnder said in his reply that the whole crux of the matter was that, although the Commonwealth Government had informed producers that they would get what they termed a fair return for their l.p.g., no-one was yet able or willing to put an actual price tag on it. He continued

Ultimately, the Commonwealth must provide this answer and, until such time as they do, I see no way of furthering the project.

The project certainly involves more than the gas field; surely it also includes the Redcliff project and other projects that are an integral part of the whole scheme. Will the Premier therefore say what action the Government has taken to obtain, without further delay, a price tag for the raw gas and, more particularly, for l.p.g.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think the Leader understands where the markets are. At present, the producers of dry gas are trying to renegotiate prices, and this matter is currently being discussed with their consumers in New South Wales and South Australia. The Commonwealth Minister has tried to facilitate those discussions and, indeed, he has been kept constantly informed of them.

Dr. Eastick: Was he invited in?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was asked to come in by the producers, who have been to see him, just as I have. The producers have certainly not suggested that the Commonwealth Minister is intruding in this matter. Indeed, they have asked for his help and, what is more, they have got it. When the prices for dry gas contracts have been renegotiated, it is expected that final decisions will be taken regarding the liquid.

Dr. Eastick: Is one dependent on the other?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it is. The whole viability of the liquids line depends on the dry gas contracts, and I have said that until I am blue in the face. That is what the whole exercise is about, and that is why we sold gas to New South Wales. It is not possible to give a final price for l.p.g. until the petro-chemicals consortium gives a price for the liquids that it is taking and until the breakup of those liquids is agreed upon. The Commonwealth Government has clearly indicated to the State Government and the producers that the latter will get a market price for their l.p.g. that will make it economic for them to produce it and convert it to gasoline.

Dr. Eastick: That's a bit airy-fairy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They cannot give a price in isolation from the remainder of the project. If the Leader thinks that business is conducted in that way, I can only say that he will never conclude a contract about anything.

Mr. Venning: He's done all right so far.

The Hon. D A DUNSTAN: So far he has not had the opportunity and, on present indications, he will never get it anyway. The producers have not yet obtained from the petro-chemicals consortium a final proposal regarding prices

Dr. Eastick: Is the same bloke holding them up?

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he is not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader must comply with Standing Orders, just as other honourable members must. He can ask a question and receive a reply, but he cannot continually interject and get four or five answers to his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position in this respect has clearly been stated by Mr. Zehnder and Mr. Blair: we are waiting on the I.C.I. consortium regarding the prices to which I have referred, and there is no question that the Commonwealth Minister is holding up decisions in this matter. Indeed, he has been of signal assistance to the Government in pointing out not only that Commonwealth Government assistance will be available in relation to l.p.g. conversion and prices within the total picture, but also that the Commonwealth Government will guarantee back-up supplies from the Mereenie-Palm Valley field and, therefore, that the amortization periods for the project should be different. That is clearly the Commonwealth Government's position. Mr. Connor has not been holding up this matter, and it is obvious from the Leader's explanation of his question that he does not understand where our markets are.

CITY RATING

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say whether there is an agreement between the South Australian Government and the Adelaide City Council that guarantees to private and commercial developers fixed rates for a certain period at the same rate as applied before redevelopment or restoration of properties, or does this condition apply only to commercial enterprises? I have received a complaint from one of my constituents who wrote to the Adelaide City Council regarding a statement that had been attributed to the Premier in the November, 1973, issue of *Vogue Australia.* I should like to read the relevant part of the report.

The SPEAKER: I hope it is not lengthy.

Mr. WRIGHT: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not lengthy. The report states:

We have also agreed with the council on special rating "holidays"—five years of rates pegged at the pre-development level—for people who restore and create residences in the heart of the city

The Adelaide City Council, after receiving an application from my constituent, replied to him, but probably I am not permitted to read all the correspondence. The council's reply concludes by stating:

I advise that the payment of the rates due should be made to the City Treasurer before December 1, 1973, in order to avoid a penalty of 5 per cent which is required to be added to unpaid rates as provided in the Local Government Act, 1934-1972.

The letter also states that it is regretted that the council is not able to alter the assessment relating to the property. It is obvious from that correspondence that, although my constituent applied on the basis of the report in *Vogue Australia,* the council did not see fit to grant the concession and I ask the Premier whether there is an explanation for this action.

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

UNDERGROUND WATER

Mr. RODDA: I understand that a public meeting is to be held in Mount Gambier this evening at which officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Mines Department will describe the underground water studies that have been carried out in the South-East and explain the administration of the Underground Waters Preservation Act. The advertisement that has been brought to my attention about the meeting also states that ample time will be given for discussion of the matter and for questions. The fact that constituents have asked me for information about this meeting highlights the immense interest being taken in the use and preservation of the wonderful commodity of water that we have in the South-East, and I ask the Minister of Works whether he will explain the reason for the meeting.

The Hon. J D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's question. As all members know, not long ago the South-East was brought under the control provisions of the Underground Waters Preservation Act, and this action caused much discussion in that area about the reasons for taking it and about what it meant. Already at meetings held in Millicent and Padthaway officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Mines Department have explained the provisions of the Act and the effect it would have on landholders regarding irrigation, stock bores, and so on. The Mount Gambier meeting is a further meeting in that area and I understand that Mr. Keith Lewis (Engineer-in-Chief designate), Mr. Tuckwell, of the Underground Waters Advisory Committee, and an officer of the Mines Department will be present to give information to landholders in that area. I expect that that meeting will complete the meetings to be held in the South-East and it will give Mount Gambier landholders the opportunity to hear not only why that area has been placed under the Act but also what effect that action will have on them. The landholders will have the opportunity to question the officers on any specific aspect of the controls in which they are interested. I wanted these meetings to be held, and I would see to it that meetings were held anywhere else in the State. The meetings were held in the South-East not merely because I, along with the member for Victoria, have a special interest in that part of the State: I would see to it that meetings were held in other parts of the State, because I think the member for Victoria would agree with me that many doubts and objections have arisen purely from ignorance. The Government and the departments involved have a responsibility to inform, as well as they can, all the people likely to be affected. This is the purpose of the Mount Gambier meeting and it was also the purpose of the two meetings already held. I hope that the meeting this evening serves that purpose and that it will relieve the honourable member, the member for Mount Gambier, and me of some of the queries that have arisen in the past. I hope that the people in the area generally will be better informed than they have been. As the member for Victoria knows, there is a need to protect our valuable underground water resource, particularly in the South-East, because we virtually live on top of it. It is in the interests not only of that part of the State but of the State as a whole to ensure that the underground waters are properly protected, and that could be done only by taking the action that we have taken. I hope that the meeting will be a success.

BLOOD ALCOHOL LEVELS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he has considered ways in which the blood alcohol levels of people involved in fatal or other serious road accidents may be publicized more widely, perhaps on a regular basis? It is not possible for newspapers to report the involvement or otherwise of alcohol in relation to an accident, and I am not suggesting that the people concerned should be named, because obviously if that was done there would be a possibility of legal proceedings being instituted. However, the relationship between blood alcohol levels and these accidents tends to be forgotten. The Victoria Police Surgeon (Dr. John Birrell) has stated that the reporting of fatal road accidents by newspapers highlights many aspects of road safety but tends to soft-pedal the association of alcohol with the road toll. The doctor stated that some time ago, in a spectacular crash in which several youths were killed, publicity was directed at hot-rods and suicidal corners, but no publicity was given to the fact that the driver had a blood alcohol content of .138 per cent. Other examples have been given and, as the taking of blood alcohol levels has become an established fact, I ask the Minister whether he will use these figures and whether they could be used in the way I have mentioned.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, because it has been exercising my mind for a long time, not only since the Bill was introduced but since before then. In fact, I vividly recall being accused by one of the honourable member's colleagues of failing to provide safety precautions on a bridge, whereas it was stated publicly that the cause of the accident was the cause to which the honourable member has referred. All too often the wrong reason is attributed as the cause. I have been getting these statistics since we started taking these figures about six months ago, but I have said that I am not satisfied with the way they are presented, because they do not show the real core of the problem. They are factual figures but they do not really show the number of accidents in which alcohol was involved or the extent to which it was involved. The Road Traffic Board and the police are co-operating in this area and we are examining how to produce these figures in a more meaningful way. However, I am sure the honourable member appreciates that the first problem we encounter is that in many cases legal proceedings could be pending and it is not possible to produce the information at the Lime. I am trying to have the information presented in a different and more meaningful way. Both objectives are fairly difficult to achieve but it is sufficient to say that the difficult things take a little longer, and we are still trying to achieve the objectives to which I have referred.

RUTHVEN MANSIONS

Mr. COUMBE: Recently it was announced that Ruthven Mansions would be vacated. As the building is extremely unsafe, I hope it will be demolished. Can the Minister of Works say whether it will be demolished and the site used for other Government purposes, or whether the Government intends to offer the building and site for sale?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I have already announced, I think three or four weeks ago, the Government intends to demolish the building as soon as possible. The future of the site has not yet been determined

RAILWAY PROPERTY

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether work being done on railway property by district councils can be said to constitute an infringement of the Local Government Act? As the Minister is also, as Minister of Transport, responsible for the South Australian Railways, he will know whether railway properly is considered to be the property of the people and whether work being done on that property by district councils does constitute an infringement of the Local Government Act.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As it is not within my province to give legal interpretations of the Local Government Act, I will ask the Crown Solicitor to examine the matter, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

ROAD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Transport say whether, in cases where Commonwealth Government money is needed for road development in this State, the Commonwealth Government requires an environmental impact study to be carried out and submitted before it makes the money available?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is referring to the present situation, the answer is "No". If he is referring to what will be the position from July 1, under new legislation, I can say that I expect the position will be as he outlined in his question.

BEACH SAND

Mr. MATHWIN. Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether it is intended to continue the programme for replenishing sand on metropolitan beaches and, if it is, when and where replenishment will be commenced and sand brought in from the sea? Last year, replenishment of sand took place at several beaches. I refer particularly to Somerton, Glenelg, Brighton, and Henley Beach, at which beaches considerable erosion has occurred in certain areas, so that it now seems obvious that something will have to be done about the situation. Will sand be transported to these eroded areas?

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes The honourable member will recall that a survey was undertaken to establish whether the sand reserves off shore were sufficient to enable sand to be dredged from those reserves and placed on the beaches. Initially, the result showed clearly that, to varying degrees, there were substantial supplies of sand off shore Further tests have produced complications in relation to the extent of these reserves. In some cases, the depth of sand was substantial, but then came a strata of clay-like material and, after that, additional sand. Because of difficulties in relation to the size of the grain of the sand, the areas from which sand should be removed, the need to ensure that seaweed growth would not be affected, and so on, it has taken longer than we would have desired to take final decisions about using these offshore sand reserves. A considerable quantity of sand has been transported from the Taperoo area and placed along the beaches. Currently, we are considering the use of on-shore resources of sand to undertake in the short term the work to which the honourable member refers, until final decisions can be made about the use of offshore resources. I will take up the matter with the Coast Protection Board to see whether I can obtain for the honourable member any specific programme of work.

HAHNDORF SEWERAGE

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Works obtain a report on progress being made in relation to a deep drainage system for Hahndorf?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will look into the matter and let the honourable member know.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Development and Mines explain to the House his reasons for nominating Mr. Tony Richardson as his appointee to the committee under section 8a of the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act? I have been asked by people in several quarters why the Minister chose to nominate Mr. Richardson, who some consider has a vested interest in Monarto (not a financial interest but an interest as the General Manager of the commission). The view is being expressed to me that surely it would have been better to appoint an outsider who was able to look at matters objectively without being so closely involved in this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is that Mr. Richardson has been nominated because he is General Manager of the Monarto Development Commission. He is only one of three members of the committee to which the honourable member has referred, the other two being the State Valuer-General and a person nominated by the Institute of Valuers (Mr. L. H. Laffer). Mr. Laffer is not in any way under the control of Mr. Richardson In addition, the State Valuer-General (Mr Peter Petherick) is not under my Ministerial jurisdiction, and the only one of the three that is accountable to me as Minister Assisting the Premier is in fact Mr. Richardson. I think it is important that the Monarto Development Commission be represented on the committee. It is important that it not have an in-built majority. It has not.

LAND SUBDIVISION

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to say what is the Government's policy with respect to subdividing leasehold land in watershed areas? Secondly, will he obtain a report on the subdivision of leasehold land forming a property known as Amaroo adjacent to Millbrook reservoir at Chain of Ponds? There have been many complaints from and much consternation has been expressed by people living in the Chain of Ponds and Millbrook area concerning a recent sale of the Amaroo property, and an investigation indicates that permission was given between November and December, 1972. to divide the lease into 13 parts.

The Hon. J D. Corcoran: What is the size of the areas?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think they are about 20 acres (8 ha) and the new section numbers run consecutively from 441 to 453, in the hundred of Para Wirra I think the Land Board decided to grant these subleases but it seems to be in direct conflict with the strictures relating to freehold land in this area. Indeed, it seems to conflict with Government policy, and it is one area where the Government has, by law. complete control.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up this matter with my colleague. I take it that the honourable member's complaint is that this land was held on perpetual lease and that the Land Board permitted a subdivision into areas not considered to be viable. Also, I take it that he is referring to the board's policy prior to a certain date in 1972 and prior to amendments to the Planning and Development Act which now prohibit subdividing areas of less than, I think, 70 acres (28 ha). I assume that this provision did not apply at the time but that the subdivision would be

contrary to the general policy that any area under perpetual lease must be a viable unit. The honourable member queries the Land Board's decision in relation to subdividing this area: I do not know the nature of the land, although it might be considered that in this area 20 acres could sustain a viable unit and could produce—

Mr. Goldsworthy It couldn't.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has a better knowledge of the area than I have, but I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report for him

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works (Engineering and Biology Building),

Nuriootpa Police Station.

Ordered that reports be printed.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask. leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It deals with two minor matters arising under the South-Eastern Drainage Act The South-Eastern Drainage Act provides for landholder representation on the drainage board and on the appeal board established pursuant to its provisions. A "landholder" is defined in the principal Act as the owner of a freehold estate in the land, the holder of land under an agreement with the Crown or the holder of a perpetual lease of the land. In a number of cases land is held by a small family company. In this case the members of the company are strictly not entitled to be appointed as landholder members of the drainage board or the appeal board because they are not "landholders'. The Government feels that such persons should be eligible for appointment and hence the present Bill contains provisions under which a Director of a body corporate or a member of its board of management is eligible for election or appointment to one of the boards established under the principal Act where the body corporate is a landholder in respect of land situated in the South-East.

The second amendment deals with interest on unpaid rates. At present the principal Act provides that interest commences to run after the expiration of three months from the time at which the rates became due and payable. The principal Act, however, draws a distinction between the time at which rates become due and payable and the time at which rates become recoverable. In fact they become "recoverable" some time after they become "due and payable". The Government believes that it is appropriate that interest should run as from three months after the rates become "recoverable" and an amendment is made accordingly.

Clause 1 is formal Clause 2 provides that the amendments will be retrospective to April 1, 1972. The amendments are made retrospective in order to validate the election of certain persons to the appeal board. Clauses 3 and 4 provide that, where a body corporate is a landholder in respect of land in the South-East, a director of the body corporate or a member of its board of management shall be eligible for election to the drainage board and the appeal board respectively Clause 5 provides that interest shall run as from three months after drainage rates become recoverable.

Mr RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1972 Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING. I move.

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

In 1972 amendments were made to the Supreme Court Act under which the court was empowered to award interest to a successful plaintiff running from a date prior to the date of judgment. Before these amendments, with a few exceptions, interest ran from the date of judgment, but there was no power to award interest from a date before judgment. The purpose of the amendments, as honourable members will recall, was to remedy the injustice that occurs where a defendant delays settlement of a plaintiff's just claims, thus depriving him of proper compensation for a substantial period and at the same time obtaining the financial advantages that delay in the payment of compensation might confer. These amendments were considered by the Full Court in the case of *Sager* v. *Morten and Morrison.*

The major question in this case was whether the amendments made by Parliament in 1972 empowered or obliged the court to award interest on future economic loss (that is, loss to be suffered by the plaintiff after the date of the judgment). A consideration of the judgment in that case discloses the considerable difficulty inherent in a distinction for this purpose between loss or injury to be incurred or suffered in future, and loss or injury incurred or suffered before judgment. However, be that as it may, the Government accepts the view of the judges that greater freedom and flexibility should be built into the provision for the award of interest, so that the court is empowered to do substantial justice between the parties without reference to rigid rules. The amendments proposed by the present Bill therefore confer on the court power to fix an appropriate rate of interest to be paid by the defendant, or alternatively to fix a lump sum to be paid by him in lieu of interest. A further amendment is made to the principal Act under which the persons presently designated in the Act as "messengers" will, in future, have the statutory title "tipstaves". This amendment is designed to give a more appropriate designation to the office. The Supreme Court "messenger" performs many functions that are not really those of a messenger, and the term "tipstaff" has been traditionally used in relation to those who hold this office The Act is therefore brought in line with this existing tradition.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 empowers the court to fix a rate of interest to be paid by the defendant upon any portion of the judgment debt as from a date earlier than the date of judgment at such rate as the court may in its discretion

decide. A further provision is inserted enabling the court to award a lump sum in lieu of interest. Clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7 change the designation of a Supreme Court messenger to "tipstaff".

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the paying of refunds on certain containers; to prohibit the sale of certain containers; for matters incidental thereto and for other purposes Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This is a Bill to impose a mandatory returnable deposit on beverage containers. The principles on which it is based are not new. They were developed by the trade, and for many years have been applied by the beverage industry to bottles. But this well-developed and organized system of deposit and refund, of issue and collection, has not included so-called convenience beverage containers, those cans and non-reusable containers which so disfigure our rural and urban environment. This measure will extend a long and well-established mechanism to all beverage containers and not simply some as at present.

The apparent novelty of requiring a compulsory returnable deposit on all beverage containers is an illusion. It was first imposed in Oregon in October, 1972. It was imposed in Alberta in January, 1973, in Saskatchewan in August, 1973, and in Vermont in September, 1973. The Province of Manitoba has announced that it will introduce such a legal requirement in the near future and various local governments, being Ann Arbor, Oberlin, Bowie and Howard County in the United States of America have also done so. In all these areas, with the possible exception of Vermont, the system is working well, has been accepted by the local population as an effective measure and has created surprisingly little disturbance to the container industry, except in Oregon. In that State alone cans virtually disappeared from the market, largely because pull-top cans were banned. For this reason this Bill specifies that such openers shall not be banned in South Australia until the last day of June, 1976. We do not intend this legislation to "ban-the-can", as has been done in Saskatchewan, but we serve notice in this measure that the pull-top opener must disappear within two years.

I am not unaware of the interest our prior notice of intention to introduce such legislation has generated. It would, of course, be impossible to have lived in South Australia over the last few months without being so aware as a result of the massive advertising campaign so freely undertaken by some sectors of the packaging industry. Consequently, it is necessary to explain some of the thinking that lies behind the introduction of this measure today. This measure is introduced to resolve a problem of great public interest that has been drawn very strongly and frequently to the Government's attention by councils, as well as the Local Government Association, health authorities, including the National Health and Medical Research Council, the beverage-packaging industry, the press, many members of the public of South Australia, and by members on both sides of this House. Most of the complaints received referred to increasing litter caused by non-returnable beverage containers, a problem which is particularly obvious in coastal and other areas with many summer visitors and tourists.

Such areas are expensive to clear according to the councils affected, but they can be cleared. Of equal or possibly greater significance is litter, much of it concealed litter, in outback areas, in the seas, on our coasts, on roadsides, and in tourist areas and national parks where clearing up is not easy, is very expensive, and in too many cases is virtually impossible. It must not be forgotten that non-returnable containers in this State are taking over an increasing share of the market. At present they represent about one-quarter of all soft drink sales and the potential, which may not be reached, is of course four times that. The problem at present is great and disturbing with about 100 000 000 cans sold each year in South Australia. The potential is horrifying if some method of ensuring return is not established.

If all sales in returnable bottles disappear, the existing system of deposit and return would also disappear, so losing a long-established recycling system at a time when so much thought is being given to ways in which further such systems can be established for all kinds of material. Of importance in the Government's initial detailed thinking were other problems that could arise or had arisen, such as the cost of and sites for garbage disposal, particularly in the Adelaide area where problems are beginning to appear, resource use, and the possibility of establishing a viable system of recycling. Thus, litter control is only one aspect of what the Government has always considered as part of a much bigger problem.

We may not be said to be tackling the problem piecemeal, as this legislation is only the first stage. We intend to introduce further legislation specifically to cover the problems of litter throughout the State and waste disposal of all kinds, particularly within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. At present we await a final report on litter control, while the problems of waste disposal are now being studied on behalf of the Australian Environment Council. The Government has always been aware of the possible adverse social effects of any legislation, particularly in this case in relation to employment and to the industry which generates that employment. It has been equally conscious of the likely adverse effects of simple expedients such as banning selected products and the problems that could arise in introducing a deposit system on beverage containers.

We have been particularly aware of difficulties that could be faced by small traders, if they were to be forced by legislative action to accept the return of many bottles and other containers. We have, therefore, made provision for the establishment of collection depots covering specified areas to which other containers will be returned for deposit refund. A provision is made that such collection depots may cover delineated regions and need only accept containers of a specified description. Consequently, a depot may be a shop or store, or may be a specialized centre at which containers only will be received and refunds paid. On the basis of experience in the Province of Alberta, it is expected that the minimum number of such depots that will be required in the metropolitan area is about 20.

This provision is not extended to bottles, following discussions with representatives of the small traders who consider that the return of bottles is advantageous to their businesses. Following discussions with representatives of the beverage industry, particularly the soft drink part of that industry, a provision is made that containers must be marked so as to clearly identify the refund value that the

container carries. The efficiency of collection and problems associated with various types of container varies and, consequently, a provision has been made to enable differential refund values to be laid down. The amount of this refund value will be determined by regulation to ensure that flexibility of implementation so necessary in a period of rapidly escalating costs, but initially the level of a minimum refund value will be 5c on cans, non-reusable glass containers, including stubbies, and soft drink bottles. It will be 1c for reusable beer bottles.

To ensure convenience for the public, traders, and beverage industry as a whole a provision is made to establish collection depots to service delineated areas. To ensure the necessary flexibility of operation in the early stages of the legislation, the extent of the collection area in relation to any collection depot will be established at the discretion of the Minister responsible for the implementation of this legislation.

To consider the Bill in some detail, clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purpose of the measure, and the attention of members is particularly drawn to the definition of "beverage". Clause 5 provides for the declaration of a day to be "the appointed day" for the purposes of this Act. It is on and from the day so appointed that the regulatory provision of this measure will come into effect. Necessarily, the fixing of this day will require consultation with industry. Clause 6 provides for the marking of containers, as defined, with a statement showing the refund amount payable in relation to the particular container. Subclause (2) of this clause provides for the simple proof of the approved manner and form of marking the container.

Clause 7 deals with glass containers. This clause provides that any retailer who sells containers carrying a particular brand or trade description to identify its contents must accept delivery of empty containers carrying that brand or trade description. The retailer must also pay to the deliverer the appropriate refund amount. Under this provision the retailer is not obliged to accept any unclean containers. Part TV comprising clauses 8 to 12 deals with containers other than glass containers. Hence the retailer as such is not required to play any part in the collection process. Clause 8 merely makes clear the application of the Part that refers to containers other than glass containers. Clause 9 provides for the establishment of collection depots in relation to containers of a particular type or class. In relation to each such collection depot a collection area is delineated. Subclauses (2) and (3) are formal and self-explanatory.

Clause 10 prohibits the sale of beverages in containers, as defined for the purposes of this Part, other than from places or premises that lie within a collection area established for the collection of containers of the kind sold. Subclause (2) of this clause is an evidentiary provision. Clause 11 enjoins a retailer, whose place of business or premises lie within a collection area established for the collection of containers of a kind he sells, to exhibit an appropriate sign showing the location of the appropriate collection depots. Subclause (2) of this clause is again an appropriate evidentiary provision Clause 12 is, it is suggested, reasonably self-explanatory, and sets out the obligations of the person in charge of a collection depot.

As was referred to above, while the retailer, as such, is not required to handle empty containers as defined in clause 8, there is nothing in this Part that prevents a retailer, if he considers that it is in his economic interests to do so, from establishing a collection centre at or near his premises. It is entirely up to him. Clause 13 in express terms prohibits the sale of beverage contained in a "ring-pull container" on or after June 30, 1976. Clause 14 is a fairly standard provision dealing with offences by bodies corporate. Clause 15 is an evidentiary provision, and clause 16 is formal. Clause 17 provides an appropriate regulation-making power.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 5. Page 2280)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) I support the Bill It is a Bill that must be considered in Committee, because the issues are complex and, in discussing the matter with those who have been responsible for preparing the measure, it has been clearly indicated that several aspects of the Bill will be subjected to alteration. I acknowledge receiving from the Parliamentary Counsel, with the permission of the Treasurer, several amendments that relate to queries that have been raised by members of the Public Service Association, by Parliamentarians, and by others with whom the Bill had been left for consideration.

Whether we will be blessed or damned as a result of the passage of this legislation remains to be seen. Without doubt the measure means considerable advancement compared to the existing conditions for present members of the Public Service and those in other associated areas Il has been indicated that in some cases the transfer of benefits may disadvantage these persons, but the Government intends that those situations shall be corrected when they have been determined. I agree completely with that altitude. It is not intended (or desired by Opposition members) that any person should be at a disadvantage after transferring to the new scheme. However, after the Bill is passed those who apply to enter the scheme will know its full ramifications.

In this overall situation one may question whether the Commonwealth Government intends to introduce a national insurance arrangement that will bring about the complete destruction of the Superannuation Fund in South Australia and the distribution of that money. However, there may be some formula by which it may be possible to include in the Commonwealth scheme the entitlements that have been due, or some other arrangements may be made Until the Commonwealth Government decides that it will make available to persons in the Public Service and associated organizations an arrangement that is equal to the benefits provided in this measure, I cannot accept the responsibility of allowing the destruction of this scheme if such action will be to the eventual disadvantage of its present members.

This Bill is extremely complex. One must recognize that its complexity is almost entirely associated with the transferral provisions that have given rise to the decision not to allow any person to be disadvantaged. The many combinations of benefits available under the present scheme, as well as the circumstances in which entitlements will have to be transferred to the new scheme, cause these complexities, although it would be more easy to approach this matter on a simpler basis. I acknowledge the difficulty of providing for existing pensioners. It has been clearly indicated that their situation had not finally been determined when this measure was introduced, but their position will be safeguarded by drawing a line on the records of the fund and determining later an entitlement that will be agreed to by those who will benefit.

One recognizes that the Bill contains a provision for adjustments to be made later, and I acknowledge that

discussions have been fruitful and decisions made, and that, in the amendments to be considered, provision is made for the complete dispersal of the present fund. This will be an advantage to all members of the scheme to whom the fund is to be made available at 9 per cent by an across-the-board arrangement. The intention of this Bill is based on an initial distribution of 3 per cent with the balance to be considered. That situation has been determined, and we will consider a 9 per cent distribution It would be difficult to peruse the Bill and say that this, that, or some other clause related to a certain factor, and there would be no benefit in such an exercise. However, one of the major reasons for this Bill being introduced is the real problem of inflation, and the fact that the escalation of the inflationary spiral has prevented members of the present fund from receiving the full benefit that was intended when they accepted membership of the fund.

The larger percentage of salary that has been required to be placed in the Superannuation Fund by persons as they move up the salary scale has caused the difficulties that have brought about the need for a complete re-adjustment of the superannuation system Many people were disenchanted with the old scheme Many senior public servants were forced into poverty if they took all the units to which they were entitled, and undoubtedly this played a major part in the initial discussions on this matter Because of other commitments, because of the rate of taxation that applied to their fairly high salaries, and because by the time they had reached a high salary range the large sums of money they were required to pay for units was more than they could claim as concessional deductions under taxation provisions, some members of the fund could not take up all the units to which they were entitled. Many instances could be given to substantiate the fact that many public servants were paying between 12 per cent and 15 per cent of their salary. While this may not seem a large percentage in some circumstances, it is a high percentage when the only source of income is the salary from which the deduction is being made. In other cases 12 per cent to 15 per cent of salary may be payable, but the person paying that amount may also receive other remuneration, so the percentage he would pay compared to his total income would therefore be lower.

Figures have been quoted, which I believe are correct, showing that the cost of each unit is $87 and that at 16 years of age it costs 6c a fortnight to purchase one unit on a projected basis of employment, but at 59 years of age it costs $8 a fortnight to obtain one unit, and that sum may apply to many units. This is why members in the higher brackets of the Public Service have been unable to take up their full entitlement. Reserve units were available to members, but they were entitled to take out only 16 units more than the ordinary units to which they were entitled, and they could receive the benefit from such units only if they had been able to convert them into ordinary units by the time they retired. That provision was effective when the Superannuation Fund was first introduced, but it ceased to have any real value, and this matter was another reason for the disenchantment I have mentioned.

A considerable public division of opinion has occurred on this matter. A working party was set up to evaluate the fund as it existed and consider methods by which an alteration could be effected. We were given to understand (in fact, it was announced publicly) that the decision reached by that working party was, with the exception of minor adjustments and necessary technical alterations, satisfactory to the people to whom it was intended to apply We then had the public' spectacle of many people criticizing many of the recommendations and basing their arguments on material which I am pleased to say was subsequently proved false and which was not mindful of the true situation. In this respect one can accept that the actuarial advice given to the original working party was proved correct and that the projections have, with minor exceptions, been vindicated by subsequent investigation.

One of the unfortunate aspects of a measure as complex as this Bill is the problem that arises when a person is asked to give technical and rather complex advice based on information to which he does not have total access I am firmly convinced on information made available to me subsequently that this situation did arise, and that a person made pronouncements and predictions not based on fact, resulting inevitably in confusion. This was indeed unfortunate, and caused several hackles to rise.

The argument still exists that some members of the fund believe that they would be better served by what is commonly called the Commonwealth majority scheme. Although the majority report has not yet been accepted by the Commonwealth, doubts have been expressed whether the total Commonwealth scheme would be an advantage or an advancement on the scheme we are now considering. In some areas there appear to be doubts that one scheme is better than the other. However, in a matter as complex as this I believe that we must take it *in globo.* The scheme we are considering was investigated by people who recognized its complexities and had the opportunity of talking to officers made available to answer all the hypothetical questions posed and to give all the assessments that could be made. They have come up with a clear agreement that the proposed scheme in total is best suited.

I have already indicated that we will await with interest the decision that will unfold if and when the Commonwealth moves in this area, and we will then see whether the national scheme can absorb the proposed South Australian scheme. If it is not possible for the South Australian scheme to be absorbed, will the individual contributor be able to exercise his right to opt into one or other of the two schemes? In other words, will a contributor have the right to belong to and participate entirely in the State scheme to the exclusion of the Commonwealth scheme, or will he be forced into the Commonwealth scheme, but at the same time be permitted to continue to contribute to the State scheme? That situation will depend greatly on the financial ability of the individual to participate in both schemes. However, I am thinking now of an intangible, a situation which might not eventuate in the Commonwealth sphere and which therefore will not require the degree of attention I have outlined.

In speaking of the introduction of such a measure in South Australia at this time, one wonders whether any element of guinea-pig activity is associated with the new scheme One does not deny that the old scheme was failing, nor does one deny that members, regardless of the side on which they sit, have accepted the responsibility of improving the existing situation. However, in recent years the South Australian Parliamentary system has been used to introduce guinea-pig schemes that we are led to believe will subsequently be used elsewhere after the pilot scheme has been completed or proved successful in our State. If we are fortunate enough to have a scheme that is better than anything existing elsewhere in the Commonwealth, on a State-by-State basis, if we have a scheme which will be adequate and which proves better than the proposals at present before the Commonwealth, and if there is no major disadvantage to the community as a whole,

then let ours be the Parliament that sets the pace The only question to arise is that, in including in the scheme certain authorities such as the Electricity Trust of South Australia and other semi-government organizations, we must ask whether we are creating a situation that will force every other South Australian employer to follow suit. We must consider the flow-on that invariably follows any advancement in one sphere or another, and decide whether we will be loading on the South Australian community an additional sum which, in turn, will adversely affect the industrial advantages that South Australia, as a manufacturing State, has enjoyed. Time alone will tell, but the point is pertinent to our economy at this time; the generous opportunities that will be available to persons in the Public Service fund will have a marked cost effect on the services provided in this State and the revenue to be used in fulfilling the obligations that the Government, and in fact this Parliament, accepts with the passage of this Bill.

A most unfortunate aspect of the measure is that the Government has been unable to state a specific sum of money that will be involved in its implementation. Even though we are debating this issue to finality today, I challenge the Treasurer to give the House (and the public generally) a clear and concise statement of the cost of this scheme. I am not expecting a figure to within $10 or even $1 000, but we should be able to expect a figure within $10 000 or $100 000 as an estimate of the cost Another important aspect relates to portability as between various departments and employers within the State and the opportunity for people at present employed in other States or in the Commonwealth sphere to enter the scheme. I will not mention the opportunities that exist to make special provisions for persons whom it is desired to employ in this State, but I recognize the urgent need on a Commonwealth basis, let alone a State basis, to find some formula to provide adequately for portability. I state in advance my acceptance of the need for this Parliament to find a formula (or to implement the formula when it is found) that will allow this portability, and therefore improve the ability of the Government to make use of people who would otherwise want to work in the service of the State but who would be denied the opportunity to come from some other State or to move out from private enterprise within the State into the Government service because of difficulties regarding their future superannuation

In some situations the Government must pay for benefits it does not receive, and as a Parliament we are responsible for ensuring that money spent on behalf of the public is spent only when service has been received. We must ask ourselves some pertinent questions regarding the benefits that accrue to some people and not to others. We must make clear whether there is any possibility in various circumstances and under various political Administrations of action being taken to offer inducements to some people to the disadvantage of others. The level at which special inducements without service will be available to potential employees in the future is a matter which must occupy our minds, even though we approve the generality of the provisions in this Bill.

Clause 62 provides that the Governor will make a decision annually, given by proclamation, to determine the minimum salary on which superannuation payments will be made. This is an area in which the Government of the day could advise the Governor to indicate a minimum amount to which the provision would apply, and this could be a distinct inducement to a large proportion of the community. I do not believe that, under the present Administration, and certainly not under any Administration in which I had a responsibility, that measure would be incorrectly used, but we must recognize the existence of what may be termed by some a loophole in the measure. It could lend itself to abuse, so we must remember its existence and the disastrous effects that would follow if it were to be used on some future occasion for political benefit. I have said that a line has been drawn so that the benefits that apply to persons who joined the scheme before January 1, 1973, will be to their advantage. A decision has been made regarding the distribution of this benefit, and I believe that decision is satisfactory to those who have been charged with the responsibility of determining the form of distribution.

I accept that, in supporting this Bill, one is also supporting a certain degree of retrospectivity, as the commencement date for entitlements is January 1, 1973. I have said many times in this Chamber that retrospectivity is against the principle of the Party of which I am Leader. However, in this instance I acknowledge that many public announcements have been made on this matter long before now, and this degree of retrospectivity is therefore acceptable, as it has been announced and promoted in all discussions associated with the measure. It has also been clearly stated that any real anomalies found in the Bill will be corrected. I accept responsibility for supporting any amendment that may have to be moved to correct such an anomaly which may not be recognized now but which may arise in future. I have already said that I appreciate and accept the information that has been given regarding amendments that will be considered in Committee. I highlight this support by again reading to the House the last two sentences of the Treasurer's second reading explanation, because this illustrates the responsibility which is accepted by the Government and which I accept on behalf of my Party. Those sentences are as follows:

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

I emphasize the statement that the Bill gives full effect to the undertakings given by the Government to those whose interests are vitally affected by it. The value of this Bill, the fund that will be created by it, and the superannuation benefits that will flow from it are the Government’s responsibility. The Government has had many discussions on this matter, and investigations and counter-investigations have been necessary before the Bill could be introduced and to bring honourable members to the point at which they are now able to debate the matter. To all intents and purposes it would appear, from the information which has been made available to the general public and which is available to all Opposition members, that the major promises made by the Government have been honoured in this measure. Because of the complex nature of this matter it is not possible (although I do not want to run away from my responsibility of investigating this matter) for Opposition members to be absolutely certain, in the absence of documentation and not having been party to the discussion that has continued for a long time, whether all the promises that the Government made to those who will benefit from this scheme have been effectively encompassed within the Bill. The Government bears the

responsibility of ensuring that those promises have been honoured. As far as the Opposition can determine, that is the situation, with one or two minor exceptions on which there has been public debate and on which finality has been reached by compromise or by other agreement, between the Government and the participants of the scheme I do not want necessarily to list or discuss all those variations about which there has been much comment and which have had wide public scrutiny.

One must ask, though, how long it will be before some of the provisions contained in this Bill are vitally amended. Regarding entitlement, it is clearly laid down that there are to be two levels of benefit, a higher benefit and a lower benefit, the latter being half of the former. One can accept that, to introduce additional levels of benefit, further complexities will be involved, complexities for which we are not looking at this transitional stage The Treasurer should indicate clearly whether, following the discussions he has had with the beneficiaries, the agreement he has obtained from them states clearly that the two levels of benefit are all that are desired, at least in the foreseeable future. If a time limit has been placed on the possibility of discussions regarding increasing or widening the levels of benefit, this House should be informed.

In his second reading explanation, the Premier made a peculiar statement regarding the transitional phase when he used the words "does reasonable justice to all" One must ask whether the Government has any doubts that reasonable justice has been done to all concerned. It is significant that it was found necessary to use those words in the second reading explanation. This may be only a small point associated with the benefits that will accrue to only a small number of people. However, if that group of people has been identified, and the Treasurer possesses any facts that resulted in the inclusion of that statement in his second reading explanation, it behoves him to make that information available to the House.

One must also ask what real incentive exists for one to contribute to the scheme before one reaches 30 years of age. One would not argue that, by joining the scheme at, say, 17, 18 or 19 years of age, one receives considerable benefits in relation to the cost of units, not only at that age but also throughout the period of one's contributions. However, because a person is required to provide virtually only 30 years of service after reaching the age of 30 years to be able to retire on a pension at the age of 60 years, there is grave doubt whether many people will desire to enter the scheme before reaching the age of 30 years. Was this figure reached because of the costs associated with training, with marriage, with the development of a house, and with other items involving young people up to and beyond the age of 30 years in considerable expense, or was it a figure reached by agreement that 30 years should be the time permitting the maximum benefit? I am not denying the gamble it would be for a person who failed to enter the scheme before the age of 30 years if he was unfortunate enough to be invalided out of the service or killed, leaving no pension benefit to his widow. It is a risk that many young people may be prepared to take when the pressure on their income is such that they must balance up their priorities.

I wonder whether in fixing the age of 30 years real consideration has been given to what may be a disastrous effect on the lives of many dependants of a person who should have been (and I put "should have" in inverted commas because I recognize there is no element of compulsion in this measure) in the scheme Has consideration been given to the disaster that may accrue to the dependants because of this provision, which clearly states that the commencing point shall be at the age of 30 years, allowing of an option to enter the scheme earlier if so desired? It is possible for a person coming into the scheme after the age of 30 years to purchase by a lump sum the entitlement that will eventually give him the benefit of the 30 years of service; but one recognizes also that the Government, or at least the proponents of this scheme, have been very fair to all participants in the scheme, in that a person must pay for the Government portion of his eventual pension in so far as it relates to the under 30 years of service portion that he seeks to purchase. There can be no argument about the fairness of that, but it does introduce an element of gamble, which could be disastrous to the dependants of a potential member of the fund.

I said at the outset that this was largely a Committee Bill. Questions about various clauses will be asked during the Committee stage, but I should like now to refer briefly to about seven or eight clauses. Clause 6 increases the number of persons who can be included. The scheme will now take in semi-government authority employees and similar persons. The second reading explanation indicates also that this provision permits the staff of His Excellency the Governor to be included in the scheme. Can the Treasurer say what other organizations or groups of people associated with the Public Service or the field of service to the public will be advantaged in this way? That will have a marked effect or influence on the eventual flow-on aspects to which I referred earlier.

Will clause 11 force the authorities into the scheme? This clause could be interpreted to suggest that the semi-government bodies, some of which have been named, could be forced to enter the scheme almost by what one commonly calls, in this place, the back-door method. It is an area that undoubtedly must have been considered, and I believe that the Treasurer will need to be able to say, if not at the end of the second reading debate certainly during the Committee stage, what decision has been reached on that form of force.

Clause 13 provides a wide opportunity for investment. It includes what one may term a fairly arbitrary level in the type of organization that can be included in the investment. A company with a capacity of $1 000 000 or more may be invested in. Why a $1 000 000 company? Why not a $2 000 000 company or a $5 000 000 company, which would in normal circumstances tend to be in a much safer position than a $1 000 000 company would be in? This is not a hypothetical situation; it requires some consideration in due course Clause 45 provides for a "years of service related scheme". That is the wording used, and we accept it. The advantage of late entry does not preclude the need for the individual to pay for the period being bought. In clause 45, there is a variation that does not exist in some of the other areas: the person is directly responsible for paying the Government portion of the total. I mention this only in passing, but we shall need much guidance on it later.

In clause 49, it appears that the Government proportion will not be bought by applicants when they are being induced to enter Government service. This must be defined: we must know in advance the parameters of the entitlement that will permit a person to enter the Government service and to obtain the benefits of the Government proportion of the scheme without having to pay a lump sum payment for that portion. That may well be a desirable provision to induce people of merit into the Government service, but there should be some initial guidelines and it should not be open to negotiation later; it should be open to interpretation later by persons who may not have been in the initial discussions on this

matter and therefore do not know the original intention of the provision. Clause 50 is clear, but how realistic is it? In the explanation of this Bill, the Treasurer said:

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

A qualifying period of 20 years is stated as being the period that will allow this person to obtain a special benefit that does not apply to other contributors. Whilst I agree that a person who has given 20 years service and who then seeks to enter the scheme must be considered, by a simple amendment that period could be changed to 15 years, 10 years, or some other period. Prudence and common sense demand that the Public Actuary must investigate this matter and give details to the Government of the day before any decision is made, but al this stage it is extremely important to have a clear indication of intent.

Clause 80, which deals with a special retrenchment benefit, is another area where this type of preferred treatment seems to apply, and these facts must be known before members can be expected to pass the measure. I support the second reading, believing that, when the Bill comes out of Committee, it will be an advance on the present measure.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): My contribution to this debate will be brief, because the Leader of the Opposition has covered the Bill comprehensively and has clearly expressed the Opposition's attitude. Judging by the look on the Treasurer's face, he had a late night last night, and I would not want to prolong his agony.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he could be teasy?

Mr. GUNN: He could be, but that matter is irrelevant, anyway. During the time that this Superannuation Bill has been under public discussion, it has provoked much controversy. As one viewing the matter from some distance, I followed the comments in the *Public Service Review,* particularly the advice given by Mr. Kent, the actuary who was advising the Public Service Association. A report in the *Public Service Review* of Monday, December 3, 1973, of a comment by Mr. Kent states:

> The ingredients for a good superannuation fund are probably four. The benefits provided should be reasonable in relation to the person's final salary, his years of service, his social services entitlement and the amount he has paid into it.

I do not think Mr. Kent knew what a good superannuation scheme was. He referred to the ingredients for a good superannuation fund but I do not think he gave competent advice to the people whom he was advising. I thank those people who have been kind enough to assist me on this matter. I admit that I have not much knowledge of the operation of superannuation schemes, which are extremely complex. The Public Actuary and his officers and the Parliamentary Counsel should be thanked for advising members about the full implications of the scheme. I consider that it is one of the best schemes in Australia and I sincerely hope that it meets the requirements of those whom it is designed to assist. I understand that about 19 000 persons will be involved in the scheme when it commences.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How many of your constituents will be in it?

Mr. GUNN: Persons employed by the South Australian Railways, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department, the Marine and Harbors Department and the Education Department, as well as other persons, will be in the scheme. The savings to public servants by way of reduced contributions will be significant and examples were given in one issue of the *Public Service Review* a few weeks ago I cannot understand why certain circles have strongly opposed parts of the scheme. Perhaps, as I said earlier, they did that because of poor advice from the person employed to advise them. I now want to make a comparison, but I do not want to get far off the track in this debate.

The Hon. D. H McKee: Well, sit down.

Mr. GUNN: That is a silly remark and one to which we have become accustomed from the Minister. We have seen him trying to handle his own legislation in this House. He has not had any idea of what has been in such Bills as the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill under consideration.

Mr. GUNN: I appreciate your protection, Mr. Speaker. I was about to make a comparison between, on one hand, the benefits that the widow of a contributor to this scheme will receive from the South Australian Treasury for herself and her dependants and, on the other hand, what happens to the widow of a breadwinner who owned a rural property or a small business. The widow in the latter case must pay the South Australian Treasury a large amount in State succession duty, and her assets are frozen, but the widow of a contributor to this scheme would not have her supply of ready cash cut off immediately on the death of her husband. Money would flow to her immediately, and rightly so. If this Parliament passes legislation of this kind, we can never again justify, particularly in regard to small and medium estates, the requirement to pay State succession duty. I am completely in favour of this superannuation scheme, because it gives many benefits to our public servants

Mr. Jennings: How have you been justifying succession duty for 20 years?

Mr. GUNN: I have never justified State succession duty and I will never try to do so, because it is morally wrong.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Your political Party supported it in the past.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister's Party wants it.

Mr. GUNN: On the death of a clerk employed in a State Government department at a salary of about $9 000 a year, his widow would be entitled to about $6 000 a year plus, if killed at work, workmen's compensation up to $25 000. If he was partially disabled he would receive a benefit. On his death, his widow would receive two-thirds of his entitlement A person owning his own business or a small rural property would need to have an estate, in my opinion, of $120 000 or more to receive that much income. I challenge any honourable member to deny those figures. If it was a primary-producing estate, the widow would be called on to pay about $17 500 State succession duty and about $3 000 in Commonwealth estate duty. If that is not discrimination, I challenge the Minister of Labour and Industry, who had much to say a while ago, to say so. This scheme is designed to assist public servants, and Opposition members have nothing against superannuation, which I believe is a good thing.

Mr. Max Brown: You want to get a dollar out of it for the big landowner.

Mr. GUNN: I want nothing of the kind I am making a proper comparison.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's no comparison; you're out of order even referring to it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: The basis of the superannuation scheme is to provide a person, when retired, with financial security, and it guarantees that, where the husband, who was the contributor, dies his widow and children can live on a scale similar to the one to which they were accustomed during his lifetime. That is only right and proper. But so is it right and proper that on the death of a man who owns a small business, whether in commerce or secondary or primary industry, his widow and children should also be able to continue to live on the scale to which they had been accustomed during his lifetime.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now getting outside the ambit of the Bill. The debate will continue in line with the contents of the Bill. The honourable member for Eyre

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that these comparisons are relevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may make a comparison but he must not debate a subject matter not contained in the Bill The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. I think I have made the valid points I wanted to make. The Bill is mainly a Committee measure, consisting as it does of 140 clauses. Some clauses in the Bill are of concern to me, particularly clause 122, which provides that *de facto* relationships may be taken into account I believe that, as this clause will cause much difficulty in administering the scheme, it should be deleted or amended.

Mr. Jennings. Do you think it's immoral?

Mr. GUNN: No; I did not say that. It will cause difficulty in administering the scheme. For the benefit of the member for Ross Smith, I have discussed this matter with competent people, and I will leave it to his imagination. I do not intend naming them, but they are in a position to know that it will cause much difficulty to the tribunal to be set up under the Bill. To take a hypothetical case, what would be the position of a wife who had lived for 20 years with her husband, who then deserted her and lived for 18 months in a *de facto* relationship with another woman? If the other woman applied to be a beneficiary under the terms of the Bill, what would happen to the legal wife, who had probably raised children of the marriage?

If the contributor had had children by his *de facto* spouse, what would the position be? I understand that the tribunal will not be empowered to split up the deceased contributor's pension. Cases could arise whereby the widow of a deceased contributor might be cut out of her just entitlement in favour of the *de facto* spouse. Surely that would be wrong The provision should be amended so that the wife would have first claim on the entitlement. With certain reservations, I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support what the Leader has said. The Leader covered the Bill adequately, and it can no doubt best be dealt with in Committee. It is the responsibility of the Government, which employs civil servants, to ensure that they have a reasonable superannuation scheme. However, I emphasize that we should be moving towards a national superannuation scheme if there is to be justice for all. Under the old legislation the Government had to pay 70 per cent of the contributions to keep the superannuation fund solvent, this money was paid by the taxpayers, few of whom were able to be covered by similar superannuation schemes or able to invest to the extent of retiring under the same conditions as civil servants retired. The sooner we adopt a national superannuation scheme, whereby everyone is treated fairly and squarely, the better.

I emphasize the point the member for Eyre made with regard to the amount of capital required to provide an income on retirement equivalent to that of a public servant's superannuation. When the Government starts talking about wealthy people, I point out that only about 100 estates in South Australia each year amount to over $100 000, and only between 2 and 3 per cent of estates exceed $10 000 in value. It is people other than those covered by private superannuation schemes and the Government superannuation scheme who retire on a lower living standard. It is rather surprising to see that, in 1974. the number of contributors to the South Australian Superannuation Fund decreased slightly, yet the number of public servants increases by 8 per cent each year. It is hard to understand why the number of contributors to the fund has not increased.

Was the old scheme so unsatisfactory that people were unwilling to contribute to it? Will they be willing to contribute to the new scheme? On the surface, the new scheme seems to be very good, and it will be hard to understand if people do not join it at the full rate. The failure of people to join a superannuation scheme shows a certain irresponsibility with regard to their future needs In the past, perhaps the means test applied to the age pension has meant that it has not paid certain people to join the superannuation scheme. However, if Commonwealth Government politicians honour their promise that all people over 65 years will receive the age pension without a means test, there will be an incentive for everyone to join a superannuation scheme. This will further influence the living standards of the community. We must watch carefully in Australia (and this applies throughout the rest of the world) the difference in living standards between those on low incomes and those on higher incomes.

As an accountant, I am rather surprised at the difference between the South Australian Superannuation Fund and private enterprise funds in relation to the payment of contributions by the employer. A private enterprise concern pays its contribution into the fund each year out of current earnings. However, in each year, the Government puts into the fund only the sum that it has to pay out to people who are receiving the pension in that year. If the Government carried out proper accounting procedures and paid in its proper contribution each year, the fund would have a substantial sum with which to earn income that would be of considerable benefit to people drawing from the fund. There will be further debate on specific aspects of the Bill during the Committee stage.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): In a recent series of features, the *Australian Financial Review* has dealt with superannuation. The feature on March 4, 1974, commenced as follows:

Perhaps more than any other year 1974 will see enormous change and challenge for superannuation fund managers in Australia.

That comment can be applied to the South Australian Superannuation Fund more readily than it can be applied to the superannuation scheme of any other State. The year 1974 will be the year of superannuation in South Australia. This Bill contains a major proposal for a new scheme which, I say at the outset, I support. Changes to the old scheme were overdue. Benefits were low and contributions. especially at high salary levels, were particularly high. The Leader has already outlined this situation. As people neared the end of their careers in the

Public Service and were promoted to high salary levels, their contributions to the superannuation scheme climbed to ridiculous proportions. Moreover, the old scheme treated unfairly those who withdrew from it before retiring. I had this unfortunate experience when I had to pull out of the Public Service scheme after being a contributor for five years. At the end of that time I received back only the money I had contributed, less a 2½ per cent service charge. It is ridiculous that I should have contributed to the scheme for five years and should then receive no benefit at all, although the fund had been able to use my money to its advantage; and on top of that, I had to pay a 2½ per cent service fee.

In announcing a new scheme, the Treasurer made two generous promises: he said that the overall scheme would be at least as good as that of any other Public Service scheme, and that no present contributor would be disadvantaged as a result of any change. At the time, I believed that the Treasurer's promises where somewhat extravagant, and I still hold that belief. The Treasurer fully realized that the Commonwealth Government also was changing its scheme. Therefore, he was virtually giving a blank cheque to the public servants of this State, without knowing what the Commonwealth would introduce in its scheme. Nevertheless, I support the new scheme as outlined in the Bill. I have certain reservations that I will outline. A couple of weeks ago, in reply to my question, the Treasurer said that the additional cost of the scheme to the South Australian Government would be $3 400 000 in the first year. I understand that that estimate was calculated on a very conservative basis. Until it is known what present contributors to the scheme will do, it is impossible to work out the cost of the new scheme. The estimate of $3 400 000 could well be doubled. This concerns me because South Australia already has, at 13.5 per cent, the highest rate of inflation of any State in Australia. During the past 12 months, we have seen amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act that will add further—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill. Any reference to matters outside the Bill must be linked up with the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was linking up my remarks. I am sure that other legislation that has been passed will add to the inflation rate, in the same way as I predict that this legislation will add to it. My next reservation relates to something that is not in the Bill. I should like to see provision made whereby a person could transfer from one State superannuation scheme to another, from a State scheme to the Commonwealth scheme, or from a State scheme to a private enterprise scheme. Of course, such transfers should also be able to apply in reverse. I understand that it was impossible to provide for transferability or portability in this Bill However, I believe we should look forward to this as an ideal for the future.

Already, this Bill is extremely complicated. If the inclusion of the provision to which I have referred would delay this Bill or even add to its complexity. I should rather see that provision brought in separately. I look forward to some form of portability in the future. We now live in an age of mobility in the population and the work force. In *Future Shock,* Toffler discusses this matter, saying that people are changing from one employer to another at an ever-increasing rate. Therefore, for this to be a meaningful superannuation scheme, no matter how long a person has been working for the South Australian Public Service, it is important that there be some means of portability in his superannuation. I hope that some such portability can be introduced later.

Thirdly, I should like to comment on the adjustment to benefits to be received by the superannuants. In the Bill this adjustment is based on the cost of living or the consumer price index, which in South Australia has increased by 13.5 per cent in the last 12 months, whereas the increase in salaries over that period has been between 18 per cent and 20 per cent. It can be reasonably argued (and I have heard economists argue in this way) that increases based on the cost of living do not necessarily allow a person to maintain the same standard of living as that of the rest of the working population. The reason is that the cost of living does not necessarily include all luxury items. Therefore, one could argue that in certain circumstances any adjustment in the amount received by the superannuants should be based not only on the cost of living but also possibly on salary increases or an additional percentage above the cost of living. I believe that under the proposed Commonwealth scheme increases are based on the consumer price index plus a 1.4 per cent annual increase. This gives a greater advantage to the superannuants than does the scheme in this Bill.

The fourth reservation I have relates to the back-dating of the operation of this legislation to January 1, 1973. I do not object to its being back-dated, because the people were promised then that a new scheme would be introduced. It is therefore only right and proper that the operation of the legislation should be back-dated. However, since January 1, 1973, many people have withdrawn from the Public Service superannuation scheme, possibly voluntarily or possibly because they believed that their extra contributions would be too great and they decided to take the benefits without wailing for the new scheme. Possibly people were forced to withdraw, as happened in my own case. People who have withdrawn, no matter for what reason, since January 1, 1973, should also receive some sort of benefit.

The fifth and final reservation I have, possibly the most important reservation, relates to the position of private enterprise superannuation schemes as a result of this new Public Service scheme Are we giving the Public Service a benefit that private enterprise has little or no hope of ever being able to match? It is important that we maintain as many people as possible in the private sector of our economy, because that sector is the productive sector, whereas the Public Service is the service or non-productive sector. It is important, if Australia is to have a rapid growth in its gross national product, that it maintain as many people as possible in the productive sector. As a result of the State Public Service having such an advantage over private companies, there could well be a greater drift of employees toward the Public Service and away from the private sector. If the private sector tries to adopt a scheme similar to the scheme in this Bill, there will be further increases in costs and in the rate of inflation.

I should like to compare the relationship between contributions by the State Government and public servants with the relationship applying in private companies. Under the old Public Service scheme the State Government contributed 70 per cent and the employees contributed 30 per cent—a ratio of nearly 2.5 to 1. Under the new scheme it is impossible to determine the relationship, but it will certainly be greater than the ratio I have just quoted. The proposed Commonwealth majority scheme involves a similar ratio. Let us relate this to Cullen and Morton's *Quarterly Salary Review.* That publication indicates that only 28 per cent of private companies are at present contributing to superannuation schemes at the ratio of 2 to 1. None of

them reached a ratio of 2.5 to 1. The schemes of other companies involved ratios below those I have referred to.

It is therefore fair to say that only 28 per cent of private enterprise is matching the present Public Service scheme, and the rest of private enterprise is well below it. Now, we are introducing a new scheme that will place private enterprise even further behind. The 1973 *National Executive Salary Survey* published by the Australian Institute of Management shows that only 12 per cent of private companies were contributing at the ratio of 2 to 1. This indicates that the private sector is well behind the Public Service in connection with superannuation benefits, and the private sector will now be even further behind. I wonder what the effect of this will be on the number of persons employed in the private sector, and I wonder how the rate of inflation will be affected.

I turn now to the politics carried on two weeks ago by the actuary acting for the Public Service Association. Only yesterday I asked the Treasurer whether any major benefits were obtained by that actuary as a result of the negotiations conducted two weeks ago. The Treasurer clearly indicated that no further benefits whatever were obtained. Yet we saw statements in the newspapers that the Public Service Association, through the actuary, had wrung several more drops of blood out of the Government. Those newspaper reports created a false impression that the Government was continually giving greater and greater benefits. Those press reports have also allowed the actuary to escape with his neck intact.

I turn now to the question I asked about the additional cost of the new scheme. Concern is usually expressed when the Government allocates massive sums through legislation without carefully examining the facts, and here we have another case. Until I asked my recent question, no figures had been calculated to determine the cost of the scheme. No-one had worked out the cost to the Government until after the scheme had been proposed and after I had asked the question of the Treasurer. I consider that to be an irresponsible action by the Government and, if the Government is to prove to the South Australian public that it can manage finances responsibly, it must do its financial planning before introducing legislation. It is important that the cost involved in any intended legislation be carefully calculated before the Bill is introduced. I support the legislation and believe that public servants should be grateful for having such a generous scheme offered to them, but I should like them to keep in mind the reservations I have raised during this debate when the scheme is considered in future.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, support the Bill, which has taken a long time to be introduced I congratulate my Leader on the way in which he spoke today and on the excellent manner in which he covered all the points of a Bill that is difficult to understand. This is a most complex Bill. The original legislation was introduced in 1926, but suggestions of an improved scheme were made by the Treasurer before the 1970 election in order to woo a section of the community. The Treasurer has diddled around with it since then and played with it like a big-game fisherman. The present scheme has been totally inadequate, and was so poor that those public servants who advanced to executive positions would never have been able to obtain out of the scheme anywhere near the amount that they had put into it. I pose the question, whether pensioners whose birthdays fall in the first 10 months of 1973 are at any disadvantage compared to those who have retired or will retire before July 1, 1974? Is it in the spirit of this legislation that these groups should be equal?

Also, are any substantial relief provisions available in this legislation for contributors who have to pay large sums during their last year of service? Will these contributors get full value for their payments? The Treasurer, in one of his speeches on this matter, promised that this relief would be available. There seem to be divided opinions about this new scheme and I wonder whether senior officials have been consulted. If they have, what is their reaction? After all, they are specialists who know what the scheme entails, and I believe that within these groups concern has been expressed about anomalies that exist. When summing up the Bill in his second reading explanation the Treasurer stated:

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

I hope that the matters to which I have referred will be replied to by the Treasurer, and I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition). Can the Treasurer say whether, in view of some of the definitions provided, the present individual contributor will be asked to make an election, and will he be given a clear statement of his position? What is the situation regarding checking of the entitlement? If an anomaly is detected at some future stage, is it intended that it will be corrected, even though the contributor's entitlement, as assessed at the time, may have been completely paid out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The checking out of entitlements involves a computer programme, which is subject to its own internal checks

Dr. EASTICK. I understand that, but there is an element of risk in computers related to human error.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The board always has power to correct what are mathematical errors. I move:

In the definition of "age of retirement", after paragraph *(a)*, to strike out "and" and insert:

> *(b)* in the case of a deceased contributor who died before the commencement of this Act, his age of retirement as defined for the purposes of the repealed Act;
>
> and

The effect of this amendment is to ensure that the notional pension of a deceased contributor who died before the commencement of this Act will not be less than the actual pension that would have been payable to that deceased contributor.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN. I move:

In paragraph *(c)* of the definition of "commutable pension" to strike out "who, on or before the commencement of this Act, had attained the age of sixty years" and insert "who had attained the age of sixty years before the commencement of this Act or who attains the age of sixty years on or after the commencement of this Act".

The effect of this amendment is to ensure that all widows who entered on a pension after January 1, 1973, will have a right to commute their pension.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A DUNSTAN: I move

In the definition of "the Board" to strike out "Superannuation Board of South Australia" and insert "South Australian Superannuation Board"

This is a minor amendment that simply connects a drafting error.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Employees of public authorities"

Dr. EASTICK. Is it intended to force authorities into the scheme? Although this may not apply immediately, it may if and when statutory authorities are established in future. Will authorities' already in existence and having a scheme in operation be required to forgo that scheme and participate in this one? Are such authorities as the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Housing Trust and similar organizations currently outside the scheme? Such authorities, according to the Treasurer, are now drawn into the measure. The very nature of the information given suggests that this is in contrast to the situation that has existed in the past.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is almost exactly the provision under the present Act, which is being repealed. There is no change in policy. Naturally enough, when a new statutory authority is established it is sought constantly of Government that the Public Service superannuation scheme should cover employees in the new authority. This scheme is very much more generous than can be obtained by private arrangement.

Clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Investment of Fund."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the future investment policy be the same as the present policy or will it tend to move more and more toward investment in stocks, shares, debentures, and other securities? I understand that it is only fairly recently that the trust has invested funds in this area. Is it proposed, as I hope it will be, that it will continue to do so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fund has for four years now had power to invest in securities beyond normal trustee securities. The advice of the Chairman of the board was that in some cases better returns could be perfectly safely obtained for the benefit of the fund than from investment in a limited area previously allowed as trustee securities. An arrangement was therefore made that the board could undertake a new investment policy; in fact, investment advice was obtained on this score. The area in which the investment could be made was subject to the approval of the Treasurer, but the aim was certainly to broaden the securities of the fund to some extent to get the best possible return consistent with the maintenance of the board's responsibilities.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to subclause (1) *(g)*. How was the arbitrary figure of $1 000 000 determined? Is there any special reason for this figure? Does it relate to an investigation undertaken by the Government into the stability of companies involving more or less than $1 000 000? When investing the funds of many people, is there greater safety by increasing this sum to $2 000 000 or $5 000 000? Will the investment opportunities be reduced by going beyond $1 000 000? I should like to be assured that this figure has not been drawn out of the air and that there were valid reasons for the decision that was taken.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The board and the Government considered that a company with a paid-up capital of this magnitude would be a substantial one. It is intended to invest in substantial companies only, as the marketing of shares of smaller companies is often difficult. The board wanted to be sure that the shares in which it invested were easily marketable and that the company was one of substance. The $1 000 000 figure was considered sufficient to indicate a company of substance.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 33 passed.

Clause 34—"Membership of Trust."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to strike out subclause (1) and insert the following new subclause:

(1) The Trust shall be constituted of three Trustees who shall be—

(a) the person for the time being holding or acting in the office of the Under Treasurer;

(b) the person for the time being holding or acting in the office of the Public Actuary; and

(c) a person appointed by the Governor who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Governor.

It has been pointed out to the Government that it would be inappropriate to have the Auditor-General on a trust whose accounts are to be audited by him. Accordingly, it is proposed that the third member of the trust will be a person appointed by the Governor, in the place of the Auditor-General.

Dr. EASTICK: I agree completely with the amendment and the explanation of it that the Treasurer has given. This highlights a possible area of conflict. Will the Treasurer say whether this provision was taken from any other similar legislation and whether other legislation on the Statute Book will need to be amended?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know of no other example.

Amendment carried, clause as amended passed.

Clauses 35 to 44 passed.

Clause 45—"Purchase of contribution months."

Dr. EASTICK: Under this clause a person over the age of 30 years who has not subscribed to units may purchase contribution months and, in doing so, he must pay not only the sum for which he would have been responsible but also that for which the Government was responsible. That is completely fair to all persons who become members of the fund, and I agree with the sentiments that have been expressed in this respect. However, the position becomes more difficult when one relates this situation to that contained in clause 49. When the Committee is considering that clause, I will emphasize the difference between it and the clause that is now being considered. I do not think I can at this stage draw comparisons between the two without transgressing Standing Orders.

Clause passed.

Clauses 46 to 48 passed.

Clause 49—"Attributed contribution months "

Dr EASTICK: Under this clause the Minister may, on the recommendation of the employing authority of a contributor, attribute one or more contribution months to that contributor; in other words, it would be a *gratis* benefit. It is clear from reading the Treasurer's second leading explanation that such a contributor will benefit without cost in relation not only to his own contribution but also to the Government's contribution. I accept that in certain circumstances it may be necessary to dangle a carrot in front of a person to induce him to undertake Government employment. Indeed, a person who accepts such an inducement may prove to be of much advantage to this State. I suggest, however, that we are being asked to sign a blank cheque in relation to this clause. It does not indicate the maximum number of contribution months that would be made available to any person, and again one would have to accept that, by giving a minimum or a maximum, one would immediately be defining the area

of opportunity to induce a person by increased benefits. Even in the example that the Treasurer has given, he is implying that we are talking of a person with a certain expertise, aged 55 or thereabouts, for whom it would be a major financial decision to make this purchase.

However, if a person is so valuable and has so much expertise that he is worth bringing into the Government service under this provision, obviously he has been employed somewhere else and, on the termination of that employment, he would have received long service, sick leave or superannuation benefit or a lump sum payment and so would have left that employment with a certain amount of money If he is not required to pay for the contribution months that will come to him under this clause, he will get a definite advantage over all other persons in the fund, and he will still have access to his own money that he got from his previous employment. I accept that there could be cases where it could be to the advantage of the State to be able to induce a person to come into its employment, but I cannot accept this completely open-ended provision that does not minimize or maximize the advantage to the person to be induced. I need more explanation from the Treasurer on this or I shall vote against it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are many occasions when, in recruiting senior and specialist staff, it is necessary for us to make special superannuation arrangements; otherwise, we do not get those people. In these circumstances, superannuation is a matter of negotiation, in order to get the people the State needs, and there must be a means of our entering into those negotiations. This does not mean that it is unfair to other people in the fund: it is a perfectly normal thing, and in other institutions in South Australia (particularly in businesses, of course) flexibility is always there in making superannuation arrangements that will induce someone to come to a specific job. I do not see how otherwise we can specify this.

Dr. Eastick: With a maximum, surely.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is flexibility for the Government in this No Treasurer will just make a present of money, willy-nilly, merely to get people to come to South Australia. We have tried to relate their superannuation arrangements to what has been the general standard in South Australia, but that often means we have to do something about the margin of superannuation, and previously we have had to make contracts with people to make special payments in this regard. In those cases, the Government has not been extravagant: the Auditor-General has approved every one of them. That is the policy that has been followed.

Dr. EASTICK: If we accept the information we have just received, it appears that the Government has recently entered into a number of contracts—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are special superannuation arrangements.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, and therefore a special benefit accrues to the person so induced. What information has been given to Parliament on such contracts that have been entered into? Have they remained and do they continue to remain only in the knowledge of the Government of the day?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are personal contracts, and it is not the normal policy of the Government to bruit them abroad. A senior person may be brought to South Australia, for whom special superannuation arrangements have to be made.

Dr. Eastick: Without regard to his previous entitlement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In some cases there was no means of taking that over. What he could have got in a comparable position was always looked at, and it has been a matter of negotiation. As I have said, the Auditor-General has been aware of all these arrangements and has never commented adversely on them, because obviously they were entered into carefully. I do not make any hard and fast announcement that, in the case of every person we have brought to South Australia for employment, we have entered into a special superannuation arrangement. Very few people would be induced to come to South Australia if every area of their personal affairs was made public in that way. If the Leader wants to know confidentially what the situation is, I shall be happy to tell him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I take it that the Auditor-General's opinion would not be sought on the terms of contract for the employment of some person of outstanding merit by the Government. In fact, the Treasurer refers to the Auditor-General's annual perusal of State accounts, in which case we probably could not expect any comment from the Auditor-General on a contract which, in the judgment of the Government, was reasonable. The Treasurer seeks to use the Auditor-General to validate his argument, whereas it would be highly unlikely that it would be the function of the Auditor-General to comment on Government decisions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If something extraordinary was done in this way, naturally the Auditor-General would comment on it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems to me that the Auditor-General's function is to see that proper accounts are kept and that a proper audit is made. It is unlikely that the Auditor-General would take it on himself to comment on the terms of employment of someone attracted to this State. Surely the function of the Auditor-General is not to peruse the terms of employment of such a person.

The Hon D. A Dunstan: No. The negotiations are usually conducted by the Government

Dr. EASTICK: If I interpret correctly what the Treasurer has just said, he would not object to the inclusion in this clause of a statement along the lines of "only after consultation with the Auditor-General", or whatever other form of drafting might be necessary. The member for Kavel has correctly pointed out that the Auditor-General will be asked to review the situation after the event. We know from the Treasurer's statement that the Auditor-General does see these things subsequently. I ask the Treasurer to accept an amendment such as I have suggested so that there will be no misunderstanding and the public will be satisfied that what should be done has been done

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not do that. The Executive Government has a responsibility, and it will meet that responsibility. This clause provides that recommendations for undertaking a special arrangement must be made by the employing authority. The matter would go to Cabinet and it would be examined by the Treasury Department. That is the proper course, and this Government will take the responsibility for what it does.

Dr EASTICK moved:

After "contributor" third occurring to insert "and only after consultation with the Auditor-General".

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, .Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan

(teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Mathwin and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Langley and McRae.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 50—"Contribution months deemed to be attributed."

Dr. EASTICK: I should like the Treasurer to say why 20 years was decided on as the qualifying period. Was it the result of bargaining between the Government and the Public Service Association or another interested party? Does the period refer specifically to this issue in terms of advice from the Public Actuary, or what is the situation? The period could be reduced if an Administration wanted to present itself in a favourable light to many public servants.

The Hon. D. A DUNSTAN: The reason for the 20-year period is that this is the existing period now. We do not want to take away something that presently exists. Inevitably this will work itself out over a period.

Clause passed.

Clauses 51 to 61 passed.

Clause 62—"Determination of contribution salary in certain cases."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1), after "contributor" first occurring, to insert "to whom this section applies"; and to strike out subclauses (2) and (3) and insert the following new subclauses:

(2) This section applies to a contributor who is by the terms of his employment required to serve as an employee for a number of hours in a fortnight not less than the number of hours for the time being the number of hours declared under subsection (3) of this section.

(3) The Governor may from time to time by proclamation declaie both an amount to be the declared amount and a number of hours to be the declared number of hours for the purposes of this section and may by proclamation amend, vary or revoke any such declaration.

(4) A proclamation under subsection (3) of this section may be expressed to have effect on and from a day that occurred before the proclamation was made and shall have effect accordingly.

The effect of these amendments is to ensure that the concession applied to relatively low-paid employees is not extended to employees whose low pay arises from the fact that they work less than a full working week.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 63 to 77 passed.

Clause 78—"Remunerative activity by invalid pensioners or retrenchment pensioners."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out subclause (3); in subclause (6) to strike out all words after "particular" second occurring; and to insert the following new subclause:

(6a) Where pursuant to subsection (1) of this section a pension payable to a pensioner was reduced or where pursuant to subsection (6) of this section a pension payable to a pensioner was suspended and during the period of such reduction or suspension that pensioner dies, for the purposes of ascertaining the amount of pension payable to the spouse of that pensioner and for the purposes of ascertaining the amount of child benefit derived from the pension of that pensioner no regard shall be had to the fact that at the material time that pension was so reduced or suspended.

These amendments, substantially drafting amendments, bring the clause into line with clause 76.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 79 to 81 passed.

Clause 82—"Pension for spouse of deceased pensioner."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move.

After "a" first occurring to insert "contributor".

This is a clarificatory amendment.

Amendment carried, clause as amended passed.

Clause 83 passed.

Clause 84—"Commutation by spouse of spouse pension."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1) *(a)* to strike out "third" and insert "sixth"; and in subclause (4) to strike out "third" and insert "sixth".

The effect of these amendments is to give the spouse of the deceased contributor or pensioner an additional three months to determine whether the portion of the pension of the spouse is to be commuted. Often spouses need time to sort out what is best for them to do. They must also take into account pensions from the Commonwealth Department of Social Security

Dr. EASTICK: I believe that even three months may prove to be too short in some circumstances, but I realize that some people would still be unable to decide if they were given an indefinite period. Because the amendments are reasonable, I support them.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed

Clause 85—"Determination of child benefit."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN I move:

In paragraph *(c)* to strike out "section 97 or".

This is the first of the clauses to which a series of related amendments will be moved. Members will be aware that on introducing this Bill it was indicated that clause 96 gave a flat 3 per cent increase in pensions that emerged before January 1, 1973. It was also indicated, in relation to clause 97, that a further increase of 6 per cent for those pensions would be provided for within the framework of that clause. At the time of introduction of this Bill the disposition of this further increase was the subject of discussions with pensioners' representatives. I am happy to inform the Committee that these discussions have now concluded and the representatives have settled for a flat 9 per cent increase in lieu of the 3 per cent increase provided for by clause 96. The amendments to clauses 85. 94, 95 and 96 and the Government's opposition to clause 97 will give effect to this agreement.

Dr. EASTICK: I have no hesitation in accepting the amendments and the explanation given. It is indeed gratifying to know that the agreement has been reached in advance of the passage of the Bill. This makes for a much tidier situation, because people know what their entitlement will be; or, it can be determined for them.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 86 to 92 passed.

Clause 93.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (3). after "June,", to insert "1974.".

This is a drafting amendment.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise to have inserted in *Hansard* an acceptance of the degree of retrospectivity implicit in the passage of this clause. Opposition members have consistently said that they are averse to the passage of retrospective legislation. However, this legislation has been clearly identified in the public mind for a long time. At the time of its original announcement and the passage of the transitional Bills through the House, the purpose of the undertaking that had been given was clearly recognized. Although this provision should be passed, it should not be used as a precedent in respect of other legislation.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 94—"Increase in widow's pension that emerged before 1/1/73."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out subclause (4)

I have already explained the reason for the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 95—"Increase in widow's pension that emerged after 1/1/73."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out subclause (4).

I have already explained the purpose of the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 96—"Pensioners having a pension vesting day that occurred prior to 1/1/73."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "three" and insert "nine".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed

Clause 97—"Pensioners having a pension vesting day that occurred prior to 1/1/73—Further increase in pension."

The Hon. D A. DUNSTAN: I oppose this clause.

Clause negatived

Clause 98 passed.

Clause 99—"Adjustment of pensions."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "payment" twice occurring; and in subclause (6), after "from", to insert "the commencement of the pension fortnight which includes".

These amendments are all designed to make the meaning of the provision abundantly clear.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 100 to 121 passed.

Clause 122—"Application for recognition as a spouse."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "twelve months" twice occurring and insert "three years".

The amendment will require that a *de facto* spouse must have lived with the contributor or pensioner as husband and wife for at least three years while the contributor was a contributor or, in the case of a pensioner, while the pensioner was a contributor. The clause as drafted provided for a period of 12 months.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 123 to 133 passed.

Clause 134—"Elections, extension of time limits"

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

After "contributor" to insert "or pensioner".

This is a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (135 to 140), schedules and title passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

On behalf of the Government and of Parliament, I should like personally to thank and pay a tribute to the Public Actuary, Mr. Stratford, and his assistant, Mr. Barton, who have worked far beyond the normal call of duty in preparing this measure. It has been an extraordinarily difficult Bill to prepare, and it has required much work for a long period. This has meant that they have worked morning, noon, and night in order not only to prepare an outline of the scheme but also to cope with difficulties that could be foreseen in the transition from the existing scheme to the new one. Also, there was a period of discussion about the scheme, and in this Mr. Stratford again gave us an enormous amount of assistance and excellent advice. I believe we all owe him a very real debt of gratitude. Also, Mr. Daugherty, the Parliamentary Counsel, has worked enormously hard on this measure. He has had little time at home, and I am sure that I am public enemy No. 1 in the Daugherty household, because he has had to work on this Bill for a long time. He has worked very hard and with the usual competence that we know he has. I am sure that we would all want them to know how much we appreciate what they have done.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I totally endorse the Treasurer's remarks about the work that has been put into this measure by the officers he has mentioned. I know that I speak for Opposition members when I say that I am grateful for the courtesy we have received from these gentlemen when explaining the contents of this Bill. However, it is the Government's responsibility to ensure that this measure will provide for the decisions that have been reached in discussions with the Public Service Association and other interested organizations, discussions that Opposition members have not been party to and have been unable to obtain details about except for the material that has been made public. I acknowledge the reasons for the situation, but if there are anomalies in this Bill that will create a situation to the disadvantage of present contributors, Opposition members will welcome the chance at the earliest moment to amend the Bill to correct that situation (which I do not believe would be intended by the Government and certainly would not be intended by those responsible for drafting the measure), which may have eluded the scrutiny given to the Bill by members of both sides.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1974)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDGES' SALARIES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 5.55 *to* 7.30 *p.m.]*

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from March 6. Page 2324.)

Clause 4—"Interpretation"—which Dr. Eastick had moved to amend by striking out the definition of "prescribed body".

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): A claim was made before progress was reported last week that the amendment would have certain effects that would not be in the best interests of the community.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It would destroy the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister may be of that opinion, but I am not. In my opinion, removing this definition will allow the Bill to do what the Minister has publicly said he wants to do. Had it not been for an amendment preceding a further amendment of mine, the Committee would be considering the deletion of more lines than it is now being asked to consider. I am not speaking of the portions which the member for Mitcham will seek to remove, nor do I take the lines I seek to remove in isolation from other lines to be considered at a later stage. We can effectively, and to the advantage of transportation problems in this State, reach the desired result by the acceptance of my amendment.

Mr. BECKER: I support the amendment.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why are you now supporting it when you opposed the Bill at the second reading? Have you been brainwashed?

Mr. BECKER: I have not been brainwashed. I do not like the legislation, because it is the beginning of the end.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: So you are going to make sure it is the end by—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BECKER: If we are forced to have this Bill passed in this House (and we on this side have not got the numbers, but the Government has the numbers and will push it through)—

Dr. Eastick: Bulldozer tactics!

Mr. BECKER: It has been pushed through to this stage and it will be pushed further. If that is to happen, let us have legislation that is fail and reasonable.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How could it be pushed through when you voted for the second reading? How is that being pushed through?

Mr. BECKER: We have not got the numbers to defeat it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You could have voted against it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BECKER. It appears that the Government's interpretation of a transport authority is entirely different from ours. The member for Goyder also joined in the act, but he had another opinion of what a transport authority should be.

The Hon. G T. Virgo: He is nearer the mark than you are.

Mr. BECKER: Nearer to what the Minister wants, but what we want is something entirely different. We recognize that private enterprise must play its part in the transport system, and we support the open-road policy.

Mr. Hall: How do you reconcile your attitude with the fact that you have said three times that you want total co-ordination?

Mr. BECKER: That is a play on words. I refer now to the leading article appearing in the *Advertiser* on March 1.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do they dictate your policy now?

Mr. BECKER: The Minister cannot deny that this would not be a biased article, giving a careful appraisal of the legislation. The Minister will not convince me that the *Advertiser* is biased, or any other form of media.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Take your tongue out of your cheek.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Hanson address the Chair.

Mr. BECKER: I am endeavouring to do so and I am being interrupted I am sorry, and I will not let it happen again In the leading article of March 1, the *Advertiser* states:

> The new Transport Authority will have the power to give directions to the Railways Commissioner, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board.

That is one of the danger points we see in the legislation. The article further states:

> But it will not completely control their operational functions. The authority is, itself, required to make a detailed recommendation to the Minister as to how this can best be accomplished. There may be good reasons, not apparent from the Minister's explanation yesterday, why what he calls the ultimate aim must await further investigation, notwithstanding the report of the committee appointed last year. But the impression left by the new Bill is that progress towards a fully co-ordinated transport service may be disappointingly slow.

The Hon. G T. Virgo: So you are going to make it slower.

Mr. BECKER: As we see this legislation, the Railways Commissioner, the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the Transport Control Board can be completely overruled, controlled, and dictated to by this authority. There are other ways in which to achieve a transport authority in this State. The article continues:

> Mr. Virgo might at least have taken the opportunity yesterday to clarify his objectives and to have indicated priorities and spelt out a time table for their achievement

That is what we have been saying, that the Bill was vague and the Minister's introductory remarks were vague. He did not want to tell us much, and he still does not. When we attack him on the issue or question him, all we receive is a series of personal attacks. The article continues:

> Fair-minded people will acknowledge his problems.

The Minister has had two trips overseas, but we still do not know what he saw there, because the Bee-line bus is the only thing that has been reasonably successful, and a similar service has been operating in Perth for 12 months.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is a complete lie, and you know it.

Mr. BECKER: A Bee-line bus service was operating in Perth before it started here.

The Hon G. T Virgo: That is a lie, and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Hanson appears to be inviting comments, and I suggest that he deal with the subject under discussion and inform the Committee of his views.

Mr. BECKER: The article continues:

> The new Bill and the Minister's explanation of it do little to dispel doubts that the Government is still groping for solutions.

This amendment has been moved to remove the control over these three organizations. The Opposition supports the principle of free enterprise and the integration of the transport system. If we are to have an effective transport system, this must be the position not just in the metropolitan area but throughout the whole State. If we are to have a transport authority, the economics of its establishment must be considered. We should not. As was suggested, have various organizations all over the State. The Opposition did not visualize an organization as large as that outlined in the Bill. We consider that an advisory panel, which could outline the whole structure of the transport authority, should be set up, but we do not go further than that. Because I can foresee the dangers inherent in the Bill in its present form, I support the amendment.

The Hon. G T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport). It seems necessary, in view of the drivel we have just heard, for me to reiterate the situation regarding this Bill, because members have obviously been so engrossed in other activities in this place that they have forgotten what this Bill is all about. I do not blame the member for Hanson for tearing up his notes, as he is doing now. I only wish he had done it before making his speech, because it might have been a better speech had he done so. The Government does not need the editorial columns of the *Advertiser,* the *News* or any other newspaper or, indeed, any other section of the mass media to write its policy for it. It is capable of determining its own policy, putting it before the people, and seeking their endorsement of it This is something that Opposition members seem completely to have ignored.

The member for Hanson suggested that I should spell out a time table. I suggest that he refer to my second reading explanation, which contains a time table. The trouble is that the honourable member has been superseded by his Leader. Although he took the adjournment and opposed the Bill (as did most of his colleagues) when he spoke, his Leader finally came in and said that he was going to salvage something from the wreckage. The Leader supported the Bill, and thereafter the others merely followed suit. If the member for Hanson refers to the

second reading explanation he, and indeed his colleagues, will find exactly what the Government is proposing: the co-ordination of the operating authorities. I should like now to repeat the following sentence from my second reading explanation:

The term "goes some way" is used quite advisedly, since the ultimate intention of having a single authority actually operating all major forms of public transport . . .

I emphasize the words "actually operating": I did not refer to planning. The Leader now wants to have a second planning authority. He has not caught up with the fact that two years ago the Government established a planning and development branch in my department under the authority of Dr. Scrafton. The Leader now wants to set up another. Let us be honest: Opposition members have not read the Bill. It has been suggested that we should cut out the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Railways and the Transport Control Board, and establish a State transport authority. It is to be a State authority, but the member for Hanson obviously has not read that. Another member intends to move an amendment to restrict this control to the metropolitan area. If that amendment is defeated, as I am sure it will be, this State will have one authority to deal with transport. That is the aim of the Bill.

If Opposition members want completely to destroy the Bill, let them by all means proceed with their amendment. They did not have the courage to defeat the Bill on the second reading, so they are using surreptitious methods of defeating it by removing all the powers conferred in the Bill and attempting to set up an authority that will have nothing to do. If that is what they want to happen, Opposition members should support the amendment. On the other hand, if the Opposition members are genuine in their desire to have a single transport authority operating for the benefit of the people of South Australia, co-ordinating this State's transport system, they should support the Bill, which will establish an authority and require that authority to report on the amendments that it is necessary to make to various Acts of Parliament in order to obtain a single operating authority. That is the whole purpose of the Bill. This was spelt out in clear and simple terms in the second reading explanation. I ask members to reject the amendment, which is designed to destroy the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment, as it widens the ambit of the Bill. I am pleased that the Minister referred to the second reading explanation. However, it comprised only two paragraphs.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I read those two paragraphs, but obviously you haven't understood them.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understood every word, although little was said in them. It is obvious that the Minister was reluctant to give any information in his second reading explanation, as he has explained in only two paragraphs a Bill comprising six pages, and the Opposition is supposed to understand everything about the Bill from reading those two paragraphs. I support the amendment, as it is the only right and proper way in which to achieve this goal.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister wants this State to have a single transport authority. If the Government wants to run all public transport in this State, heaven help South Australia, because the Government has not even been able to run the railways profitably. It has taken over private bus lines, which have been forced out of business by unfair competition. Some form of co-ordination is needed. The M.T.T. and the railways need to be co-ordinated, but the Government wants to interfere with this State's efficient road transport system, which pays its way and contributes more than its share towards the cost of our roads. However, the railways does not even pay its way, losing 50 per cent on passenger services to other States. This is the sort of situation into which we are getting because of the Minister's inefficiency. If co-ordination means ownership (and this is the first step towards it), and we have complete Socialism in that direction, the sooner we toss out this measure the better.

Mr. GUNN: This clause is obnoxious: the Minister tonight let the cat out the bag. It has been clear for some time that, on behalf of the Socialist Government, he wishes to destroy the private operator in the State's transport system. That has been the policy of the Labor Party. We want in this State a proper transport system, run economically and efficiently, so that the people can get a proper service.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are discussing an amendment.

Mr. GUNN: I was certainly discussing the amendment.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! You will be outside soon if you do not obey the Chair.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not make any utterance, yet you threatened to have me removed from the Chamber. I ask for an apology, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Did I mention the honourable member for Eyre? Can he supply evidence that I mentioned him?

Mr. GUNN: You referred to me and you looked straight at me when you made your remarks. If you were referring to the member for Kavel, although I do not wish to be disrespectful to you, I interpreted what you said as meaning that I was the offending member.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's interpretation and my interpretation are two different things. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I was endeavouring to deal with the argument advanced by the Minister of Transport, who indicated that he and the South Australian Government were to operate in the field of commercial transport. We are aware that this Bill endeavours to give the Minister complete control over the Transport Control Board, which is the licensing authority in this State. It has power to control any transport operation in this State so, if the Minister gets control of that body and wishes to operate in the field of road transport for the carrying of passengers and small parcels, he will set up another Government instrumentality, which can only run at a loss. We already have the example of the South Australian Railways, which is a complete fiasco.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with the Leader's amendment, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to it.

Mr. GUNN: The purpose of this amendment is to strike out these three authorities to which I have been referring. I contend I am in order in giving reasons why the amendment should be supported. I was trying to explain the futility of the argument advanced by the Minister, who wishes to control and direct the M.T.T. We are already aware that he is directly responsible to Parliament for that body and must accept full responsibility for how it operates.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you suggest that I don't accept the responsibility?

Mr. GUNN: I am just making an observation. It is obvious that the Minister wants to get rid of the private bus operators in the country areas.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this amendment about getting rid of private bus operators in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Order! There is nothing in this Bill about private bus operators. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: The clause clearly refers, in paragraph *(c)*, to the Transport Control Board, which has the power to control certain transport routes in this State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And buses run on those routes.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. In most country areas an efficient and well organized bus system is operating. In my electoral district no-one could complain of the service received from private bus operators, who are licensed by the Transport Control Board and have to meet its requirements. The Minister suggested that the State Government should operate in that transport field. I want to know from the Minister, who is opposing this amendment, what better service he can provide for the people than is already in existence. The railways are costing the taxpayer millions of dollars; yet the member for Spence has the cheek to criticize the private bus operators.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Private bus operators are not mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: The amendment deserves the support of every member of this Committee because it is in the best interests of all citizens, including the taxpayers, who will have to underwrite the Minister's irresponsible attitude.

Mr. Crimes: Taxpayers subscribe to private profits. Can't you understand that?

Mr. GUNN: I never cease to be amazed at how naive the member for Spence can be.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order and the honourable member is out of order in replying to them.

Mr. GUNN: This clause strikes at the fundamental system of public transport in the State, and this is about the third time the Labor Party has tried to do that. Now the Minister hopes, by a back-door method, to get Ministerial control of the Transport Control Board so that the board will be a bureaucracy, and the Government thrives on bureaucracy at the expense of the taxpayer.

Mr. HALL: The lighthearted attitude of the L.C.L. Opposition to the Leader's amendment is a continuation of the attitude of L.C.L. members to the Bill. The Leader stated that he would support the second reading so that he could move amendments (and I take it this is one of them), but the members for Hanson, Eyre, Bragg, Heysen, Rocky River, and Fisher said that they would oppose the whole Bill.

Mr. Becker: We said it should be withdrawn.

Mr. HALL: If I had time, I would throw the words used by the member for Hanson back at him, because he is not telling the truth. The L.C.L. Opposition seems to be illogical in its support of the amendment, because the Leader stated three times in the second reading debate that he believed in the total co-ordination of road transport in South Australia. Total co-ordination is the opposite of the open-road transport system that some members have spoken about in supporting the amendment.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's your position?

Mr. HALL: My position will be made clear. The member for Kavel did not say he opposed the second reading, because there had been a change of opinion at that stage, but the member for Hanson's last words in that debate were, "I oppose the Bill."

Mr. Becker: Read the sentence before that.

Mr. HALL: He said that the Government should withdraw the Bill and that he opposed the measure. This amendment destroys all concepts of co-ordination intended by the Bill. Because I do not consider that the State Government should get the power to co-ordinate at the expense of freedom of transport in the State, I foreshadow another amendment. I would sooner see the Bill fail than see the Minister given power to do to road transport what was threatened under Labor in 1966.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister's interpretation of control is that the Government would operate and control everything However, when I stated that I believed in co-ordination, I used the word correctly. The main railway lines would run profitably if they were run efficiently The member for Spence is horrified of profit, because it would take money away from someone else. What is profit when there is competition? It is what a person earns when he operates more efficiently than his competitors operate.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As the member for Heysen is trying to make a speech, I ask that other members refrain from interjecting. As it is not easy in these circumstances for *Hansard* to record what is being said, I ask that members show respect for *Hansard.* The member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: If the Minister came up with what I believed to be a genuine scheme of transport co-ordination and outlined his plans for it, I would fully support the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If you studied my second reading explanation you would see what the legislation is all about.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister wants to control all the State's transport services. The last time the Labor Government wanted to do that, public meetings of protest were held throughout the State. The Government wants to operate all our efficient road services. No doubt the Government will say that transport operators cannot operate their own trucks! The Western Australian Government tried such a move. As a strong, united opposition, apart from the fragmentation that would not accept a majority decision—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member wishes to continue speaking he must confine his remarks to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. If he has no further comments to make, I will put the question.

Mr. McANANEY: If the Railways Commissioner requests that a certain line be closed, it is the responsibility of the Transport Control Board to ensure that a reasonable alternative means of transport is provided. The matter is then referred to the Public Works Committee to ascertain whether it is in the best interests of the people of the State that the line be closed. Regarding the possible closure of the Victor Harbor line, the only evidence, which indicated that it should remain open was that no reasonable alternative bus service existed. However, the board did not do its job as well as it should have done, namely, to ensure that a reasonable alternative service was provided. For this reason, the railway line has continued to operate, although the number of passengers and the quantity of freight carried have been reduced as a result of efficient road transport operators taking more and more of the traffic. At present, many efficient transport operators compete effectively. If we had only one transport service we would return to the days when people were compelled

to use the railways. Is that what the Minister is trying to offer the people of the State?

Mr. Crimes: What do you mean by competition? Haven't you heard of amalgamations and take-overs?

Mr. McANANEY. Mr. Chairman, I will obey your instructions and disregard the remarks of the member for Spence. Road transport can operate efficiently, but we must analyse the position and ascertain what system provides the best service for the people of the State. This must be done by competition, not by some expert who may be sitting in a room, trying to determine what system is most efficient. We must determine what is the best transport service for an area. That is why capitalistic countries are more advanced than are communistic countries. I believe in the proper co-ordination of transport in South Australia, but not in the doctrinaire Socialism that the Minister of Transport proposes.

Mr. GUNN: The L.C.L. has always supported an open-road transport policy for this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This discussion has nothing to do with the clause, which deals with and defines the prescribed body. There is no justification for a second reading debate, and I ask that members speak to the clause and amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause and the Leader's amendment refer to the prescribed body, involving the South Australian Railways, the Transport Control Board, and the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the honourable member for Eyre must confine his remarks to that subject.

Mr. GUNN: This is an all-embracing clause and, if it is passed in its present form, it would have a far-reaching effect on the transport system. Surely the Minister does not deny that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with the deletion of the definition of "prescribed body", and other parts of the Bill have nothing to do with the rejection or adoption of the Leader's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled in that direction, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the clause and the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: I believe it is in order to discuss the effect that this clause will have if it is passed in its present form.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That comes in clause 12.

Mr. GUNN: This is a proper amendment to the clause and, although we have had a wide debate—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Honourable members have had a hell of a ball already.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Coumbe: That is a nice statement!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My point of order is that—

Mr. Coumbe: You are speaking disrespectfully to the Chair.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am speaking not to the member for Torrens but to the Chair.

Mr. Coumbe: You are casting a reflection on the Chair.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The amendment we are discussing is to delete the definition of "prescribed body", and the three relevant authorities are defined in paragraphs *(a), (b),* and *(c)* of the definition. Paragraph *(d)* is referred to not in this amendment but in a subsequent one. The points now being made are relevant to clause 12, and I suggest that this sort of discussion should be delayed until we reach that clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I believe I have ruled correctly on the point of order raised by the honourable Minister of Transport. This clause refers to the M.T.T., the South Australian Railways, and the Transport Control Board, as the "prescribed body" and I ask the honourable member for Eyre to confine his remarks to the amendment moved by the Leader.

Mr. GUNN: The amendment is to delete the definition of "prescribed body" and, if it is carried, it will protect a section of the transport industry that will be under attack if the clause is passed in its present form. We make no apology for our policy, and believe in an open-road transport system. As this policy has been written into our platform, we believe in co-ordinating all transport in this State. The member for Goyder should know that, because he was a spokesman for my Party for some years

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should return to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I hope all responsible members will support the amendment in order to protect legitimate operators in this State against an arbitrary decision of an arrogant and vindictive Socialist Minister.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister said that he had received a mandate from the people to introduce the Bill, but that statement is incorrect. In his Leader's policy speech the seven points on transport and traffic planning did not refer to an authority to cover all forms of transport in the State. The Government has no mandate for this and the Minister tried to mislead the Committee when he said it had, and that it had been endorsed by the people of South Australia. That was wrong, and I suggest the Minister knew it was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Glenelg must confine his remarks to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. It was indicated previously that we would support the Bill provided the Government agreed to certain amendments;

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Virgo (teller), and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dean Brown, Evans, Gunn, and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, King, Langley, and Wells.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

After paragraph *(b)* to insert "and"; and to strike out paragraph *(d)*.

The effect of these amendments will be to restrict the definition of "prescribed body" to the Municipal Tramways Trust, the Railways Commissioner, and the Transport Control Board, and to cut out what in my view is one of the most objectionable parts of the Bill, that is, paragraph *(d).* As I have said previously, this paragraph would mean that by law the Government could prescribe any body, either an individual or a company, for the purposes of this Bill, and could do it by regulation. It might be many months before Parliament could take any action, if ever it could take action. I think that is wrong. If the Government wishes to bring other bodies within the purview of this Bill it should be done by amending it so that Parliament could debate the matter, and both Houses would have to concur.

Dr. EASTICK: I support the amendments because they are consistent with the previous amendments and with the contents of the document to which I have previously referred.

The Committee divided on the amendments.

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (18)—Messrs Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Virgo (teller), and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold, Dean Brown, Evans, Mathwin, and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, King, Langley, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived.

Mr. BLACKER: I move:

After the definition of "prescribed body" to insert the following definition:

"Public transport" includes railway transport but does not include any other transport primarily or predominantly encompassing the carriage of goods.

Clause 12 contains the teeth of the Bill, as it deals with the co-ordination of all forms of public transport, on which the Bill is based. However, the Bill does not include a definition of "public transport", even though in his second reading explanation the Minister referred many times to the report of the Director-General of Transport which also refers to public transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is unnecessary to carry this amendment, as I do not want the legislation cluttered up with unnecessary provisions. The Government's attitude is clearly known to those who want to understand it: the Premier stated twice before the last election that the Government had an open-road policy on transport We have heard much from members opposite about this being L.C.L. policy, but it is a pity that they did not take the trouble to ascertain that it is also Labor's policy.

Mr. Coumbe: Mr. Walsh did not quite agree with that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not concerned with the policy of the Walsh Government. However, I remind the member for Torrens that Mr. Walsh pursued at the time the policy that he put to the people. The Government is now doing the same thing: it is pursuing a policy which it put before the people and which was endorsed. The Bill establishes an authority to investigate various transport problems: it contains no provision regarding the control of goods transport, of which the member for Flinders is afraid. Therefore, new provisions can be included only if both Houses of Parliament agree thereto I have stated clearly that it is not Government policy to impose those sorts of restriction. Indeed, the Government intends to pursue its open-road policy. It does not intend to inhibit the authority in its initial investigatory stages. Any measures recommended by the authority will come before this Parliament, and that is an adequate safeguard for the point raised by the member for Flinders. I therefore oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Virgo (teller), and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen, Dean Brown, Evans, Gunn, and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, King, Langley, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Powers and functions."

Dr. EASTICK: Because of the refusal of the Committee to accept an amendment to clause 4, I shall not now move the amendment that I intended to move.

Mr. HALL: I move:

In subclause (1) (a) to strike out "State" and insert "Metropolitan Planning Area".

I move this amendment because I do not believe the State should be subjected to the unknown trends and future actions of the Minister in road transport throughout the State. Whereas the Minister has declined to accept responsibility in this direction and says that in future legislation will be needed, it is obvious that he would use this legislation as a base for any future move. If we are serious about co-ordinating transport, those of us who believe in an open-road policy understand that it should apply to the metropolitan area. The member for Fisher has spoken of the need for planning in Monarto, a city that does not yet exist and, for all we know, may never exist. A question mark hangs over it and any future extension to co-ordinate transport at Monarto will be dealt with by this Parliament when the need arises. It is not right to threaten the rest of the State with subjugation in respect of road transport. Therefore, the argument in respect of Monarto does not apply.

The member for Fisher has followed a dual policy in this. Apparently, he has followed some general statement by the Opposition that it believes in State-wide co-ordination of transport but does not want this Bill. If there is one consistency in this debate, it is that those assertions do not match. The Opposition, on the platform outlined by the Leader of the Opposition last week, should vote for the Bill. In his second reading speech the Leader said:

Opposition members recognize the need for a single transport authority for the purpose of planning and co-ordinating the total requirements of this State.

I ask members opposite to listen to that. The Leader also said:

We recognize the need for a single transport authority . . We believe that there is an urgent need to introduce a suitable single transport authority that will recognize the need for the planning and co-ordination of the whole transport industry in South Australia.

The whole transport industry includes the road hauliers of South Australia, and I do not want them co-ordinated by any Government. The amendment will save the road transport industry from the Minister's designs and from the statement the Leader of the Opposition has made three Limes. The people in this industry were attacked by the Labor Party in 1966 when the present Minister was directing the actions of that Party from an office down the road.

Mr. Crimes: Was he a faceless man?

Mr. HALL: No, he is the hard face of Labor. My amendment limits the effect of the Bill to the metropolitan area I think it was the member for Eyre who said that, when I last had something to do with his Party, I believed in the co-ordination of transport, but the policy of the Party in 1971 was to implement metropolitan transport to a co-ordinated master plan. The honourable member who said that did not know the past policies of his Party. No-one knows the present policies of that Party other

than the policies stated by the Leader. At public meetings the Leader has defended private transport, yet he has attacked it here. I challenge members who represent country districts to say that they believe in the total co-ordination of the whole transport system of South Australia. The Minister should realize that he may lose this Bill unless he compromises and drops his hard-face approach

The Hon. G. T Virgo. Is that a threat?

Mr. HALL: Yes. This Bill must run the gamut of another place and I do not consider that those L.C.L. members will agree with the Leader's support of the total co-ordination of all transport

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Goyder wants to divide the State into two parts In fact, he wants to divide my district, because the metropolitan planning area runs through the middle of it. When road transport control operated in South Australia, goods could be carted in the metropolitan Adelaide area, and I do not understand what co-ordination would be wanted in the metropolitan area in regard to goods. The dictionary meaning of "co-ordinate" is "to bring things into relationship" and if rail transport in an area was providing a better service more cheaply, without subsidies from the taxpayer, that would be brought into relationship. The Minister has said that he believes in nationalization and operation of all transport by the Government, despite his later contradictory remarks.

Dr. EASTICK: If we can get away from emotional comments and double talk, I think the member for Goyder will appreciate that members of my Party cannot support the amendment. He seeks to stand in the past and asks the Party that I lead to accept that a view that it had in 1971 should necessarily be its view in 1974 or 1975. Fortunately, people accept that there ought to be and can be an effective change of attitude, depending on the weight of evidence available. Therefore, I have no difficulty in indicating that the Party of which I am proud to be Leader recognizes that it cannot have a sectional approach to transportation, leaving one small group in a container whilst the remainder moves hither and thither.

As the member for Heysen said, the situation which the member for Goyder seeks to introduce into the former's district would divide that district and others as well. No doubt the member for Kavel would find himself in a similar situation. Certainly other members such as the member for Fisher and I would be in a somewhat similar situation. We must all realize that we are seeking integrated requirements in the best interests of the whole State. To try to sectionalize, as the amendment provides for, would be to destroy the concept of a progressive and rational approach to a vital consideration.

Mr. HALL: I suppose I should thank the Leader for confirming what I have said about his policy. This is his opportunity to limit the operation of the Bill, which at least six members said they opposed in their second reading speeches. In his response to my amendment the Leader said that, instead of having 70 per cent of the State's population co-ordinated in their great conglomeration and close proximity in the metropolitan area, we should have 100 per cent. The Leader has neatly put that on record.

Dr. Eastick: I don't apologize for putting it on record.

Mr. HALL: Of course not, and it is good to know that it is clear. The Leader has voted for a Bill that could severely restrict any part of the State's transport industry; that is a serious departure of viewpoint on the non-Labor side. The Deputy Premier will remember clearly how much the restriction on road transport meant in the Millicent District some years ago.

The Hon. J. D Corcoran: But this Bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. HALL: The Minister said that his future planning could well contemplate other legislation being coupled with the Bill now before us. The Leader's refusal to support my amendment has confirmed what I have said and thought about his Party.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope I can explain in single-syllable words to the Opposition exactly what the Bill is trying to achieve. Although we are now on clause 12, obviously only a few Opposition members understand the legislation, unless some other members are deliberately trying to follow a line contrary to that which the Bill proposes. Clause 12 (1) provides that the functions of the authority shall be as follows:

> *(b)* to recommend to the Minister the manner and means by which the powers and functions of any prescribed body, in relation to public transport within the State, may be assumed and exercised directly or indirectly by the authority.

The authority will be concerned with existing powers and functions. If the member for Goyder can tell me that the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Railways and the Transport Control Board, the three bodies nominated in earlier clauses, have the powers to which he referred, I shall be delighted. As those bodies have no such powers, they cannot be transferred. To talk the way the honourable member has talked, along the lines that suddenly some great monster will come in and impose road transport controls that do not currently apply, is so much ballyhoo, and the member for Goyder knows it is.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's being deliberate, though.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He is trying to mislead the Committee in much the same way as he has tried to mislead the House on other issues.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's public transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. What will be the effect of carrying this amendment? It would mean that the functions of the S.A.R. within the metropolitan area would be carried out by the State Transport Authority. We would have to dream up some other organization or maintain the existing Railways Department to run every country and interstate rail service. That is brilliant thinking! Also, by depriving the Transport Control Board of its functions, no longer would there be any control of fares, services, or the mechanical condition and safety of buses. Is this what the member for Goyder advocates? I do not believe that he is consciously advocating these things, but they are the effects his amendment would have.

The member for Goyder has shown that he does not understand my second reading explanation. I ask the Committee to carry the Bill in its existing form, except for a machinery amendment I will move later. Those members who believe sincerely in the co-ordination of transport and the need for it will realize the benefits that will arise as a result of the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: I live in an area where there has been conflict between metropolitan and country services, particularly in respect of buses, for the cartage of goods. For us to draw a boundary around the Adelaide metropolitan area and try to co-ordinate transport in that area for the benefit of the public and not do it in areas such at Port Augusta, Whyalla and Monarto, would produce problems. I do not support some of the provisions of the Bill, but I could not support the amendment, because it would create an even worse situation in my area than exists there now.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (3)—Messrs. Blacker, Hall (teller), and Millhouse.

Noes (35)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McAnaney, McKee, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Venning, Virgo (teller), Wardle, and Wright.

Majority of 32 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 18 passed.

New clause 18a—"Summary Proceedings."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

18a. Proceedings in respect of offences under this Act shall be disposed of summarily.

This is a machinery clause that was omitted.

New clause inserted.

Clause 19 and title passed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved: *That this Bill be now read a third time.*

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The position of the Opposition has been made clear in the passing of this Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: You're kidding!

Dr. EASTICK: We recognize the value of some features of the Bill and we clearly indicated to the Minister the difficulties that would arise if it were passed in the form in which it was introduced. With the exception of the Minister's amendment, it is the same Bill as that introduced. Because the Minister has been unable to accept recommendations made by the Opposition which would have made it a more meaningful Bill and which would better serve the interests of South Australia, we oppose the third reading.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I oppose the third reading, because the Bill as it comes out of Committee is full of threat to the South Australian community. Clause 4 *(d)* provides that a "prescribed body" shall include—

any other person or body whether corporate or unincorporate for the time being prescribed as a prescribed body for the purposes of this Act:

Therefore, any person or any body involved in transport can be brought within the ambit of this legislation, and that situation is contrary to that which the Minister tried to describe in Committee. The powers of the authority are to co-ordinate all systems of public transport within the State, and there will be no aspect of transport that cannot be brought within the ambit of clause 4 *(d)*. Any person or body corporate or unincorporate can be made subject to the jurisdiction of the State Transport Authority. I must vote against this proposal. I could have supported it had it been limited to the metropolitan area, for the reasons given during the debate. I voted against the Bill, and I want the House to know that my reasons for so doing are those I gave in Committee. I still cannot reconcile my view with that of the Liberal and Country League, which would extend the ambit of the authority right across the State. That was one of my amendments the L.C.L. turned down. It is a most extraordinary debate and I can only urge the House to take the safe course, in view of the conflicting statements made and the obvious threat posed by the breadth of operation of the Bill, and reject the third reading.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In opposing the third reading, I reiterate that the Bill should be withdrawn and redrafted. I go along with the principle of a transport authority, and having studied the matter for nearly nine months I have come to the conclusion that, if we are to have a transport authority, it must cover the whole of the State. My interpretation of a transport authority is different from that of the Minister, who has said that it is intended to have a single authority actually operating all major forms of transport in this State. That is not capable of being realized at this stage, but it is clear that it is the ultimate aim. In the second reading explanation, the Minister said:

For present purposes there are three bodies concerned in the operation of major forms of the public transport in this State. They are the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board, and it is visualized that the proposed State Transport Authority will in the first instance be given the right to give directions to these bodies and to exercise a degree of control over their activities.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Hanson that, on third reading, the only subject for debate is the Bill as it came out of Committee, without the general discussion that is permitted on second reading. Discussion on the third reading is strictly limited to the Bill as it came out of Committee, and the honourable member must not develop a second reading speech. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER: The authority as provided for by the Bill will do more than is contemplated by members on this side. Its ultimate aim is to directly control transport throughout the State, and for this reason we oppose the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the third reading: the Bill as it emerged from Committee is totally unacceptable. Its provisions are so broad and so all-embracing that it is not to the advantage of transport people, nor does it properly define the aims of the authority. When the Minister fails to accept the inclusion of a definition—

The SPEAKER. Order! Once again I must remind honourable members that comment on third reading may apply only to the Bill as it came out of Committee, not to what was considered in Committee and not to what was refused or accepted in Committee. The honourable member for Flinders.

Mr. BLACKER: I oppose the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan, King, Langley, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, and Tonkin.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GOVERNOR)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 6. Page 2312.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which contains only five clauses and effects two purposes. It increases the salary payable to His Excellency the Governor and corrects a situation in relation to the expenses allowance. The detail as provided in the formula that will apply has been checked and found to be correct. It will offset the difficulties that have been experienced in

the past when the cost index has been put back to 100. The arrangement that has existed since 1964, when the last amendment was made, has been a matter of convenience and common sense on the part of those responsible for paying expenses. This Bill will solve the problem that has existed in the past when the basic figure has been reduced to 100. My inquiries reveal no difficulties in relation to the Bill, and I therefore support its speedy passage.

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

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PROPERTY)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 27. Page 2210.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, which consolidates all the amendments made to the principal Act. It is intended to consolidate all Acts of Parliament, and I look forward to the day when this has been done, as it will make the job of members of Parliament much easier and will enable them to assist their constituents even more than they do now, if that is possible. Members will have noticed that this Bill was prepared by Mr. Ludovici, the former Parliamentary Counsel, who is better known to other members than he is to me, because I am a newer member of this place. Mr. Ludovici did much valuable work as Parliamentary Counsel, and even now, in his semi-retirement, he is still assisting the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Glenelg that Bills are introduced by the Ministers and, although complimentary remarks are permitted to be made regarding officers, honourable members cannot amplify the position regarding those officers

Mr. MATHWIN: Very well, Sir. This is only a small Bill, which I commend to honourable members and which I support.

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

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading

(Continued from March 7. Page 2345.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In 1966 the principal Act was amended. When introducing the present Bill, the Attorney-General said:

It would appear that Parliament, in granting this power of exemption, may have overlooked the case of a society that was already registered at the time of the commencement of the amending Act.

This Bill is designed to rectify that oversight. In 1966, the Act was amended to give the Minister power to expand the voting rights of members of a society registered after the commencement of the 1966 Act. As members would know, this Bill is necessary to enable Kyabram Preserving Company Limited to take over Jon Preserving Company Limited. This is generally accepted by the industry as being desirable. The Bill enables the Minister to approve a differential scale of voting to members of a society that was registered before or after the 1966 amending Act. New subsection (9) *(a)* of section 12 gives the Minister authority to provide for the registration of a society whose rules do not conform to new subsection (8) *(a)*. New subsection (9) *(b)* gives the Minister authority to provide for amendment to the rules of a society that does not conform to new subsection (8) *(b)*. It also amends section 12 of the principal Act. I have discussed this Bill generally with the industry and, as I have said, it is in the best interests of the growers that it be proceeded with at once. Sb I trust it will have a speedy passage through this House in the interests of the industry. I support the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the member for Chaffey in hoping that this Bill has a speedy passage. I have had some consultation with, and some approaches have been made to me by, members of the Jon company to ensure that the Bill passes speedily through the House, as that will facilitate the taking over of the company. The importance of the canning industry to the fruitgrowers of the State is well known. The canneries have had a fairly chequered career since the Second World War. Some of them have disappeared, and others have been taken over and have received considerable Government assistance over the years, which has been well merited in view of the importance of the canning industry to the fruitgrowers of the State. There can be no opposition to the Bill, which I support. I trust that it passes speedily.

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

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.,

(Continued from March 7. Page 2348.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support this Bill, which will be of great assistance to the administration of the commission, for it will afford an opportunity for many specialist qualities to be used by the commission through the terms of employment being broadened. Section 17 of the principal Act limited employment in the commission to people who were not involved in the Public Service and did not work under the Public Service Act; but this amending Bill will allow people with expert knowledge to be available from the Public Service and to work under the Public Service Act. As I interpret it, it appears that, where the commission is the employing authority, an employee will be able to remain an employee of the commission without necessarily being employed under the Public Service Act. I believe this gives. much more flexibility to the employment of specialist people by the commission. Therefore, I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 14, at 2 p.m.