

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 22, 1974

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Fruit Fly (Compensation),
Supply (No. 2).

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE presented a petition signed by 100 ratepayers and residents of the District Council of Lincoln, the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln, and the District Council of Tumby Bay, expressing dissatisfaction with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and praying that the Legislative Council would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries to the area of the District Council of Lincoln and that the city of Port Lincoln be preserved as a city area and not incorporated into a rural area.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**BLEWETT SPRINGS LAND**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It has been brought to my attention that next week about 11 hectares of land in the estate of the late Mr. Z. Ward will be auctioned at Blewett Springs. Several people interested in conservation have approached me and asked me to raise this matter in this Council and ask the Minister whether an examination can be made of this land with a view to purchasing it and adding it to the State's national parks or reserves. Will the Minister refer this question to his colleague and ask that this land be inspected with a view to its being purchased?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to comply with the honourable member's wishes.

DRUG AVAILABILITY

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I am asking for information regarding a drug that is not yet available on the South Australian scene. This drug, called Carby Dopa, is an advancement on drugs currently in use for the treatment of certain neurological phenomena, particularly for a condition known as Parkinson's Disease. I believe that Carby Dopa is in use in the United Kingdom and in New Zealand, and that it was marketed by two companies: Messrs. Roche Proprietary Limited, who call it Mardopa, and Messrs. Merk, Sharp and Dohme, who call it Sinemet. I understand that it is at present being handled only by the latter firm, the former having withdrawn, and that non-medical problems may be holding up the release and distribution of this drug. My questions are as follows: first, is Carby Dopa in Australia; secondly, if it is, when will it be available in South Australia; thirdly, if the hold-up and the non-availability in South Australia are not related to medico-clinical reasons, what is the reason;

and, finally, what are the reasons for the delay in its general use?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek a report on the matter for the honourable member and bring it down in due course.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Acting Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding interest rates on rural reconstruction loans?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The rates of interest applicable to existing loans made under the provisions of the Rural Industry Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972, have not been changed. Loans made for farm build-up purposes are repayable under credit foncier terms to a maximum period of 30 years. Interest is chargeable at the rate of 6¼ per cent a year. Interest rates on farm build-up loans have not increased since the inception of the rural reconstruction scheme.

Loans made for debt reconstruction are repayable under credit foncier terms to a maximum of 20 years. Interest rates are determined having regard to the level of consolidated debt, the interest rate or rates previously applicable, and the ability of the applicant being assisted to service total costs of production and capital. Legislation provides that interest chargeable under the debt reconstruction provisions shall be not less than 4 per cent a year.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The pending removal of the superphosphate bounty is causing concern to all producers, particularly those in marginal areas, where heavy superphosphate dressings are quite essential. I understand that the Minister has made a public statement favouring the reintroduction or partial reintroduction of the bounty. Is it a fact that the Minister will recommend the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty and, if it is, will he use every endeavour to persuade his Commonwealth colleague that this is a wise move? Further, what subsidy for each tonne, and what quantity of superphosphate per property, will the Minister recommend to the Commonwealth authorities?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: What the honourable member has said is correct. I have said that the subsidy should be phased out: it should be removed over a period, and I stand by that statement. I have also said that the Commonwealth Government should perhaps consider the scheme operating in New Zealand, where a subsidy is placed on an amount (I do not know exactly what the amount is, but it could vary from time to time) that can benefit everyone using superphosphate. I am carrying out investigations through my department as to exactly what the usage of superphosphate is in South Australia in the various types of primary production, and I hope to make submissions to the Prime Minister very soon.

INFLATION

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands, as the Acting Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: When Labor got to power in South Australia for the first time for quite a long

time, it used to blame for all its deficiencies first the previous Liberal Government and later the alleged obstructiveness of this Council. When Labor a year or two ago got to power in the Commonwealth sphere it blamed for its deficiencies, which were many and have now become disastrous, first the previous Liberal-Country Party Government and, secondly the alleged obstructiveness of the Senate. Yesterday there was a new one: for the first time that I can remember Dr. Cairns said that inflation was not the fault of the Government but that of the system. I should like to recall for honourable members the speech I made exactly three weeks ago about this very question of inflation and how one changes a Capitalist system into a Socialist system. In referring to inflation I said that a Socialist Government would encourage inflation, and "then it could be said that the system had failed". Those were almost the identical words that Dr. Cairns used yesterday. I think the South Australian Government (in the same way as the Commonwealth Government) has failed to stand up to its responsibilities; for example, regarding the ban on the transport of steel at Port Adelaide. In view of what I have said, will the next excuse of the State Government, too, be that it is the fault of the system? If it is the next excuse, we will know exactly where we stand in relation to Socialism.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I find it difficult to reply to the honourable member's question, because I did not know that Dr. Cairns was an avid reader of South Australian *Hansard*. Dr. Cairns must have read what the honourable member said, if he almost quoted him word for word. However, to say that the South Australian Government has not done anything in respect of the steel dispute at Port Adelaide is completely incorrect: the Government has done everything possible, and the honourable member knows that, and he is a fair-minded man. He has referred to what the Government has done on several occasions and I am sorry to hear him make this statement, especially as he knows in his own mind, as does every other honourable member, what the Government has done. This dispute is outside the Government's scope, as it is a demarcation dispute between two unions. The Government has done everything possible to settle the dispute one way or the other. This is a very difficult matter and perhaps the honourable member can tell me how he would settle the dispute, because I am anxious to hear of his solution.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If the Minister is asking me a question (and I take it that he is), I can tell him that I would settle the dispute by showing a little more strength than the present Government is showing.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as Acting Leader of the Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I understand the current situation applying at Port Adelaide is that steel is being held illegally, despite people outside the wharves waiting to pick up the steel and waterside workers on the inside willing to load it, with people in between preventing the steel being cleared, these people being members of the clerks' union. They refuse to fill out the invoices. Is the Government willing to take action to try to get the clerks' union to provide the necessary documentation, thereby enabling this steel to be removed?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have not heard of the information to which the honourable member has referred. I will find out what the situation is before I reply to the honourable member.

PETROL SUBSIDY

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Acting Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on August 1 about the implementation of a petrol subsidy in remote South Australian areas as the subsidy formerly provided by the Commonwealth Government has been withdrawn?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The South Australian Government is unable to provide subsidies on petrol because of insufficient funds.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question that I asked on July 31 about the High Court challenge involving the recent joint sitting of the Commonwealth Parliament?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The South Australian Government does not intend to participate in these proceedings.

MINISTERS OVERSEA TOUR

The Hon. C. M. HILL (on notice):

1. What was the purpose of the Minister of Agriculture's recent overseas tour?
2. What staff members, if any, accompanied the Minister?
3. What was the total cost of the trip?
4. With which South Australian overseas trade representatives did the Minister consult whilst away?
5. Will the Minister inform the Council in some detail of his observations made and opinions formed as a result of his tour, with special reference to the advantages which might accrue to the South Australian rural community?
6. Was the Minister reported accurately in the article concerning his tour already published in the *Stock Journal* dated August 14, 1974?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

- 1.(a) To establish and promote official contacts with Ministers responsible for agriculture and forestry in the visited Asian countries and the United States of America, and with their senior technical officers, and through these contacts to explore avenues of trade with those countries in South Australian agricultural products.
- (b) To study developments in rural production, research and marketing techniques in the developing countries, the United States and Japan.
2. Mr. A. F. Tideman, Chief Agronomist, Agriculture Department, and Mr. R. D. Walkerden, Secretary, Minister of Agriculture Department.
3. The final cost will not be known until several small accounts, which are still outstanding, are received from overseas. It is expected to be well within the total amount approved by Cabinet for the mission.
4. Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Japan.
5. This will be done from time to time as occasions arise or circumstances dictate.
6. Yes.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the business of the day, I have to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the Hon. C. R. Story regarding a matter of public importance relating to the administration of the Fisheries Department. Standing Order No. 116 requires that at least three members must rise in their places as sufficient evidence of urgency, and I ask members to stand accordingly.

Six members having risen:

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I move:

That the Council at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday next, August 27, at 1.45 p.m.

The purpose of moving this motion is that since November 23, 1972, this State has been without a Director of Fisheries, and I believe that that is a very serious matter. During this debate, I hope I shall be able to develop a case that will seize other honourable members and, I hope, the Government with the importance of filling vacancies, when they occur, as expeditiously as possible. The top echelon of the Fisheries Department comprises a Director of Fisheries, and that position is vacant. It has a Director of Fisheries Research, who at present is acting as Director of Fisheries, and that officer is Mr. A. M. Olsen, who was the previous Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation. It has a Principal Research Officer, and that position as at August 21, 1974 (only yesterday), was vacant. It has a Senior Fisheries Officer, and that position is occupied by Mr. S. A. Shepherd. There is a Senior Research Officer, a new position that is occupied by a Mr. F. Reynolds. There is an Economist, a Mr. R. Harding, who has been appointed but who has not yet taken up the office, because he is coming from overseas. Therefore, at present, people are not functioning in three of the positions in the top echelon. This situation becomes evident through a series of notices in the *South Australian Government Gazette*, the first notice appearing at page 2407 of the *Gazette* of November 23, 1972, and stating, in part:

1. Change the name of the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation in the Public Service to the Department of Fisheries.

2. Change the title of the office, the holder of which for the time being shall be Permanent Head of such department, from Director of Fauna Conservation and Director and Chief Inspector of Fisheries to Director of Fisheries.

3. Direct that every reference in the Fisheries Act, 1971, to the Director of Fauna Conservation and Director and Chief Inspector of Fisheries be read as a reference to the Director of Fisheries.

From there, we go to the *Government Gazette* of June 28, 1973, at page 2674, where a notice states:

Chief Secretary's Department, Adelaide, June 28, 1973. His Excellency the Governor in Council has been pleased to appoint the Hon. Hugh Richard Hudson, B.Ec., M.P., Minister of Education, to be also Minister of Fisheries.

That is the second link in the chain. The details of the third link appear at page 8 of the *Government Gazette* of July 5, 1973, which states:

By virtue of the provisions of the Administration of Acts Act, 1910-1971, and all other enabling powers, I, the said Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, do hereby commit the administration of the Fisheries Act, 1971, to the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries in lieu of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture to whom the administration of the said Act was previously committed.

This is most interesting, because here we have a Minister, in the name of the Hon. Hugh Hudson, appointed to a position that had not been created. It was not created until July 5, more than a month after the appointment, so there is something wrong there. The *Government Gazette* of July 5, 1973, at page 9, contains the following information:

His Excellency the Governor in Council has been pleased to appoint Albert Mervyn Olsen, Director of Fisheries, to be Director of Fisheries Research pursuant to section 57 (1) of the Public Service Act, 1967-1972.

That is the date when Mr. Olsen, the former Director, was sacked by the State Government. He was removed from his position. On September 20, 1973, at a special meeting

of Executive Council held at Government House, *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 47 at page 2121 states:

His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to accept the following resignations, viz:

The Honourable Donald Allan Dunstan as Minister of Development and Mines.

The Honourable Hugh Richard Hudson as Minister of Fisheries.

The Honourable Glen Raymond Broomhill as Minister Assisting the Premier.

It also states:

His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to make the following appointments, viz:

The Honourable Glen Raymond Broomhill, M.P., to be Minister of Recreation and Sport and Minister of Fisheries.

Donald Jack Hopgood, Esquire, M.P., to be Minister of Development and Mines and Minister Assisting the Premier.

So there we have the chapter of events played out. An advertisement appearing in the *Australian* on April 27, 1974, states:

Public Service of South Australia—Director of Fisheries, Present Salary: \$18 000 per annum.

Applications are invited for this office which is the Permanent Head of the Department of Fisheries in South Australia.

The Permanent Head is responsible for the general working and the business of the department and for advising the Minister on all matters relating to the department and its functions.

The functions of fisheries research and resource management are under the direction of the Director of Fisheries Research who is responsible to the Permanent Head.

Honourable members should note that the Director of Fisheries Research is responsible to the Permanent Head. The advertisement continues:

Applicants to give details of administrative experience, tertiary qualifications and war service (if any) and nominate at least two referees. A knowledge of the fishing industry is highly desirable.

I should think it would be! If a Director of Fisheries is to be appointed, I think it is almost critical. The advertisement further states that applications should be lodged by Wednesday, June 5, 1974. To my knowledge, this is at least the second time (and it could be the third) that this position has been advertised. I cannot understand why the appointment remains open. I could understand it if the qualifications for the position were extremely high and of a specific nature, but the position does not require that. It requires anything but that. Surely, in the Public Service of South Australia there are people who could adequately fill this vacancy. The anomaly seems to be the phrase in the advertisement stating that a knowledge of the fishing industry is highly desirable. That is peculiar.

The other point is that the Minister will be advised by this person, and the Director of Fisheries Research is responsible to the Permanent Head. This is a most peculiar set-up; I think it has been bungled from the word "Go". First, a highly skilled marine biologist has been appointed to the position of Director of Fisheries Research in the Fisheries Department. That person will be charged with the responsibility of telling someone (someone in all probability who is not qualified, if the advertisement is followed out) everything about fishing. It is strange, too, that I understand the present Director of Research in all probability was an applicant for the position of Director of Fisheries. Apparently he has not been selected to fill the vacancy, nor have other people with Fisheries Department qualifications. For the past 14 months at least, the Government has condoned the use of a person whom it is not willing, apparently, to put into the position of Director, but it will have him as Acting Director on a

salary very much lower than that advertised for the Director, which was \$18 000 a year.

I would think (and I have checked this with official records available to me in the library) that the present Acting Director is getting about \$15 000 a year, and he is taking all the responsibility for the department plus the added responsibilities of the research programme which is (or is not) proceeding within the department at present. The research programme is vitally important to the fishing industry of South Australia at this stage. We have a prawn industry in its infancy; after all, it has been in operation only since 1966, when the first commercial prawns were taken, so the industry has not had very much time for research work to be carried out; it took a long time to get any research done at all. That is a job for several marine biologists, and in many States, and certainly in other countries with a potential such as we have here for prawn production, two or three marine biologists would be assigned to that project alone. There are the inquiries that the Government requires for the Redcliff petro-chemical works, in respect of which the Government has asked the Fisheries Department to do some research. That will occupy the time of the research people. Then there is the new squid jigging operation, about which we see reports in the papers, and then there is abalone fishing, on which very little research has been done apart from what Mr. Shepherd has been able to do in the time at his disposal. He has done an excellent job on it, I know. Abalone fishing needs much research, because it is a good industry for 40 to 50 divers but, if abalone is over-fished, that will be the end of the industry as a commercial venture, in exactly the same way as, if the petrochemical project gets out of hand and ruins the breeding grounds of prawns, that will be the end of that industry in South Australia. The rock lobster (crayfish) industry is important to South Australia, and in the South-East we were very close to fishing that industry out. It needed a spell. Some boats were put out of the industry and some went out voluntarily. Some have been absorbed into the prawn industry, but people in the South-East think that too much fishing is going on.

I am seeking answers to questions I have on notice at the moment asking whether or not the catch in the South-East is on the decrease and to what degree that has happened in the past two or three years, because that is most important. The returns to the fishermen of rock lobsters have certainly dropped, for two main reasons: first, freight rates, which have increased by more than 50 per cent in the past two years; and, secondly, devaluation of the currency by the Australian Government, which has had a nasty effect.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A critical effect!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, it has, not only on the rock crayfish industry but on many other industries that are employing people who do not want to ask for very much help. They are private enterprise orientated people who go about their business not seeking Government support, but they must have it; and the sooner the Commonwealth Government decides what it will do about compensating those people in some way for the losses they have sustained as a result of devaluation the better. That has been going on for a considerable time, and the latest I have read on the matter is that the Minister for Primary Industry (Senator Wreidt) is at present setting up an interdepartmental committee to study the position, and that committee will report back to the Australian Fisheries Council in due course. What we cannot get through to Canberra is that people go broke while there

is all this procrastination, and the sooner something is done about it the better.

But let me return to this matter of the Director, which is most important. The position of Director has deteriorated greatly in the past 12 months at least, because a person who has an acting rank is never prepared to take nearly as much responsibility as is the person who has been given the job. First, he has to move reasonably cautiously while he has the acting rank because everyone else who has some vested interest in the position is ready to put a spoke in his wheel, so he has to go along in that position fairly delicately. I am not speaking particularly of Mr. Olsen in this matter but I am speaking about people at large who are working in an acting capacity. The position with the Director in this case is that the Government needs advice; the fishing industry needs advice. Several important new committees have been set up, one of which is the committee set up to advise the Minister of Fisheries on new licences for the prawn industry, that committee being headed by Mr. Harniman, SM, as Chairman. It has as members two fishermen representatives, two departmental representatives, and one administrator. It is curious that this committee should have been set up while there is no Director, as the very person who should be establishing the guidelines for that committee will have no say in the matter. The committee has been set up and someone else (I do not know who) has laid down the guidelines for it to function.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is rather like sending a ship to sea without a captain.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is absolutely right. What company in South Australia with a turnover of \$14 000 000 (that is the size of the operation we are looking at) and with that sort of enterprise would leave its management without a general manager and say to the secretary or someone else: "Fill in for a while. It is only for a matter of 15 months or so. Fill in and keep it rolling, but do nothing else—just keep the show rolling."? That is apparently what the Government is doing with the Fisheries Department now: it is endeavouring merely to keep it on the rails, but it says, "For heaven's sake, do not come up with any bright ideas or ask for money, because neither will be welcome."

With a good research team the industry could go ahead and be developed in many ways. From Ceduna to the Western Australian border, at the head of the Bight, except for the initial scanty research that went on there 15 to 20 years ago, very little research has been done. It is known that there are prawns there, but whether they are saleable or not I do not know. There are also huge quantities of scale fish, but nothing has been done and, as there are restricted licences for prawning, people will not leave the established grounds and go to do their own experimental work. After all, they pay fairly heavy fees. Moneys are made available to the department for research, but I doubt very much whether it can use the money available to it even now (and there is Commonwealth money, too) because no proper research programme has been laid down. It is high time the Government got to work and appointed someone. If it has to keep on going to other States or overseas the Public Service must be run down to a stage that I cannot believe it is. I believe there are people in the Public Service with sufficient qualifications as administrators to do this job equally as well as anyone who can be brought in from another State. I hope that with the marine biologists available in the department (and I hope there will be many more of them

and that the department will get a good Director who will be able to organize the whole industry properly), money will be made available to enable a good industry to be developed.

Until now, I have researched only this one aspect. If something is wrong with the department's administration, surely it is up to someone to say so or to say that it is crook. The Public Service Board is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that these positions are filled and of keeping the department's efficiency at an optimum level. If it has found reasons why the department is not functioning properly, or why a Director cannot be appointed, Parliament ought to know about it. As Parliament's representative in this respect is the Minister in charge of the department, I seek from him an undertaking that the position of Director will be filled and that Parliament will be told at what level of efficiency the department is at present operating.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. Such a motion (that the Council adjourn) is used as a means whereby members can express their point of view on any matter of urgency and, having been debated, the motion is usually withdrawn. I support what the Hon. Mr. Story has said. In the past three or four years I have constantly drawn the Government's attention to the declining interest that it has been taking in the fishing industry in relation to the financial provisions that are made to it in the Loan Estimates and the Budget that come before the Council each year. I have constantly said in the speeches I have made on those Bills that this has occurred.

If one looks back through *Hansard*, one will see that, of all the industries covered in the broad category of primary industry, the percentage share of the available money made available to the fishing industry has been declining, compared to that allocated to other areas. The South Australian fishing industry has over many years been developed by a fairly rugged group of individuals who have a deep respect for the industry and who are willing to accept reasonable controls to ensure its future. However, the Government's financial policies have done nothing, in my opinion, to help the industry or to allow it to develop further. The Hon. Mr. Story's point is indeed valid: this is an industry that is of tremendous importance to South Australia, and the department controlling it has been without a Director for quite some time; I am not sure exactly how long.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Since November, 1972.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the honourable member. One should examine the importance of this industry to South Australia. The total fish production from 1968 to 1972 increased from about 8 000 000 kilogrammes live weight to about 11 000 000 kg live weight. That is a remarkable increase. I will now give the Council the following additional comparisons. In the 10 years between 1961 and 1971 the gross value of the South Australian fishing industry increased from \$2 800 000 to \$9 200 000; that is an increase of 224 per cent. Anyone looking at those figures would agree that that was a remarkable increase in, and development of, the industry. I will now compare this with other primary producing industries in the State. In the same period, the value of agricultural products in South Australia increased from \$161 000 000 to \$166 000 000; the value of pastoral products increased from \$94 000 000 to \$123 000 000; and the value of dairy produce increased from \$30 000 000 to \$43 000 000. Those figures should be compared with the increase from \$2 800 000 to \$9 200 000 in the fishing industry. In

1970-71, the total value of forestry production in South Australia was a shade over \$11 000 000. At the same time, the fishing industry income was \$9 200 000.

As the Hon. Mr. Story has said, fishing production has now reached more than \$14 000 000 a year or, in other words, more than double the value of forestry production. These figures illustrate the tremendous importance of this industry to the State, and for this industry to be left without a departmental Director is something that should be raised as a matter of urgency in this Council. I also refer to the tremendous importance that must be placed on continued research into the fishing industry. If there is one as yet unknown resource, surely it must be that which relates to this industry. Research related to the tapping of this resource is of the utmost importance.

One of the most important aspects of research into the fishing industry is the provision of a good research vessel and of a good marine laboratory, about neither of which this State can boast to any degree. If one compares the laboratory facilities in other States with those in South Australia, one will be disappointed. The same applies regarding a survey vessel. However, that is not the main burden of my song at this stage. I strongly support the view expressed by the Hon. Mr. Story, that the appointment of a Director is of absolute importance to this State and, indeed, is a matter of urgency that honourable members have a right to stress in this Council. However, many other aspects of the industry also need to be stressed. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I support the motion. One of the things that concerns me is that the person who is Acting Director at present has no authority to ensure that the work carried out on research into—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The time has expired for debate on the motion. Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 591.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): One reads with much apprehension the Loan Estimates documents supplied by the Treasurer. It is fair to say that never before has a Treasurer made so many assumptions in Loan Estimates, never before has he said that the Treasury assumes that it will be getting so much money for this purpose and so much money for that purpose, and never before has he said that we have got a little more money in some areas than we had expected to get. In other words, there has been much uncertainty, which reflects the Commonwealth Government's financial policies and economic policies.

There is some uncertainty, too, about where some of the plans that have already been put in train in this State will eventually finish in regard to the expenditure of Loan money. I therefore have some sympathy for the Under Treasurer, Mr. Carey, and for his senior officers at such a time. I have a very high regard for those public servants; their job has not been easy recently.

However, I cannot extend the same sympathy to the Treasurer or to the Government of the day, because it is in times such as these that a Treasurer and a Government have a clear duty to exercise extreme prudence and caution in planning the expenditure of Loan funds. They should be extremely careful not to over-commit the State and they should concentrate on worthwhile developments. Because of the current financial uncertainty, the time has come

when they should back off from some schemes that are in progress at present.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Such as?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Monarto is one, and the Redcliff project is another.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You would wipe them off completely, would you?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will deal with that question in a few moments, if the Minister will be patient. Some of these schemes at present appear to be financially uncertain and in some cases socially dangerous, particularly the Redcliff project. There should be a serious review before such projects proceed. If history proves that the projects should not have been proceeded with, the responsibility for proceeding with them must be placed at the door of the Treasurer and the Government.

One area to which great attention should be given, an area of which we hear very little nowadays, is the standardization of the railway line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook. The Redcliff project is socially dangerous. Further, extreme caution should be exercised in regard to continuing with plans to develop Monarto.

Whilst I supported the Bill to approve the construction of the railway line to Christie Downs, I think the time has come when caution should be exercised in this connection. I also have queries in regard to the new building under construction in which the office of the Minister of Agriculture will be situated.

I also intend to query expenditure on a building for the Transport Department. In addition, I am not satisfied about whether some of the expenditure under the lines for railway maintenance will be devoted to work on the standard gauge railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie, about which there has been press comment recently.

I cannot find in the Loan Estimates any preliminary capital items dealing with the standardization of the railway line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook. I would have thought that some initial capital outlay should be mentioned in the Loan Estimates. Perhaps initial capital is to be expended and perhaps it falls under a different heading; anyway, I cannot find it specifically mentioned. This indicates very little progress in connection with the project.

The delay, the bungling, the false statements and the hopes expressed regarding the line over more than four years by the present Government make the whole venture a historic monument to the Labor Government's failure to plan and construct it in adequate time for South Australian industry and the South Australian people to gain the benefits that they deserve from such a project. All the other major mainland capital cities of Australia are joined to a standard gauge network, and Adelaide has been left out.

Whilst there were moves, particularly between 1968 and 1970, to expedite this last link in the standard gauge network between capital cities, it now seems that very little progress has been made in the years since then; South Australians deserve better treatment than that.

The history of the matter goes back a long time. In 1965 and early 1966 the then Labor Government approved a plan to put to the Commonwealth in regard to proceeding with the line. The Labor Government's approved plan at that time did not include a plan to run a standard gauge spur line to Elizabeth. In 1970, just before the last L.C.L. Government went out of office, a plan was produced on the recommendation of Maunsell and Partners. That plan was satisfactory to the Commonwealth Govern-

ment and was, with one exception, satisfactory to the then State Government.

The only point of disagreement was the spur line to Elizabeth. The State Government believed that the Commonwealth Government should agree to that spur being included as part of the overall plan. It took that view because of the cost involved, but agreement was not reached on that one point. However, early in 1970, agreement was reached between the State and Commonwealth Governments for the project to proceed.

Early in 1970, when the Labor Government came into office, we heard much propaganda (but this was based on nothing but the sheer playing of politics) that the plan was not acceptable to the new Labor Government, that the plan was no good, and that the plan approved by the previous L.C.L. Government proved that it had deserted industry. It was claimed that the spur lines to service industry located throughout the metropolitan area were not included in the plan.

The then State Labor Government said it would never agree to a plan that did not provide for spur lines to major industrial centres in metropolitan Adelaide. The Government shouted that from the rooftops. The Premier even went on television on several occasions and spoke untruths on the whole subject.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think they were snide comments?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They were real, snide comments. Certainly, they were not imagined snide comments of which we had examples in this Council the other day. The estimated cost of the line in 1970 was \$47 500 000, and the spur line in dispute was estimated by the State Government to cost about \$900 000, although, in all fairness, I point out that the Commonwealth Department of Transport believed that the cost of the spur line could amount to \$2 000 000. It will be interesting to see what the final cost of that line will be if and when the Government announces that the plan will proceed.

The ironic situation for the people of South Australia is that the estimated date of completion for that railway line was 1974. If the project had been proceeded with originally, and if that relatively minor issue had been finalized, the line would have been finished this year, yet there is still only talk about it. This was one of the first items referred to in that section of the Loan Estimates that I checked a few days ago.

It is apparent that the Government, after projecting its false political publicity about this matter in 1970, lost complete control of the situation. I later asked a question in respect of this matter. The State Government having said it had reached agreement with the Commonwealth Government and could proceed with the line, I asked whether a spur line would be built to Chrysler's Tonsley Park complex. The reply I received was that such spur line had not been agreed to.

All the talk about not giving in to the Commonwealth until the spur line was agreed to proved to be completely false. Meanwhile, we have lost four years. We are now in the year when the project should have been completed, yet we do not even know now what will be the monetary consideration and loss resulting from that four years delay. Nevertheless, we have a situation where, with little difference, we will ultimately see some form of agreement. Meanwhile, South Australians have had to suffer this delay and the repercussions of it.

To rub salt into the wound, the Government seems to rejoice in annually referring to this project in its yearly policy stated by the Governor in his Opening Speech. If

this were not such a serious matter it would be so ludicrous that it would make a good musical comedy. In 1971 the Government's plans were stated by the Governor, as follows:

Agreement has now been reached with the Commonwealth Government for the connection of Adelaide to the Sydney-Perth standard gauge railway system, and my Government intends introducing a Bill to ratify the agreement.

A year later, in outlining the Government's programme, the Governor made the following statement:

South Australian Railways officers, together with a group of consulting engineers, are preparing a master plan for the new standard gauge railway to link Adelaide and its major industries with the existing Australia-wide standard gauge network. Estimates for the project are expected to be completed by August this year.

In the next year the Governor made this further reference:

My Government expects that finality will be reached in negotiations with the Commonwealth Government relating to the agreement for the construction of a standard gauge railway line to Adelaide. Once agreement is reached appropriate enabling legislation will be placed before you.

With the passing of another year, a few weeks ago the Government's plans were again outlined by the Governor in this Chamber, and reference was again made to this matter, as follows:

Agreements have already been entered into between my Government and the Australian Government for the construction of a standard gauge railway line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook, and the construction of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs line. Legislation to ratify these agreements will be placed before you, and in the meantime the necessary planning of the project is proceeding.

It is not unfair to say that the present Government and the Minister in charge of this work do not really know what is happening in respect of this vital project. Now, in the year in which the project should have been completed, I ask when the project will be started. What will be its cost?

I shall be especially interested in this when an announcement is made or plans are at last made public. What will be the difference between the final plan (whenever it is achieved) and the plan that could have been proceeded with in 1970 with a minimum of negotiation and delay?

It would have been far more beneficial to the people of South Australia if the Premier and the Government had spent more time on matters such as this rather than on projects dealing with matters of transportation and setting up smoke screens, as they have done on so many recent occasions, seemingly in an attempt to take public attention away from the delay involved in the construction of this large and vital project linking our capital city with other capital cities by standard gauge line.

We have heard all sorts of rubbish about dial-a-bus. We heard about Dr. Breuning, and about the change of name from freeways to high speed transportation corridors. We have also heard about highly paid and senior officers being brought to South Australia to take up positions in the new Transport Department. We have heard of all this empire building, but the people of South Australia want results, and they are definitely focusing their attention on the railway project to which I have just referred. I hope it will not be long before some definite plans are made, some action taken, and some capital expenditure outlaid so that real progress can take place.

While projects of great worth to the State, such as this one, are delayed, what is the Government doing in new ventures to help the State? The most spectacular from the newsworthiness point of view would be the new town of Monarto. Now, with the Loan Estimates before us, the financial story behind this development is beginning

to unfold. We are now told by the Treasurer that, in the financial year ended June 30, 1974, the sum of \$6 356 000 was spent on the establishment of this town. We have been led to believe that Commonwealth involvement is assured and we have heard on many occasions from Ministers, State and Commonwealth, about the participation of the Commonwealth Government and the participation of the State Government can expect with these new growth centres.

I read with great interest in a pamphlet issued by the Cities Commission entitled *Cities Commission Bulletin*, dated June, 1974, the report of an occasion at Monarto on Thursday, May 9 last. The Hon. Mr. Uren was at this function, as were other dignitaries, including His Excellency the Governor, the South Australian Premier, and the South Australian Minister of Environment and Conservation. Some of these gentlemen planted trees in Monarto and an official function was held. At that function Mr. Uren stated, according to this pamphlet, that, by agreement with the South Australian Government, the Australian Government would make available up to \$8 200 000 for the Monarto project during the financial year that (at that stage) would end on June 30, 1974.

I asked a question the other day as to how much money the Commonwealth Government had provided, and I was given the figure that appears in the Loan Estimates: \$4 413 000. That is a long way from the \$8 200 000 Mr. Uren announced in what would be undoubtedly a prepared statement; certainly, he was not speaking off the cuff to the press or to any other group of people. He was at a most important function in the town and he said the Government had available \$8 200 000 for the State Government for Monarto. It provided only \$4 413 000.

The other day the Minister told me that a further sum of \$1 078 500 was still being processed as claims made for the year ended June 30, 1974. I want to make the point that about \$2 000 000 of State funds had had to be put into Monarto already (that was up to June 30), and in my view that money could well have been spent on the purchase of open spaces, and the purchase of Hills face land for the purpose of national parks in the environs of metropolitan Adelaide, where about 850 000 people want recreation spaces and a great deal of aid from the South Australian Government to ensure their enjoyment of such open spaces.

The State Government has put back \$2 000 000 into Monarto, and we might also ask how reliable one can expect the promises of the Commonwealth Government to be in relation to further finance. I do not want to go into the issues that have arisen in recent times in criticism of Monarto, but the public at large is perturbed about reports of some of the risks becoming apparent in the development of this new town.

One point that has not been mentioned a great deal, although I think it will become more prominent with the passing of time, is that the excess population growth in metropolitan Adelaide that was expected when the town of Monarto was first conceived is not the same rate of population growth as is occurring now in Adelaide. The population growth rate is decreasing and in my view we are getting very close to (if we have not already reached) a situation of almost zero population growth in metropolitan Adelaide. That will become more apparent in the next year or so, and if and when it occurs the basic reason for the establishment of Monarto will have disappeared.

I suggest the Government should be extremely cautious about further expansion and development of the plans for

Monarto until it is able to observe the population growth in metropolitan Adelaide. The population question is only one point. A most important point is the hard fact of life that this Government is regimenting public servants, forcing them to live in an area that is not of their own choosing.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is not right, and you know it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is right.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I said they would not be forced. That was made quite clear.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister says they will not be forced, but let us just consider the employees of his own department. I was speaking to one of them the other night. He works in the planning section of the Lands Department, and there are others in the department in a similar situation. Has the Minister got the effrontery to say to those senior officers, "Your department is going to Monarto, but we are not forcing you to go there. The choice is yours"? These men are in the middle years of their lives, with homes established here, with children and families, and their whole social life is here in Adelaide. What else could they do? What is the Minister wanting to do to them—put them on the street? He tells me that they are not being forced.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is right.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Of course they are being forced. It is a shocking state of affairs that this Government will force public servants (and there is no other way it can be put) to live in a place not of their own choosing, in a completely new town. Another point that is raising grave doubts about the project concerns the environment and ecology of the area. We have heard reports of grave fears regarding effluent disposal and possible pollution of the Murray River as a result. There have been serious questions as to whether or not sufficient research has been carried out, and there is a further development: the first region of the new town area to be developed for housing is not the most attractive aesthetically.

The first part to be developed is that part close to the present public transport and the existing main road area, but I am told that the natural contours and landscapes farther north are far more attractive than the area in the vicinity of the main road and the railway line. So the public servants, these men who are being asked to be pioneers, will not even be housed in the most attractive part of that town.

Therefore, faced as this Government must be with the realities of life and as the Commonwealth Government has cut back on its pre-school scheme and its plan to abolish the means test, and knowing the great political pressure that will drain some funds into the Albury-Wodonga area, surely this Government, if it is prudent, will be cautious about committing Loan funds to a further expansion of the plan for Monarto. It is my view that the Government should cut the painter and let this dream drift astern, in the knowledge that at some time in the distant future, if circumstances warrant, the concept can be taken in tow once again.

I come now to the South Australian Housing Trust and its housing allocation in the Loan Estimates. In 1973-74 the total Loan money available for housing was \$32 750 000. The estimate in the figures before us, for the year 1974-75, is \$38 400 000. In the year 1973-74, the Housing Trust was allocated \$15 500 000, and the Government expects it can allocate, in this current year, \$20 340 000 to the trust.

It can be seen again that much of the increased amount of money going for housing in this State is being appropri-

ated to the Housing Trust. At the same time, under the new agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments, the Housing Trust and housing commissions elsewhere in the other States are restricted to spending no more than 30 per cent of their moneys on houses that will be available for sale; the balance of the money will be for rental accommodation.

I do not deny that at present there is a strong demand for rental houses. Indeed, we have reached a situation (in my experience, for the first time since the Second World War) where young couples who want to marry and buy their own houses cannot do so because of the high interest rates and the unavailability of the necessary finance—a very sad state of affairs. However, that is another story and we must not let that blind our vision when we remember that house ownership has always, in this State, been a foundation stone of our way of life.

It has great benefits, socially and economically, and it cements the family unit. It encourages pride in ownership; it provides security of tenure and, in lieu of rent, people find that the principal and interest payments go towards building up their capital. This leads on, of course, to financial and social security.

Also, widows and widowers can live on in later life and feel secure for many years if the family home is owned and paid for, as it usually is after about 20 to 25 years. This current trend of the Commonwealth Government to force the States' housing authorities to build so much rental accommodation will tend to discourage those ambitions to secure one's own freehold home, and will tend to reverse the achievements that have brought great happiness and contentment to many South Australian people because they had those opportunities. One solution (which I mentioned, I recall, some years ago) is that I believe the South Australian Housing Trust should sell, by private agreement with its tenants, some of its rental houses to those tenants. That would have the effect of increasing the percentage of home ownership and of the Housing Trust's being able to acquire more money for its general uses and purposes.

It may well have to provide the finance for the occupants to purchase those houses but, nevertheless, over a period of time that capital and the interest thereon would return to the Housing Trust. Also, it would reduce the trust's costs tremendously, because it is a fact that today the costs of maintenance of houses by landlords, of rent collection, and of landlords' obligations by way of rates and taxes and outgoings of that kind make the ownership of rental accommodation a very expensive business, and the Housing Trust must find its costs in that area very high. Those costs would be far greater than the cost of the management of mortgages and the collection of moneys from the respective mortgagors. There is considerable merit in the proposal, which would have the beneficial effects to which I refer.

I mention two other items in the Loan Estimates. One is under the heading of "Department of Transport", where \$400 000 is being allocated for an office block. I could find no reference to it in the Treasurer's remarks, so I ask (and I should like the Minister to reply to me on this when he closes the debate): what are the plans of that department in regard to establishing its own building? I am wary of the plans of the Minister of Transport because I believe he has put some plans in train (and very expensive plans at that) well before their time. I believe his appointment some years ago of the Director-General of Transport was about 10 years before its time.

In no way do I criticize the appointee but I do criticize the Minister for implementing those plans.

There were only two or three officers in the department at that time, but to say that there was no senior officer of a standing comparable with that of other directors in the Public Service is ridiculous. Indeed, we have another officer of almost comparable standing in that department, the new Chairman of the State Transport Authority. So I think the planning was bad in regard to that initial matter because it was too early. Those are the reasons for my criticism.

Then I should like to know what plans are in hand for a new building because, when one commences a new construction today, one must accept the fact—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The operative word is “commences”.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes—that the cost can be enormous. As the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has said, once this line is passed, the building can commence. Surely we are entitled to ask: where will it finish? What will be the total cost? Who will occupy the building? Are we to start building an empire and, if we do that, what of all the railway employees, who already do most of this work under the Transport Department, together with the employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust? Are we to have duplication here? Parliament must be given this information if members are to carry out their responsibilities of questioning the Government and watching its plans. My other question concerns the Agriculture Department, in which I know the Minister of Agriculture will be interested. I notice that the new building, to be known as the Education Building, being constructed on the corner of Gawler Place and Flinders Street, is to cost about \$3 950 000. I understand that one of its tenants is to be the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Will there be room for the department?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not mind the Minister's having a Ministerial office in such a new building, but he will be quite a distance from his troops who, I understand, are to be 72 kilometres away.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They may be glad of that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They may be, but the main point is what size the Minister's staff is to be. I want to know what personnel the Minister intends to have, as these early plans may have been finalized when the Government approved the construction of the building.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It will be the same staff as the Minister now has.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Very well. I take it that none of the Minister's staff will be going to Monarto, either voluntarily or by being pushed.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No-one is being pushed.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There seems to be some duplication. It has been stated that the Minister is to be a tenant of the building, and he has admitted that most of his department is going to Monarto. There has been much publicity that most of the Agriculture Department, Lands Department and Environment and Conservation Department are going to Monarto.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It may not happen.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is the point I was trying to make a few moments ago. It needs only a stroke of the pen from Canberra and the Minister to continue saying that he has \$8 200 000 available for Monarto until the end of June, and to provide only \$4 400 000 (as happened last year), and the whole thing may, as the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill says, be scrapped. We must

bear in mind that \$2 000 000 that has been raised from the people of this State has already been spent at Monarto, apart from the \$4 400 000 that has been provided by the Commonwealth Government which, after all, is the people's money, too.

I have only two more points to make, the first of which relates to the Christie Downs railway line. In this respect I am urging the Government to be cautious. I am sure all members want to see the people being served by the new Christie Downs to Adelaide railway line. However, on Tuesday the Minister said in reply to a question that the estimated cost of the project was \$8 944 000. It has been stated in the Estimates now before honourable members that \$1 500 000 of State money has already been spent. The crucial point is that no money has yet come from the Commonwealth Government for this project. I would not like to see other railway plans shelved or to see the Government's priorities upset if, for some reason or another, no money came from Canberra.

I do not think the Government could in future simply fall back on the excuse that this money was not made available, as I believe a prudent Government should be cautious when it is expecting to receive Commonwealth funds. Here we have a project which, if it continues in its present planning, will cost the State nearly \$9 000 000 and which, I hope, will be subsidized by the Commonwealth Government. As no money has yet come from Canberra for this project, the Government should be cautious indeed before it proceeds with its plans at the rate at which it would normally have proceeded with them. That is the fairest way I can put it.

The last point I make deals with railway safety, the question of railway maintenance being referred to in the lines before honourable members. Is any of the money provided for railways to be allocated to the Broken Hill to Port Pirie standard gauge railway line? The quality of bridge construction on this line was recently questioned by a member of the public. In reply, the Minister said that this was utter tripe, or used an expression of that kind. I make the point, however, that serious derailments occurred on this line in 1970, soon after it was completed, and fears were then expressed regarding whether the track was in proper condition.

I well remember arranging for an investigation of this matter by Maunsell and Partners. When I later asked questions in this Council to follow up the results of that report, its contents were denied to me. I have copies of those questions here. However, I will not repeat them in full but touch on them only briefly. On August 19, 1970, I asked the Minister, among other things, the following question, under the heading “Derailment”:

Have Maunsell and Partners completed their investigation and reported on the causes of derailments on the new standard gauge line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie and, if they have, will the Minister table that report in Parliament?

On September 15, 1970, the Minister gave me a long reply, the relevant part of which is as follows:

Maunsell and Partners have not yet reported on the causes of derailments on the new standard gauge line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie.

Then, on November 19, 1970, I asked the following question:

The firm of Maunsell and Partners has been carrying out an investigation into the causes of derailments on the new standard gauge railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. Earlier this session I asked whether this inquiry had been completed and whether a report had been received and, if it had, whether the report would be tabled or its contents made known to members of the Council. At that

stage the Government had not received the report. Has the report of Maunsell and Partners now been received? If it has, will the Government table it?

On November 25, 1970, the Minister replied:

The report on the derailments on the Port Pirie to Cockburn standard gauge railway line has been received by the Government and is currently being studied by South Australian railway engineers and the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport. When Maunsell and Partners were commissioned to carry out an investigation by the honourable member in his then capacity as Minister of Roads and Transport in the former Government, the terms enunciated by him clearly stated that the report was to be submitted to the Government. Accordingly it would be a breach of confidence if the report were now tabled in this Parliament. However, honourable members may be interested to know that the report stated that "nothing has emerged from our investigations which would point to a basic shortcoming in either vehicle design or train handling".

The point I want to make is that the Minister's reply did not make any mention of shortcomings of the track. The report was denied to honourable members of this Council by a Minister and a Government that preached open Government and participation by everyone for the benefit of all. I should like to know whether the investigation by Maunsell and Partners queried the track and, if it did, whether the condition of the track was in any way attributable to the condition of bridge work and other construction work, about which there has been publicity recently.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think the Minister will give you a reply?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I do not think the matter will rest until the public knows the whole story. Will some of the money allocated for railways be applied to work on this track, and are the Railways Department and Commonwealth Transport Department completely satisfied with the track? In his reply the Minister did not practise what he preached in regard to open Government: he quoted only the part of the report that was favourable—that part dealing with vehicle design and train handling.

I should like to know whether this matter should have been made public and investigated fully. We must remember that the safety of the crews of freight trains is involved. Also, the lives of the crews and passengers in passenger trains are at stake. Therefore, will the Minister give a full explanation of this matter when he replies to the debate? It is with much concern that I support this Bill, and I trust that the queries I have raised will be answered by the Minister when he closes the debate.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move the second reading forthwith.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No!

The PRESIDENT: Ring the bells.

While the division bells were ringing:

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. I ask whether this motion is being moved under Standing Order 458 or some other Standing Order.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member can look up the number. The question before the Chair is that a suspension of Standing Orders has been moved and, an objection having been raised, the suspension requires a

vote of the Council and an absolute majority. Lock the doors. The question before the Chair is that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the honourable Minister of Health to move the second reading of the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill forthwith. I appoint the honourable Minister teller for the Ayes and the Hon. Mr. Story teller for the Noes.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Mr. President, I called "Aye". So, I cannot act as teller for the Noes.

The PRESIDENT: I therefore appoint the Hon. Mr. Hill teller for the Noes.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield (teller), T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, C. W. Creedon, G. J. Gilfillan, F. J. Potter, A. J. Shard, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (7)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, and V. G. Springett.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

The PRESIDENT: There not being the required majority, suspension of Standing Orders is not granted.

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

That the second reading of the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

I seek your ruling, Mr. President, as to whether I have a right to speak to the motion.

The PRESIDENT: No. The Council has given a decision, and there is no alternative but to put the matter down for the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 593.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern): Previous speakers have pointed out that this Bill needs to be carefully considered. Any Bill establishing an authority must be carefully considered because, with such Bills, it is not usually as easy as with other Bills to get a true picture of the situation simply by examining the Bill to determine exactly what the legislation is intended to achieve, or what exactly is the scope of the legislation. This is the nature of things, because it is not easy to contemplate exactly what the authority might need to do.

If, as I say, a Bill creating an authority needs careful study to determine exactly what it provides, even greater care should be taken with any amendment to such Bill in order to determine exactly what alteration it makes to the original Act. Previous speakers have said that they hope other honourable members will also examine the Bill and express their views about it. I intend to refer only to the matter of the extension of powers of the authority which this Bill seeks to effect. Like previous speakers, I hope that other members will express their views on the Bill, especially on other aspects of the Bill, which I do not intend to canvass.

The powers of the authority are greatly extended by this Bill, and this is an alarming situation because of the changes made to the constitution of the authority. Members of the authority will now be entirely Government appointees, without there being any limitation concerning the area from which they will be drawn. Therefore, it follows that these extended powers given the authority come close to the powers given to the Government. Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act. Section

10 (2) (b) provides for the approval of the Minister before exercising certain powers on his being satisfied that it is necessary or desirable to do such things in order to protect the interests of the authority, or to promote or assist in the operation of any pipeline owned by or under the control of the authority.

The effect of this amendment contained in clause 8 is that the Minister may give his authority if he is satisfied of these things or that the exercise of these powers is "in the public interest". This is very wide, and it would be only in the clearest case of abuse, only in a case where it was obvious that the exercise was for a private or other non-public purpose, that it could be said that exercise of any of these powers was not in the public interest. The powers contained in section 10 of the principal Act are wide anyway, and, as the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has pointed out, this was not surprising in the case of the principal Act, which was passed at a time when there was no natural gas in South Australia and wide powers were necessary to establish the industry satisfactorily.

However, the industry has now been satisfactorily established, and the business of refining and storing liquid petroleum is well established in this State. At this stage, when one would have thought that the need for wide powers was reduced, it is intended to enlarge these powers through clause 8 in a double-barrelled manner: first, to extend the powers to include liquid petroleum as well as natural gas and, secondly, to extend the powers to cases where the Minister is satisfied that exercising them is in the public interest. However, these powers become more sinister still when they are no longer coupled with the duty of conveying the producers' products in its pipeline.

Having said that, I refer to clause 10, which seeks to repeal section 13 of the principal Act. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has raised the point that section 12 of the principal Act provides powers of compulsory acquisition for the purpose of "constructing or operating (and I stress the words "or operating") a pipeline or (as amended by clause 9) petroleum storage facilities connected or to be connected with a pipeline and for any other purposes of this Act". I stress the words "any other purposes of this Act". Of course, "other purposes" include the wide powers set out in section 10, especially those in subsection (1) (e), which provides:

purchase, take on lease, or otherwise by agreement, acquire, hold, maintain, develop and operate any natural gas—

that is amended by the Bill to "petroleum"—

—storages and the necessary facilities, apparatus and equipment for their operation.

If section 12 as it is to be amended is taken in conjunction with section 10, and the two sections are read literally, it seems clear that the interpretation of the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill is correct: that the Government or the authority could, if these amendments are accepted, take over the Port Stanvac refinery or any other petroleum installation. This interpretation follows clearly from the wording of the two sections in their amended form. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill's interpretation is correct according to the plain grammatical, literal and accepted meaning of the words. That, of course, according to the canons of

construction, is *prima facie* how Statutes are to be interpreted. It is well known that a Statute can be interpreted only according to its words, and the Minister's second reading explanation or other debate cannot be called in aid in interpreting a Statute. The Acting Minister of Lands yesterday interjected, when Sir Arthur Rymill was speaking, and said:

Are you afraid that the authority will take over these pipelines?

I do not know that I think this will happen, but such wide and unnecessary powers should not be contained in a Bill. This has been a habit of this Government in always seeking powers wider than is necessary.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Or not quite as wide as is necessary, as in one case.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: That is so. I intended to refer to the Emergency Powers Bill, in which both situations apply: some powers sought are wider than is necessary and others are not sufficiently wide.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is on your standard.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I cannot speak on the Minister's standard. I can only speak on my own standard.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Let's be honest about it. You are speaking just on your side of the business.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Does the Minister expect me to speak from his side?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: This is supposed to be a House of Review, not necessarily a Party House. You are making it a Party House.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not making it a Party House. I am expressing my own views as one member of a House of Review, and I think it would be quite dishonest of me to speak in any other way. Yesterday, when speaking on another matter, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said he was disturbed at the practice of this Government in relation to compulsory acquisition. The wide power to which I have just referred is a power of acquisition and, as was the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I am worried about the way in which this Government may exercise that power.

In reading the Bill and referring back to the principal Act, I could not help thinking the Government had not sufficiently considered the effect of the Bill on the operation of the principal Act. For this reason, I support the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan when he says that the Government should withdraw the Bill, repeal the principal Act, and bring down fresh legislation to cover the areas in which it wishes to legislate. I shall reserve my decision on how I shall vote on this measure until I have heard other members speak.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.30 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 27, at 2.15 p.m.