

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Thursday, October 2, 1975

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) 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:

Constitution Act Amendment (Ministers),

Constitution Act Amendment (Ministry),

Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER CHLORINATION**

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I wish to make a Ministerial statement on the *Advertiser* report in which the Australian Minister for Health is reported to have stated that his Health Department is looking into alternative water disinfection methods because of concern in the United States of America regarding a possible health hazard associated with chlorination of water supplies.

First, let me say that I have already telexed Dr. Everingham expressing concern that his statement can only cause unnecessary alarm among the people of Australia, where chlorination is used almost universally to disinfect public water supplies, particularly as there is no evidence whatsoever to support an adverse association between chlorination and public health, either in this country or overseas.

Chlorination has been used almost universally to prevent water-borne disease in public water supplies since 1897. Some authorities, notably in France, have used ozonation as an alternative, probably because of the chlorinous tastes and odours resulting from chlorinating very polluted raw waters. Ozonation has not, however, gained general favour, because it is not possible to measure a residual to determine effectiveness, and because it is more expensive.

The present statement no doubt stems from a report by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency this year. This report and other related reports have been studied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which has carried out evaluations of chlorinated hydrocarbons in South Australia's water supplies. The work to date has shown that the levels of these substances are well below those specified by accepted international water quality standards. The department has also purchased recently a mass spectrometer which will enable the Bolivar laboratories to more readily monitor the presence of these substances. I must point out that we are concerned here with levels of less than one part per thousand million, and for some compounds even less than this.

I must also emphasise that the United States of America reports have not shown that chlorination has any adverse effects on public health. This is confirmed by the Director-General of Public Health (Dr. Woodruff), who has advised me that "there are no known reports of adverse effects from the drinking of chlorinated water in South Australia". There is no doubt that the benefits of chlorination far outweigh any potential harmful effects (if any) of compounds that may be created by the process, and that there is no information to justify any change in disinfection

practice in South Australia. In fact, to discontinue disinfection of water with chlorine would result in great harm to the public. I trust this statement will allay any fears the South Australian public may have felt as a result of Dr. Everingham's statements. In conclusion, I wish to assure this Council that the Public Health Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department will continue to assess the results of any research carried out on this matter and will also continue to monitor our water supplies to ensure that they meet international criteria for water safety.

**QUESTIONS****PRISONER'S DEATH**

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about prison security?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: All prisoners entering the prison are searched at the front gate and then taken to the remand yard, where they exchange their normal clothes for prison clothes. If the time of entry coincides with shower parade, this procedure includes showering. Dreyer had been in Adelaide Gaol previously and would be familiar with this procedure so that, had he wished to take in some form of drug, his preparations could have been made in advance. Unless there is particularly good reason for so doing, body apertures are not searched, although every effort is made to have the prisoner talk in an attempt to ascertain whether he is concealing anything in his month.

The coroner's report states that the deceased had some tablets in his possession on admission to prison and these were subsequently released to his family after his death. These tablets were placed in the deceased's property and did not remain in his possession. Many prisoners, on admission, have tablets in their possession which they claim are on doctor's prescription. These tablets are immediately handed to the surgery for certification and may be returned to the prisoner or placed in the prisoner's property, depending upon the circumstances, the tablets, and the nature of the prisoner's disability.

In spite of much vigilance by officers and the medical staff, no cases in prison where prisoners are noticeably affected by drugs have been discovered. If Dreyer took some form of drug during the afternoon of February 13, 1975, it is quite impossible to explain how he came by it, other than to express the opinion that in some way he secreted something on his person during the search and clothing change procedures. Having received this report, I am satisfied that prison security in this regard is as good as it could be.

**POLICE PARKING**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I received a letter from the Secretary of the Police Association, as no doubt other honourable members did. I should like to quote relevant portions of it, as follows:

For many years police officers have had a parking problem for their private vehicles when attending duty in Adelaide. The situation is, to say the least, bad particularly as regards shift workers. It is costing a lot of money to individuals in parking fines, and in some cases, damage to vehicles.

It goes on to state:

In recent years members have been forced, because of economic circumstances, to purchase homes quite some distance away from the city and in many instances public

transport is either not available or unsuitable because of the hours worked by the individual. There are frequent cases when a police officer will finish night duty, go home to breakfast and a quick sleep and then be required to return to Adelaide to attend court.

Further on, it states:

Some members work shifts that finish at 2 o'clock in the morning; others finish at other odd hours, because they are required to work overtime when on afternoon shift, and for these and many other reasons they have a need to have good convenient transport to and from work. The problem is that members of the Police Force are finding it extremely difficult to obtain parking space near their place of duty. The letter further states:

In January, 1974, the then Chief Secretary advised me that inquiries were made regarding the possibility of the purchase of land in Carrington Street to provide parking as requested by us on behalf of members, but at that time funds were not available to proceed with the project. Because of the seriousness of this situation I am urging all members of Parliament to do all within their power to assist our members in this matter.

I have a high regard for the South Australian Police Force, and I will do all in my power to assist its members. Can the Chief Secretary say what consideration has been given to the request of the Police Association for parking facilities to be provided in close proximity to Police headquarters?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I realise that this has been a problem for some time. Investigations have been carried out, but, as I cannot tell the honourable member what the position is, I will find out for him and bring down a report.

#### ADELAIDE OVAL DRINKING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I refer to a report on the front page of yesterday's *Advertiser* dealing with the banning of patrons taking alcohol to Adelaide Oval during the coming cricket season. The report stated that the South Australian Cricket Association had banned the taking of liquor to the oval following requests made by the South Australian Police Force and after several meetings between the two bodies. The report indicated that the taking of cans and bottles of alcoholic beverage to major sporting grounds had become too dangerous, and that this was the reason for the ban. I question whether there is not an alternative solution to this all-embracing ban against people bringing their own alcoholic liquor to Adelaide Oval during the cricket season.

I refer to today's *Advertiser* editorial, which concludes that such a ban is unavoidable. The editorial refers to the enjoyable aspects of sitting and chatting at the oval over a can of cold beer while watching the play on a hot summer's day. The editorial refers to the tradition of about the last 20 years, which it stated has added undeniable colour to the scene of matches at Adelaide Oval. Although the editorial concludes that such action is unavoidable, I question whether it is as inevitable as that. At cricket matches at the Adelaide Oval there is often a picnic atmosphere in the hot weather, and part of the atmosphere comes from people arriving at some time in the morning with an ice box filled with alcoholic liquor (usually cold beer) and some sort of picnic lunch. Such an event is a full day's outing.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do people have crayfish, as well?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I suppose some do. The editorial also states that the carrying of alcoholic liquor into a football oval or a soccer ground has been banned, but I believe that a distinction can be made between spectator activity at a cricket match and at a football oval or soccer ground. Certainly, the entertainment is different in the sense that soccer and football are finished with in a short space of time, whereas cricket is played over a whole day and takes on a picnic atmosphere.

I do not wish in any way to be taken as condoning the behaviour that has led to the ban and, as the editorial points out, the behaviour of a minority is affecting the enjoyment and convenience of the great majority. I am not unmindful of the problems of family people taking their children to the cricket, or of genuine cricket lovers who do not wish to imbibe. I add that it is probably not a problem for most days in the cricket season. Certainly, there seems to be a problem on a Saturday or a Sunday, and probably on a Friday on which Test matches are conducted. Surely, there is hardly any problem on the Monday of a Sheffield Shield game, yet the ban has been imposed on that day also.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: On what Bill are you speaking?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: This is my explanation before asking the Minister a question. I would like to be more optimistic than the authorities who have imposed this ban, and I hope that a less severe alternative can be found. In particular, I refer to a public education campaign and perhaps stiffer penalties for offenders and unruly people at the cricket ground. Perhaps a limit could be imposed on the amount of alcoholic beverage brought to the ground. Finally, a last-chance ultimatum could be issued to spectators for this season.

My questions are as follows: first, will the Minister obtain details of the discussions between the South Australian Cricket Association and the South Australian Police Department regarding this matter; secondly, will he explore with the association and the Police Department possible alternatives to the total ban on "bring your own" liquor, including the possibility of a public education campaign and stiffer penalties for unruly behaviour in the crowd; thirdly, will the Minister suggest that, in conjunction with such an education programme, a last-chance ultimatum be issued to cricket spectators for this season and that the position be reviewed at the end of the season, in the light of the response to such an appeal?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think the members of the South Australian Cricket Association realise that, when they imposed this ban, they were batting on a sticky wicket. They also realise that on some cricket days the slow action of some players drives the public to drink. These were, therefore, matters that the association had to consider. The honourable member's suggestion is a good one. It is an unfortunate fact that the minority can spoil an outing for the majority, and I agree with the honourable member that, if there is some way to overcome this problem, it should be examined. I will refer the honourable member's brief explanation and questions to the South Australian Cricket Association to see whether it can come down with some sort of a solution.

#### SMALLPOX VACCINATIONS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: A recent newspaper report (unfortunately I do not know the date of it) stated

that it was not necessary for one to have a smallpox injection or vaccination before travelling overseas. I have been advised that it is necessary to be vaccinated for smallpox. In fact, I had such a vaccination at 2 p.m. today. Is the Minister aware that the newspaper report to which I have referred has Created much confusion and inconvenience to the public, and will he make a Ministerial statement, through the media, advising the public of the true position regarding smallpox vaccinations?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I read the press report that it was no longer necessary for people to have smallpox injections when travelling in certain areas overseas. I, too, am suffering with a sore arm as a result of having had such an injection. True, smallpox is not as prevalent as it was in most countries. However, it is still advisable, and in the interests of everyone, to continue having these injections. I do not think it is necessary for me to make a Ministerial statement to the media along these lines. The gentleman who raised this matter in the press was correct in what he said. However, he did not say that people should not have these injections: I think he said that it was no longer necessary for them to be compulsory. Of course, it is entirely up to people travelling overseas to decide whether they want to put up with a sore arm for a few days in order to ensure that they will not contract any of these diseases. It is left entirely to the person concerned to make this decision.

#### URANIUM STUDY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy in another place, I direct my question to the Minister of Lands. As can be seen from the Estimates of Expenditure, the Mines Department expects to spend \$20 500 this financial year on a uranium enrichment study committee. Will the Minister ascertain who are the members of that committee, what guidelines have been set on which the committee is to report, and will that report be made available to Parliament?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This question would normally be directed to the Minister of Agriculture. However, I will ensure that it is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy in another place and that the reply is brought down here.

#### LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Under the Long Service Leave Act, a worker can obtain the benefit of *pro rata* long service leave only if his employment is terminated lawfully or on grounds other than misconduct. This situation applied to a worker's right to *pro rata* annual leave until the Labor Government, by virtue of section 81 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, provided that *pro rata* annual leave would be the right of all workers, regardless of the reasons for the termination of employment. Unfortunately, once again, hundreds of non-unionists eligible to join trade unions reaped the protection and the benefits of the Labor movement, the initial approach for the change having come from the trade union movement. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry introduce soon a Bill to amend section 4 of the Long Service Leave Act so that a worker will be entitled to *pro rata* long service leave irrespective of the reasons for or the manner of the termination of his employment?

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

#### TRADE AND PROMOTION APPOINTMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier, whether he will obtain for me the terms and conditions of the appointment of the recently announced appointee to the position of Director-General of Trade and Promotion, and will he say whether the remuneration involved is appropriated within the Budget now before the Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

#### POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

#### BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

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

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

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

This measure, which is in exactly the same form as a measure that passed the House of Assembly during the last Parliament but which subsequently failed to become law, provides for the payment of refunds on certain containers. There is no question that cans create very considerable litter problems in this State, and the enactment into law of this measure will, in the view of the Government, go some way toward solving this problem. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purpose of the measure, and the attention of honourable 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 IV, 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 which is 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 mentioned 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. Clause 16 is formal. Clause 17 provides an appropriate regulation-making power.

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

#### **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITY PLAN)**

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

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

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

The purpose of this short Bill is to extend the life of the City of Adelaide Development Committee by a further six months from June 30, 1976. Honourable members will be aware that this is the second extension of the term of this committee, which was essentially intended as a temporary measure until permanent legislative arrangements were made for the control of development within the city of Adelaide.

Honourable members will also be aware that a plan for the development of the city has been prepared by consultants to the council of the city of Adelaide. The Government understands that the council has approved this plan, and in fact it was placed on public exhibition on August 14 of this year. The purpose of placing the plan on exhibition was to facilitate public comment on it. The council has allowed a period of three months, expiring on November 14, for such comment, and undoubtedly after that date will need some time to consider the comments received and possibly modify the plan in the light of those comments.

Present indications suggest that the council will be in a position to submit the plan, as finally settled, to the Government before Christmas, but this will depend on the nature and extent of the submissions received by the council from the public. Since the plan which will form the basis for the development of the city for the indeterminate future impacts a great deal of the physical activities of the Government, some further time will be necessary for the Government to determine its attitude to the plan

in its final form. Here I would indicate that for some time past the Government has had the evolving plan under continuous review as an aid in formulating its attitude.

From the foregoing, it is clear that, until the plan is settled, it is impossible for the Government to present to Parliament settled proposals for the legislative framework within which the plan will operate. At present various alternative proposals as to appropriate legislation are under consideration. At this stage, it is dear that while proper regard must be made to the unique circumstances of the city of Adelaide, the effect of planning for the city must be viewed in the context of the whole State. Clause 2 of the Bill, which is the only operative clause, extends the life of the City of Adelaide Development Committee by six months, until December 31, 1976, since within that period it is likely that legislation to give effect to the plan will be placed before Parliament.

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

#### **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1, Page 982.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I rise to speak briefly to this Bill, and to approve the second reading, which is traditional for members in this Chamber. I wish to speak mainly on one subject, the allocation of moneys to the Mines Department. With the inflationary trend that has occurred right across the nation, and with the attitude adopted by the Commonwealth Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr. Connor), a great uncertainty is being experienced in the mining industry, in relation to base metal exploration as well as oil and gas exploration. Private enterprise organisations are uncertain of what to expect next, and there has been a slowing down and to some extent virtually a stopping of the industry, especially in the search for and proving of new fields, in relation to base metal exploration as well as oil and natural gas. This is a deplorable state of affairs from which no doubt the nation and the industry will suffer for many years to come. Once we dispense with the experts the mining companies employ, and once those people leave the State or the country, it is quite another matter to get them back. It is one thing to go mining in Australia, but it is another to go mining in Texas or Colorado.

The men who were here are no longer employed in these fields of endeavour, and they will be extremely hard to replace. Because of the short-sighted attitude of the Commonwealth Government, and because of the inflationary problems for which the Commonwealth Government must take much responsibility, the future of South Australia in particular is extremely bleak. It is interesting to note from Parliamentary Paper 9 that in 1974 the Mines Department received \$4 100 000 and that in 1975 it will receive \$5 100 000. It is obvious to me that it is considered a cinderella department. Only two other departments will receive smaller sums of money: the Sport and Recreation Department is to receive \$2 300 000, while the Labour and Industry Department will receive \$2 900 000. If private enterprise is unable to continue to search for and open up new fields of endeavour in the total mining scene, I believe that the Mines Department, with the initiative and foresight of the State Government, should be looking into the matter and supplementing much of the work previously done by private enterprise. I acknowledge that the reputation of officers of the Mines Department is among the highest in Australia, and I claim that we have the expertise to do much more work. However,

if no initiative comes from the top, the department will wither on the vine from lack of finance and lack of initiative from Government level.

I am mindful of the story of a company drilling for oil and natural gas in Queensland some years ago. It drilled through some of the richest phosphate rock deposits ever found in Australia, but the eyes of the men concerned were intent on looking for signs of natural gas and oil, and they were blind to other mineral deposits. Many months later, when a geologist in Canberra was looking at the core samples that had been sent from Queensland (it is obligatory upon all mining companies to file their core deposits from drillings), he noticed that the samples were rich in phosphate rock. Now the mine is being opened, and as a result of a little observation from an intelligent person another industry is being established in Australia at a time when phosphate rock is in short supply throughout the world.

With the expertise available to it, the Mines Department should be encouraged to find and prove more deposits in all aspects of the mining industry, both for private enterprise and for the Crown. When a change of Government takes place in Canberra, the mining people will know where to go for certain minerals, and there will be no holding back. The other point I wish to make is that there are only two oil-drilling rigs in Australia capable of drilling to a depth of more than 3 353 metres. One of those rigs is on the far north-west coast of Western Australia. The other rig is here in South Australia. The owner received a State Government guarantee to enable him to buy it. Recently, there was a statement by Santos in the press that, owing to lack of finance, Santos was unable to continue drilling in even known fields of natural gas in the Cooper Basin; it was unable to afford it. The man who owns this rig (there is only one rig capable of drilling to this depth) is under contract to Delhi-Santos. Should Delhi-Santos or Santos not be able financially to keep this rig working, I make the plea to the Government to ensure that the rig is kept here.

In 1972, when Mr. Whitlam became Prime Minister, there were some 36 oil well drilling rigs in Australia capable of drilling to 3 048 m or 3 353 m. In 1974, there were two left—the one I have just mentioned and the other on the north-west coast of Western Australia. To me, it is most important that this rig, in which this State Government has a financial stake, should be kept here at all costs, even if private enterprise companies are unable to employ it or keep it working in the short term. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. Of course, the real test of the Government's ability to run the affairs and finances of this State for the next three years is to be seen not in this Budget but in one Budget in the future, because this Budget may have been saved from eventual economic disaster by the transfer of the country railways of South Australia. In the future the benefits of this transfer to the State Budget will diminish. While taxes still rise because of inflation, unless the Government controls its future expenditure, we shall be faced with increases in State taxation. Of course, this year it is a rather strange fact of life that in State taxation, although we have seen a balanced Budget, people are paying more; but that is the way it operates. I hope the Government will look at this matter and see whether some more realistic method of levying State taxation can be brought into being. That does not imply support for a move to an

income tax sharing proposal; one would not have to be a genius to work out the end result of that for the South Australian taxpayer. I certainly would not support any move in that direction.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are saying that Mr. Fraser's suggestion has no merit?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: You are right. The Government is, in fact, having a small honeymoon from the full effects of inflation, whereas the other States that, for reasons best known to themselves, have kept their country rail services are having severe difficulties in facing huge deficits. But I say again this is a small honeymoon, and it will not last long unless the Government brings its expenditure into line. While the Government has this respite, I believe it is an ideal opportunity for it to examine ways and means of raising State taxes. There are many fields where taxes are grossly unfair and unreasonable, such as land tax.

We are the only mainland State in this country that has rural land tax. I believe this should be looked at, because land tax is not based on production, on the amount of money a person gets back from production. We have a situation where many farmers are faced with incomes below the levels of those of the average workers in the State, and they have to pay out large sums in rural land tax. It is time some method was found of either bringing this back so that it relates to net income or production or abolishing it altogether. The opportunity is now there.

Last year in this State there was an increase of \$2 000 000 in revenue received from land tax, an increase of 17 per cent, whereas rural incomes went down to the extent of probably, in many cases, 80 per cent to 90 per cent. I know of one person who was selling his stock for over \$300 a head last year: similar stock this year is being sold for \$80 a head—an enormous decrease. He has just received notification of an increase in the value of his land by 100 per cent. The effect on his land tax will be enormous. How can we justify this sort of situation of a tax bearing absolutely no relationship to the amount of money a person receives? It seems that everyone in this community is, to some extent, protected from the ravages of inflation except this one group. It cannot go on forever.

The second point I should like to speak about is the state of the housing market in this State. We read today that the Housing Trust is raising rents by \$3.50 a house. That is only the beginning. It was said it was a 15 per cent increase in rent. Well, the State Budget has already allowed for a 21 per cent to 26 per cent inflation rate so, before the end of the year, or early next year, I predict we shall see another rise of a similar proportion to cover the deficit of the Housing Trust. Of course, to bring the whole business to a realistic rental situation, there will have to be further increases. If we want an example of that, let us look at what is happening in Western Australia, where rents will go up in two stages this year, by 50 per cent. Why has this happened?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: In South Australia it is 15 per cent.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Why has that happened there?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Because of a Liberal Government.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Why is this happening? Because the effect of inflation on the housing market has been the greatest single effect on any industry. The

cost of housing increased by probably 40 per cent last year, and it will not be too far off that this year. It has reached the stage where it will soon be impossible for a person to buy his own house or even, if inflation keeps going, to rent his own house. People will be running to the Housing Trust in increasing numbers trying to get the cheap housing available through the trust. The trust will not be able to provide this, however, because of increasing deficits. It is a situation (probably, we have not seen a situation like this) where there has been a decrease in the amount of building, both Government and private, through lack of finance, to such an extent that the situation will be as bad as it was just after the Second World War, when people could not obtain housing. I have been looking around for accommodation, and the general word is around the real estate people that, because of the decrease in the amount of housing, housing will be in extremely short supply.

If we want an example of how much it has decreased, let us look at the figures for 1952-53 from the Housing Trust, when it completed 4 172 units. This year, the figure is 1 589. What on earth is going wrong? Has our population stopped growing? It certainly has not. Any decrease in the population this year will not be felt in the housing market for at least 20 years, unless people start marrying younger. That is not likely to happen. If they do, they are foolish because of the costs they have to face.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Don't you believe in marriage?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, I believe in marriage, but one has to wait until one is 30 years of age before one can save a deposit; it used to be 21 under a reasonable Government.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: These days, a man automatically has to send his wife out to work, even if they have a young family. He cannot afford a house on a single income.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You did that before, anyway.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The problem is even more exacerbated for young people trying to save for a house. I know of one couple that had a deposit gap of \$1 000 two years ago. They are both working and they have saved at the highest possible rate they can but their deposit gap is now greater than it was when they started. They just cannot keep up with the increasing costs of the house that they wish to purchase or build. The cost has increased enormously—by 40 per cent, and it will be nearly 70 per cent or 80 per cent in two years.

This situation is an indictment not only of this Government but also of the Commonwealth Government and everyone in those Governments concerned with the economy. An example of how expenditure has increased can be seen in the workings of the Housing Trust. The figures applying to the trust clearly show that expenditure on salaries and wages alone increased by 40 per cent last year. There was only a 10 per cent increase in trust staff, and it is no use saying that the increase resulted from employing more people. No increase in interest payments has caused this increase in expenditure, either. Last year, 44 per cent of the sum raised by the trust on rental houses was spent on interest payments, yet this year only 39 per cent is to be spent on interest payments. Therefore, interest payments are not worrying the trust. The increased expenditure results from increased costs and, as I have said, it is an

indictment of the Government that young people in South Australia and throughout Australia will be faced in the future, first, with not being able to own a house and, secondly, with potential problems in even renting a house. Certainly, we do not have enough accommodation for future families. This situation is shameful in a country where it has always been almost axiomatic for a person eventually to own his own house; this will no longer be the case. Perhaps that is what the Government wants. The Government may want everyone to live in Government housing, but I certainly do not.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is your suggestion?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Perhaps I can give the honourable member some advice on what should be done. I am not the Government; I am the Opposition (or part of it), but the responsibility for the situation rests on the Government's shoulders. I urge it to get its head out of the clouds, to stop fooling around with pie-in-the-sky talk of worker democracy and worker participation, and to get on with the job of providing houses. Changing the structure of the trust will not provide more houses. It will involve spending more money and setting up a committee whose members will be paid extra money, and so on.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: There'll be 13 subcommittees.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: There will be more by the time the Government is finished. It is nonsense for the Government to act in this way when the trust is faced with such problems. It is time the Government stopped fooling the people with such public relations exercises, admitted it had problems, and then got on with it and did something about them. More houses will not be built as a result of so-called worker democracy in the trust. That will make absolutely no difference and, in fact, it will probably hinder the show.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Don't you agree with the principle?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: We have had enough grandiose schemes thought up by the Government at election time. That is the only time we hear about them. In examining industrial development in this State, I point out that the only time we get a burst about what the Government is going to do is at election time. It has to save up its programme (because it has so few achievements) until election time, when these little projects come forward. The problem is that we then never hear of them again. When we think of the time, energy and money the Government has put into Redcliffs, with absolutely no result, and when we see such a waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation, we realise what an airy-fairy Government we have—a Government of no achievement.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Government is not interested in the real problems of the people. It is willing to sit back and let people slowly but surely lose the opportunity of obtaining their own house.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: That's a disgraceful statement.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Look at Monarto—the great scheme designed for what is in all practical terms the finish of the Murray River and the lakes (that is all it will do). However, with a little luck we will not get Monarto, because the Government is not serious about it now. It will send the Monarto Development Commission rocketing around Australia, and hopefully it will lose its way and not come back again. The commission will cost \$900 000 a year in wages, and we will

lose that amount of wages in South Australia but, in view of what has been done so far and the little that has been achieved, we are better off without the commission.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Did you take advice from Dean Brown?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No. Darwin can have the commission, especially in the light of achievements evident there. The commission can give good advice on how to achieve nothing.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you thinking of joining the Liberal Party again?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The real situation is that there has been in the life of this Government no real development project in industry. Nothing has been achieved at all. In fact, if one took out statistics, one would see a decrease in what has been achieved during the Government's term of office. That is an indictment on the Government. The Government has three more years in office (unless some disaster befalls it; I hope one does) so, for a change, let us see some achievement. Let the Government not get its public relations machine geared up any more: it should get into gear itself and do something for the State, and then the people of the State will be grateful, but if it does not do this, they certainly will not be. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I would now be foolish not to take advantage of the opportunity to speak. I am well aware of my inexperience as a debater in this Council, and I am aware of some of the ability of the debaters opposite.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Their ability is not too good.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I cannot agree there. On certain issues when members opposite are roasting trade unions they are good. However, I concur with Norm Foster. His contribution the other day was direct and truthful, and it exposed the Opposition for what it is. Norm Foster—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable member should refer to Mr. Foster as the Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Thank you, Mr. President, for your assistance. The Hon. Mr. Foster said in certain terms that the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. R. C. DeGaris) was disgraceful. The Leader talked about the Constitution Convention, and he got away with that by saying that his reference to that matter had something to do with money and related it to the Budget. Unless the Hon. Mr. DeGaris puts up a better show, I doubt whether he will be able to attack the Government. The Leader has already attacked the Government's use of the guillotine in another place, saying the Opposition did not have time to debate the Budget.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did I say that?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I said that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am sorry, it was Mr. Hill who said that. I will learn, Mr. President, but I have only been here a little while. I certainly know who Mr. Hill is.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not expect honourable members to use the title "honourable" on every occasion, but I point out that the use of Christian names is especially objectionable, and that is why I called the honourable member to order, because he said "Norm Foster".

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am used to calling him "Norm". Neither of us expected to be here. However, I think that the Hon. Norman Foster made it clear

that the Opposition's contribution in opposing the Bill and the allegations made were completely unfounded.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who opposed the Bill?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You didn't oppose it—you criticised it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What criticism did I make?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Very little, and I thank the Leader for his help. Little criticism was made of the Bill, but the Hon. Mr. DeGaris criticised the use of the guillotine.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Well, then, the Hon. Mr. Hill said that the Government should not have used the guillotine. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris, with all his ability to knock the Government over the years, was astounded: he has had a reasonable press in the past, but on this occasion he had no press, because he could not criticise the Bill. He has now asked what criticism he made: the criticism was practically negligible.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: On the contrary, I had a good press on this matter. My speech was in two parts.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The only good press you got was yesterday when you found out that the Liberal Movement was going to support the Beverage Container Bill, and you jumped in and said something.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Leader got a good press on the Bill.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He should get something: he owns the newspapers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Which newspaper do I own?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You do not own them; but you have the owners in your corner. I know that the Leader does not own the newspapers, but he may as well own them, the way he gets the press and the media to support the type of garbage he promotes.

#### *Members interjecting:*

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I hope I do not have to answer interjections all the time, as I want to speak in support of the Government. Of course, the Hon. Mr. Hill's contribution was an amazing one. He talked about \$10 000 000 being buried somewhere. But then the Auditor-General's Report was tabled. He was amazed how that sum of money could be buried and that the Opposition should be hoodwinked. This shows just how much research the Opposition has done. It now knows that, in his report, the Auditor-General referred to this \$10 000 000.

Members opposite say that they are concerned about the Treasurer's Financial Statement. The Opposition, the press, and those who are opposed to the Labor movement, realise that this is the best Financial Statement that has ever been produced in South Australia. In fact, it has not been opposed by the Opposition. The Treasurer has made the point that this is the best financial report and Budget in Australia, and this has never been denied by the Opposition. The Hon. Mr. Burdett said that everyone must budget well; that shows efficiency.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I didn't say that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The honourable member said something like it. That is near enough to what he said, anyway. That is how I interpreted it and, if he did not say it, he should have. True, the most important thing in the running of any organisation, household or Government is drawing up a budget and a financial statement. This Budget makes South Australia the leading State in the Commonwealth, because it is the only State that has shown a surplus and presented a decent Budget. It was interesting to note that the Opposition's good friend

(I think the Liberal Movement has disowned him), Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, came to South Australia. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris's friends in the media gave him a great press coverage, saying, "Mr. Bjelke-Petersen is here." That gentleman went on television and said, "The poor people of South Australia are being led by that socialist, Don Dunstan. They ought to come to Queensland and see how that State is run."

Of course, Mr. Dunstan, with his courage, is always willing to appear on television and debate any issue. However, despite his having been invited to do so, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen would not appear on television. On the same night that the Treasurer appeared on television, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen was missing because he could not tell the people more lies, having already told so many. He said that the people of Queensland had more money, yet that State's workers have less, per capita, in the bank than do our workers. He said that they have cheaper land in Queensland than we have in South Australia, but that was a lie to the extent of about 25 per cent. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen also said that they have cheaper housing in the Liberal State of Queensland than we have in the Labor State of South Australia. That was another lie. On and on he went! Mr. Bjelke-Petersen would not appear on television here, but our Leader, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., M.P., is always willing to do so. I was interested to see that the media, the friends of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, had much to say about the guillotine. The Hon. Mr. Hill said that those in another place should have gone through the Budget line by line.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: They could have done it here.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The honourable member has given me much advice over the years, and I am pleased to see that he is continuing to help me today.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Can you show me where the lines are in the Bill?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I believe the public ought to know, through the press, that this is the best Budget that South Australia has had. We now have the best Government in the whole of Australia. Although it would be interesting to go through the Budget line by line, I do not intend to do so. If we had a decent press, it would say (and this would have to be done on a double spread), "This is what happened in 1975 under the Dunstan Labor Government, and this is what will happen in the following year."

All honourable members know that the Labor Government, in its policy speech, made two announcements, the first of which was that it would withdraw the petrol franchise tax. Anyone who reads the press here would know what I, as a trade union secretary, had to say about the introduction of the 6c a gallon petrol tax. I have concerned myself with the workers of this State and country people. It is nice for the Liberal Movement to say that the Government does not concern itself with country people or the people on Kangaroo Island. However, that is a deliberate lie and is propaganda that has been used, especially because of an industrial dispute on Kangaroo Island in which I was involved. I am proud of the part that I played in that dispute and to say that I have many friends on Kangaroo Island who write to me for help.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Ted Chapman?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I did not want to raise his name, as Ted Chapman is known as the most disgraceful character ever to occupy the benches of Parliament in any part of Australia.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must not make any derogatory remarks concerning members of another place.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I thank you, Mr. President. I would not have done so but for the Hon. Mr. Burdett's interjection. I had no intention of referring to Mr. Chapman. I apologise to you, Sir, although I certainly do not apologise to Mr. Chapman. One can see from the first page of the Treasurer's Financial Statement that this State has a cash surplus of over \$8 000 000. On the second page of his statement, the Treasurer refers to the Government's election promise that widows or widowers who are left owning their own house will be relieved of the burden of succession duties, and that taxation will not be increased. That is a real Financial Statement, which impressed the people of this State. That is why the people of this State voted, contrary to what the Gallup polls stated, for a Labor Government.

Much has been said in the Council about the inability of the present Government to govern successfully. However, this Financial Statement gives the lie to that suggestion. The Hon. Mr. Cameron, who has just resumed his seat, said that South Australia has a surplus Budget solely because of the recent Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill. In this respect, I believe that that was one of the best decisions ever made by a Government of this State. The experience in other countries has proved this. The Commonwealth Liberal Party and the Country Party supported that legislation. The decision to transfer the country railways to the Commonwealth Government undoubtedly helped the South Australian Government. However, this all enters into the running of the Government—good financial deals being made in the interests of everyone in this State.

I have no doubt that, because of what happened in the Commonwealth election in Tasmania and the Queensland election, the Opposition in this Council made a political decision to reject the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill. It did so, but not because the Bill was crook. Although it knew the Bill was good and in South Australia's interest, the Opposition thought it was a good chance to try to kick the Dunstan Government out. There is no doubt about it: the Dunstan Government broke all records and was returned because this Government has always been able to represent not only trade unionists and unfinancial members of the unions, but the whole spectrum in South Australia.

I stopped by a studio to have my photograph taken and the man said, "I am a Liberal, and I tell the Liberals that, too." I said, "They will be pleased about that." He said "I tell them I am not a Labor member but Dunstan is the best Premier of any State." I have heard people say this in the Liberal Party, because they realise that Don Dunstan is able to confer with the trade union movement and to get the support of the trade union movement. There are fewer industrial disputes in this State than in any other State. Mr. Dunstan has been able to have dialogue with the trade union movement. The Liberals have never had it, they have never supported trade unions, and they have never done anything for the Labor movement. I will give the former Leader of the Liberal Movement (Steele Hall) credit for having some political honesty. That is why he was kicked out of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Dunstan must have straightened you out after what you said about him in the press.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: What did I say? Let me say that Steele Hall had some political nous, because he believed in redistribution and in not having any more



gerrymanders. But, on the other side of the coin, the L.M. generally, and Robin Millhouse especially, hate trade union officials, the trade union movement, and even non-unionists. They just hate the workers. I was involved for three days in a court case in which Robin Millhouse also was involved, and I said to him, "Tell me of one instance in which the Liberal Party in South Australia, or the L.M. in its short term, has ever proposed doing or done anything at all for the workers." For the first time in his life he could not reply, because he did not want to tell a lie.

Not much was said in this Council in criticism of the Financial Statement. In fact, when the Hon. Mr. Carnie was speaking in this debate yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Blevins interjected and said, "What do you find wrong with it?" and he replied, "Nothing much." I want to go a bit further and say there is a lot right with it; it is one of the best Financial Statements and it is the best Budget ever presented in the whole of Australia. It is a credit to the whole of the Labor Party, the Cabinet, and everybody associated with the Government in the preceding year. It was interesting to note that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris knocked Medibank. All the Liberals have knocked Medibank. I have a newspaper cutting quoting the Canadian authorities, including one of the leading medical experts in Canada.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What's his name?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You are asking me his name, but I do not have to mention it. I am not teaching you, but I am telling you something.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Let us know.

The Hon. I. C. Burdett: There's no point in it if you don't give his name.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: it does not matter about his name; he is a leading medical authority, and I will make this press article available to the Parliament and to Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: That is very kind of you.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He says, in effect, that the Medibank scheme in Australia is similar to the Canadian scheme; it has to be a success, and it is a scheme that will benefit everybody in the Australian community. There is a half-page spread on it. Before Medibank was introduced, whenever a person went to the Commonwealth to get a needle it cost him \$4 or \$5; today it costs nothing, because Medibank covers that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It has been free for some time.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Then the Commonwealth Labor Government has done that, but I am not talking about the Commonwealth Government here.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: You're not talking much about the Budget, either.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: What do you think Medibank is? It is in the Budget. Put your glasses back on. This is the Financial Statement, which refers to Medibank. I will read it out, because it is important to the people of South Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did I criticise Medibank? I criticised the impact on this Budget, and so does the Treasurer.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He does not. I will read what the Treasurer said, namely:

Medibank: The financial problems of the 1975-76 Budget have been eased considerably by the State entering into an agreement with the Australian Government to conduct and finance its hospital system under the Medibank arrangements. Under the agreement the Australian Government and the State will each meet half of the net operating costs of recognised hospitals. Under the

previous arrangements the State had been responsible for almost two-thirds of operating costs and, with the continued escalation of costs, it had become increasingly difficult to raise fees in order to avoid an increase in the proportion of cost falling on the Revenue Budget. The net financial benefit to the State in 1975-76 is estimated to be of the order of \$25 000 000 but for a number of reasons it is not possible to give this estimate with confidence.

The Treasurer is admitting he is not infallible, but at this point the Leader has not denied these figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes, I have. I have analysed the Budget carefully, and those figures are inaccurate. I have pointed that out.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Leader has not proved that. I listened to his speech in this Chamber, and he did not impress me. Medibank arrangements were designed to bring improved standards of health care within the reach of all Australians. What I, the Labor movement, and the Labor Government like about Medibank is that there were over 1 000 000 people, most of them migrants and very poor, who could not afford and did not have hospital benefit protection, but under Medibank they will be covered.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many of these people are in Queensland?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: They will be covered. I do not know whether the Leader has been to Queensland, or whether he has been in hospital there.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I've been to Queensland, and there is free hospital treatment there.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You have not been in the western part of Queensland and found out how it works.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes, I have.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No, you have not. You have been to the major cities. What about the back country where the doctors say, "Go to the surgery today and I will pull your tooth out there"? That is what happens in Cloncurry. Although you get free treatment in the hospital, the doctor will say, "Be at my surgery at 7 o'clock tonight," and he will charge you \$10.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: He won't even bother.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He will not bother during the day, because he gets extra at night.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many of these people not insured in Queensland come under the free hospital system?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I do not want to teach the Leader everything; he ought to know these things. He should not be asking me the question. However, under Medibank people will have access to free hospital treatment, not immediately but in the long term. In Queensland, there is free hospitalisation in public wards, and the public wards in Queensland were always full when I was there. It was not completely free hospital treatment in Queensland. It was called free, but—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Like Medibank!

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is not like Medibank; Medibank is free.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Doesn't Medibank apply only in public wards?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: At present, yes. The free hospitalisation that has been operating in Queensland for more than 20 years was introduced by a Labor Government; such a worthwhile service would not have been established under a Liberal Government. It is easy for the Opposition to criticise what the Labor Party does, because the Liberals never do anything. Last evening a

television programme dealt with the story of that great hero of the Labor movement, Jack Lang. Viewers saw details of the reforms he introduced, and they saw that in past years Jack Lang was depicted in the media as a red villain because he provided widows' pensions, workmen's compensation, and child endowment. In past years the media maligned Jack Lang and showed him as a communist guerilla coming down to gobble up the people. Thank goodness the people of today do not swallow such propaganda. The Democratic Labor Party has gone, but its place has been filled by the Liberal Movement, which does not want to support the Liberal Party, because it is too conservative, too old, too right-wing, and because it has no ideas.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did Jack Lang introduce workmen's compensation?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: On a State basis, he did.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the 1900 Act?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It might have been a compensation Act, but it did not give the worker any weekly payments. Jack Lang brought in workmen's compensation that provided a worker with weekly payments. The 1900 Act was probably brought in by a Liberal Government, and it had nothing in it for the workman.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Hon. Mr. Foster said yesterday that workmen's compensation was introduced by Jack Lang. We had legislation in 1900 in this State.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Fancy the Liberal Party ever talking about workmen's compensation! Any worthwhile reforms were brought in by a Labor Government. A magazine (not issued by the Communist Party) that I read recently referred to the Liberal Party's attitude to the age pension in 1917. In past years the press said that such reforms were communism. It was said that giving people something for nothing would make socialists of them, but nowadays the people are waking up. In his Financial Statement the Treasurer says:

While I am disappointed that a longer term improvement in the financial assistance grants along the lines of the States' submission was not achieved, I am happy to be able to report to the House that the approved addition to those grants, the special grants associated with the railways transfer and the financial benefits of the Medibank agreement enable me to present a Budget which allows for modest expansion, which aims at a balance on the year's current operations and which does not require any new or increased taxes.

Let us consider the New South Wales Liberal Government, which is increasing taxes and increasing the price of petrol. The New South Wales Premier, Mr. Lewis (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's counterpart), has allowed prices to run wild, and he has allowed private enterprise to run wild. When the Hon. Mr. Hill spoke on the Sheriff .50 pack the other day, he did not knock the rip-off associated with the cans, because that is connected with private enterprise, which sells an aerosol can for \$3.59. I believe that price control should be on a national basis; that would stop rip-off merchants, but the Liberal Party always believes in the private enterprise system.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Are you talking about the Appropriation Bill?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes. The Hon. Mr. Hill even suggested that the Government ought to provide another boat to service Kangaroo Island. The Labor Government bought the *Troubridge* for the benefit of the Kangaroo Island people, and this Government decreased the freight rates. Further, the Labor Government recently assisted the farmers to shift their stock. A Government

member has said that we always meet our responsibilities, and I point out that we have a responsibility to the Kangaroo Island people in connection with transport, because of their isolation. However, Kangaroo Island people should have no more demand on a Labor Government than has a council worker at Ceduna or a station hand in the Far North. Such a worker does not get any subsidy in his wage packet in connection with travelling or transport. However, the Kangaroo Island farmers get such a subsidy.

Many farmers claim that workers receiving social services are bludgers who are being subsidised by the farmers. Recently, it was stated in the press that the average farmer in Australia was being subsidised 42 per cent. The Labor Government will always listen to a case of hardship, and the farmers are no exception. Of course, they do not get preferential treatment but, if the Liberals had their way, farmers would get such treatment. Over the years the farmers have got good treatment from the Liberals through the electoral gerrymander.

The Treasurer's Financial Statement shows that there will be improvements in education, a vital area. When I left school, there was much unskilled work, and I participated in unskilled trades. Because of technological changes, there are now fewer positions available for uneducated and unskilled people. Recognising this, the Labor Government has decided to increase expenditure in this field from \$181 000 000 last financial year to \$214 000 000 this financial year. A previous speaker asked: "What is the Government doing about industry?" What is more important than the education of our children?

A previous speaker referred to the question of assisting Santos and multi-national companies to drill for oil. Such firms receive encouragement from the Commonwealth Government, but they cannot have the lot for themselves. We encourage oversea investment, but not on the multi-nationals' terms. The investment must be on terms that benefit the people of Australia, not the privileged few represented on the other side. Independent schools will receive, on the basis of need, a sum equivalent to 20 per cent of the estimated cost of educating children in State schools. A matter that should concern Opposition members (but they did not give the Government any wrap-ups at all) is public health. In the next financial year, expenditure on public health will be increased by \$2 000 000, and other medical benefits are also to be available.

It is obvious that one problem in relation to unemployment is welfare. The cost will be great, but it is necessary that the under-privileged in our society should be looked after and should not have to fend for themselves. Forty additional social workers will be recruited by the Community Welfare Department. When I have travelled to other States, people there who have visited South Australia have congratulated the Dunstan Labor Government on its attitude to welfare and to the under-privileged in our society. It stands alone in its concern. This will apply in the financial year under review, and in the next financial year the amount of money allocated will be increased so that more social workers can be engaged. However, this has always been the attitude of this Government. I do not think anyone on the other side could deny the progress made on behalf of the under-privileged by the former Minister of Community Welfare (Len King). In the next 12 months the people of South Australia will see that the best Government for them is the Dunstan Labor Government. I thank honourable members for the hearing they have given me, and I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. Many suggestions have been made, some of which did not go as far as I thought they might have done. Suggestions regarding taxation reforms have been noted. It is not possible for me to provide an answer to every question raised during the debate, but replies will be prepared and made available to honourable members as soon as possible.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the line relating to transport. I asked questions and sought further information during the second reading debate regarding the transportation system to Kangaroo Island. I have not had a reply in this Council from the Minister of Transport, and I listened a moment ago when the Chief Secretary said that members would, in due course, by letter have their inquiries answered. I was rather surprised to read in today's *News* the answers to the questions I raised about the *Troubridge*. I believe that is poor Parliamentary practice.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What page?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is on page 2. The only thing the Minister has not done is to put his own photograph in the article. When queries are raised in the Budget debate on matters relevant to the Budget, members should obtain replies directly in Parliament. If the Minister wants to gain some publicity from matters raised, it is then up to him to do so.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The Government could still be congratulated, couldn't it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am pleased that it has taken some notice of what I said.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You said it only yesterday.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not say it yesterday. The Minister involved noted what I said some days ago and has given a press release to the *News* on the matter. That is quite obvious to anyone. I think honourable members should be given the replies in the first instance, and not have to wait for another week or two after reading about it in the press.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (GIFT DUTY AND STAMP DUTIES) BILL

Second reading.

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

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

The object of it is to put into effect my Government's decision to grant, for a period of one year, generous reductions of the stamp duty and gift duty normally payable on transfers, where a person transfers a joint interest in his matrimonial home to his spouse. The succession duty advantages that flow from the joint ownership of a matrimonial home are considerable and, if my Government's plans for a new scale of succession duty rebates come to fruition, it will be even more advantageous for a couple to own their home jointly.

It is obvious that many people who do not presently own their home jointly could not afford the considerable cost of stamp and gift duties imposed upon transfers, and so are put at a considerable disadvantage in planning their estates. It is my Government's intention to facilitate such transfers by reducing the duties payable thereon. The proposed concessions are primarily directed at matrimonial homes of a gross value not exceeding \$40 000. However, concessions will be available on a reduced scale for homes exceeding that value, and the formulae provided by the Bill also take into account amounts outstanding on mortgage.

Furthermore, it is proposed that a person who transfers an interest in his home to his *de facto* spouse will be entitled to claim the benefit of the concessions provided by this Bill. This demonstrates yet again my Government's desire to eradicate, where reasonably possible, discrimination on the ground of marital status. If one takes a realistic look at our society, it becomes apparent that a considerable number of people are, and ought to be regarded as, spouses for all practical purposes, despite the absence of a marriage certificate.

There are a few restrictions envisaged by the Bill: the concessions may be claimed only once during the relevant period, and the house in question must be the principal permanent home in which the donor and his spouse are living together as husband and wife at the time that the gift is made. Part I of the Bill contains formal provisions. The Bill is deemed to have come into operation on July 14, 1975. Part II amends the Gift Duty Act. Clause 4 is formal.

Clause 5 repeals section 11 of the principal Act, which already provides some concession of duty on the transfer of a joint interest in a matrimonial house. New section 11 re-enacts in a more understandable form the present provision of the principal Act that relates to duty under \$5. It is made clear that a gift exempted under this section may become dutiable when aggregated with other relevant gifts. New section 11a re-enacts in subsection (1), in an amplified form, the existing provision of the principal Act that provides a concession of duty in relation to certain matrimonial house transfers. Subsection (2) provides for the temporary concession of duty that will be available only during the period of one year commencing on July 14, 1975. A donor can claim the benefit of either subsection (1) or subsection (2), whichever is to his best advantage.

Under subsection (2), where the gross value of the house does not exceed \$40 000, no gift duty will be payable on a transfer of a half interest in the house. Where the house is valued at more than \$40 000 and is not subject to a mortgage, the value of the gift is reduced by \$20 000. Where the house exceeds \$40 000 in value and is subject to a mortgage, the value of the gift is to be determined with reference to a formula that takes into account a proportionate amount of the outstanding mortgage debt. (I will give an example of the working of this formula when I have completed the explanation of the clauses of this Bill.) The effect of paragraph (b) is that the rate of duty payable on such a gift is the rate that would normally apply—that is, the actual value of the gift is taken into account for determining the rate applicable. Paragraph (c) provides, however, that only the dutiable value of such a gift need be taken into account when determining the rate of duty applicable to other gifts made within the period of 18 months before or after that gift.

Subsection (3) sets out the circumstances in which a donor may claim the benefit of subsection (2). It should be noted that a person who owned a house jointly with his spouse on July 14, 1975, will not be able to claim the benefit of this provision. Subsection (4) limits a donor to only one claim for a gift duty concession on the transfer of a joint interest in a matrimonial house. Subsection (5) supplies some necessary definitions. It is to be noted that the concessions of duty provided in this section may be claimed only with respect to a house and the area of land on which it is situated that does not exceed 0.2 hectare. Subsection (6) gives the Commissioner the discretion to decide whether two persons who are not married are living together as husband and wife. It is the Commissioner's intention to accept as sufficient evidence a statutory declaration that the two persons concerned are living together as husband and wife on a permanent and *bona fide* domestic basis. Subsection (7) enables the Commissioner to admit certain cash transactions as gifts that may attract the concessions provided by this section.

Part III amends the Stamp Duties Act. Clause 6 is formal. Clause 7 provides a similar scheme for the temporary reduction of stamp duties payable on a transfer of a joint interest in a matrimonial house by way of gift. Where the gross value of the house does not exceed \$40 000, no duty is payable. Where the gross value exceeds \$40 000 and there is no mortgage, the duty normally payable is to be reduced by the sum of \$360, which is the stamp duty payable upon the sum of \$20 000. Where the gross value exceeds \$40 000 and there is a mortgage on the property, the duty normally payable is reduced by a proportion of the sum of \$360 determined by reference to a formula that takes into account the amount outstanding under the mortgage. (An example of the working of this formula will also be given.) The subsequent new subsections conform to the provisions relating to gift duty that I have already explained.

I now give three examples of the way in which both concessions of duty are calculated where the gross value of the house exceeds \$40 000 and there is a mortgage over the property. I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### EXAMPLES

Example (1):

	\$
Gross value of matrimonial home.....	45 000
Mortgage debt.....	9 000
Equity.....	36 000
Value of property conveyed.....	\$18 000
Stamp Duty—	
Duty payable on \$18 000 is \$300.	
Reduction in duty:	
	9 000
	20 000 — (20 000 X -----)
	45 000
$r = \$300$ (-----)	
	18 000
	20 000 — 4 000
	18 000
	300 X 16 000
	18 000
	= \$266.66
Amount of stamp duty payable \$300 — \$266.66 =	\$33.34

Gift Duty—

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dutiable value of gift:} & \quad 45\,000 - 40\,000 \\ v = (22\,500 - 20\,000) - \left( \frac{\quad}{90\,000} \right) 9\,000 \\ & = 2\,500 - 500 \\ & = \$2\,000 \\ \text{Value of gift, \$18 000; therefore, rate of duty is} & \quad 4.8 \text{ per cent} \\ \text{Duty payable by donor, \$2 000 X 4.8 per cent} & = \$96 \end{aligned}$$

Example (2):

Gross value of matrimonial home.....	\$ 60 000
Mortgage debt.....	10 000
Equity.....	50 000
Value of property conveyed.....	\$25 000

Stamp Duty—  
Duty payable on \$25 000 is \$510  
Reduction in duty:

$$\begin{aligned} & \quad 10\,000 \\ & 20\,000 - (20\,000 \times \frac{\quad}{60\,000}) \\ r = \$510 \left( \frac{\quad}{25\,000} \right) \\ & \quad 20\,000 - 3\,333.34 \\ & = 510 \left( \frac{\quad}{25\,000} \right) \\ & \quad \underline{510 \times 16\,666.66} \\ & \quad 25\,000 \\ & = \$340 \\ \text{Amount of stamp duty payable, \$510 — \$340} & = \$170 \end{aligned}$$

Gift Duty—

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dutiable value of gift:} & \quad 60\,000 - 40\,000 \\ v = (30\,000 - 20\,000) - \left( \frac{\quad}{120\,000} \right) 10\,000 \\ & \quad 10\,000 \\ & \quad \underline{= \$8\,333.33} \\ \text{Value of gift, \$25 000; therefore, rate of duty is} & \quad 5.5 \text{ per cent} \\ \text{Duty payable by donor, \$8 333.3 X 5.5 per cent} & = \$458.33 \end{aligned}$$

Example (3):

Gross value of matrimonial home.....	\$ 60 000
Mortgage debt.....	50 000
Equity.....	\$10 000
Value of property conveyed.....	\$5 000

Gift duty under provisions of section 11a (1)—  
Dutiable value under section 11a (1) (a) (i) is  
\$4 000, for which no duty is payable  
Gift duty under section 11a (2)—  
Dutiable value of gift:

$$\begin{aligned} & \quad 60\,000 - 40\,000 \\ v = (30\,000 - 20\,000) - \left( \frac{\quad}{120\,000} \right) 5\,000 \\ & = 10\,000 - 8\,333.33 \\ & = \$1\,666.67 \\ \text{Value of gift, \$5 000; therefore, rate of duty is} & \quad 3.1 \text{ per cent} \\ \text{Duty payable would be \$1 666.67 X 3.1 per cent} & = \$51.66 \\ \text{In this case the donor should claim the benefit of} & \quad \text{section 11a (1).} \end{aligned}$$

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

#### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGULATIONS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 984.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition):  
I support the Bill. In doing so, I should like to thank the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Burdett for the excellent speeches they made and the information they gave

the Council on their analysis of the Bill. I think the Hon. Mr. Burdett made the point extremely well that retrospective legislation—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Hon. Mr. Burdett made the point extremely well that retrospective legislation (or, in this case, retroactive legislation, no matter what category it falls into) should be generally opposed. But there are exceptions and I believe the Bill before us now is one such exception. It arose originally from the Government's action in opposing the Myer Queenstown development.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It made a crook old profit.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In an attempt to get its way, the Government introduced a Bill making a legal action taken by the Myer organisation an illegal action, with the retrospective legislation it attempted to introduce in the Parliament of South Australia. No democratic Parliament, in any circumstances, should condone such legislation. I am very sorry that the Hon. Mr. Blevins was not a member of the Council when that Bill came through—

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I am very sorry myself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —because his dissertation on British justice would have been a worthwhile contribution to that debate. Perhaps even now he may wish to pass an opinion on that Bill, in relation to his ideas of British justice.

This Bill is retroactive. In the press release of speeches made in another place, it was fairly clear that there the opposition was to retroactive legislation, and one can understand that viewpoint; but this Bill only clarifies and makes legal what is generally accepted at the present time as being legal. This is a totally different case from making illegal what has been thought to be legal. Even in cases such as this, retrospective legislation needs careful consideration. The reasons for the Bill are contained in a recent judgment given by Mr. Justice Wells. Most of those reasons have been explained to the Council by the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and I do not intend to canvass those two grounds again.

Planning and development regulations and the Planning and Development Act have been used, I believe, by the Government and Ministers of the Government on more than one occasion to bring a building project to a halt—not because that particular project was against the law, but to bring it to a halt purely because the Government wanted to bring it to a halt. There are many examples of this happening in South Australia. Almost, by forcing a long and drawn out court case, the Government has been able to stop building projects that were within the law. This attitude of the Government, and of the Premier in particular, has not been sufficiently publicised. Some Ministerial actions do not bear much resemblance to the Hon. Mr. Blevin's ubiquitous British justice or, for that matter, any form of justice at all.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Why do you sneer at that? I thought you would have regarded it as an honourable phrase, especially coming from one who thinks of himself as a lawyer.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The term "British justice" is an honourable phrase. All I am saying is that the Hon. Mr. Blevin's interpretation of British justice is not satisfactory. If the Hon. Mr. Blevins is keen on his British justice let him now state what his view is on retrospective legislation in regard to Queenstown. The

actions of Ministers require scrutiny by Parliament when action has been taken under planning and development regulations to bring a project to a halt, not because it is illegal but because the Government decided in its wisdom that it should stop the project willy-nilly. That has been done. When that is followed by legislation which makes a legal act illegal, then that does not stand as an interpretation of British justice. I admit that this Bill is somewhat away from that concept. As the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. Hill have explained, all that it does retrospectively is to clarify and make what is now thought to be legal and what is accepted as being legal, a clearly legal act. For that reason, although it is retrospective legislation, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Planning regulations."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move to insert the following new subsection:

(19) When a council has, before the commencement of the Planning and Development Act Amendment Act (No. 3), 1975, acted on the assumption that planning regulations to which subsection (17) of this section applies are invalid, or suspended, any consent given by the council under Part V of this Act is, for the purposes of this Act, sufficient authority for the person who has the benefit of the consent to do anything for which the consent was sought and granted, and no further consent or authorisation is required under the planning regulations by reason of the provisions of subsection (17) of this section.

The reason for this amendment is that in my canvass of certain councils as to how this legislation might affect them, the situation was brought to my notice that a minor change was required to the Bill. As a result of the judgment of Mr. Justice Wells some councils immediately sought legal advice about what action they should take when they considered applications from ratepayers to build and other applications normally dealt with under interim planning control or building regulations.

The advice they received followed the lines of the judgment and, as a result, the councils were to base their decisions on existing interim development control. If the building regulations ran concurrently with interim development control, in the opinion of His Honour the regulations had to be considered as being in suspension during that period of concurrency. Therefore, the councils gave permission under interim development control provisions.

If the Bill passes, the regulations which have been before the Council will no longer be deemed to be suspended, and it will be possible for new applications to be made, or for appeals to be made, against decisions of councils based on those regulations. Representations were made to me, and I agree wholeheartedly with them, that this would be grossly unfair and against the whole spirit of the legislation now before the Council. The Corporation of the City of St. Peters was specifically involved. The amendment is otherwise self-explanatory.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I concur in the honourable member's amendment and I inform him that the Government is happy to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

### RETURNED SERVICEMEN'S BADGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 984.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: This Bill seeks to update the Statute and was prepared by Mr. Ludovici, one of the best authorities in Australia on such legal procedure. The Bill updates the Statute, but it is strange that in these modern times we must include more words in legal headings than previously was the case, instead of being able to trim such headings down. The Returned Services League has been understood by all people to be the R.S.L. The long title of the principal Act is now amended by inserting the words "league formerly known as" before the original title. This makes the title longer than it was. Doubtless, the learned gentleman who has drawn this Bill had a reason for doing that. I accept that and I have no further comment to make but to support the Bill.

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

### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (R.S.L.) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 984.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I have few comments to make regarding this Bill, which is similar to the Returned Servicemen's Badges Act Amendment Bill, with which the Council has just dealt. Perhaps the only clause of consequence in the Bill is clause 5 (c), which inserts a new subsection (2) in section 104 of the principal Act. The new subsection refers to a private Act, the Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League Club (Licensing) Act, which was passed in 1934, section 2 of which provides, in part, as follows:

A person shall not be a member of the club referred to in this section unless he—

- (a) during the Great War which commenced on the fourth day of August, nineteen hundred and fourteen, served outside Australia as a member of any naval or military force . . .

In fact, a controversy raged for 20 years regarding whether persons should be entitled to be members of the club if they had not served outside Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What's the position now?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: They have reached agreement, although I have always thought this happened 20 years too late. Persons who volunteered for the services were permitted to become members of the club. This Bill nullifies the restriction imposed by section 2 of the 1934 private Act to which I have referred. I agree with this and have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

### PRE-MIXED CONCRETE CARTERS BILL

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

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

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

This Bill is to provide a system of licensing in respect of the operators of pre-mixed concrete trucks within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. As honourable members no doubt remember, the pre-mixed concrete industry suffered from acute industrial troubles during the first half of 1974, arising mainly from the fact that the number of trucks in operation was increasing to an extent not

justified by the needs of the building industry. The so-called "little man" (that is, the man who owned and drove his own truck) found himself being virtually squeezed out of the industry. This, and other difficulties within the industry, culminated in a crisis that brought the carting of pre-mixed concrete to a complete halt in May, 1974. The repercussions to the building industry as a whole were considerable.

Representatives of the various factions involved (that is, the concrete manufacturers, the employed drivers and the "owner-drivers") approached my colleague at that time, seeking some solution to the impasse and to the various problems involved in maintaining viability in the industry. Many discussions were held with representatives of both parties, both alone and together, and the dispute was settled when substantial agreement was reached that the most appropriate solution would be to regulate and control, by way of licensing legislation, the number and distribution of pre-mixed concrete trucks operating within the metropolitan area. On the basis of these terms of settlement, the industry swung back into action without delay.

This Bill seeks to put into effect the agreement reached in settling the dispute. The Transport Workers Union and Concrete Manufacturers Association have reached substantial agreement on the provisions of the Bill, and I wish to congratulate them all on the conciliatory manner in which they have conducted all discussions in the matter. I am confident that the Bill now presents no insurmountable problems, and I have no hesitation in commending it to honourable members as a measure that is vital to the continued smooth running of the pre-mixed concrete industry.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions, which are self-explanatory. Clause 5 establishes the Pre-mixed Concrete Carters Licensing Board. The board will have three members, one coming from the Concrete Manufacturers Association, one from the Transport Workers Union and one, the Chairman, nominated by the Minister. A member may hold office for three years and is eligible for re-appointment. Clause 6 empowers the Governor to appoint deputies to any member of the board. Clause 7 provides for the removal of a member of the board from office and the filling of vacancies.

Clause 8 entitles board members to certain allowances and expenses. Clause 9 preserves the validity of certain acts of the board. Clause 10 provides for the manner in which the business of the board is to be conducted. Clause 11 provides for the appointment of a Secretary of the board. Clause 12 provides the board with the necessary powers in relation to any proceedings (that is, inquiries, applications, and so on) before the board. Clause 13 requires the board to furnish any party to proceedings before the board with its reasons for making any particular decision or order. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of inspectors.

Clause 15 provides inspectors with the necessary powers of inspection and investigation. An inspector must produce his certificate of appointment when requested, and may exercise his powers at any reasonable time. Clause 16 provides for the fixing of the appointed day, which will be some months after the Act is brought into operation. All existing truck operators will therefore have ample time in which to obtain the necessary licences. Clause 17 provides that a person is guilty of an offence if he operates a pre-mixed concrete truck within the metropolitan area, otherwise than in pursuance of a licence.

(It should be pointed out at this stage that the word "operator" is not intended to include a person who is simply employed on wages to drive a truck that is owned by a company or some other person.) Clause 18 provides for the granting of licences by the board. All "existing" operators (that is, persons who were operating trucks on October 1, 1975) will be granted licences by the board without any consideration by the board as to the needs of industry. In the case of any other applicant, the board will have regard to the needs of industry, and this applies whether the applicant is applying for a licence in respect of a truck previously licensed under this Act, or in respect of a truck that has never been the subject of a licence.

Clause 19 requires the board to give an applicant opportunity to make representations to the board before it may refuse his application. The board is given the power to specify a time before which a rejected applicant may not re-apply without the prior approval of the board. Clause 20 empowers the board to impose conditions upon the holding of a licence. Subclause (2) specifically empowers the board to tie the so-called owner-drivers to certain concrete manufacturers. This means that the big companies will each be apportioned a certain number of independent truck operators. Subclause (4) empowers the board to revoke or vary any condition of a licence that has become oppressive, and so on.

Clauses 21 and 22 provide for the application for, and form of, licences. A licensee may apply to have his licence varied if he wishes to replace a licensed truck with a new one. Clause 23 provides that a licence is not transferable. Any purported transfer would therefore be null and void and the purported transferee would be unlicensed and guilty of an offence under clause 17 of the Bill. Thus, trafficking in licences will be prevented.

Clause 24 deals with the renewal of licences, all of which will expire annually on the anniversary of the appointed day.

Clause 25 empowers the board to inquire into the conduct of any licensee. An inquiry can be set in motion by the Minister or the permanent head of the department, or by the board itself. A licensee the subject of an inquiry must be given the chance to make representations. The board may either cancel a licence as a result of such an inquiry, or suspend the licence for a specified period of time. Clause 26 gives any party to proceedings before the board a right of appeal to the Minister. The Minister may himself determine such an appeal, or appoint some other competent person for that purpose. There is no right of appeal against the outcome of such an appeal. Clause 27 contains the standard provisions relating to the annual presentation of reports to the Minister and to Parliament.

Clause 28 provides for certain evidentiary matters. Clause 29 gives the board and other specified persons the usual immunity from legal action in respect of acts done in good faith. Clause 30 creates an offence where any person in authority improperly uses or divulges information gathered in the course of his duties. Clause 31 is the standard appropriation provision. Clause 32 provides for the disposal of prosecutions in a summary manner. Clause 33 extends liability for offences by a body corporate to the directors of that body, with the usual defence. Clause 34 provides for the making of regulations for the purposes of the Bill.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 7, at 2.15 p.m.