HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 25, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act Amendment,
Architects Act Amendment,
Cattle Compensation Act Amendment,
Companies Act Amendment,
Constitution Act Amendment (Salaries),
Crown Lands Act Amendment,
Juries Act Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries).

PETITION: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. BURDON presented a petition signed by 3,994 electors residing in the Mount Gambier, Millicent and Victoria Districts. It stated that any further restriction on the use of road transport by taxation, legislation or otherwise would be detrimental to the interests of the State; that the cost of any such legislation or control would add to the cost of living in the country and would discriminate against residents of such areas; and that, therefore, the petitioners were opposed to such control, restriction, or discrimination in any form. It urged that no legislation to effect such control, restriction or discrimination be passed by the House of Assembly.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I read in this morning's newspaper a report of last night's meeting of the Senate of the University of Adelaide. This report states that the senate passed a statute that forbids members of the University Council to be members of Parliament at the same time. Can the Minister of Education say, first, whether this decision by the senate is designed to stop the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) ever going back to the university? Secondly, is the legislation that set up the university and provided that there should be a certain number of members of Parliament on the University Council to be over-ridden by a statute of the University Senate? As I do not think that would be the case, can the Minister say how the senate can pass such a statute and whether it is valid?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am sure the item in the newspaper has nothing to do with the honourable member for Glenelg. In fact, I am sure that the council of the university would be only too glad to see him at any time, in view of his qualifications. Regarding the Leader's question, I point out that the University of Adelaide Act provides clearly that there shall be five members of Parliament on the University Council, and obviously a statute of the university could not over-ride the Act. I do not know just how this matter arose. It appeared to me that it might mean that a person who was employed at the university could not also be a member of Parliament and on the council at the same time. That was the only interpretation that I could put upon it. I have had no advice from the university, and at the moment I am not sure of the import of that statement.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the report in the *Advertiser* is somewhat garbled, and that the new statutes passed by the senate refer, first, to the removal of the previous prohibition on professors being members of a political party, and secondly, to the provisions that a person, whilst a member of the academic staff of the university, may not be a member of Parliament. Has the Minister been able to obtain information that may confirm my impression?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I understand that that is the case, and it will be noticed that this accords with what I suspected was the position, as one statute prohibits persons becoming members of Parliament whilst they are employed at the university.

BURRA SCHOOLS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning a library subsidy for the Burra Primary and High Schools. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: There has been some confusion over this matter, which involved the raising of £1,000 from a joint public appeal by these schools and the payment of a subsidy of a similar amount by the Education Department. The position is now clear departmentally, but I understand that at present only part of the subsidy has been applied for by both the high and primary schools. As soon as applications are received for the balance, payment will be approved.

PISTOL LICENCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On Tuesday I asked the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a question arising out of a very strong complaint I had received from a priest in my district regarding the renewal of his pistol licence. Since then, I have had another complaint detailing almost identical circumstances. I understand that the Premier now has an answer on this matter, and I should be glad if he would give it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chief Secretary states:

In accordance with the usual practice, pistol licence renewal forms were prepared and distributed by the Police Department during November, together with a reminder that pistol licences should be renewed before December 31. This is a service not required by the Pistol Licence Act but is supplied each year for the convenience of licence holders. However, as there was a Bill before Parliament which proposed an amendment to the fees prescribed in the Act, it was decided to decline the acceptance of licence fees until after the first week in December, when it was expected that the Bill would have been passed or Parliament would have risen until after December 31. All police stations were then advised accordingly and instructed to request applicants for pistol licences to inquire again after the first week in December. No mention was made of any specific increase in fees, but the proposal to increase the fee to a particular amount has been reported in the press and it is conceivable that this amount was mentioned in discussion between the police officer and the applicant.

No pistol licences have yet been issued for 1966, but some fees at the existing rate may have been received before the abovementioned instruction was given. In such cases it will be necessary to hold the applications and advise the licence holder if and when there is any variation in the amount to be paid. It is unfortunate that the department's endeavour to assist licence holders by reminding them of the renewal date, and refusing to accept fees which could be altered before the fee was actually payable, has been misconstrued.

TOTALIZATOR BETTING.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier obtained detailed information about why there should be a 50c minimum bet on the course, to which he referred when discussing the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill (Decimal Currency) yesterday?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The decision to make the minimum totalizator bet 50c, or 5s., was arrived at by Cabinet after detailed discussions with the clubs and with those authorities responsible for operating the totalizators. Bound up with the prescribed minimum bet is the unit to be used for purposes of calculating the dividend. Another factor is the great desirability for convenience for all transactions to be in silver coins, and the lowest silver coin in the future will be 5c, equal to 6d. First, if there were to be a 25c minimum ticket this would have to be the unit for calculating dividends, and the "fractions" involved would be on an average twice as high as at present, if payments are to be in silver coins (dividends are taken to the completed 3d. on a present 2s. 6d. unit). This would lead to serious dissatisfaction, particularly to the small punter, for if his dividend worked out at, say, 39c for a 25c investment he would be paid 35c, losing over 12 per cent as a fraction to the benefit of charities. On the other hand, if it were worked on a 50c basis the dividend, being 78c for 50, would actually pay 75c. The punter would then forgo as a fraction for charities less than 4 per cent. All clubs and totalizator authorities in this State and other States agree it will be impracticable to pay dividends involving smaller coins than 5c.

Secondly, the 2s. 6d. minimum has applied for many years, since before the 1930's. Since that time the value of money has so altered that a 50c unit now would be roughly half of the worth of 2s. 6d. in 1933. The proportion of people at present using the 2s. 6d. totalizator windows is small, and of those who do use those windows many take more than one ticket. The costs of operating the 2s. 6d. windows are relatively high, and are even claimed to cost the clubs in staff wages more than the margin available in the tickets. Victoria has at present 5s. minimum units both on course and for T.A.B., and it is understood Victoria is proposing a general 50c unit in the future. New South Wales on courses has a 5s. minimum unit, and is understood to be proposing to have a 50c minimum unit on courses in the future. At present, the New South Wales T.A.B. provides for half units of 2s. 6d., and there is a variety of opinion as to whether or not T.A.B. in that State should continue a half unit.

No decision has yet been announced about this. Queensland, like New South Wales and Victoria, has a 5s. minimum on courses and is likely to adopt 50c for course betting. Whether South Australia, if it introduces T.A.B., will have half units as has the existing New South Wales system, or 50c units as has Victoria, is yet to be determined. But, it is pointed out, the recent vote in Parliament mentioned the Victorian approach generally. In any case, with a 50c minimum on courses this State will be in line with other States for on-course totalizators. Furthermore, it is proposed that bookmakers on the "flat" will continue to accept 20c bets after the introduction of decimal currency, so that the person who occasionally wants such a low bet will be able to get it.

Mr. HALL: I understood the Premier to say that Cabinet might still consider the introduction of half units of the 50c minimum bet, and that the half units were now used in Victoria. Can the Premier say what the half unit consists of? Does it mean that a person can place a half-unit bet or will the whole unit have to be taken out by two people?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The half unit referred to was 50c, the equal of 5s. Half again of that is a quarter unit, or 25c. The normal bet, particularly in Victoria, is 5s. The report indicated that New South Wales was continuing with the 2s. 6d. unit in off-course betting but that that State was expected to introduce a system of a 5s. unit for totalizators on the course. A further discussion will be held in New South Wales on this question after decimal currency is introduced in February, and it will then be decided whether the 2s. 6d. unit will be continued with, but that is problematical. I doubt whether any advantage would be gained in course betting by providing for a bet of less than 5s. However, in no circumstances should it be suggested that, if two or more people desired to make a 5s. investment on a totalizator, police action would be taken against them.

PUMPING COSTS.

Mr. COUMBE: As it has been announced that, because of the dry season, continuous pumping of Murray River water into the Adelaide reservoirs is being carried out, can the Minister of Works say what this is costing?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Having given these figures some weeks ago when pumping commenced, I think the average cost is about £1,700 a day, but the cost may be greater on some days than on others. However, I shall obtain the figures and inform the honourable member.

ROAD MAINTENANCE FUND.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Premier may recall that, prior to this year's election, the Treasury was paying to the district councils concerned rebates of the one-third of a penny ton-mile tax collected pursuant to legislation previously enacted. As I understand that, since then, portion of this tax (it may have been 80 per cent) was to be paid into a road maintenance fund and that the remainder would be paid to the councils, can the Premier say how much of that tax the district councils have received since the election?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall consult with the Minister of Roads who, I believe, is handling this matter.

MODBURY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: In the Loan Estimates £80,000 was allocated for a major addition in brick to the Modbury Infants School to be built adjacent to the existing primary school facing the Golden Grove road at Modbury. This building is necessary, as at present four grade 1 classes and two grade 2 classes are housed in a stone building that is about 100 years old, and in five temporary classrooms situated on departmental land on the Montacute road at Modbury. When the new infants school is completed, these children will be transferred to it from existing inadequate buildings. Because of the expected continued increase in enrolments at this school, as a result of increased building that is taking place in the area, can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. RODDA: This morning several members (including me) visited the Government Printing Office, and saw the cramped and antiquated conditions under which the printing staff are working. We were impressed with the way which the staff were performing their important task under fairly difficult conditions. Has the Government any plans to move the Government Printing Office to more modern premises?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This was one of the first matters considered by my Cabinet before the House met this year. The situation was not new to us, for we had seen conditions at the Government Printing Office previously.

The previous Government bought land at Kent Town for the erection of a new printing office, but doubt now exists whether that land will be satisfactory. The Government is at present considering the use of a site at Thebarton now occupied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Further, the Public Stores Department's property at Mile End is to be transferred, because the land is needed for railway purposes. Inquiries have been made into whether the Thebarton property could be extended to the original frontage on the roadway, and I doubt whether that would interfere with the present road requirements. The Minister of Works has requested the Public Buildings Department to examine the feasibility of drawing up a plan for a printing works that could provide, if necessary, for further expansion. A firm plan that would permit further expansion does not exist at present. Having seen the very modern printing works of the Griffin Press, I point out that the whole of that operation is carried out on the ground floor, and the Government believes it desirable to follow that practice. I point out also that in the latter part of 1966 certain land at Islington will become available. It may be appropriate to consider then whether the facilities now at Thebarton can be re-sited in that area so that room for expansion will be provided. At the same time it will be ascertained how much land will be required to re-site the printing office near Adelaide. Probably the Thebarton area is the most likely place. The Minister of Works has certain tasks concerning the arrangement of these matters. However, the Government is most anxious to provide the new office as soon as possible.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the Premier said, the previous Government bought land at Kent Town which appeared to be eminently suitable for a new printing office. At least, it was the best location that we could discover, after several years' investigation. I am aware that the Engineer-in-Chief has always thought that to take from him his depot at Thebarton would be a serious inconvenience to him in carrying out maintenance services in the metropolitan area, particularly in the western suburbs, and he was always most reluctant to give over that land for any other purpose because it was so suitable to him. Also, as the Premier said, there is the complication of the widening of the Port Road, and the provision of a piece of land along the frontage of the Thebarton depot by the Engineer-in-Chief was more or less settled. In view of that, if the site at Kent Town has to be abandoned and the Thebarton site is to be used, this makes the whole proposition extremely costly and delays the completion of a new printing works. Obviously, if the Engineer-in-Chief's depot is to be re-located either at Mile End or at some other place, that will take some time; it will be an extremely costly move, and probably less advantageous to the Engineer-in-Chief as a result. Will the Premier tell the House the reasons for the present Government's now finding that the site purchased at Kent Town is unsuitable? He will appreciate, I think, that to go to some other site, particularly the Thebarton site, would involve both delay and heavy cost, and obviously there must be, in the minds of the Government, some compelling reason why this site is not to be used. If the Premier does not desire, for domestic or confidential reasons, to answer my question immediately, perhaps he might be good enough to indicate it to me privately. However, this is a matter of considerable interest, and I should like to know whether the Premier can indicate what are the Government's present objections to the site purchased at Kent Town.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is a question not merely of the Government's objections to the site at Kent Town but of what can be done to make the Kent Town land an efficient site for a printing works. I said earlier that a survey plan was being drawn up to see whether that site could be used and whether it would be efficient for the purpose.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: On that land?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes. The idea of using Kent Town has not been abandoned, and the matter is still being examined. However, I point out that there will still have to be storage capacity, particularly for the Supply and Tender Board, and we must provide for storage capacity for various departments, particularly the Education Department. In addition, we must expect a further increase in the work force, and we must also consider parking space. All those things will be closely examined. When I referred to the road widening involved at Thebarton I had in mind that it would make an area available for parking requirements. In view of the old junk at the Thebarton depot, it might assist if some of the junk merchants were asked to go down there and carry it away to their own depots.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Quite frankly, I do not think it is old junk.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I should be interested to know when it would be used again.

I have seen what is down there. The Minister of Works has already mentioned the plans to decentralize, particularly in the suburban areas, to provide for this type of accommodation. If the Kent Town site proves unsuitable, it will be necessary to reconsider the Thebarton site and, if that proves to be unsatisfactory, we will have to think of something else.

ARBURY PARK.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I refer to the property, sometimes known as Arbury Park, which was purchased by the Government from Sir Alexander Downer. I understand that the property had been planted by Mr. Wollaston (and these plantings are a credit to him), who named the property Raywood Park. Sir Alexander Downer built a beautiful house on the property (which was a credit to him) and renamed it Arbury Park. I saw a statement in the press some time ago which led me to believe that the property was to be again renamed. Can the Minister of Education tell me the correct position? As most people seem to have become used to the name being Arbury Park, will the Minister say whether that name is to be retained?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The whole of the area will still be known as Arbury Park but it has been decided to call the 22 acres, which includes the house built by Sir Alexander Downer, Raywood, because that was the name given to the property by the man who did such an excellent job of planting the beautiful trees there. There is no intention to do away with the name of Arbury Park. It might be of interest to the honourable member to know that I have set up an Arbury Park Committee to see that the whole area is developed satisfactorily and to ensure that we co-ordinate the various organizations interested in the area. The committee consists of Mr. A. W. Jones of the Education Department, who will be chairman, Mr. H. J. C. Mutton and Mr. W. F. T. Harris of the Education Department, Mr. J. N. Yeates of the Highways Department (the Highways Department is interested because of the freeway to go through the area), Mr. D. A. Speechley of the State Planning Office, Mr. A. E. Simpson of the National Fitness Council, Mr. H. F. Malkin of the Public Buildings Department, and Mr. H. Beare of the Education Department, who will be the secretary of the committee. The committee has already met and is considering all the various aspects of development of the area with a view to co-ordinating the requirements of the various bodies concerned. Raywood will be used as an in-service training centre, and we expect that it will be of considerable use in this direction not only to the Education Department, but also to other organizations.

CHOWILLA TIMBER.

Mr. CURREN: Yesterday the Minister of Forests, in reply to my question concerning the Chowilla Timber Committee, said that the committee would be appointed soon. As I understand that he now has the names of its members, will he give them to the House?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am indebted to the honourable member for his earlier suggestion of which the Government took notice. I am pleased to say that the appointment of this committee has now been finalized. The members will be Mr. J. Thomas, Assistant Conservator of the Woods and Forests Department, who will be chairman, Mr. W. S. Reid, who is a member of the Pastoral Board, and Mr. J. A. Ligertwood, Engineer for Irrigation. I have already asked Mr. Thomas to call the committee together as soon as possible with a view to determining its programme, as I believe this matter is urgent. It is also thought to be urgent by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Lands Department and the Woods and Forests Department. I hope that the committee will become active and that its programme will be known soon.

IRON ORE EXPORTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe the Premier now has a reply to a question I asked concerning the development of the export of iron ore from Whyalla.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Mines has forwarded me a copy of a letter of November 22 from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to Mr. Barnes, the Director of Mines. That letter states:

Thank you for your letter of November 18 concerning our plans for a pelletizing plant at Whyalla. You will remember that this development was mentioned to the Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh, when I saw him, together with the Minister of Mines and your good self, in Adelaide on August 16. Since that time we have pushed ahead with our proposals and we are installing at Whyalla a plant of the grate-kiln type with a capacity of at least 1,500,000 tons per annum of pellets. The plant is of a very modern type designed by the firm of Allis Chalmers of the United States and we anticipate that it will be in operation during the second half of 1967. Initially it is proposed that this plant be fed by fine ores primarily from the Iron Prince and Iron Baron areas and these ores will be pelletized without any beneficiation treatment.

We do have in mind, however, that this plant could well be the initial stage in a project for upgrading the jaspilites or other low-grade ores of the Middleback Ranges. You will remember that we have done a good deal of pilot plant work in this direction and the overall process involves fine grinding, separation of the ore from the gangue and then agglomeration of the concentrates. We have no definite plans in this direction as yet, as firstly we wish to ensure the satisfactory operation of the pellet plant. But we are laying the pellet plant out in such a manner that ore concentrates from an upgrading plant can readily be introduced into the circuit. I trust that this information is suitable for your purpose, but please do not hesitate to get in touch with me again should there be anything more you should require.

TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was gratified when, at the beginning of the sitting today, the member for Mount Gambier presented a petition and moved that it be received and read. I think it contained about 4,000 signatures, many from the member's own electoral district. I noted, too, that, as it must to conform with Standing Orders, the petition contained a prayer that transport control be not reintroduced in this State, and the prayer indicated opposition to the present Bill on this matter. Does the member for Mount Gambier intend to take any action to support the prayer in this petition? If he does, what action does he intend to take?

Mr. BURDON: I ask the member for Mitcham to put the question on notice.

ASSURANCE INVESTMENTS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the investment made by the Mutual Life and Citizens' Assurance Company Limited in H. G. Palmer Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but as soon as I have one I shall inform the honourable member.

ADELAIDE POLICE COURT.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that some time ago complaints were made to the Attorney-General about conditions in No. 6 Courtroom at the Adelaide Police Court by justices visiting the court and those who operate in the court. A complaint was made to me today by a justice from my district who sat in this court recently; he said that the poor conditions still exist. As some action was to be taken by his department, can the Attorney-General say whether plans have been made to improve conditions at this court? If so, when is it expected that the work will be commenced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the time, I urgently requested action by the Public Buildings Department, but since then I have had to request urgent action from that department for a number of other court buildings, and this may have caused the delay. It seems that the Public Buildings Department is having to take urgent action to provide accommodation at the Supreme Court, following the passing of the Juries Act Amendment Bill, in time for the next arraignments. It is obvious that the Public Buildings Department is active elsewhere, but I shall consult my colleague to see whether something can be done quickly. We have a long-range plan with the Public Buildings Department for completely altering the main building at the Police Court to provide additional accommodation to be occupied by the Coroner's Court, the Licensing Court, and the Country and Suburban Courts Department magistrates.

MARISTOWE HOSPITAL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of November 2 about the Maristowe Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been supplied with the following report from the Director-General of Medical Services:

The Maristowe Private Hospital at Freeling is recognized by the Commonwealth Department of Health as an approved private nursing home. Inmates who are hospitalized receive a Commonwealth benefit of 20s. a day whether members of a hospital benefit fund or not. The funds do not pay any other fund benefit to inmates of nursing homes except in exceptional circumstances. The Maristowe Private Hospital does not come within the category of hospitals which could qualify to receive a State Government subsidy such as is paid to the country Government-subsidized hospitals. There are about 100 approved private nursing homes in the State and to grant any form of Government subsidy to one of this number would create a precedent which could involve the Government in a considerable expenditure.

NANGWARRY CLUB.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Forests has been approached by certain people at Nangwarry, and I also have been approached, about the possibility of a licensed club being set up in that town. There is a hotel at Kalangadoo, seven miles away, and another at Tarpeena, three miles to the south. As much unrest exists at Nangwarry regarding living conditions and amenities, the request for a licensed club in this town has been made to me. Can the Minister say whether his department has any plans in this regard?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I recently received a petition, through the Conservator of Forests, from the residents of Nangwarry, requesting that I introduce legislation to establish a licensed club there. Having taken the matter to Cabinet, I point out that it was decided not to introduce such legislation. I pointed out to the residents their rights under the local option poll system and said that, if a poll were conducted and a vote was recorded in favour of a licence, the people concerned could apply.

SOLDIER SETTLERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Repatriation a reply to my recent question concerning the living allowance paid to soldier settlers in my district, compared to that paid to soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received an interim report on the matter, which has not yet been finalized. When it has been, I shall bring a report down for the honourable member.

UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Education any further information in relation to the auditing of university accounts by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Since the Leader asked his question yesterday, I have had further discussions on the matter with the Vice-Chancellor of the university, and have taken the matter to Cabinet. The Vice-Chancellor has assured me that, in order to meet the convenience of members of this House and of another place, they will all be supplied with a copy of the university accounts every year. There seems to be no reason why this arrangement should not prove adequate. As I have already said, the university, at our request at any time, is prepared to ask its auditors to dissect, or give any further information on, its accounts. Cabinet has agreed that this arrangement should be adopted.

STURT GORGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From time to time, with predecessors of the Minister of Lands, I have raised the question of making the Sturt Gorge (which is the boundary between my district and that of the member for Onkaparinga) a public reserve, as it is a most attractive spot and not really useful for anything else below the dam that is being constructed. I did prevail on the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), when he was Minister of Lands, to look at the area. I asked the previous Minister to do the same thing earlier in the session, and he agreed. However, I did not press the matter because I knew how busy he was. Will the Minister of Lands visit the area with me one day with a view, I hope, to lending his support to the area's being made into a reserve?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Provided the honourable member assures me that he will not try to walk me off my feet (and I know that he has much ability in that regard), I shall be only too happy to accede to his request.

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SITTINGS.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the House to be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill.

A gentleman's agreement exists between members opposite and the Government to continue to sit while a conference between Houses is held provided that no vote is taken on any matter on the Notice Paper. This arrangement was carried out when the last conference took place and the agreement was honoured by all members.

Motion carried.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 3144.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Since I have been a member, I do not think any measure has given me greater personal satisfaction than has this Bill. One reason for that satisfaction is that I hope (and everybody responsible for the measure hopes) that the Bill will enable the citrus industry of South Australia to give the rewards to the producers which are justly their due, but which for a long time have been denied them. I realized, when I was Minister of Lands (and as the present Minister of Lands and the previous Minister of Lands realize) that there

was one factor in war service land settlement areas on the river, particularly in Loxton and Cooltong, which militated against those places ever being a success until we applied a remedy that would enable the citrus industry to be elevated to a position where an adequate return from the harvest of the fruit would accrue to the growers and lift the status of the industry and of the growers themselves. After much investigation and considerable thought I appointed a committee to investigate the problem, and I pay a personal tribute to that committee. Any member who reads the report on the file will realize that the committee gave unstinted attention to the job it had to do, and intelligence to the compiling of the report. The report can do nothing else but reflect great credit on those who compiled it.

The committee had 12 months in which to compile the report and in which to make the necessary investigations, as the ramifications of the industry extended all over Australia. The report that has emanated from the committee does credit to its members and they can be justifiably proud of it as I am proud of the confidence I had in them when I appointed them. The members of the committee were Mr. J. R. Dunsford, the Director of Lands (who was the Chairman of the committee), Mr. Miller, Chief Horticulturist of the Agriculture Department, and Messrs. Brown, Pettman and Katekar, who are growers. I mention their names individually because of the results accruing from their work. I particularly wish to thank Mr. Dunsford for his direction of the committee. I pay a tribute to the previous Minister of Lands (Hon. G. A. Bywaters), because he saw the necessity for this measure, took an unbounded interest in the subject and furthered the ideas we had had in mind. The report is of such importance to the irrigation areas of the State that it has some features that are unique in the writing of reports on such matters as this. It touches on so many families who can be lifted from a mere existence to a standard which they, when they undertook the work, could justifiably have expected to attain.

When this committee is established it will enable growers, and through the growers the whole of the river districts, to enjoy what was denied them during the time when the citrus industry was in a position where it was not returning, in some cases, even water rates for the people who produced the fruit. The Bill provides for a citrus industry organization committee that will consist of four grower members, two members of noted knowledge and ability in commerce and industry, and a chairman. The grower members will be elected by growers. In each case they will be nominated by 20 other growers and will then be elected under the usual conditions of a poll, and this poll will be taken by the State Electoral Office. Therefore, each grower who is nominated will have been supported by 20 growers, and this will clearly indicate that the man nominated has the confidence of a great body of growers. The 20 men who nominate a grower will each represent many other growers. We will then have the best men that are available amongst the growers. The Governor will appoint two men with knowledge of commerce and industry, as well as the chairman.

Time is the essence in this matter and it is absolutely essential that the organization begin operating before the forthcoming citrus harvest. In order to expedite the initiation of this measure the first grower members will not be elected, as provided in the Bill, but will be appointed, as will the other members of the committee. They will then be on the committee for two years. Provision is made for a poll to be taken at two-year intervals for the continuance of the committee. I hope it will never be necessary to take any such poll. Provision is made that if dissatisfaction exists then a poll can be instigated by a petition signed by 100 growers. Growers can also petition for a poll on whether the committee should continue to exist. The Opposition intends to move a small amendment to this clause to improve it and I shall say more about this at the appropriate time. The committee will have only one idea in mind and that will be to do the best for the industry because a failure by members of the committee would be a failure to themselves. As growers are members of the committee, one can hope for the best.

The other clauses of the Bill are the normal clauses usually included to establish committees. I do not think any honourable member will disagree with the main provisions of the Bill. In case it might be thought that the growers themselves have contributed wholly to the disaster that is overtaking this industry, I assure the House that that is not so. Although it must be recognized that in appointing men on land settlement areas like that great discretion is used and great care taken to select the right settlers, even amongst the best of the settlers there will inevitably be people who have had no experience, or very limited experience, in the production of fruit under

irrigation. Anybody who has had any experience of it must know that it is a highly specialized occupation, far more specialized and requiring far more application and thought than is generally realized by people who see the oranges growing on trees and who think that is the way they do it anyway and that no effort is needed other than to plant an orange tree and sit in the shade until it is time to harvest the fruit. It is a complex operation, more particularly so when semi-arid land is first brought under irrigation and planted with top cover such as fruit trees and vines to make a big demand upon soil conditions. Those trees were planted in ground that is practically sand, and the only other contents of the soil in the main were what was left in a wind-blown area after it had been worked over as wheat-production country in the Murray Mallee.

We can do many things with sand, sunlight and water, but we cannot continue to do it for very long until we improve the conditions under which those trees are growing. We have had a bit of a fall-down there, not necessarily through any fault of the settler, although in a few cases that has been so. There was also a lack of experience, probably, when spray irrigation and other things were first introduced in the irrigation areas. The committee, in full appreciation of things as it found them, gave the following factors as examples:

More important factors of concern, apart from individual management, are faulty irrigation design, insufficient pressure, incorrect sprinkler heads, and unevenness of water distribution, together with unbalanced or faulty manuring programmes. In some instances poor drainage has been a contributing factor.

Many of those things were beyond the control of the settler handling them. It shows that it is a very brave person indeed who essays to bring into production an area like that and says, "We will do this without any complications or any possible element of failure." That cannot be. It must be recognized that some mistakes have been made there. The growers have made some mistakes, and the engineering problems associated with irrigation and various other factors have had mistakes incorporated in them. Because of that we must look at this picture not in a sectional way but as an overall problem. The investigation into the citrus industry by the committee has shown the wide ramifications of these problems and what is necessary in order to alleviate the condition there. This Bill is designed for that express purpose. As I have said, I have great confidence in the people who investigated this matter and those who prepared the Bill, and I have great confidence regarding the application of this Bill to the problem in hand, for I consider that it will assist in the growth and marketing of citrus fruits. We may have to be cautious here, because we all know that we cannot aspire to immediate and complete perfection, but I think this measure will be the greatest contribution to stabilizing the industry that has yet been attempted. Because of that, I give it my full support, and I hope that this House will support it also.

I said earlier that I considered that part of the Bill needed to be amended. Although I am not allowed to discuss the amendment, I can say that it concerns the question of voting. The Bill refers to the necessity for two-thirds of the growers voting at a poll to be in favour, but of course there was no mention of the minimum number upon which the poll could be counted. I intend to move that 60 per cent be the majority required, provided that there is a 30 per cent poll. I think that is fair and reasonable, and I think the Minister might agree to it. Another amendment that I have provides that no-one with fewer than 50 trees will have a vote. I think that is necessary in order to ensure that a multiplicity of small growers whose trees are not a major portion of their livelihood shall not be enabled to endanger the security of the measure or the security of the committee.

Mr. Freebairn: They were a lot more generous than they were in the poultry game.

Mr. QUIRKE: Those engaged in horticulture would naturally be more generous than people raising poultry. The amendment would also prevent the possible aggregation of many small growers into one organization, and all that is involved there is deleting the word "growers" and inserting "persons". This relates to the people with fewer than 50 trees.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That would occupy about half an acre.

Mr. QUIRKE: With 50 trees on the river there would not be a large return, whereas at Mypolonga they could return considerable quantities of fruit. We want to be fair, but we do not want anything to endanger the successful working of this Bill. I commend the Bill to the House, and hope that it will enjoy a speedy passage so that there will be no hitch in its operating before the beginning of the next citrus harvest.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill and, like the member for Burra and the Minister, commend the members of the inquiry committee, who worked diligently for a

long period inquiring into all aspects of citrus growing and marketing. As a result of their report, this Bill has been introduced, and it will be welcomed and accepted by most citrus growers in the river districts. I am a commercial grower and my returns, like those of most others engaged in the industry, are not as good as they were a few years ago. The members of the committee are to be highly commended, as their work will be of immense benefit to the citrus industry.

The Federal Citrus Council some weeks ago issued a press statement indicating that it was working towards a plan for Commonwealth control of the citrus industry with the ultimate objective of obtaining a citrus stabilization plan on a Commonwealth-wide basis. I know that Ministers of Agriculture in other States have shown much interest in the inquiry and are anxiously awaiting this Bill. When they receive a copy of it, I trust they will introduce legislation in their Parliaments that will eventually lead to legislation being introduced by the Commonwealth Government. That will enable a stabilization plan on a Commonwealth-wide basis to be introduced, and that is the only way in which it can be worked. The member for Burra said that he intended to move an amendment on the unlikely eventuality of the discontinuance of this committee. I agree with the suggested amendment, the terms of which are similar to those is Acts passed during the last Parliament with respect to the control of oriental fruit moth, red scale, and San Jose scale. Proposals in the suggested amendment have been taken from those Acts.

I am pleased the Bill has been introduced and have no hesitation in commending it to the House. I join with the member for Burra and the Minister in hoping that it will receive a speedy passage in this Chamber and that another place will deal with it expeditiously. It is essential that it be passed during this current portion of the present session so that the committee can be established in time for the commencement of the next harvesting season, beginning with navel oranges in April and May. Once the committee has been established the benefits gained from its operations will be of ultimate benefit to all citrus growers.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I am at a disadvantage because I did not listen to the Minister's second reading explanation and was unable to receive a *Hansard* proof of it. The reasons for the introduction of this Bill have been obvious for a considerable time. It originated from a request that I received from the citrus organization to draft a Bill to set up a statutory body to control and market citrus in South Australia. I attended and addressed many meetings on the purposes of my Bill, the general principles of which met with almost unanimous approval at every meeting. The only queries raised by the drafting committee of the Murray Citrus Growers Association, which approved of the draft Bill, were on the setting up of a particular board. If we had been able to proceed with legislation then we would have had time, before the coming harvest, to set up a poll of growers (which was provided for in the Bill) and to appoint a committee of management or the directors of the board.

In the meantime, the Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee was set up to report to the Minister on what should be done to relieve the citrus industry of its many problems. It is now near the end of November and before the next harvest, particularly of navels, it will be necessary for statutory authority to be given to the committee quickly, otherwise there will be insufficient time for it to organize the necessary machinery to handle the coming crop. It is essential that this Bill be passed immediately. Many of its provisions are in line with my Bill, although some depart from it. The main purpose of the Bill is to appoint a Citrus Organization Committee, to be given the powers provided in the Bill. I notice that in some clauses the word used is "may", as in this clause relating to delegation. At first sight, I am not keen on the idea of Parliament setting up statutory control of a body and then that body transferring some of its powers to another body, a marketing authority. That is a bad principle in any marketing organization but in this case the industry would be at a disadvantage in that regard because we have an organization that has been conducting a voluntary scheme of marketing through the years, on the whole doing a moderately good job. There was criticism of the Murray Citrus Growers Association and the way in which it was handling some of its problems, but at least it is true to say that it did the marketing.

If this committee was set up in time to handle the coming crop, it would not have the necessary experience and knowledge of the previous authority to handle it. In accordance with the committee's report, what could happen is that the committee could arrange for a body to handle some parts of the marketing of the fruit because of its knowledge, that body to keep a watchful eye on the licensing power it

would have to secure from the Citrus Organization Committee, and then at any time the committee could make fresh arrangements. That seems to be the only way to get over this problem of urgency. When a marketing board is established to do the marketing, I should prefer not to set up a committee with powers of marketing and then have somebody else do the job. That is not a sound idea in any orderly marketing scheme but, because of the urgency here, I think that this is the best way of handling it. The Citrus Organization Committee, comprising these seven members with these powers, can make any alterations in the future, probably after 12 months or two years, after seeing how its licensing authority for marketing has been working.

I addressed many meetings on this, some of them in New South Wales (Gosford) and Victoria (Mildura), after receiving invitations from the citrus growers in those places to explain to them how to go about getting statutory control. I was astonished to learn that the growers in those States were, in the early stages of that series of meetings, a little more enthusiastic about getting statutory control than were some growers in South Australia but, as time went on and the position was explained to the growers, we got far more enthusiasm from growers in South Australia and practically unanimous support for the principle of setting up a State statutory authority in order to market citrus.

I hope this Bill will become a model for the other States. Although a poll was held a few months ago in New South Wales on whether the growers were in favour of setting up a statutory authority and the proposal was defeated, my information is that the growers there did not then understand the position clearly and many people who spoke advocating a "No" vote said, "We do not think a State statutory body is sufficient." In the Primary Producers Marketing Act in New South Wales there is a section enabling the Minister, after receiving a petition from a specified number of growers, to hold a referendum on whether the growers desire to set up this type of marketing or not. That meant that a State statutory body in New South Wales would have been set up if the poll had been carried. The people advocating a "No" vote argued that a State body was of no use to the industry. They adopted that attitude because they needed to get the industry on a proper basis. They needed a Commonwealth scheme for all the States to operate under a Commonwealth board. I agree with setting up a Commonwealth board, but the growers at that time turned it down on those arguments, although not by a big majority, many voting even in favour of a State board. So the question is, "Do we go about it in this way by getting statutory authority, first by establishing a State board within the State, or do we go about it by setting up one Commonwealth board without having a board within each State?"

In New South Wales if a poll was held, even now, with the idea of setting up a Commonwealth statutory body with stabilization provisions, it would be carried by an overwhelming majority. I think that is the only difference of opinion among the citrus growers in that State. In Victoria, judging by the meetings held at Mildura and other places close to Mildura, I am satisfied that a favourable vote would be taken on this question.

Mr. Quirke: This Bill will not militate against that?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No; I will come to that. In South Australia we find ourselves faced with a Bill that will set up a statutory authority within the State. Those growers in the other States have been anxiously awaiting the report of this Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee. They have taken no action about it but I believe this Bill will be used as a model for the other States to follow: first, to set up a State statutory authority within each State and then for the respective State bodies to approach the Commonwealth Government about setting up an overall Commonwealth body to control export and take any other steps necessary in regard to money that the industry may need from Commonwealth sources in regard to the export of oranges, and oversea prices. Therefore, this Bill can be commended as a first step towards alleviating the problems confronting the citrus industry, which has passed through a serious time.

The difficulties have arisen because, in the first place, as it was on a voluntary basis there was no statutory authority compelling the growers to deliver their fruit to the marketing authority. Consequently, any hawker who liked to come along with a truck and call in could pick up small parcels of fruit, run away with them and start selling that fruit in places like Murray Bridge and Balaklava; and the prices he charged for that fruit became the measuring stick for the prices of citrus throughout the State. Of course, they could not care less whether or not it was a payable price to the grower. Because of the increase in

acreage and the consequent increase in production, the voluntary marketing authority was not organized sufficiently to handle the increased production. Consequently, the price of citrus fell to disastrous levels. The growers found themselves in a serious position. Some soldier settlers at Loxton, Cooltong and other places could not meet their annual commitments to the Lands Department.

It can easily be understood why the enthusiasm among these settlers to have some statutory control has grown. There has been a large increase in acreage of citrus along the Murray River, particularly in my district, including Ramco Heights, Ramco Extension and Golden Heights. Have we reached the stage when we should limit the acreage of citrus? I do not think it wise to insert in a State Act power to a body or Minister to grant licences or to allow increased acreage.

This power should be inserted in a Commonwealth Act, to apply to all States. A Commonwealth authority should have power to obtain returns and statistics not only of acreages planted but also of production in the respective areas. If the power were inserted in State legislation, other States could say "South Australia is increasing its acreage and, although that is the State that should have the power to limit its acreage, it is not prepared to do it." The statutory authority could determine the availability of oversea markets to absorb increased production. There has been insufficient promotion of citrus in Australia, although I admit it is difficult for a voluntary marketing organization to promote sales. However, this should be one of the first jobs of the statutory authority. Sales of citrus (including fresh oranges and fruit juices) should be widely promoted.

The Berri fruit juice company has been doing a fair job in processing second-grade oranges into juices, but this has not solved the problem of getting the juices sufficiently attractive so that more can be sold. Orange juice is not sweet enough to be attractive, particularly to young people. We are constantly plagued by television advertisements telling us why we should drink Coca-Cola. The authority to be set up should accept the challenge, and tell the world why it should drink South Australian Sunkist orange juice. Those of us who have visited Northern Queensland have seen many of the shop windows displaying signs, "Drink pineapple juice", and the shops are laden with it. The committee will have to do this sort of thing to promote sales of juice. Promotion in Australia could result in increased sales overseas, as well. New Australians enjoy eating oranges, and the authority to be established could, through the Commonwealth Department of Trade and the trade commissioners in various oversea countries, promote sales of citrus fruit and juices. I am confident that, if that were done, many more sales would result.

California is at present preparing a new concentrate of juices which, I understand, is acceptable to many people. It is sweeter than our orange juice, and I expect that it will be only a matter of time before our own processing factories will be able to improve their product in this way. By sweetening the product and by making it more attractive, particularly to children, nobody can even guess what the increased consumption will be. The lack of statutory control and finance has certainly not led to greater consumption. The members of the Citrus Inquiry Committee, whom I know personally, deserve high commendation. The Chairman (Mr. Dunsford), of the Lands Department, has applied himself assiduously to his task, notwithstanding that he has been taxed with other duties. Mr. Miller was also an excellent type of officer for the inquiry. The grower representatives, Mr. Harry Katekar of Renmark, Mr. Max Pettman of Loxton, and Mr. Eric Brown, are well known to me and are growers of high-class citrus who conduct their orchards most efficiently.

At present Mr. Katekar is conducting an experiment into the drag-line spray system in an effort to improve the production of oranges in the upper river districts. It is believed that some growers in those districts are not using the present spray system properly and that that has some effect on production. Although I am not a horticultural expert or able to probe this question, I believe that the statutory authority, in conjunction with the Agriculture Department, will be able to investigate the types of manure and nitrogenous fertilizer to be applied at the right times. I have seen an orchard at Monath owned and controlled by a Mr. Valliaux, where a different system of dressing citrus trees (by the use of both nitrogenous fertilizer and spraying) has been used, with outstanding results. Officers of the Victorian Agriculture Department have probably noted this, and we may be able to see some improvement in the production of the soldier settlement scheme at Loxton and other places if we can secure the right officer to investigate this method. We may be able to ascertain, too, whether the contour flooding of trees has been beneficial.

It has long been recognized that the Murray Valley is the best area for citrus because the soil there is the Winkie type of red sand and it is adjacent to the Murray River. The most favourable producing area extended from Mildura to Waikerie. Renmark and Waikerie navel oranges were highly regarded on the markets in other States and became known as River oranges. Since those early days, the Murray Citrus Growers Association has adopted the name "Riverland" for oranges, and these oranges are having a favourable impact on markets in the Eastern States, particularly in Sydney and Melbourne, and as far away as New Zealand and Singapore.

This Bill provides that the board set up will have power to register a brand and grant a licence for it to be used for the marketing of citrus. I have advocated that we should sell our wines under one South Australian brand. We have seen that good results have been achieved by keeping the name "Riverland" before the public in other States.

Mr. Casey: Something like "Kangaroo" butter in London?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That may be. Does the honourable member mean Farmers Union butter? Another problem with which this industry is faced is the need to reduce its costs. Experiments have been conducted in the delivery of fruit in bulk containers from the orchards to the various packing sheds for processing. Whether the fruit, when processed, can be sold in bulk under statutory authority remains to be seen, but one of the big expenses facing growers is the cost of cases (they cost about 4s. each) for delivering the fruit to merchants. Naturally, the merchants demand the fruit in cases. It would be impossible to process the fruit without having a body with statutory authority, such as the proposed board, empowered to licence people to sell oranges in a certain way, and that power is given in the Bill.

A statutory authority set up under a State Bill could run into difficulty with section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Mildura is only 90 miles from Renmark by a good bitumen road, and merchants and others could cross the border, buy oranges in Renmark, Berri, or Loxton and take them back across the border. This legislation could not prevent that, because the merchants could invoke section 92.

However, there are ways of overcoming this difficulty, but one State alone cannot do it. It is necessary that New South Wales, Victoria and probably Queensland, band together with South Australia under one Commonwealth-controlled board. By virtue of complementary powers given by the respective States, such a Commonwealth board would be able to control the oranges in all the States concerned. The board could license merchants in Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, and the board would have effective power to cancel the licences of any merchants who purchased oranges not covered by the authority given. However, one State alone could not exercise the power, and the purpose of the measure would be defeated.

There is no power vested in a State Parliament or in the Commonwealth Parliament to enable this legal problem to be overcome in any way other than by the passing of complementary legislation, despite the fact that primary industries have given overwhelming approval for the setting up of their marketing boards. This lack of power in a Parliament is a serious state of affairs. The National Farmers Union of Australia has considered requesting the Commonwealth Government to submit a referendum to the people on whether they favour alterating section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution so as to provide that, where a poll of growers shows that a big majority desires to set up a marketing board for their commodity and a State Parliament approves of the setting up of such board, then the Commonwealth will be able to set up an authority such as the Australian Wheat Board, the sugar authority and, to a lesser extent, the Australian Barley Board, such board to be exempt from the effects of the provisions of section 92.

The suggestion was that this referendum could be held at the same time as the forthcoming referendum on the number of members of the Commonwealth Parliament. Unfortunately we have not obtained approval from the Commonwealth Government of this proposal. This matter may have to be considered in the near future, because it is the unquestionable desire of citrus growers to have a statutory board set up and the Government has placed this Bill before us, but the Bill cannot be completely effective because of the possible actions of litigious merchants and others who want to break down an orderly marketing scheme. Many people say that section 92 should not be varied, because to vary it would interfere with transport, trade and so on. However, the amendment to section 92 that I have suggested would have nothing whatever to do with transport but would remove the effect of section 92 only from the particular marketing authority that had been given approval by the growers and by the State Parliament

to operate. Any other matters of trade and commerce between the States would still come under section 92.

The committee set up to inquire into the industry spent a tremendous amount of time studying the various aspects of marketing. It travelled extensively, did its homework and studied the position in California, South Africa and other places. I pay a tribute to the committee for the work it did. Although I shall support the second reading of the Bill, I have not had much time to study the effect of its clauses, and a closer scrutiny may be needed in Committee. I agree with the Minister that the matter is urgent. I do not know whether the debate on the Bill will be adjourned and continued on Tuesday, with a late sitting to get it through. I am greatly interested in this matter because it affects my district and because I am also interested in marketing schemes. Therefore, I shall want to study the clauses closely in Committee. I am not particularly happy about one clause in the Bill that provides that there is power to revoke a licence issued by the committee set up by the Bill. Another provision is that if the licence is cancelled by the committee the matter can be taken to a court, which can either revoke the licence or allow it to continue. I do not like this type of provision. At the wish of the growers Parliament may, in its wisdom, set up a committee and provide it with statutory authority and charter to operate as a marketing organization. Experience has shown that if such an authority is set up it must be all-powerful in order to be efficient. It is no use providing half measures that permit some litigious individual, when the committee has cancelled his licence, to go to a court. No committee would cancel or suspend a licence if the individual concerned complied with the conditions it laid down. The licence would be suspended only if that person were not playing the game and not doing what, in the opinion of the committee, was right for the industry.

If a litigious individual went before a court, the court might give him back his licence. This would mean that he could practically put his fingers to his nose to the committee, and the committee could do nothing about it. For this reason, I want to study this clause. If Parliament gives powers to a committee it should not permit these powers to be broken down by litigious individuals. This can break down an orderly marketing scheme. For a marketing scheme to be efficient there must be complete power. For instance, trading across the Queensland border is taking place because of the drought in New South Wales. As a result of the fortuitous rains and early dry weather in the Darling Downs, a good quantity of wheat has been havested. Wheat with a 19 per cent protein content is being reaped, and this is valuable from a miller's point of view. Some millers are getting growers to sell wheat across the border and are paying 9s. to 9s. 6d. a bushel premium. It can be seen that this immediately breaks down the effectiveness of the marketing of the Australian Wheat Board.

Another instance has occurred at Lameroo and Pinnaroo where merchants have come across the border from Victoria and offered attractive prices for feed barley. Some growers are selling barley to them because of the good cash offer made and because they are not prepared to wait until they get a final realization from the Barley Board. Therefore, we should see that in this type of legislation not too many loopholes are left that enable litigious individuals to take away the efficiency of a board of this type and break down its marketing arrangements. Once a grower sells to a merchant others follow, and this grows like a snowball. Soon the stage is reached where the price received by those selling outside the board becomes the measuring stick, and this breaks down the price fixed by the board. This means small returns to growers. Growers then ask, "What is the good of the board anyhow?" They get sick of it. This can happen if too many loopholes are left in this type of legislation. I shall want to examine this clause closely in Committee to see its effect.

Other clauses will also have to be examined closely. We should make sure that we do not take away too many of the powers given to the committee by the Bill. If there is to be a committee, it should have all the powers necessary to make the marketing of the industry successful. Of course, I have not had time to compare the clauses of this Bill with those in the Bill I have on file. One complete difference has been brought about by the urgency of the matter. I had provided for the setting up of a committee, after a poll by the growers. However, there is not time to take a poll from growers to see whether they are in favour of a committee. Because of the lack of time, I am afraid this provision is not feasible. I am not sure whether the Bill provides, in accordance with the recommendations of the committee of inquiry, that a subsequent poll can be held. Clause 36 refers

to the winding up of the committee, and the members for Chaffey and Burra referred to the two-thirds majority. My Bill dealt with the question whether it was necessary to have the board wound up. Clause 36 is different from that and provides, in effect, for a continuance. Whether this clause relates to a recommendation of the Citrus Organization Committee about taking a subsequent poll, I have not yet had time to study. Clause 36, the marginal note of which is "polls on continuation of this Act", provides:

Subject to subsection (2) of this section, if at any time after the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, there is presented to the Minister a petition signed by not less than one hundred growers requesting that a poll of growers be taken on the question whether this Act shall continue in operation . . .

I do not know whether we need that clause at all. I would prefer it to be at a subsequent stage, because we have not the time to get this statutory board into operation for the coming harvest and there would not be time for a poll. A subsequent poll as to whether the growers approve of this type of marketing could be held. If that is what the Citrus Organization Committee means I think it is in conflict with clause 36.

I like the idea of a marketing scheme such as we are considering here under which growers can say whether they want it or not, but because of the time factor it is not possible to have a poll. However, in 12 to 15 months I should like a Bill to be introduced giving the Minister power to initiate a poll to see whether growers approved a scheme. Such a poll should be decided by a simple majority of the votes cast. In the dried fruits legislation introduced by the Commonwealth Government, when a poll of growers was taken over 60 per cent of the growers (not 60 per cent of the votes) had to be in favour. Because the required number of growers registered did not vote, the legislation did not come into force. Many growers did not vote, and their votes were recorded as "No" votes. We want to obviate such an occurrence in this legislation, and that is why this clause is unnecessary at this stage. It is certainly unnecessary to have a three-quarters majority as in the amendment suggested by the members for Burra and Chaffey. I question whether we need a clause such as this. I do not like the wording of this clause. The question that should be asked is whether the growers approve of the marketing authority.

Several other clauses I wish to inspect more closely but, generally speaking, the powers in these clauses seem to be satisfactory. Sufficient power must be given to enable a board to operate satisfactorily. Some of the clauses should be a little tighter, but we shall have the opportunity to make the board more efficient and to close any loopholes, such as those in relation to the Potato Marketing Board. In my opinion, we should have a look at that board in the near future to try to improve it. I did not like the set-up of the Potato Marketing Board when the Bill left this Parliament during the last Parliament and the board has run into difficulties simply because it is not operating properly and because it has not sufficient exclusive rights and powers. I know people say that the individual should have some private rights that should not be taken away lightly, but here we have a situation entirely different from the general set-up of open marketing. Where open marketing operates, everybody has rights under the common law and the law of the country, and these rights must be safeguarded. This situation is different where growers of a particular commodity want to set up a statutory marketing board. Having set up such a board, why should anybody else outside the board want break it down when it meets with the approval of the growers and of Parliament? Merchants, who are there only to make profits, should be curtailed. I am not condemning merchants, as they play an important part in marketing, and the system has worked well with the Australian Wheat Board. The merchants in that industry are licensed by the board; flour millers also are licensed, and that set-up works exceptionally well. Where people work well together, as do the flour millers and the Australian Wheat Board, there is no complaint.

Every opportunity should be taken by this new authority to see that the existing marketing channels here and in Melbourne are given every opportunity to continue their present marketing operations, because they provide a service to consumers. In other words, the board should not shut down existing marketing channels disposing of citrus. Having given these people the opportunity to co-operate with the board, if they try to break down the principles of orderly marketing we should not worry if the board cancels their licence, which it would not do lightly.

Generally speaking, this Bill meets the demand from the growers in the Upper Murray districts. I know it meets with the approval

of growers in other States and that they are anxiously looking forward to its passing. At a later stage no doubt the Minister, when he has seen how this grows in the Eastern States, will have to take up the matter with the Agricultural Council and try to get financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government to insert some stabilization provisions to give the industry security and prosperity in future.

This Bill is an important first step, but it does not completely answer the whole problem because a great quantity of South Australian oranges is exported. We must see that the return to the growers is sufficient to keep them in the industry and give them security and prosperity. At a later stage, after seeing what happens with the co-operation of other States, it must be taken a step further and a Commonwealth body must be set up for stabilization. We know it is beyond the powers of a State Government to provide financial assistance for exports. As honourable members know, export powers lie with the Commonwealth Government by virtue of the Commonwealth Constitution. Let us give this first step our blessing, and give the Minister the necessary powers to take this to the Agricultural Council to see that, as soon as possible, we get a Commonwealth stabilization board. That would go a long way towards providing the security and prosperity this industry needs.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. Generally speaking, over the years orderly marketing schemes have proved very successful. I do not think we could necessarily say the same about stabilization schemes, and perhaps the member for Ridley and I could get into a long argument over that. However, perhaps this is not the time to argue that point. This Bill provides for an orderly marketing scheme, and I think that is most necessary in the industry. When we look at the fine report brought down by the committee, and when we consider the numbers of trees that have been planted and the possible extra production over the next 10 years (judging on the experiences of last year), we see that an orderly marketing scheme is essential. I have always believed that we should have a poll before a board is set up. However, I think that in the circumstances as explained by the Minister we can accept the fact that there is urgency in this matter. Therefore, I consider that the House should accept what is provided in this Bill in this respect.

When I was in the River districts last year I was shown some returns indicating that practically nothing was received for a consignment of oranges. However, I think that in every instance in which I was shown returns it was demonstrated that in the grading of the oranges a certain percentage was rejected as being unsatisfactory to the trade, and this indicated to me that either the grower was sending in unsatisfactory fruit or that the various wholesale or retail organizations were rejecting good fruit. I think somebody was definitely at fault when there was so much waste and so much was deducted as charges. In some instances, eight cases were sent in and only two or three were sold, yet the growers still had to pay the grading charges on the rejected fruit, and that is what made these instances look much worse than they were. I think that with an orderly marketing scheme this position will be improved.

I consider that with marketing boards it is a good thing to have frequent elections of members. In this case, the term is for only two years, with one member retiring every year, and I think that is a good idea. We have found with the Potato Board that some growers have been dissatisfied, and it takes a long time to effect changes in the board's personnel. The member for Ridley suggested that perhaps a poll should be held within a short time to make up for the fact that one is not being held now. However, I think the provision in this Bill covers the position admirably. Even though a marketing board restricts the liberty of the individual to a large extent, I agree that it must be given very strong powers so that there can be no loopholes. If the majority are in favour of it, I think everybody in the industry should accept that principle.

As has been mentioned here, the Potato Board has proved to be unsatisfactory. I have attended a number of the board's meetings over the last year when potatoes have been bringing an all-time record price, yet there have been 60 to 100 growers at the meetings complaining about the operations of the board. If anybody knows the way in which primary producers attend meetings, they will realize that if the producers are discontented when prices are high they must definitely be most dissatisfied with the way the board is handling things. The board must show discretion in the exercise of its powers. I think the main trouble with the Potato Board is that it gives a monopoly to its agent, and a monopoly of wholesalers getting together is not

good. The board refused to grant a merchant's licence to a grower co-operative because it had a washing licence, and that is very bad. I have spoken in this place about the issuing of receipts. I maintain that when we do something that merely creates additional work, without any attendant advantages, it is a bad thing for the community. It is not a good thing to create an additional point at which a particular commodity has to be handled, for this only causes more work and adds to the cost.

Perhaps the Potato Board could use the present legislation as a model. Nobody has been mentioned as the chairman of the board. With some boards, elderly men who have retired from one job have been given the job of chairman. However, I think such a position requires more drive and initiative and particular knowledge than such people sometimes have. I think often a younger person with drive and initiative is required. I am also strongly opposed to departmental officers ocupying these positions. Those people are trained for their own jobs. They may be, say, agricultural experts, but they do not necessarily have any knowledge of marketing or administration. I think such a position requires more than just a part-time appointment. I recall once being told that the chairman of a particular board was not available, that he was away on a job until the following week, yet a day or two afterwards I heard that that particular board had made a decision correcting the anomaly about which I had complained. At another meeting I attended, the chairman of that particular board showed in answers to questions that he did not have the full knowledge of that industry.

This is a well set-out Bill, but I have pointed out some weaknesses that may occur with marketing boards. This is a Bill that I support, although perhaps it can be improved by a few minor amendments. I do not speak against legislation unless I think I should, and I have been eloquent this last week because much bad legislation has been introduced, but I support the intention of this legislation.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I appreciate the way members have addressed themselves to this debate, as all have supported the Bill. It merits their support. It has been eagerly awaited by the industry, and I know that it will be accepted by the industry generally. I hope it will pass both Houses before Parliament adjourns next Thursday, and I am sorry it has not passed through this House today so that it could have gone immediately to the other place.

References have been made to the Citrus Organization Committee: I point out that this is not a board. The member for Ridley thought that we should not take away powers by allowing the court to upset a decision of the committee. I realize this is difficult, but if this provision was not made we would have been criticized for being undemocratic, as the right of appeal is included in most other marketing Acts.

I appreciate the references to orange juice because I am a large consumer of it: I have about two pints a day, and it is a drink that should be used by more people. It is recognized as containing vitamin C and is sometimes called "bottled sunshine". Most members drink it because they realize its value. Orange juice has a great future as a drink.

I appreciate that the Bill has been accepted completely by the Opposition. Although the Citrus Organization Committee will be a State statutory body, the ultimate aim is to set up a Commonwealth statutory body. Recently I met Ministers of Agriculture from the other States and spoke to them about the report of the Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee. All of them told me that they would like a copy of this report when it was available because they were interested in it. They said they would eagerly await the report so that they could read it, and I will send each of them a copy immediately. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COUNTRY FACTORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to bring the provisions of the Country Factories Act into line with those of Part V of the Industrial Code, as amended in 1963. While the provisions of the Industrial Code relating to industrial arbitration operate throughout the State, the provisions governing working conditions in factories (Part V) apply only in the metropolitan area; working conditions in factories in country districts (including cities such as Elizabeth, Whyalla, Port Pirie and Mount Gambier) are governed by the Country Factories Act. This Act was first introduced into Parliament in 1945. When introducing the Bill, the then Minister of Industry and Employment said:

Part V of the Industrial Code provides for the regulation of conditions in factories in the metropolitan area. The legislation lays down rules to be followed as regards the ventilation and sanitation of factories and contains a considerable number of provisions requiring moving machinery to be fenced or otherwise guarded so as to minimize the danger of accidents to employees. The purpose of this Bill is to make similar provision for country factories and to secure that, in general, the same conditions will apply in factory areas in the country as apply in the metropolitan area.

At that time there were 272 factories in the nine country districts to which the Act was applied and in those factories about 6,500 persons were employed. Now, there are 980 factories in the country districts to which the Country Factories Act applies, in which a total of almost 22,000 persons is employed.

The many amendments made to the Industrial Code in 1963 followed lengthy conferences that had taken place between the Secretary for Labour and Industry and representatives of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, the Employers Federation of South Australia, and the United Trades and Labour Council of South Australia. After the Industrial Code Amendment Bill had been introduced into Parliament in 1963, the Secretary for Labour and Industry discussed with the secretaries of the three organizations I have just mentioned the desirability of making similar amendments to the Country Factories Act. Again, it was agreed that the existing provisions in the Country Factories Act should be brought into line with the Industrial Code. Early in 1964 the Secretaries of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, the Employers Federation of South Australia and the United Trades and Labour Council of South Australia advised that the present Bill, as now drafted, was satisfactory to them. With one exception, to which I shall refer later, the Bill simply brings the statutory requirements concerning matters now dealt with by the Country Factories Act into line with the corresponding provisions of the Industrial Code as amended in 1963 and which apply in all factories in the metropolitan area.

The Government considers that there is a number of provisions in this Act, and in Part V of the Industrial Code relating to working conditions in factories, which should be amended, and that additional matters should be included in this Act in order to give greater legislative protection to employees. It has been decided, however, not to introduce such legislation during this session but to introduce the present Bill as an interim measure. The aim of the Bill is simply to give effect to an agreement made nearly two years ago between the two major organizations of employers in this State, and the United Trades and Labour Council of South Australia, so that the present unsatisfactory position of having different laws applying in country factories from those that have applied in metropolitan factories since January 1, 1964, may be remedied. Broadly, the definition of a factory is a place where one or more persons are employed in the making, altering, repairing, ornamenting, finishing or adapting for sale of any article. The Act does not apply to any place where the owner is the only person engaged; there must be someone employed by the owner or occupier before it is a factory within the meaning of the Act.

Clause 2 provides that it shall commence on a date to be proclaimed, and clause 5 makes alterations to five definitions, four of them being identical with the new definitions adopted last year in the Industrial Code. The fifth alteration concerns the exclusion of agricultural premises from the definition of a factory, and this is the one exception to which I have referred. The present definition expressly excludes any premises occupied by a farmer, pastoralist, viticulturist, dairy farmer, horticulturist, poultry farmer or apiarist if they are used solely for the purpose of the occupier as a farmer, etc. This means that, if any work is carried on on a farm which is not for the purpose of the occupier as a farmer and which would otherwise come within the definition of a factory, the farm must be regarded as a factory. Thus, if a person were employed using a power-operated sawbench for the purpose of cutting firewood, for sale even for a short time, the farm would be a factory within the meaning of the Act. The amendment made by clause 5 (*d*) alters the definition by removing the word "solely" in the exclusion provisions and substituting the word "principally", and is designed to give effect to the original intention.

Clause 6 is consequential upon an amendment made in clause 7 of the Bill. The latter clause amends the provisions relating to the registration of a factory. Instead of the present requirement that a factory occupier must register within 21 days after occupying a factory, the application for registration will, by section 5 (7), be required before he goes into occupation. Before registration, the factory will be inspected and a provisonal permit will be issued to a new factory pending registration. The registration of factories will be

renewed annually (subsection (2)), but separate registrations will not be required for factories and shops carried on in the same building if the shop is registered for the purposes of the Early Closing Act. These amendments are identical with those made to the Industrial Code in 1963. Clauses 8 and 9 of the Bill make consequential amendments. Clauses 10, 11, 12, 13 and 16 are amendments of terminology, corresponding to those made to comparable sections of the Industrial Code. The effect of clauses 14 and 15 is to repeal the existing requirements concerning the reporting of accidents and to provide new requirements for the keeping of records of accidents for factory occupiers and the sending of notices concerning them, bringing them into line, not only with the provisions of the amended Industrial Code but also with those of the Scaffolding Inspection Act. The amendments will remove much of the confusion that has existed in the past because of different provisions under different Acts relating to the same subject matter.

Clauses 17 and 18, which respectively require factory occupiers to keep appliances for the prevention and extinction of fire and to provide sufficient and suitable sanitary conveniences, amend sections 22 and 25 of the Act along lines similar to the amendments made to the Industrial Code. The amended sections will empower the making of regulations in respect of these matters of detail that can more appropriately be prescribed by regulation. Clauses 19, 20 and 21 make alterations in respect of the powers of inspectors at present contained in sections 26, 30 and 31, and insert a new section so that the powers of inspectors, not only to make inspection but also to issue notices when defects are found, will be identical with those under the amended Industrial Code. Clause 22 provides for an alteration in the penalties in a number of sections to bring them into line with penalties in respect of similar matters under the Industrial Code.

I emphasize that, in accordance with a promise made in the policy speech of the Premier, the Government is considering various matters associated with safety in industry, including the desirability of making other amendments to the Country Factories Act, including additional provisions. These amendments will not be presented to Parliament in this session, and some of them may not be as straightforward as those contained in this Bill, which contains nothing of a controversial nature. As I have stated earlier, the Bill brings the provisions of the Country factories Act into line with similar laws passed by this Parliament in 1963 in respect of factories in the metropolitan area; and it has been agreed to by the major employer and union organizations in the State.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 3131.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): The main provision in this short Bill is to bring the South Australian Act more into line with the provisions extant in other parts of Australia. The important feature of the Bill is that, while its provides for increased benefits, it also provides for a fairly substantial increase in contributions, which is a pre-requisite to the additional benefit. I think one can find little fault with that principle. I have always held the view that, in respect of any superannuation scheme, it is proper that, if the contributor desires to increase his scale of benefits, he should also be prepared to increase the scale of contributions. From time to time these matters are reviewed in the Parliaments of the various States (and, I have no doubt, in other Parliaments as well), according to increased costs and improved standards of living. That is right and proper. This matter has not been reviewed in Parliament for some years; the Bill institutes a review and provides for some alterations. It provides for a 14 per cent increase in contributions and increases in benefits, rising from 12 per cent after nine years to 20 or 21 per cent after 18 years' service. Prior to the introduction of legislation to give effect to any changes of this kind, the proposals are actuarily considered by Treasury officers to see that the contributions match the benefits (and *vice versa*), that the demands made on the Treasury, as a result of any changes, are completely investigated, and that the interests of the general taxpayer are preserved. Members of Parliament in South Australia are conscious of their obligations to the general taxpayer, and have not in the past (nor do they intend at this time) reached out for benefits out of line with those generally afforded to members of Parliament, according to the responsibilities of their office. The present law provides that after nine years' completed service a member is entitled if defeated either at preselection or at a general election,

to a pension of £720 a year, which increases by £60 a year up to 18 years of completed service.

The new provision is that he will receive £728 after eight years' completed service, rising to £806 for nine years, and continuing by annual increments of £78 as far as 18 years' completed service. At 18 years' completed service the old provision was that, for each three-year period completed, a member would receive an increase of £60, which has now been altered to provide that, after 18 years' service, he will receive an increase for each completed year (and not each completed three years). A person who may have to retire for health reasons after 19 years of service is at present penalized, for he does not receive any benefit for that additional year. As the normal term of Parliament is for three years, a member elected between general elections may have served 2½ years beyond the 18 years and, under the present provision, would not be eligible for an additional benefit.

I do not suggest that we should make the increase in allowance available for portion of a year (months or days), but I think that to make the Act applicable to each completed year of service is a fair and proper provision. A member pays his contribution every month and, even under the new provision, he may have paid his contribution to the fund for 11 months and still not receive the benefit because the year is not completed. He will, under the new provision, receive £26 for the nineteenth year and another £26 for the twentieth year. They are the main provisions affecting members.

Under the new provisions, a member may retire voluntarily after 15 years of service, whereas the old provisions required him to serve for 18 years before retiring voluntarily. It has been my view for a long time that to require a member to complete 18 years before he can elect to retire is too long. It may tend to encourage a member to attempt to continue his service even though he may think that he should not be doing the job; in other words, it places an obligation on a member to continue when he may not be able to render to his constituents that service that he would desire to give.

Mr. Lawn: Generally speaking, members do not come into this House until they are getting up in years and, under the old provision, they have been required to serve for 18 years before they could retire.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The retiring age previously provided was 65 years, whereas this Bill makes it 60 years, and that variation is consistent with the other provision reducing the period that a member must serve before he can retire voluntarily from 18 years to 15 years. There is a clamour that the period of occupancy of executive positions in industry and elsewhere be reduced to the active life span of younger men. Any member who has given conscientious services to a State for 15 years is entitled to be allowed to elect to retire, particularly as members of Parliament are subject to occupational hazards that other types of persons are not faced with. Every member of Parliament is likely to be rejected by the electors at any election.

Mr. Lawn: That is right.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Therefore, a member is not secure in his work. He is subject to the goodwill of the electors and the view they take of the policy of his Party. He has not the security of a person employed, say, in the Public Service, or of a self-employed person. Regard should be had to all these matters. Despite that, the general provisions of the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund are much in line with the Public Service Superannuation Fund so far as the liability of the general taxpayers to subsidize is concerned. The Public Service Superannuation Act requires a contributor to pay something like an average of about 30 per cent of the funds required to maintain the fund in an actuarially sound position, and the State contributes 70 per cent. Those are about the amounts required to be paid under this Bill and so, in spite of the occupational hazards of a Parliamentarian, he does not draw on the taxpayer to a greater extent than does any public servant of the State.

Mr. Lawn: Hear, hear! That is correct.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In addition to that, whereas under the previous provision a contributor could elect to contribute at varying rates for varying benefits, this Bill requires that every new member will be required to contribute at the maximum rate. Of course, he will not automatically qualify for the maximum rate.

Mr. Lawn: That will make administration of the fund simpler and easier.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is so. I think that almost all present members have elected to contribute at the maximum rate. The new Act will require that contributions be at that rate, and the provision is reasonable. I think that this proposal commends itself to members. It has been considered by both sides of the House privately in discussions by

the Parties, and members agree that it is what they desire. I also think the proposal will commend itself to the general public. After all, we are somewhat jealous of our reputation in the eyes of the general public and, for the reasons I have given, I think the provisions are reasonable from the point of view of the taxpayers and that they are acceptable to members. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACTS REPUBLICATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 3133.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have not even looked at the measure. In any case, this is the Attorney-General's Bill, and I would prefer that he be here, as the Minister in charge, when I debate it.

Mr. Jennings: We made an arrangement that we would not take any votes while the conference was on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is news to me, and I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2742.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): This Bill deals, first, with the provisions in the principal Act regarding Aborigines and, secondly, with increases in certain fees. The provision in the old Act, which entitled every full-blood Aboriginal to keep two unregistered dogs, has now become obsolete. I agree with the principle that, as far as it is possible, Aborigines should be brought into line and should have the same responsibilities, rights, privileges and obligations as other citizens in the community. I agree that, as far as it is humanly possible to bring Aborigines into line, this should be done. Therefore, I see not reason why this Act should not also be brought into line.

Clause 3 provides that, after June 30 next year, the dogs kept by full-blood Aborigines will require registration. As I am sure you know, Mr. Speaker, and as many other members know, the problem of roving dogs in areas where stock is raised is serious. It is true that many Aborigines reside in and around townships that are contiguous to pastoral properties. It is extremely difficult to control dogs at night, and it is true that in some cases dogs owned by Aborigines are responsible for damage. I hasten to say that much blame is sometimes attached to Aborigines that is not properly placed upon them in relation to this matter. All country people know that the most innocent looking dog by day can become a real killer at night. Many people who own dogs never suspect them of becoming dangerous and get the shock of their lives to find one morning that their dog has been abroad that night and has been responsible for killing many sheep. The only remedy in such a case is to destroy the dog because once he goes out at night in company with other dogs and hunts sheep there is no cure.

It is completely unfair to say that by and large Aborigines are the only people who own dogs that cause this sort of trouble. Those of us who are familiar with the living conditions of Aborigines realize that they keep far more dogs than they need and far more than they can possibly maintain. Every now and then police officers have the unenviable job of going to the places where Aborigines congregate and of destroying many dogs. To a certain extent the Bill will stop Aborigines from keeping, in their communities, a number of dogs. I believe it will do some good in that respect. Clause 5 increases the fee payable by an owner of a stray dog, when he collects the dog, from 5s. to 10s. for the first period of 24 hours after seizure and, for subsequent periods of 24 hours, from 1s. to 3s. I do not mind people having dogs and I applaud them for it provided they look after them. Dogs that roam the streets or the countryside are a menace. The fees could be even higher than they are. I do not quibble with the proposed increases and I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the second reading. In general I agree with the principle of the Bill although I wonder how many dogs will be running around the Musgrave Ranges and places like that with registration discs on. There seems to be no room for dissent with the principle of extending privileges to Aborigines. I do not see anything wrong in the change of fees for reclaiming stray dogs. The only point I make is that registration of dogs is one of the few annual payments one makes during the year for which no account is rendered. In almost every other case, where one has to make an annual payment, there is some arrangement whereby an account is posted. This happens with motor vehicle registrations, broadcast listeners' licences and nearly everything else I can think of, but in this one

isolated case this provision does not apply. There may be a few other instances, such as in the licensing of a bull, when no account is sent. With the registration of dogs many people are late in paying the fee. I can see no objection whatever in paying a penalty if one is late with the fee. However, I think it is reasonable that people, who like to have some sort of system, should be sent an account.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Aren't they informed by a notice in the newspaper?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Sometimes they are, but most people do not read the part of the newspaper where this notice is made. It seems to me reasonable that an account should be provided if one is prepared to pay the extra cost of it. Consequently, I will move an amendment to provide for accounts to be sent to people who wish to receive them. It will provide that if a person chooses to have an account sent he will pay an extra 2s. 6d. at the time he registers his dog. I should not think there would be any objection to this and I hope it will be accepted. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I have listened to what has been said by both honourable members who supported the Bill. As they said, it is a simple matter and there is no doubt that the changes made are desirable. One change is in line with the present-day view of Aborigines being brought into line with the rest of the community. With regard to registration of dogs it is desirable that from June 30, 1966, dogs owned by Aborigines should be registered. The increases in the fees, I believe, are quite reasonable, as there has been an appreciable change in the value of money since they were originally fixed. There is no doubt that councils in particular have had much difficulty over the late registration of dogs and much trouble following the seizure of stray dogs. Therefore, I am sure these increases are justified. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2742.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I support the Bill and have little to say on it except that, in my opinion (and perhaps I am biased), it does not go far enough. Alsatian dogs, intelligent good-looking animals as they are, are somewhat out of place in a predominantly pastoral context. However, that is a personal view and perhaps I am wrong. Alsatians, and the many crosses of the breed, seem to be coming into their own because of their intelligence. In any case, it is idle talking about abolishing the breed because too many people are interested in them and regard them highly. I have no quarrel with the proposal contained in this Bill, and I support it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I am glad that this Bill is being supported. It is a simple measure to increase the registration fee if it is not paid within 21 days of the due date of registration. Although the honourable member said he might be a little biased in this regard, I think he probably has justification for his attitude. I know that the place of Alsatian dogs in the pastoral industry is debatable and has raised controversy. Therefore, I appreciate the feelings of pastoralists toward this type of dog if it gets away from the leash. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2742.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): This Bill is in a rather different category from the two just considered, but again it is not one that I criticize. Its object is to provide a service to the Elizabeth area and to enable the Municipal Tramways Trust to license operators in that area. The operations of the Trust, as all members know, are prescribed under the Act and for many years have been confined to the metropolitan area. It has been entitled either to operate in that area or to license operators to operate on its behalf.

This Bill does not presuppose that the trust will operate in these new areas now, but it does bring those areas within the control of the trust and the trust will therefore be responsible for the type of service operating there. Previously the service has operated under licence from the municipal bodies concerned, but with the rapid growth of buildings and housing developments in those areas it is not unreasonable that the trust should now be given the right to operate there and to integrate the services of that area with its own metropolitan services.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: There have been requests for it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, there have been many requests. Possibly the main justification for granting the requests is the development of Elizabeth east of the Main North Road. When the town of Elizabeth was mostly confined to the western side between the main road and the railway line, it was near the railway line and had reasonable access to it. With the growth on the eastern side, which has been phenomenal, the people there have become remote from any contact with suburban transport. I say "suburban" in the broad sense, since the Railways Commissioner runs frequent services from Adelaide to Gawler, which is in the nature of a metropolitan service. However, the people on the eastern side are remote from this convenience and with the growth in that area the time has come when this request should be granted. The Bill achieves this by removing the limit in the amount of fares that may be charged by private operators without their coming under the control of the trust. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Continued from November 24. Page 3128.)

The managers having proceeded to the conference at 3.15 p.m. they returned at 5.40 p.m. The recommendation was as follows:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its suggested amendment and that the House of Assembly amend the Bill accordingly.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the recommendation of the conference be agreed to.

We were unable to obtain any assistance from the Legislative Council on the vital issues. The Legislative Council suggested that a Bill be introduced next financial year to provide for new rates of land tax with the proviso that it operate for not more than five years. We pointed out that the Legislative Council itself should not at any time introduce any amendment concerning an annual revision of land tax. As this House has given way to the Legislative Council on its amendment, we will still obtain the revenue we desire for 1966, but we will have to introduce a new Bill next year. This is legislation which I would hate to introduce every 12 months, and it is to be hoped that that will not be necessary, although, of course, if at any time the Government finds it imperative to collect extra revenue and it cannot get the revenue any other way it will have to do so. The point was made that this Bill should have been introduced earlier. However, my reply was that the House of Assembly was a House of free speech, that the time for free speech had been used to the fullest advantage, and that I had never desired at any stage to short-circuit any speeches. We suggested that there should not be an annual review of this matter but no agreement could be reached, so we did not agree to the other proposals. We consider that, as a result of the conference, the House of Assembly has conceded enough.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 30, at 2 p.m.