

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 6, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

CHANDLER HILL TO HEATHFIELD
MAIN.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister of Works told me a few months ago that the new main leading from the Chandler Hill tank through to Cherry Gardens and Heathfield to augment the Stirling and Crafers water supply could be completed by the coming summer. As I noted recently that this work was proceeding, can the Minister say whether the programme will be definitely completed by the summer months?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I understand that the department intends to have the service completed and functioning for the summer, I shall call for a report and notify the honourable member when it is to hand.

MEAT PRICES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about meat prices?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Nelsons and Producers Meat Markets (South Australia) Ltd. sell carcasses of meat by auction. Sales of beef and veal by this company are only a small proportion of total sales. Prices, excluding delivery to retailers, are usually below the ruling wholesale levels. The beef quotations referred to are for carcass weights, 63 per cent of which yield saleable cuts. The estimated sales return from this 63 per cent would average:

4½	per cent at retail prices exceeding 70c a pound.
17½	per cent at retail prices exceeding 60c a pound.
31	per cent at retail prices exceeding 50c a pound.
10	per cent at retail prices exceeding 40c a pound.
63	per cent.

A recent survey revealed an average margin on beef of about 8c a pound which, although fairly high, is not considered to be excessive. Regular surveys in the metropolitan area show that prices have remained relatively stable for several months. As regards veal, a little over 50 per cent of the carcass weight yields saleable cuts. Present prices vary from about 40c to 45c for stewing veal to an average of 80c to 85c for veal cutlets. One butcher who

bought manufacturing beef at 13c a pound and veal at 18c a pound has reported that the beef yielded 50 per cent meat and was mostly used for making mince meat that retailed at 28c a pound, with a small quantity being sold as steak and kidney at 39c a pound. The veal provided a limited quantity of usable meat that was used to make fritz.

HIGHWAYS REPORT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wanted to ask a question of the member for Unley but as he is not here I will direct the question to the member for Chaffey. I read with interest a letter in this morning's paper (to which the member for Chaffey was a signatory) complaining about the presentation of extracts from the Highways Commissioner's report in yesterday's *Advertiser*. The honourable member said in his letter (*inter alia*):

By quoting passages out of context the impression was given that expenditure on roads and bridges was subjected to savage cuts for this financial year.

Since the Highways Commissioner's report became available to me immediately after Question Time yesterday (the member for Glenelg kept it until Question Time was over), I have read it with great attention and, for the life of me, I cannot see where any statements in yesterday's paper were taken out of context.

Mr. Ryan: Question! No second reading speeches!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the member for Chaffey, as a signatory to the letter, say what passages in particular he complains of as having been taken out of context?

Mr. CURREN: I request the honourable member to put his question on notice so that I can give a considered reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises from an answer given yesterday regarding the report of the Highways Commissioner. The Premier said that the report in yesterday morning's *Advertiser* quoted out of context part of the Highways Commissioner's report, and that it made much different reading from the contents of the Commissioner's report. Because the report was not available to me until after Question Time yesterday, I could not see what the Premier was driving at. I have now looked at the report and I cannot understand what was taken out of context yesterday morning by the *Advertiser*. I ask the Premier to elucidate, for the benefit of members, what was taken out of context.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not responsible for the member's understanding of the position. I have nothing further to add.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns one comment in the Highways Commissioner's report, which was tabled yesterday but which, unfortunately, was not available to me until Question Time had concluded yesterday.

Mr. Hudson: Question!

Mr. Heaslip: Play fair!

The SPEAKER: "Question" having been called, the honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently I pricked the honourable member.

Mr. Quirke: This is a fool's game, and two can play it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the House to order so the honourable member can ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of the comment made by the Highways Commissioner that the shortage of staff is general throughout the Commonwealth, but that the problem appears to be worse in this State than anywhere else, what action does the Government or the Minister of Roads intend to take with regard to staff shortages in the Highways Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to convey that question to the Minister of Roads. This problem has existed for some time in this department and, whilst I was acting Minister of Roads during the absence of the Minister overseas, it was brought to my attention. I think the honourable member would realize the difficulties associated with this question; it is not an easy one to answer. I understand consideration has been given to this matter for some time, but I do not know whether any solution or finality has been reached. I am sure my colleague will be pleased to convey what he can to the honourable member.

SHARKS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I recently referred to the Minister of Agriculture a report that a professional fisherman at West Beach had been netting many sharks off suburban beaches. Since then, on inquiring, I have found that professional fishermen in the West Beach area claim that if they had sufficient nets available they would be able to keep the waters off suburban beaches free of sharks during the summer. Many hundreds of sharks have hitherto been caught with a reasonably small net and, although it is true that some of these are not considered man-eating sharks, nevertheless any

sharks near swimmers at suburban beaches cause the swimmers to leave the water. I have been told that Governments and local councils in other States provide a subsidy to fishermen for nets of this type. As it has been estimated that for a cost of about \$4,000 all metropolitan beaches could be serviced, will the Minister of Agriculture investigate the matter and consider assisting fishermen prepared to undertake this job?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the matter raised by the honourable member is interesting, I promise him that I will fully consider it. After discussing it with the Acting Director and Chief Inspector of Fisheries, I will take it to Cabinet to see what can be done.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When considering this matter, will the Minister be guided by a reluctance to put into operation any form of netting that will involve the wanton slaughter of large numbers of small and harmless sharks and other fish?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Certainly, all these matters will be considered. Of course, we do not want to do anything that would jeopardize the fishing industry.

SITTINGS.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Premier say when the House will rise, bearing in mind the fact that members are usually heavily committed towards the end of the year. Further, does the Government intend to follow last year's precedent and continue this session into the new year? If it does, for how long is the session likely to continue?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A motion to be moved provides that after next Wednesday Government business will take precedence of private members' business. It is intended to adjourn on November 17, to resume on February 28, and to adjourn again not later than March 23, 1967.

ADELAIDE OVAL.

Mr. LAWN: Following a test cricket match and a letter in the press concerning the sale, at the Adelaide Oval, of food and drinks in February this year, I asked a question in this House. Since then, I understand that the South Australian Cricket Association has made considerable improvements in the facilities for the sale of these items, as well as other improvements. Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say what improvements have recently been made by the association at the Adelaide Oval?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall inquire of my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

WHEAT HARVEST.

Mr. RODDA: We have experienced a mixed bag as far as misfortunes in the wheat season are concerned, but most of the State is enjoying a reasonable season. Of course, there is an old saying that when the heavens burst forth the corn doth fill, and we hope this is happening. Some good judges are making all sorts of wild guesses as to the results of the season. I know that the officers of the Agriculture Department have plenty of facts at their fingertips. As I have an interest in my district in respect of the results of the harvest, will the Minister of Agriculture indicate the estimated wheat harvest for this season?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I know that much is at stake as a result of my answer, as people throughout the State are interested in what the harvest will be. The honourable member, with his flowery language, reminded me that the rain falls on the just and the unjust as well. However, there have been worries this year, although recent rains have benefited the State, particularly Eyre Peninsula where the crop is expected to be about 40 per cent of South Australia's total crop. This is good news, because much new country has been opened up in the upper part of the peninsula. At this time of the year many forecasts (some of them wild) are given, but I would not be game enough, with my limited knowledge, to forecast, because so many things may happen between now and the completion of the harvest. Mr. Pearson (Chief Agronomist) has been remarkably accurate in his forecasts and I place much faith in them. Although he said that the total crop would depend on the finish of the season, he recently forecast that about 55,000,000 bushels of wheat would be produced this year. Such a harvest would be a record, and I am sure that all members hope that this will be achieved. If it is, I shall buy the honourable member a drink.

STATE FINANCES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Treasurer say whether moneys that should have been allocated to the Highways Fund have been taken into Consolidated Revenue; whether any moneys allocated under special Acts have been placed in Consolidated Revenue; and whether any moneys allocated to the proposed Morphett Street bridge have not been spent on that project but transferred to Consolidated Revenue?

If this has happened, can the Treasurer indicate the amounts and the reason for transferring this money from special allocations to General Revenue?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Most of these matters were dealt with yesterday, but in view of the further question, I will obtain the information for the honourable member if he is here at Question Time next Tuesday.

KADINA HOUSING.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 14 about the allocation of Housing Trust houses at Kadina?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The five houses referred to by the honourable member that are at present planned for erection at Kadina by the Housing Trust during the financial year 1966-67 are all single-unit houses. One house is almost completed. This house, together with another not yet started, is being erected for sale to the Education Department and occupation by its officers. One house, just commenced, will be sold to a local business organization and another, also for sale but not yet commenced, is being erected for a private purchaser. The fifth house has not yet been commenced but will, on completion, probably be offered for sale in the first instance.

LIBRARIES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the debate on the Estimates I asked the Minister of Education questions about library subsidies. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The \$45,926 voted for capital subsidies in 1965-66 included \$25,126 for undrawn approvals carried forward from 1964-65 for the establishment of libraries at Enfield, Mitcham and Murray Bridge, \$19,500 for establishing library services at Tea Tree Gully, Mount Gambier, Mannum and Noarlunga, and \$1,300 for minor capital items at various libraries. During 1965-66 no claims were made for capital subsidies provided for the Mannum, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge and Noarlunga libraries. Last year's actual expenditure on this line (\$17,442) was therefore well below estimate. The \$38,900 proposed for capital subsidies in 1966-67 includes \$26,500 voted last year but not paid for the establishment of the four libraries just mentioned, provision for the establishment of new libraries at Unley and Port Augusta, and provision for minor capital items at other libraries. Because of the limit of funds available, it was decided that other proposals for new library facilities could not be subsidized this year.

Accordingly the establishment of a library at Payneham, of second libraries at Salisbury and Burnside, and of third libraries at Enfield, Elizabeth and Salisbury, was deferred.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although I do not expect the Minister of Education to be able to reply today, will he ascertain how much money was allocated to the Public Library this year to be spent on books and how much of that allocation has already been spent?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

HIGHWAYS OFFICERS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about the forthcoming oversea visits by Highways Department officers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the Commissioner of Highways (Mr. J. N. Yeates) and the Assistant Commissioner of Highways (Mr. H. E. Roeger) attended the Fifth World Meeting of the International Road Federation in London from September 18 to 24 and a seven-day study tour of the United Kingdom arranged by the federation. Their return journey is *via* the United States of America to visit Texas and New Mexico where roadmaking conditions are similar to those of South Australia. Approval has been given for the Assistant Engineer for Materials (Mr. A. G. Cooke) to attend the Fifth Australian and New Zealand Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering in Auckland during February, 1967, and to present a paper entitled "Preloading for a Highway Embankment at Port Adelaide, South Australia".

URANIUM.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the Mines Department's activities in prospecting for uranium in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The major industrial powers throughout the world have established electricity generating stations based on atomic energy. Although most of these stations are integrated into the national grid, all are regarded as experimental, in that the cost of power produced exceeds that of conventional stations, and they are being operated mainly to gain experience and to test alternative designs. However, the efficiency of atomic plants is steadily increasing, and it has been

estimated that a large capacity atomic plant (in excess of 500 megawatts) may be competitive with a conventional plant by about 1980.

It is in anticipation of a rising demand for uranium in about 10 to 15 years' time that world interest in exploration for this material is increasing. The Mines Department has issued an exploration permit for minerals, including uranium, in the Crocker Well area but at this stage the department is not directly undertaking uranium exploration.

CITIZEN MILITARY FORCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On August 23 last I asked the Premier a question on notice about the Government's policy on paying members of the Public Service, daily-paid and weekly-paid Government employees and people employed by semi-government instrumentalities attending full-time Citizen Military Forces training. In the course of his answer, the Premier said that the conditions for daily-paid and weekly-paid Government employees and employees of the South Australian Railways were being considered, following requests by unions. As about six weeks has now passed since the Premier gave me that answer, can he say whether Cabinet has yet had an opportunity to conclude its deliberations on this matter and, if it has, what the Government's policy will be in future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although some matters are still awaiting consideration, Cabinet desires to finalize this matter as soon as possible. When a report is available, I shall notify the honourable member.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the course of a comprehensive reply given yesterday by the Premier, he indicated that the Government had received from the Bechtel Pacific Corporation much more information than was disclosed in the documents presented to Parliament. Will the Premier make the Bechtel report, as such, available to honourable members so that they may see the full implications of the data obtained by the Government in this important matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think the Government on this occasion has been most generous in making information available not only to the Prime Minister but also to members of this House. I consider that the Government has done a good job, and I have nothing further to add.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Education any information about the alleged discrepancy between the proper and actual deductions from payments due to school cleaners under contracts, for which I asked on September 21?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As the matter is still under investigation, I have not yet received a report. As soon as I do, I shall notify the honourable member.

RECREATION OFFICER.

Mrs. STEELE: There is some concern amongst probation officers of the Social Welfare Department (and I understand some embarrassment has been caused to heads of institutions) as a result of the recent appointment of a Recreation Officer in the department. This officer is working on the Kensington and Norwood pilot youth project and, in connection with this scheme, made a visit to another State to obtain an insight into similar work being done elsewhere. He has also been associated with recreational work at the Boys Reformatory Institution, Magill; in fact, a recent press article referred to a "reformatory recreational officer." Can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether applications for this position were called according to usual Public Service procedure so that other probation officers with appropriate qualifications could apply, and whether another position will be created soon? Also, will the Minister undertake to investigate the matter, and will he assure the House that such appointments, when made, are consistent with the accepted practices of the Public Service?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Hall, a probation officer, was seconded by me, pursuant to specific statutory power given to the Minister of Social Welfare, to do certain work for the Social Welfare Department as a recreation officer. The creating of a specific post of Recreation Officer in the Public Service was taken up with the Public Service Board, which made certain recommendations upon the matter that were not satisfactory to Cabinet. As a result, the matter has been referred back to the board to see whether it can re-examine it, because Cabinet believed that certain anomalies would be created as a result of the board's original recommendation. In the meantime, Mr. Hall remains seconded for this particular work. When a position is created pursuant to the Public Service Act, naturally applications will be called; all persons who have qualifications in this area will

have the opportunity to apply and, if necessary, to appeal against any recommendation made.

This particular officer has been of great use in this area of the department. Only yesterday I was able to publish the fact that as a result of his work and organization we were not only going to have the oval at Magill ready to be played on this season, and prepared in such a way that it will be one of the finest ovals in the area, but this was done entirely without cost to the public of South Australia and at a cost of only about \$17,000 to the organizations concerned, which contributed this as a community effort towards the training of boys at Magill. I take this opportunity to express my considerable gratitude not only to the firms concerned but also to the officer.

PICNIC GROUND.

Mr. CURREN: Certain organizations in the Barmera district (namely, the council, the Community Centre Committee, and the Apex Club) are working to establish a new picnic area at Lake Bonney. Can the Premier give any information about a Government subsidy to assist in establishing this picnic area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Approval has been given for a Government subsidy on a \$1 for \$1 basis, up to a maximum of \$2,115, towards the cost of establishing a new picnic area on the eastern side of Lake Bonney.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.

Mr. RODDA: Some of my constituents have told me that there has been some dissatisfaction about the proposed route of the extensions of Drain C (through the Penola swamp). I understand that the South-Eastern Drainage Board has made investigations into the dissatisfaction of people in the area. Can the Minister of Lands say whether there will be a further inquiry into the control of this flood-water, which comes from Victoria? I understand that the plans formulated to deal with the matter arose out of previous investigations. Apparently requests have been made for a necessary alteration to the drainage to put this matter into effect. Will the Minister inform the House of what is likely to transpire?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, objections have been raised to the final report of the Land Settlement Committee in relation to the route that Drain C is to take. Of the two proposals put to the committee one would have routed the drain through the swamp itself, and would have drained the swamp at certain periods of the year. The other proposal was

designed to leave the swamp in its present condition, diverting the drain around it. This was the proposal adopted by the committee. As a result of objections raised by several of the honourable member's constituents, further investigations have been carried out by the South-Eastern Drainage Board. In fact, the Director has told me that a report on the matter is available. I have not yet studied that report, but when I have done so I will decide whether the matter should again be referred to the Land Settlement Committee for further investigation. I expect that, if there is any difficulty about the matter, that is what will happen, and people who have raised objections will have the opportunity to give evidence before the committee, which can further investigate the objections.

STRATHALBYN ROAD.

Mr. McANANEY: I notice in the report on the five-year plan for roads that certain hills roads will be eliminated from the plan. One of these is the road to Strathalbyn because it is very expensive to straighten it in the hills areas. I ask the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, whether an alternative route from Strathalbyn to connect with the freeway at Verdun has been considered, as this road would be less expensive to make.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall ask my colleague to obtain a report for the honourable member.

FREELING WATER SUPPLY.

Mrs. BYRNE: My attention has been drawn to the poor pressure of the water supply serving section 365, hundred of Nuriootpa, near Freeling and other nearby properties. Will the Minister of Works have this matter investigated with a view to improving the supply to these farms and to enlarging or replacing this main, if necessary.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

EXPORT LAMBS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My question concerns the size and quality of export lambs from South Australia sent overseas. When looking at the shops in London and in the provincial towns in England, I noticed that on almost every occasion, English lamb was selling at prices above those quoted for imported lamb both from Australia and New Zealand, and also that the cuts of meat displayed came from carcasses which were far larger than those that we, as producers in

this State, have always been advised to produce. I need not elaborate on that because the Minister of Agriculture knows the weights which have been advised as a desirable export limit to producers in this State. Producers have always tried to conform with the conditions laid down. In view of the rather serious slump in the number of our lambs exported this year, will the Minister have this matter thoroughly examined. This may take a little time and require discussions with the Australian Meat Board and other authorities. It rather perturbed me to see that the English housewife apparently prefers the locally produced meat and is willing to pay a higher price for larger cuts. This is the crux of the matter. I ask the Minister whether he will have an examination made as to whether or not the recommendations to the local producers should be reconsidered (and possibly changed if my surmise is correct) and either bring a report to this House or see that a statement is made for the guidance of producers in respect of future production.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to convey the observations of the honourable member to the department and all associated with the export of meat overseas. What the honourable member has said today is somewhat contrary to my general belief on this matter and to what I have been informed since taking office. According to my information, the size of lambs for export is about 29 lb. If it is the wish of the people of the United Kingdom to have the larger carcasses, I think we should look at this matter.

WINSTON AVENUE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There appears in this morning's *Advertiser* a letter concerning wastage of public money, signed by "I. Rate" of Daw Park, who complains about what is, in effect, a lack of co-ordination between the Mitcham Council and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Although the area in question is not in my district but in that of the Premier, it does concern a council the greater part of which I represent, and, as I know the Minister of Works is anxious to express some view on the complaint, I ask him whether he has seen this letter (I believe he has) and whether he has any information to give the House on the matter complained about.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am extremely grateful to the honourable member for having asked the question because, when I saw the letter this morning, to say I was

concerned would be putting it mildly. I was so much concerned that I got in touch with the department immediately because I understood in the past that there was the utmost endeavour made to secure the greatest co-operation between the councils and the Engineering and Water Supply Department when new roads and footpaths were to be laid. These authorities confer to see that they are not overlapping and that the work is done in the correct order. I had an inquiry made and the report is as follows:

Inquiries which have been made this morning reveal that the trench in Winston Avenue, Daw Park, complained of in the letter from "I. Rate" to the Editor published in the *Advertiser* of October 6, 1966, has been excavated by the P.M.G. Department. The only excavation made by the Water Supply employees in the whole of Winston Avenue is one 2ft. x 2ft. repair hole made opposite No. 70 Winston Avenue, made necessary to effect a repair to the damaged service. Manhole castings and inspection point covers are being adjusted by Sewerage employees. No other activity by the Engineering and Water Supply Department has occurred in this street or locality recently.

I again thank the honourable member, because I am sure that the writer of this letter would feel he had done an injustice to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and would regret having written the letter before making full inquiries.

STOCK QUARANTINE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Some weeks ago the Minister of Agriculture sent a senior officer of his department to Kalgoorlie to study the quarantine restrictions that the Western Australian Agriculture Department is applying in respect of sheep entering from the Eastern States. Can the Minister comment on the findings of his officer?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

YEARLING BULLS.

Mr. McANANEY: For several years yearling bulls have been exported from Yugoslavia to England where they receive a premium price. As I have read of experiments in other places where weaning bulls fatten much more quickly than steer calves, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any such experiments have been conducted by his department?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain this information for the honourable member.

SOCIAL WELFARE ACT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the debate on the Social Welfare Act last session I complained about the botch into which the legislation would fall because of the extensive amendments to it, and the Attorney-General said that, as soon as the measure was passed, work would be undertaken to provide a reprint to bring the Act up to date. It is important that that should be done because of the difficulty of magistrates, including voluntary magistrates, having to work without such a print. I think I am correct in saying that the Act operated from January this year, and, in view of the Minister's undertaking, work on the reprint must now be well advanced. Can the Attorney-General say when it will be published and available for use by the bench, the bar, and the public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall ask the Chief Secretary for a report from the Government Printer.

EFFLUENT DRAIN.

Mrs. BYRNE: On September 14, the District Council of Tea Tree Gully submitted a design plan to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, as required by section 530c of the Local Government Act, for a common effluent drain to serve 46 allotments at Kerrison Avenue and surrounding streets in Ridgehaven, Tea Tree Gully. As residents of this area are anxious to have a common effluent drain installed because they are experiencing septic tank problems, will the Minister of Works ascertain whether this plan can be approved soon so that the work can be commenced?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I remember that the request was followed up, but regret that there has been a delay in answering this question. As I appreciate the urgency of this matter and the desire of the people to have an early reply, I will obtain an immediate report for the honourable member.

LOXTON ROAD.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether money previously allocated to Route 34 (from Loxton to Swan Reach) has been transferred to Consolidated Revenue, and when work will commence on this road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

HILLS FREEWAY.

Mr. SHANNON: Many people are worried about the final result of the plan for the new freeway from Measdays to Stirling, and at present it is difficult to envisage what is intended to be done. I believe the department would be well served if it prepared a plan of the area and placed it on a board on a site near its depot at Crafers, where it could be readily seen by people, as I receive inquiries almost weekly from interested people. This is not a new idea: it is a common practice in other places to do this for the guidance of the public. Will the Minister of Lands forward this suggestion to the Minister of Roads?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe there is much merit in this suggestion. I shall be happy to pass it on to my colleague, and I hope there will be some result.

CITY TRAFFIC.

Mr. COUMBE: Recent reports on traffic flow in the city of Adelaide and in North Adelaide indicate that serious bottlenecks are caused by the increased flow of traffic to the northern suburbs from the city. It has been suggested that one of the more serious bottlenecks is at Frome Road, adjacent to the Albert bridge over the Torrens River, near the zoo. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether the redesigning or rebuilding of this bridge to relieve this bottleneck has been considered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

DRIVING LICENCES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I asked the Premier to consider providing provisional driving licences for younger people over 16 years of age when they first applied and, after a period without accident, they would qualify for a full licence; but if they had been convicted of any offence in the meantime, the licence would be suspended for the time being. As this is an urgent matter in view of the increasing accident rate, will the Premier further consider it? If he has already done so, has he an answer to the question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This question involves other matters associated with the Motor Vehicles Department. I mentioned recently that we were obtaining a further report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles concerning the *alpha numero* registration system, and this affects the question raised by the honourable member. Cabinet has considered this matter, but no decision has been reached because of the need for further information.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yesterday, the Premier read a report on rail standardization which I am sure was appreciated by members opposite, as we did not previously know what was going on. He said:

The conversion of the Adelaide to Port Pirie railway in isolation would of itself introduce some disabilities as well as some advantages, and the Railways Department has studied these aspects in very great detail. It is felt that as a first step an integrated standard gauge system on the Peterborough Division would be more advantageous, followed by a co-ordinated system leading into Adelaide. I ask the Premier whether the Government is satisfied that this essential link-up should go via Peterborough from Western Australia, rather than via Port Pirie, or whether the Government will try to get a direct line from Western Australia via Port Pirie to Adelaide.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report from the Minister of Transport.

REPORTS.

The SPEAKER: I refer to the question raised by the member for Mitcham concerning the necessity of having two copies of any report available as soon as the report is tabled. I will not outline the practice which governs the tabling and availability of reports because I believe it is well known to members. I believe the practice that has obtained in the past is satisfactory and that members do have a reasonable opportunity to examine reports without undue delay. Where appropriate, advance copies are made available to members, for example the Treasurer's financial statements and the Auditor-General's Report. I have been advised that the report of the Highways and Local Government Department to which the member for Mitcham referred was available to him for nearly 24 hours prior to his first inquiry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: EDUCATION AID.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yesterday, when the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) asked me a question, he used the words "Institute of Teachers", and in my reply I used the word "institute", with reference to a meeting to be held in the Bonython Hall on October 24. I should have

used "South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association" as this body is arranging the meeting. I have conveyed the honourable member's message to the President of the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yesterday I asked the question referred to by the Minister of Education about the forthcoming meeting in the Bonython Hall, which I said was organized by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I realize that the explanation the Minister has just given is correct and that the meeting is actually being organized by the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association. I named the wrong organization because I consulted a document prepared by the Executive Officer for Commonwealth Aid of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The institute commences its circular to the headmasters of all schools and presidents of all parents' organizations as follows:

The South Australian Institute of Teachers calls on you as head of your school or as president of your parent organization to play your part in the final phase of the 1966 campaign for Commonwealth aid for education leading up to the Federal elections in November.

The document continues at considerable length and is available to members, but I shall not quote further. It indicates that the South Australian Institute of Teachers, if not actually organizing the meeting, appears to be masterminding a campaign for Commonwealth aid. The one-sidedness of the panel of speakers surprised me when I asked my question yesterday.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Standing Orders Committee, together with minutes of proceedings.

Ordered that report be printed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendment.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Flinders Uni-

versity of South Australia Act, 1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966. Since the passing of this Act in March of this year an election under section 11 of this Act has been conducted. The experience gained from the conducting of this election clearly shows that section 12 and section 14 of this Act do not make satisfactory provision for the election of the eight members to council by the Senate of the University of Adelaide or for the election of members by Convocation after Convocation is constituted in 1971. The Government accordingly accepts the representations made by the Council of the Flinders University that the Act should be amended to give this aspect of the Act a more workable and more widely acceptable basis. The amendments proposed would have the effect of ensuring that the Senate of the University of Adelaide would be relieved of the burden of conducting any further elections of members of the council as provided for in section 11 of the principal Act and further of clarifying and simplifying the procedure whereby Convocation itself elects members of the council after 1971. Under the existing section 12 of the Act two members of the council elected by the Senate of the University of Adelaide shall retire after one year's service, a further two after two years' service and two more after three years' service and so on. This means that apart from the election conducted on July 1, 1966, further elections will have to be conducted in 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970. In addition, an election would be necessary under subsection (2) of section 12 to fill a casual vacancy.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide has brought to the notice of the Council of the Flinders University the impracticability and considerable financial costs in giving effect to section 12 of the Act. He has pointed out that there are more than 10,000 members of the Senate of the University of Adelaide and, strictly, all those members of the senate should be notified of an election for members of the Council of the Flinders University. Under the standing orders of the senate only those members of the senate resident in the State of South Australia and such other members as may request it need be notified of meetings of the senate. These at present number about 5,000, and this number will increase annually by 700 to 800. Of the 5,000 members of the senate not at present on the mailing list, the Senate of the University

of Adelaide does not know more than half of their addresses and many of these would prove to be out of date. From this it will be seen that it is completely impracticable for the University of Adelaide to notify substantially all members of the senate of an election for members of the Council of the Flinders University. It will also be appreciated that conducting an election of this magnitude entails a tremendous amount of work and considerable expenses that would have to be borne by the Council of the Flinders University. The Council of the Flinders University is seriously concerned with this state of affairs.

Apart from the foregoing, the council has come to the conclusion that it is generally undesirable that some of its members should continue to be elected by the Senate of the University of Adelaide since this is a body quite separate from and not concerned with the Flinders University. It is intended, therefore, that the Act should be amended to provide, in effect, that after the first election (which has already been conducted) the Senate of the University of Adelaide shall no longer have the burden and responsibility to conduct elections of members to the Council of the Flinders University. Clause 4, which repeals and re-enacts section 12 of the principal Act, accordingly provides that the eight members elected to the council by the Senate of the University of Adelaide on July 1, 1966, shall continue and remain in office until an election is conducted by Convocation in accordance with section 13 of the Act. All casual vacancies occurring in the interim period will be filled by appointments made by the Council of the Flinders University.

The person appointed to fill a casual vacancy would be in the same classification as that of the person whose place he filled, that is, he would either be a member of the academic staff of the university or a person not employed by the university. This provision generally has, it is felt, considerable merit since not only does it give some degree of permanence to the eight elected members of the council, thus enabling them to take a full and effective part in all the preparatory and planning work connected with the establishment of a new university but also and, perhaps more important, it would avoid any feeling on the part of the council that the affairs of the Flinders University were to some extent being controlled through the ballot box, as it were, by an outside body whose interests might not always be in accord with the interests of the Flinders University.

Clause 5, which repeals section 14 of the principal Act, covers the same ground as the existing section 12 except that it provides for a new procedure for the conducting of elections of members to Convocation after Convocation is constituted. The new proposals envisage that from the time Convocation first meets there will be four of the elected members retiring every other year, though they would be available for re-election. This would ensure some degree of continuity and also ensure that the experience that some of the members have gained may be utilized for a longer period of time. Subclauses (1), (2) and (3) accordingly replace section 12 (1) but subclauses (4) and (5) reproduce section 12 (2) and (3) with one important qualification. The words "of all members" occurring at the end of subsection (2) have been deleted. The reason for this is that the existence of these words in this subsection might well impose a burdensome requirement upon Convocation to trace all its members in various States of Australia and throughout the world. The election will, however, still be by postal ballot and the council will in due course make a statute or regulation under section 20 (1) dealing with the procedure, etc., to be followed in an election. I commend this Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. C. D. Hutchens:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to inquire into and report upon:

- (a) all aspects of the survey and equipment of fishing vessels and regulations therefor; and
- (b) the need for any amendments to the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, considered necessary to ensure the proper management of fisheries resources, including amendments to provide for licences for master fishermen, part-time commercial fishermen, employee fishermen, amateur fishermen and fish dealers.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2074.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): This motion undoubtedly calls for the widest inquiry into the fishing industry since the inquiry by a Royal Commission in 1934, the Commission's terms of reference being merely to "inquire into and report on the fishing industry". Although that is virtually the purport of the second part of this motion—

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Was the 1934 Royal Commission acted on?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In reply to the Minister's interjection, it may be appropriate for me to mention the curiously inadequate explanation given by the Minister of Marine. Although two Ministers are involved in this matter (the Minister of Marine to deal with the survey of vessels, and the Minister of Agriculture to deal, of course, with fishing), I think we had one of the most inadequate explanations for a far-reaching Bill that I have ever heard. The Minister in his explanation concluded by saying that, if further explanations were required by the House in regard to the latter aspects of the inquiry, he was confident the Minister of Agriculture would oblige. That, to my mind, is not a satisfactory way to introduce a Bill. We have a second reading explanation one day, and the matter appears at the top of the Notice Paper for debate by the Opposition the next day.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is Order of the Day No. 1 on the Notice Paper, which is not a Bill, and there has been no second reading explanation. Is the honourable member referring to that?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am sorry, Sir. I called it a Bill, but the Minister's remarks amounted to the same as a second reading explanation. I have to speak without having had the benefit of the explanation of the Minister of Agriculture, and he can help me only by way of interjection. That is not very reasonable, particularly as this committee will have wider terms of reference than had the Royal Commission appointed over 30 years ago. The answer is much simpler if we try to work out why this committee is being appointed. This is being done to provide a political solution: it is not being done to ascertain facts, which the previous Royal Commission had as its purpose. Any suggestion to alter fishing regulations inevitably involves a protest from some section of the community. The Government is anxious to see that the Opposition is in some way committed. The Opposition will be prepared to nominate members to this committee, who will take part in and contribute to the inquiry. However, it should not be assumed that, because the Opposition nominates members to the committee, the committee's report will automatically commit the Opposition. We will see what the report says and comment on it. This is a political solution by the Government, and it will not be a fact-finding committee in any sense. If it were, a far more extensive inquiry would have to be conducted.

This is a huge problem that would require wide inquiry. I shall comment on paragraph (a) of the motion, which mentions "all aspects of the survey and equipment of fishing vessels and regulations therefor". Apparently, the existing regulations are unsatisfactory, as the Minister says they are causing dissension, but he has not said much about what is happening. For instance, he did not say how many vessels had been surveyed or give any idea of the types of alteration that were being insisted upon. He gave practically no details. He gave an example of the type of argument that can be advanced when he referred to the question of whether plastic fuel lines should be permitted. When a motion is put forward for a Select Committee, the need for the particular inquiry should be justified by facts, and a proper outline of what is unsatisfactory about the present regulations should be given. I do not doubt that there is dissension, but he did not say what that dissension was. He gave what I believe was a most inadequate explanation in all respects.

A survey of vessels is clearly a most difficult problem. At present, on my understanding, it deals with vessels of 25ft. and longer but not with smaller vessels. The Minister has not referred to what I believe is one of the most obvious matters involved: last year, without there being any debate, he appointed a Small Boats Committee to inquire into whether small boats should be registered and their operators licensed. Its members are unpaid and it has been sitting for about 12 months. It is dealing with only one aspect of this problem: power boats. This matter is related to the fishing industry because power boats are used for that purpose. The Chairman of this committee (Mr. Wight) is an officer of the Harbors Board, and also on the committee are representatives from boat organizations. It has had many sittings, mostly at night. I gave evidence that I shall not outline in detail, but it appeared to me that the committee was compromised, almost before it started, by its initial terms of reference, because it was almost an accepted fact that small boats should be registered and their operators licensed. I believe that, although safety is of great importance, it is not necessarily assisted by many bureaucratic measures relating to licences and so on.

I am waiting to see the committee's report. It has already been sitting for a year and it has not yet finished its inquiries. However, the Select Committee will deal with a far wider problem, including the aspect covered by the

Small Boats Committee, and it will have to report much more quickly. All members know that there are some most unsatisfactory vessels. All sorts of people go to sea. Some good seamen are impossibly casual, taking risks they should not take. Many foolhardy people go to sea and, however safe their boats may be, they can still get themselves and other people drowned by mishandling the boats. Of course, there is an obvious need for some sort of regulation. In relation to small vessels, I believe that generally it would be better to provide for some safety measures to be compulsory rather than to have inspections in all cases. Inspections are expensive and, in certain cases, unnecessary. The cost of inspections is calculated at so many dollars a foot of the length of the vessel.

As an extreme example, let us consider the case of a fibreglass boat bought straight from a shop. If it is well looked after it will be practically unmarked after 10 or 20 years, but the man who purchased that boat would have to pay an inspection fee, based on its length, in just the same way as would a man who has a home-made wooden craft that he has knocked together with steel nails in the backyard. Despite that, both men have to pay the inspection fee. The fibreglass vessel bought from a shop will pass the inspection, but people can still be thrown out of it because of mishandling or overloading. This is the sort of thing that concerns the Small Boats Committee. However, the Select Committee will deal with fishing vessels of all sizes. A Royal Commission on Fisheries was appointed on August 9, 1934, and it gave its final report (which was one of three) on October 8, 1935. The first report consisted of four and a half foolscap pages of close print, and was made on November 21, 1934. The second report consisted of 40 pages and was made on August 30, 1935, about 12 months after the date of appointment of the Commission. The final report, which was made on October 8, 1935, consisted of 15 pages, so a total of three reports, comprising 60 pages, was given after 14 months' deliberation. Its terms of reference were really not as wide as those of the Select Committee we are asked to appoint. Is it any wonder that I draw the inference that this is a committee to solve a political problem rather than a fact-finding one?

I have had much to say on the fishing industry, and I do not propose to continue in detail now. I have voiced my concern because I do not believe it has had the attention from this Government that it deserves. The fishing havens

and facilities provided by the previous Government were unequalled throughout Australia. There is the slipway at Port Lincoln, and slipways and havens have been provided along the South-East coast and elsewhere along our long coastline. Since this Government has taken office, the expenditure from the Loan Account has been extremely small. It has been diminishing, and it has reached the lowest figure in its history since the fishing industry assistance provisions were first introduced. This year \$40,000 is provided in the Loan Estimates for the Kingston jetty and other minor works and services, and that is all. It should not be thought that there is not a great need for more facilities yet. At Thevenard, and back along the coastline, there are projects needing attention. This applies particularly to Thevenard.

A new vessel was to be provided for research purposes which would be larger than the present one. The present vessel is quite sound but it is not large enough to work anywhere in the Bight near the head of the continental shelf. The larger vessel was to be provided by the previous Government, but nothing has been done, so far as I know, since this Government took office. This industry is of an in-shore type in South Australia, using small boats and small enterprises, with a few men associated with each other rather than huge company operations participating in it; they operate all the way along the coastline. Of recent years, with the rise in the tuna industry, bigger company operations have become important, and we need to know much more about tuna and how to catch them. Under the present system of pole fishing, it appears that the young fish and not the largest fish are being caught. By far the largest fish are caught by long-line methods, which are used in South Australian waters. Long-lining involves a big outlay, and it is doubtful whether South Australians will ever use this method. I am not technically qualified to say, however, but certainly a large outlay of capital is needed. It is the sort of thing that a great fishing nation such as Japan is adept at, but we would be struggling to get it going.

What is our attitude to people of other countries fishing in our waters? Can we do anything about them? At least this matter will interest the Select Committee because in the terms of reference it is asked to investigate the need for amendments to ensure the proper management of fisheries resources. One assumes that extends beyond the limits of

State waters. The possibility of trawling has been talked about a lot; the Select Committee should pay some attention to this possibility in the future. The possibility of fishermen in other States using restrictive trade practices should also be considered. I can recall an occasion when the South Australian tuna boats were all set to go to New South Wales waters to fish near Eden, when suddenly they were told that they all had to have a safety survey certificate, which they did not possess and which they did not know how to obtain. It appeared that there would be no hope of their getting ready in time to fish when the tuna were running at Eden, which is in the last few calendar months of the year. This was eventually overcome, but after the Eden fishing stops the New South Wales fishermen fish off Port Lincoln. The New South Wales fishermen complained to their Minister, and asked, "Why don't we get looked after as the South Australian fishermen do by their Government?" so we should at least bear in mind the possibility of some restrictions on fishing by the other States. The Select Committee should take evidence on that matter.

The legal minimum sizes of fish should, and undoubtedly will, be considered by this Select Committee. This is a big problem, and I know that many people have ideas on what is the right size, what should be done about altering fishing regulations, and what the bag limits should be. The committee will be busy taking a lot of evidence. Another big problem that is always hotly contested is that of netting. Earlier this year the Minister of Agriculture requested a conference between members of various organizations, departmental officers, and members of Parliament who had fishing interests in their districts. The conference was to have been held on the day following prorogation of Parliament but, as the House sat into the early hours of the morning, the meeting was cancelled. Following that, a particularly unfortunate statement was made by the Attorney-General in which he mis-stated what had taken place at a conference with another place and, as a result of that gross mis-statement and the fact that the Premier endorsed the Attorney-General's remarks, members on this side were so incensed at the treatment they had received that they decided they would not attend any more conferences until they had considered the position and, therefore, did not attend the conference that had been arranged.

Now, we are to have a Select Committee to inquire into these matters, but it faces an

enormous problem, and I do not know how it can do real justice in the time available. If it has enough time, can meet often, and take all the evidence necessary, it will do a good job, but I believe its appointment is to solve a political problem more than anything else. The Opposition is willing to provide representation on this committee, but is not committed to the subsequent report. I have doubts of the capacity of the Select Committee (not of the members themselves) to inquire into the far-reaching problems of vessel safety and fishery management, to say nothing of fishing licences, dealers' licences, etc., in the time available to it.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The member for Alexandra has covered everything fully. I agree with what he has said: this is a complex problem. Although I believe in the principle of appointing a Select Committee to inquire into a particular problem, it seems strange that the Government has tried every means to handle certain problems, such as a referendum, committees—

Mr. Ryan: Did you say "referendum"?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, a referendum decided Government policy on one issue, and the Government has set up many committees and has tried so many ways to determine a policy. However, when a contentious problem arises, the Opposition is asked to join in making Government policy and to assist in solving the problem. Whatever the findings of this committee, objections will be raised by either amateur or professional fishermen. I understand that, apart from around the coastline, the Commonwealth Government has some control of fishing, so that it will be difficult for a South Australian committee to make a decision to fit in with the Commonwealth Government pattern. At present fishing regulations are to be gazetted, but they should be held over until the finding of the committee is available, otherwise the scope of its inquiry would be limited. I support the motion.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I understand, from what the Minister said when moving this motion, the Government's reasons for desiring a Select Committee, but I regret the need for its appointment. It is unfortunate when problems of an industry develop to such an extent that this approach is necessary to solve them, but we understand why. The fishing industry is complex, as it is composed of a wide variety of people, and I know from experience that there is always a conflict between the lines and the nets that will never be resolved to the satisfaction of both parties.

Fishermen are good honest people who work hard and who fully deserve anything they can gain from the pursuit of this activity.

Mr. Casey: You are speaking of professionals?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and more particularly about people who make their livelihood from fishing. They are individualists, as are people engaged in primary production. That is good, but this attitude sometimes arouses rivalries that are hard to resolve. Some years ago we gazetted regulations for the survey of fishing vessels following approaches by groups of fishermen who were concerned (and they had every reason to be) about the loss of life occurring around our coastline because of various factors, mostly a combination of unseaworthiness and weather, which had been responsible for a serious loss of life. Realizing the difficulties confronting any administrator, I approached the matter with some caution, but I considered that the regulations promulgated would go a long way towards meeting the major requirements of safety in the fishing industry.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is a fair statement.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When a regulation or an Act of Parliament contains a line of demarcation between one group and another there is always something of an anomaly about the borderline, and dissatisfaction is expressed by either those on one side of the line or those on the other.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Wherever you draw the line, it is wrong.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Despite any future action of the Government or the Minister, this problem will exist. I am not anticipating the methods of investigation that the committee may adopt, but I believe that in coming to its conclusions it will be faced with the problems of drawing a line. The inquiry will necessarily create some difficulties. I do not support it in the rather pious hope that it will solve all problems, and I do not suggest that the committee can make recommendations that will solve all problems. We should look at this motion realistically and we should not cause members of the industry to hope that all problems will be solved to their complete satisfaction. If, as the Minister has informed me, the present problems are so great that this inquiry must be set up, I do not oppose it although I regret the necessity for it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the member for Flinders for his remarks. As a former Minister in

charge of this department he is aware of the complexity of the fishing industry and he has stated the position very clearly. I agree that the need for such an inquiry is regrettable. We would like a clear-cut solution to the problems of the fishing industry now. I cannot say the same about the members for Stirling and Alexandra, particularly the member for Alexandra who was also in charge of this department. He must know the complexities of the industry. I do not think that, on assuming office, we had all these problems placed before us purely because of a change of Government. What often happens is that proposals made to a former Government are re-presented when a new Government takes office, and this happened here.

The member for Alexandra would have had an intimate knowledge of the needs of this industry, and, if so, he should have done something about them, but he did not. The recommendations of the 1934 Royal Commission, which he mentioned, were not adhered to. Consequently there has been growing dissension for many years, and the member for Flinders mentioned only one cause of dissension when he referred to differences of opinion between net and hook fishermen. The member for Alexandra has said that a political solution is being sought. I take exception to that statement. The whole purpose of this inquiry is to discover what is required. I admit that I lack this knowledge and consequently I am proposing the appointment of a Select Committee today. Regarding the political side, I realize that whatever the decision of the Select Committee, the Government must take responsibility for bringing the legislation before Parliament if the committee's recommendations are adopted. I have no objection to that, but when I accept the responsibility of office I want to do what I think is right, whether it is popular or unpopular. I want backing for any action I take.

If there is insufficient time to delve into this problem there may be a recommendation for an extension of time. If so, we shall be happy to do something about it. Shortly after assuming office I received a deputation of fishermen. The member for Millicent who represents a district vitally concerned with the fishing industry asked me to go to Millicent to discuss some problems with a group of fishermen. Unfortunately, the member for Millicent was ill at the time but the Director of Fisheries and I met these men and discussed their problems at great length. There were fishermen from the South-East, the South Coast, Port Adelaide

and Port Lincoln. The fact that people will come from as far as Port Lincoln to Millicent indicates their great interest. One of the main complaints was that amateurs were taking crayfish out of the grounds in great quantity and consequently creating a shortage in the South-East. They had facts and figures demonstrating great concern for the future of the industry.

One of their complaints was that farmers who earned a full-time living from their farms were going out in boats (many of which were not surveyed because they were under 25ft.) after the harvest and taking large quantities of fish. They stated that speedboats were going out with small numbers of pots and that, because of their speed and mobility, these part-time fishermen could do the job much more quickly than full-time fishermen and were making great inroads into their livelihood. They quoted comparisons between their past and present catches to prove that something should be done to preserve the fishing industry. There were differences of opinion, one of which related to the number of cray pots that should be allowed. Some wanted a limitation on the number and some did not.

Following that meeting I met a deputation of Kangaroo Island fishermen when I was Minister of Lands, and they told me that people engaged in industry were making inroads into Kangaroo Island fisheries. Full-time fishermen claimed they were competing with people earning good incomes from other work. These people were using smaller boats that were not subject to a survey and taking considerable quantities of fish, which was not in the interests of the fishermen concerned. Having received two deputations from the Port Adelaide and South Coast areas, both having various problems and their own ideas of solving them, I subsequently distributed a document containing certain suggestions. In addition, I asked members (to which the member for Alexandra has referred today) to attend a meeting of those interested in the fishing industry in their particular districts. We all know about the reason for the boycotting of that meeting. I was disturbed by that action, because I have always believed that the industry should be considered purely in a non-political way.

That meeting broke down, but I sent out a document prepared by the Director containing his plans. I should point out here that I am not in favour of all the suggestions advanced by the Director, particularly the suggestion concerning amateur licences. As I have said,

many differences of opinion exist throughout the industry. The document that I circulated sought purely a reaction on the part of those engaged in the industry; indeed, the reaction was rather violent. People expressed to me their particular views on the matter, some claiming that persons earning only the basic wage or just a little more should be able to earn an extra income through fishing.

We know that waterside workers in such areas as Port Lincoln supplement their incomes in this way, and provision has been made for that circumstance in the document to which I have referred. However, the document was objected to by some people. Many full-time fishermen desire to see amateur fishermen precluded altogether, but I do not agree with that. A sensible approach must be adopted. That is why I believe a need exists to inquire into and investigate every aspect of the industry and to take evidence, if necessary, from the Directors of the departments concerned in other States, so that Parliament will be fully apprised of the conditions applying elsewhere. Western Australia has done much to foster its fishing industry; it has implemented a policy (which does not exist in this State) of levying fishermen.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: South Australia's problems are unique, because of the gulfs.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True, although some other States are blessed with a long coastline, particularly Western Australia and Queensland. Western Australia has also established a fund for the fishing industry, which fund is buoyant. Indeed, much more money is spent on the industry in that State than in South Australia. As our system of paying all moneys received into Consolidated Revenue does not permit that system, I believe that this aspect should also be investigated. The evidence from a Western Australian officer associated with the industry in that State would be one of the invaluable benefits to be derived from an inquiry of this sort, not only for Parliament but for me in administering the department. I deplore the fact that statements were made in the House today about this matter being purely a political situation; that is not the case. I deplore, too, the accusation made by the member for Alexandra. The whole reason for the motion is to gain information that I do not possess at present.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you confident that a Select Committee will handle the whole of the terms of reference satisfactorily?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, although whether it will have adequate time is doubtful. However, if it is necessary to extend the time so that the inquiry may extend into another Parliament, that can be achieved. Investigations should commence as soon as possible in order to solve this vital problem. I hope that the Select Committee's report will benefit every member as well as the whole of the industry. If the Opposition reserves its views on the matter, that is indeed its prerogative. However, I hope that any information to be gleaned from this inquiry will place the matter entirely outside the bounds of a political argument, because I believe the industry is far too valuable for that. I support the establishment of a committee to examine the various aspects of surveying boats as well as the other matters referred to in the motion, and I trust that everybody concerned will approach this matter sensibly. I am pleased to hear that the Opposition intends to nominate a representative to the Select Committee, because I believe that that is the way in which such an inquiry should be undertaken.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I was delighted to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that the motion was not a political stunt—

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You wouldn't understand that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: — because, in my innocence, I thought it was. Right from its inception I thought the Government's move represented an easy way of trying to overcome what is indeed a keen political problem. The problem is not incidental to this Parliament; it existed many years ago. The fishing industry has already been the subject of a Royal Commission which investigated at great length many aspects of the industry and interviewed fishermen in every fishing port in South Australia. That Royal Commission had to be appointed because of the time involved. The Commission took a book of evidence and presented a costly report. As the Government will realize in due course, Royal Commissions cannot be appointed and paid for with small copper coins. The Royal Commission was established as a result of a debate on the Estimates in Parliament, one of its members being the late Hon. R. J. Rudall, who was one of the most intellectual and competent people ever to serve in a Parliament in which I also was honoured to serve. Personally, I do not think even one of that Royal Commission's recommendations was ever adopted. If one recommendation was adopted,

it related to the appointment of the Director of Fisheries in the future (the chief fisheries officer) who was to be a scientific officer rather than one merely with technical ability. I believe that this possibly led to the appointment of Mr. Bogg who has had some scientific background. However, if scientific examination of our fishing grounds is a consideration then why is the vessel, which was purchased for research, in port and why has it been in port since the Government came into office? If a need exists for scientific investigation, why are we not doing something about it? We have inspectors in the department, a competent officer in charge, and a vessel which was recommended as entirely suitable for research. Apparently, this committee is to report upon these matters. The terms of reference state:

(a) all aspects of the survey and equipment of fishing vessels and regulations therefor.

The regulations have been in force and the surveys have been made; the only problem is that the fishermen do not desire to pay for the survey.

The Hon. J. D. Coreoran: That is not true.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is no need for the Minister to say it is not true. I was in Government when the fees were implemented and they received strong opposition from fishermen who did not desire to pay. That is one of the problems.

The Hon. J. D. Coreoran: That's better; but you said before that it was the only problem.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Whether or not the Government should charge the cost of surveys to the fishermen is a political problem. It is no different from whether the Government should charge rent for Crown lands. The Minister knows that this problem comes up every day, but we do not have a Select Committee to see whether the Lands Department should charge rent for Crown lands. Whether fishermen are charged for the survey carried out in their own interests and for the safety of themselves and their crew is a political question.

When the Minister of Agriculture first commenced a series of conferences, his whole purpose was to get Opposition members to go along and to agree to some policy. Then the fishermen could have been told that both Parties had agreed to something, and that it therefore did not matter for which Party they voted. That was purely and simply a political move. When I was Premier, my Government imposed these survey fees, but I did not go along to

the Labor Party and ask it to hold my hand because somebody did not like me; I did not ask for a Select Committee so that I could get someone to share the terrible responsibility of charging a few shillings for the survey of a boat. The first question to be decided is whether fishermen should be charged for this survey. I do not think any member of the House has ever disputed the necessity for the survey. There were several bad fishing accidents before the survey was introduced and it was proved conclusively that unseaworthy ships were going to sea. Every other State in the Commonwealth requires a survey. I believe, too, that most of the fishermen agree that there should be a survey.

The only question that arises is whether the survey should be conducted at the public cost, at the cost of the fishermen, or at a reduced rate. Those were the three alternatives suggested in my time and undoubtedly the Minister has had the same alternatives raised with him from time to time. For the Minister of Agriculture to get up and say that this is not a political question is laughable. Every time charges are levied it is a political question. The terms of reference of the committee also state:

(b) the need for any amendments to the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, considered necessary to ensure the proper management of fisheries resources, including amendments to provide for licences for master fishermen, part-time commercial fishermen, employee fishermen, amateur fishermen and fish dealers.

Has a sentence ever been devised that contains more politics than that? Everyone knows that professional fishermen believe that the fish in the sea should, in some way, be protected for the professional fishermen. From time to time they say, "These amateurs are taking our fish". Right from the start, this is a political question. The Minister of Works is smiling: he knows this is a political question. It was too hot for the Minister of Agriculture to handle so he passed it over to the Minister of Works. First, the Minister of Agriculture tried to suck in the Opposition but it did not come to the party, so he got up in the House this afternoon and said righteously that this was not a political question and that he had handed it over to the Minister of Works. He also believes that if he can get the Opposition to share the responsibility it will be better for him. Of course, the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department has always been attached to the Agriculture Department, and how it can now become a part of the Public Buildings Department or of the Engineering

and Water Supply Department is anybody's guess.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The Supply and Tender Board comes into it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My guess is that the Minister of Agriculture found that this was a political problem and, having tried to arrange conferences with the Opposition to which the Opposition did not respond, he then decided to hand over the matter to the Minister of Works, who now has the job of reaching some conclusion on it. There is no popular solution to this problem. This Select Committee will be abortive, because it cannot furnish a ready-made answer to fulfil the political aspects of this matter. If the committee made a unanimous recommendation, Parliament would not approve of it. The Minister will find that his own members will not approve of the suppression of amateur fishermen. It will not be approved by this Parliament or this country, but unless members are prepared to suppress them they will not give satisfaction to the professional fishermen. I do not think the inquiry will be useful, but the Government wants to try, and as we always like to help we will not hinder it.

Honourable members know that a Select Committee can only sit during a session of Parliament, and if, at the end of the session, it has not reported, the only way to continue the investigation is by making the Select Committee a Royal Commission. I believe that was the procedure (and I speak without having checked this) when the Hon. R. J. Rudall was first appointed. He was appointed chairman of a Select Committee, but he could not visit 10 per cent of the ports of South Australia before the end of the session. I warn the Select Committee that it will be a gross dereliction of duty if it does not inspect every place that has a fishing boat.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Rudall found that everybody demanded that the Royal Commission, with *Hansard* reporters and the whole box and dice, visit their town.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is this to be an expedition?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It will be much more ambitious than the one the Attorney-General will go on. It will take longer and cost more money. The Opposition knows that the motive behind this motion is political and, although I do not oppose it, I warn the Government that I am unlikely to agree with the results of the inquiry. I do not believe

there is a case for the amateur fishermen and, unless we are prepared to suppress them, we will not get professional fishermen to approve of the findings. I do not oppose the motion.

Mr. Coumbe: You damn it with faint praise.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, I do not praise it. I think the Minister of Marine was pushed into moving this motion by his colleague, who found he was in deeper water than he thought.

Mr. Millhouse: He wanted to preserve his popularity.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly. In this world, particularly in politics, popularity is important.

Mr. Millhouse: Especially on the front bench at present.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall not go into that, but the Minister of Agriculture, having had a look at the water and having put his toe in to see how cold it was, decided that it was best to hand this to another Minister. I will admit that he did say this was not a political question; he did whitewash the situation before he left it, but it is political. I know of no section of the community that is more politically minded than is the fishing industry. I say that without in any way discrediting that industry. If honourable members do not know that now, I am sure they will know it in the future. If I am any judge, when the Government selects members for this Select Committee, the members who have the most fishermen in their district will be the least likely to get this job. The member for Frome, and perhaps the member for Unley, may be appointed, as I do not think either has any large fishing industry in his district.

Mr. Casey: We would like to have you with us; you are unbiased!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: You would have a competent amateur fisherman! While I do not oppose the establishment of the Select Committee, I doubt the wisdom of appointing it, because in the course of my own political experience I have seen this very thing tried and fail. The gentleman in charge of the 1934 Royal Commission was extremely competent and had complete integrity, and he did his utmost to find some solution to this problem. I do not oppose the motion, but I shall hold myself independent as to the result that may arise from this action.

Motion carried.

Referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Brookman, Burdon, Hutchens, Pearson, and Ryan; the committee to have power

to send for persons, papers, and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on March 14, 1967.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1965.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This is a simple Bill, introduced because the licensing hours and conditions in South Australia are being investigated by a Royal Commission, and it provides that no further licences will be issued in this manner until the findings of the Commission are known and the House has had the opportunity to amend legislation covering this matter. This seems to be a reasonable conclusion, but it can bring difficulties in specific areas. The Act was amended in 1954 to provide for local option polls in 1955 or any third year thereafter. This Bill alters 1955 to 1968, which means that local option polls that may have been held next year will be postponed for a year. Practical difficulties arise and I should like to have an amendment covering them, but I see no satisfactory method of amendment.

The Para Hills Community Club is being formed and it was intended that it should apply for a licence and operate as a club as soon as it had received a liquor licence. The club has collected much money, has an active committee, and many local residents support it as many people in the area are United Kingdom migrants who are club-minded. I have spoken with the Chairman of this club who said that he was sorry that this difficulty had arisen and that the club's application would be postponed for one year, but that he could understand the reasons why this was being done. I should have thought that applications from organizations which had collected large sums, and which were community-based, would be considered so that they could go ahead. A licence providing for a community club will no doubt be available whatever the decision of the Commission and the deliberations of the House, and we are probably anticipating that Parliament will alter the Licensing Act. I do not oppose the Bill: it has merit, but it does present difficulties. I hope that it will not prevent for long the granting of licences that normally would be granted. No legislation has been presented as a result of the Royal Commission's finding, and this measure is denying a licence to this club for reasons that do not yet exist. I am sure that, if the Commission does not reach a

decision acceptable to this House, legislation will still be proceeded with.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): The point made by the Leader of the Opposition is not clear to me, and perhaps the Attorney-General will explain it. However, assuming that the Commission has not brought down a report by the end of this period, will there be a further Bill to defer the right to take an option poll? We have no assurance that the Commission's report will be available by the time that the extension period expires. Secondly, suppose the Commission brings in a report before the period expires: I should think that it would be almost a miracle if, on this contentious matter, legislation had been devised that would be accepted by Parliament.

This is not controversial legislation, but I do not believe that it solves the problem. Perhaps it would be better to allow things to continue normally, as, to a certain extent, we are pre-judging what the Royal Commission will suggest with regard to future local option polls. I know that a strong case has been presented to the Commission on this aspect, but there is no reason to curtail immediate action under the Act. We are, to a certain extent, anticipating that legislation will be introduced that may put the whole onus of licensing on to the Licensing Court. I do not want it to be assumed that that is my own view on this matter. These matters are before the Royal Commission and I cannot predict its recommendations. I ask the Attorney-General what the position will be if no conclusion is reached by the time this Act expires in one year. This is a controversial matter and it seems doubtful that there will be a conclusion within this time.

In a year's time we shall be close to an election and social questions will become rather awkward. I very much doubt whether a year is sufficient, but I should like the Attorney-General to give some lead as to what will happen if no legislative action is taken. The mere presentation to His Excellency of the Royal Commission's report does not of itself do anything. The only thing that would have any bearing is any legislation that follows the report, if it is adopted by the Government. Many areas are growing very rapidly and in some of them there is a strong demand for extensions. Under those circumstances I doubt very much that we should hold up indefinitely the granting of a possible extension.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): This provision causes me concern. For a considerable time the people of Lyrup have been agitating for a poll for the establishment of a club. They just missed out last time because the number of licences available had gone: other clubs were in front of them. At the last poll a substantial majority was in favour of an increase in the number of licences. Since then the Lyrup people have been working assiduously: they have made arrangements for their premises and they have their own constitution. They are waiting for this poll so that they can go ahead. This provision will throw them back another 12 months, and I am greatly concerned. This legislation is rather premature because we do not know what the Commission's recommendations will be regarding polls. I suggest that the Attorney-General let this matter stand until we discover the Commission's recommendations about polls. The people I represent at Lyrup will be disappointed and frustrated.

I appeal to the Attorney-General not to go on with this Bill. In any case the House will meet again next February so there is plenty of time to see what will happen at the Royal Commission. There could be an interim report. The Government could suggest to the Royal Commissioner that the question of polls might cause difficulty in country areas and ask for an interim report on this aspect. There would be plenty of time in February or March to amend the legislation so that a poll might be held, but we need to see what the Commission will say. It would be possible to amend the Act and give districts affected the right to apply for a special permit for a poll to be held in that area. I do not think it is possible to go ahead with this legislation because it is premature. Knowing that the Attorney-General is amenable to reason, I make this plea on behalf of these people in my district.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I cannot agree to delay this Bill. It has been introduced to cope with a real difficulty. If we allowed local option polls to go forward and then found that it was recommended to the House (and the House took action) that local option polls should either be abolished or significantly changed in their nature and districts, then much time and money would have been wasted by the people concerned. We do not want that to happen. I assure members that it is unlikely there will be a significant delay in the presentation to His Excellency of the report of the Royal Commission. I expect that the report will be ready

this year. The working sessions of the Commission have been shorter than anticipated and it appears that the Commission's work will be completed in a reasonably short time with less cost than originally expected. We will be able to present the recommendations to Parliament after they have been considered by the Government.

The honourable member would know that the present provisions for local option polls and for dealing with licences arising out of local option polls are so strange that people in his district could be significantly advantaged (or certainly be no worse off, and perhaps better off) at the time of getting a licence. Obviously, when we were contemplating some significant changes in the Act's administration (and it was because its administration had become so difficult that the Royal Commission was appointed) people's immediate anticipation might have been disturbed, but I hope that will be only temporary. I assure the honourable member that I will do everything I can to expedite such reasonable requirements as may be recommended by the Royal Commission.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2086.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): In rising to support this Bill I should like to say at the outset that I was fascinated by the various positions taken by members of the Opposition who took part in this debate last night. We have previously seen the Leader of the Opposition dealing with financial measures. He once attempted to give away about \$1,500,000 in land tax, and on another occasion he wished to give \$1,000,000 away by removing the winning bets tax. I was expecting last night to see another attempt at some form of irresponsibility, but I was pleased (and I think other members on this side of the House were pleased) to hear the Leader say, "Although I am not going to vote against it I am certainly not enthusiastic about it." That is certainly an improvement on the attitude he has previously taken on financial measures. To the extent that it is an improvement, I think we should recognize it and congratulate the Leader on it. I hope that when other financial measures are introduced this session the Leader will continue his rate of improvement.

Mr. Lawn: The Leader has already said this Bill will be passed in the Legislative Council.

Mr. HUDSON: I did not hear him say that. The member for Rocky River, however, delighted me; he also rose in his place and said, "I shall not oppose this measure," but only 10 seconds later, following an interjection by the member for Unley, he said, "We are here today but although we oppose this measure and object to it the people of South Australia have elected a Labor Government and this Government has seen fit to introduce this Bill." What he really intends to do about this Bill remains to be seen, because in the space of 10 seconds he managed to contradict himself. Admittedly, he contradicted himself only once, which is not too bad. But whether he will vote against the Bill or support it remains to be seen. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) was straightforward in his approach: "I oppose the increase in stamp duties." At least that was clear and took only a short sentence.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), however, is committed in his remarks to vote against the Bill; he commenced by saying he was strongly opposed to the measure because it would not inspire confidence in the business community. As he worked himself up in the debate, he found himself saying in the end, "I protest as vehemently as I can against this imposition." No doubt, if the honourable member is to protest as vehemently as he can, he will not follow the point of view taken by the Leader of the Opposition: he will vote against the Bill. I understand that disagreement exists at present between the Leader and the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Gumeracha said today he was an Independent.

Mr. HUDSON: Well, that remains to be seen. I understand the disagreement relates to whether or not the Opposition should call a division on the second reading of this Bill. From what he said, I think the Leader considers that no division should be called, but the member for Gumeracha has other views on the matter. My information (emanating from a reliable source) is that not only will the member for Gumeracha oppose this measure: later in the debate he will make a considered and long statement on the whole matter of stamp duties.

Mr. Rodda: Did you have your ear close to the ground to pick that up?

Mr. HUDSON: I am not at liberty to divulge to the House the source of this information.

Mr. Lawn: Is he going to tell us about 1964?

Mr. HUDSON: I shall come to that in a moment. According to my information, however, the ex-Leader of the Opposition will oppose this Bill and will insist on a division being called, and it will be interesting to see just which way the cookies crumble, to see how many Opposition members will support their current Leader's attitude and how many will support the attitude of their former Leader. I have no doubt at all that when the member for Gumeracha speaks in this debate he will go to town on the Bill and tell us what a terrible thing is being done.

Mr. Lawn: Do you suggest that the member for Gumeracha is making a comeback bid?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know, but when somebody succeeds as King on the English throne the saying is, "The King is dead: long live the King." However, when the leadership of the Opposition changed hands on this occasion, nobody was clear who held the reins.

Mr. Casey: I think we are.

Mr. HUDSON: We will see a demonstration later, but I have no doubt on the matter at all.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the honourable member relate his remarks to the Bill before the House?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: I was dealing with the Bill and with the way Opposition members were displaying a hopelessly divided attitude, and I was suggesting that when the member for Gumeracha spoke in this debate he would lay down the law and the sheep would follow him rather than follow the new Leader of the Opposition. Members on this side will be interested to see the outcome.

I do not know where the interests of the member for Ridley lie in this matter. He will find it much easier to vote if there are two different points of view on the part of Opposition members. For the benefit of members opposite and, particularly, for the benefit of the member for Gumeracha, I shall quote what the member for Gumeracha (the then Treasurer) said in 1964, the year in which he introduced the Statutes Amendment (Stamp Duties and Motor Vehicles) Act Amendment Bill, which radically altered the level of stamp duties in this State. I shall read what the honourable member said because it will be interesting to

contrast his remarks in 1964 with what he will say in this debate later. In 1964, in his Budget speech, the member for Gumeracha said:

After mature consideration of revenue expectations for 1964-65, and a close review to determine the extent of the necessary expenditure commitments which could not be reasonably delayed or eliminated, I found that the indications were for a shortage of revenues as against expenditures of about £4,500,000. Measures are proposed which, it is estimated, will increase revenues this year by £1,250,000, including the effects of the recent small adjustments in rail fares and in public hospital charges. The main increases will be in the general category of stamp duties. They are:

1. Licence fees payable by insurance companies which are calculated as a duty on net premiums will be increased from 1½ per cent to 5 per cent. This will apply to fire and general insurance but not to life assurance business.

2. The duty on brokers' contract notes for transfer of shares will be increased from 1s. per £50 of face value to 2s. per £50 of present value, and there will be a comparable adjustment with share conveyances otherwise made.

3. The duty on mortgage documents will be increased from 2s. 6d. a £100 to 5s. a £100.

4. The one per cent duty at present payable on hire-purchase agreements will be extended to those contracts for repayment of loans to money-lenders required under the Money-Lenders Act, except insofar as they are separately secured by mortgage upon real property.

5. An *ad valorem* duty of one per cent will be levied on documents relating to new registrations and to transfers of registration of motor vehicles.

That was a substantial change in the stamp duties provision in South Australia. At that time, the member for Gumeracha estimated the increase in total revenue at \$2,500,000. If we check with what actually happened we find that stamp duty revenue for this State increased from \$5,666,000 in 1963-64 to \$8,915,000 in 1964-65, an increase of over \$3,200,000. Of course, the measures proposed in the 1964 Budget for the 1964-65 financial year did not have an effect for the full financial year. Consequently, some of the effect of increased revenue carried over into the 1965-66 financial year and, to a significant extent, the increase in revenue between 1964-65 and 1965-66 for stamp duties was a consequence of measures introduced by the member for Gumeracha in 1964.

The previous Government introduced substantial changes in stamp duties, much more substantial than those in this Bill. It will be interesting to see whether the member for

Gumeracha, when he takes part in this debate, is prepared to recognize the revenue problems facing this Government as he recognized his own revenue problems in presenting the 1964 Budget. This will be a testing time because, if he is not prepared to give recognition to the revenue problems facing this Government, in view of his previous statements we will be able to disregard everything he says. In judging the tenor of the debate, although we will be able to disregard his contribution if he does this, I suggest to members that, if he opposes this measure and calls for a division, a significant number of Opposition members will join him and not follow the Leader.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to talk about the Bill at all?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is worried about whether I am going to talk about the Bill. I want to deal with certain background to this debate, which I think it is essential to know about and understand before we consider the provisions of the Bill. This seems to worry members opposite: they do not like it one little bit. I point out that all Opposition members who have spoken so far in this debate, apart from the Leader of the Opposition, did not participate in the debate on the 1964 stamp duties legislation. They took no part in that but they were vociferous on this Bill.

It is undoubtedly true, as the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) would recognize, that taking no part in that debate in 1964 was a wise move because any remarks members opposite might have made on that occasion could have been quoted back to them today.

Last year, the Government proposed stamp duties to be levied at certain rates for all receipts of \$10 and upwards, and provided in the Bill for receipts and duty to be compulsory. That Bill was objected to and amended by the Legislative Council, and the Government was forced into a conference with the Legislative Council to try to reach a satisfactory compromise. The compromise that was reached provided that a flat rate of duty be imposed on receipts above \$50 and that these receipts be compulsory. That was not a very satisfactory compromise from this Government's point of view. As the Treasurer pointed out in his second reading explanation, it resulted in a loss of revenue to the State of about \$1,000,000. In view of the overall financial problems facing the Government at present, it should be clear to anyone who is prepared to give fair consideration to this problem that

something will have to be done. This sort of loss of revenue involved in the compromise reached between the Government and the Legislative Council last year could not be tolerated. Because of this loss, the Government has introduced this measure imposing a duty of 2c on receipts between \$10 and \$50. It is estimated that this will cover the loss of revenue that took place last year.

I point out (which no member opposite did) that this rate of duty is more favourable to the business community and to ordinary members of the public than the position that applied prior to this Government's assuming power in March 1965. Before then, the rate of duty on receipts for \$4 and over was 2d. We are proposing, in this measure, a minimum of \$10 before duty is payable if a receipt is issued. Nobody likes imposing taxation measures, and to suggest otherwise would obviously be folly. Nevertheless, it is important for this House, in discussing this matter, to recognize the extent of expenditure commitments that have faced this Government for the current financial year. As the Treasurer pointed out in his Budget speech, the basic wage increase meant an additional expenditure of \$4,700,000 on Revenue Account and \$1,000,000 on Loan Account. So, the basic wage alone applies extra expenditure on the Government's current level of expenditure of \$5,700,000. The extra interest and Sinking Fund payment to be made, net of recoveries, is \$3,300,000, so on account of the basic wage and interest alone the Government has to find an additional \$9,000,000.

When we consider the activities of Government in the field of education particularly, and also in relation to other activities such as hospitals and engineering and water supply, where a service is being provided to an expanding population, we must recognize that expenditure must increase each year just to maintain the same standard of service as was provided in the previous year. I estimated previously that that consideration alone implied an additional expenditure of \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 a year, so, before the Government can even consider improvements by increased expenditure in certain directions, we are faced with additional expenditure in this financial year of about \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000, quite apart from any plans we may have had to improve expenditure in certain directions.

The increase in Commonwealth tax reimbursements for the current financial year is only \$6,500,000. It is clear, when one compares this

with the increased expenditure of about \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000 or more that is necessary to be undertaken for this financial year, that there is a large gap between the expenditure commitments that must be faced and the revenue necessary to finance those commitments. It is in terms of this picture of the relationship of expenditure to revenue that this measure must be considered. Obviously, in drawing up the Budget for this year, the Government had to concern itself with possible sources of additional revenue, and I do not want to quarrel with the proposals in this Bill. In view of the circumstances and in view of the need for additional revenue, I regard these proposals as justified.

In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said that, apart from the duty on receipts, the Bill was concerned with altering the rates of duty on conveyances and certain other instruments. As a result of the measure introduced by the previous Treasurer in 1964, these rates of duty were 1 per cent. It is now proposed that, up to a limit of \$12,000, the new rate of duty will be $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent and for over \$12,000 it will be $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That division, instead of having an overall rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for any transfers or conveyances, whatever their value, is fair, because it means that a significant percentage of the conveyances and transfers in relation to house property will be taxed at $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. Most house transactions involve sales of less than \$12,000 and they will attract duty at the rate of $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent instead of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. All honourable members should prefer this to the rate applying in Victoria, of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on everything over a much wider range of documents.

Comments have been made about the comparisons between rates of taxation in this State and those in other States. Members opposite have suggested that the Government intends to raise the level of taxation in this State to that applying in other States, but that is not so. What applies in relation to these matters can be considered in this way: the Government in drawing up the Budget had certain expenditure commitments that must be met, and it had to determine how it could obtain revenue in order to meet them. In looking at possible sources of revenue it was natural to compare rates with other States. It was found that for most taxation in South Australia the rates were significantly below those in other States, and that source of revenue deserved greater consideration in order to obtain necessary revenue to meet the Government's

expenditure programme. When the full figures are available for all States for 1965-66 and for 1966-67, the overall rate of taxation in this State will be significantly below the rate in other States, and the margin of difference between taxes levied a head of population in South Australia that applied prior to 1965 will still be found to have applied last financial year and will continue for this financial year. The problems facing this Government this year are faced by every State Government in Australia, and each one has to adopt revenue measures that are just as substantial, and maybe more substantial, as those proposed by this Government. In view of the circumstances and of the need for additional revenue, what the Government intends to do in this measure can be supported, so I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I am not happy with this measure. Last year we discussed a Bill that increased by 50 per cent the duty on cheques and brought in considerable revenue. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.).

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 11, line 24 (clause 8)—After subsection (2) of new section 31h insert the following subsection:

(3) The board shall not without the approval of the Minister pay to any of its officers, employees or agents any commission based on any amount of money received or handled by such officer, employee or agent on behalf of the board.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I recommend that this amendment be accepted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Does this mean that the board will get only one permission from the Minister and that the whole purpose of the amendment will be satisfied by the Minister's granting approval to the board to pay its agents fees? Alternatively, will the Minister exercise a discretion in granting approvals from time to time?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister will be responsible for ensuring justice in these matters. The establishment of agencies will relate to officers employed by the board in a managerial capacity, who will be paid a salary, and to others, who will be employed on a

commission basis. Much of the staff will comprise females, including married women, employed on a wage. A commonsense approach must be adopted in implementing this provision.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister's approval in the matter will go a long way towards obviating the fear that undesirable features may occur: for instance, commission agents touting bets. The Minister can be responsible for discontinuing the payment of a commission if the agency concerned is not up to the required standard. However, I point out that a given number of tickets will equal a certain commission and that once a commission basis is discontinued a salary commensurate with that commission may be paid. I am prepared to accept a provision authorizing the Minister's approval.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I point out that two evils are associated with the employment of staff on a commission basis. First, a noticeable increase has occurred in the number of housewives being encouraged by

female commission agents to invest money at T.A.B. premises. Secondly, the Victorian figures reveal that many women in that State receive less than what is considered to be a fair wage. Can the Premier assure members that the provision will not result in a blanket approval?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It will not be a blanket approval. I do not wish to see the return of betting shop conditions. If any undesirable practices commence, board officers will have an opportunity to inspect the premises concerned. There will be no signs encouraging people to enter. Of course, there will have to be a notice signifying that the place is a T.A.B. agency so that people will know what it is. However, I assure members that blanket approval will not be given.

Amendment agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 11, at 2 p.m.