

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 27, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

KIMBA DAMS

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 18 about the drains and conditions of dams around Kimba?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

Dealing first with the condition of the dams and catchments, the Regional Engineer, Western, and his staff pay due regard to the condition of the catchment areas and the siltation of storages in County Buxton as part of their normal duties. Catchment areas are graded, burned off, and cleared from time to time to ensure, as far as possible, good run-off conditions. Obviously, if this type of work is overdone during extremely dry periods more harm than good can be achieved. Storages are cleaned out when possible and as required. Here again, some silt is often left in certain of the reservoirs in an endeavour to limit losses due to seepage, three which immediately come to mind being Caralue, Pinkawillinie, Curtinye.

Some of the more significant work carried out in recent months is as follows: Bascomb Rock, new reservoir, drains, grading of catchment, etc.; Roora, catchment graded; Pinkawillinie, concrete intake channel repaired, main contour bank reconstructed; Mootra, replacement of concrete intake channel; Wilka, catchment graded; Cortlincy, grading and relocation of intake drains; Curtinye, silt removed.

It is considered that the condition of all reserves and storages is at present generally good and, if useful rains occur, no serious problems are likely to be experienced with run-off and storage; obviously extraordinary take-up will occur due to the extremely dry conditions. Removal of silt and grading of catchments is continuing when possible and where required.

In commenting further on the honourable member's remarks in the House on July 19, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that some stock disposal is occurring in various parts of the State because of the very dry conditions: this action, however, is not confined to the Kimba area only. Some properties may have a fortnight's supply only, but overall storage at water conservation reserves should be sufficient for two months.

Finally, on the question of carting water into the area, the department is preparing to meet a possible starting date of the first week in

October, if conditions at that time make this action necessary. To give some idea of the magnitude of the task, the likely cost involved is about \$2,000 a week.

HOSPITAL ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my question about mutual hospital funds?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chief Secretary has furnished me with the following information:

Latest information available from the Commonwealth Department of Health reveals that there are 109 registered hospital benefit organizations in Australia (13 in South Australia) and 78 registered medical benefit organizations in Australia (8 in South Australia). The financial affairs of each of these registered organizations (including level of administrative expenses and of reserves) are scrutinized regularly by officers of the Commonwealth Department of Health. It is understood that that department is of the opinion that, generally, the reserves of the various approved organizations are adequate and, at the same time, are not excessive.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: The Keswick bridge will soon be completed at the Greenhill Road end. As there is a dual highway from Fullarton Road to Glen Osmond Road, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether the dual carriageway on Greenhill Road is likely to be continued from this section to the Keswick bridge in the near future?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to confer with my colleague, obtain the information for the honourable member, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

GAS

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the *Advertiser* this morning under the general heading of "Call for pipeline analysis" there is a heading "Price offer by producers", under which the chairman of Santos (Mr. John Bonython), when asked yesterday to comment on questions asked in Parliament on Tuesday, said:

It is my belief that the natural gas offer made by the producers to the Electricity Trust was at a price below that paid for its existing fuel.

A rider is added to that comment. I do not think it would be necessary or, possibly, proper for me to ask the Premier to indicate what the offer might have been, and I do not intend to ask him that. However, can he

say whether or not he has any comment to make at this stage on the statement to which I have referred to the effect that the producers of the gas have made an offer to the Electricity Trust that they believe to be below the price of the alternative fuels?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that Mr. Bonython was commenting on an answer given by the Chief Secretary to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition in another place. That question was asked at a time when the offer of the producers was not below the break-even point.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was asked this week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, it was originally asked over a week ago.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was answered this week.

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no debate while Ministers are replying to questions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will listen, I think I may be able to clear up the matter for him: if he is not so quick off the mark I will explain the whole matter. At the time the original question was asked, no offer at less than the break-even point with fuel oil had been made. An offer that was at less than the break-even point with fuel oil was telephoned to me from Honolulu last Sunday. However, certain conditions attached to the offer which relate to future prices in the matter and as yet have to be cleared up. Discussions between myself and the directors in Honolulu have taken place over succeeding days. I expect that a result that will be satisfactory to the Electricity Trust and to the Government will be achieved within a few days yet.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is the management of the Electricity Trust participating in the discussions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The management of the trust has been fully informed of the discussions and has spoken with me about the negotiations. I find myself in some difficulty—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I should think so. It is obvious.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite obviously in this matter certain Opposition members are playing politics in two directions.

Mr. Lawn: They don't want to help.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In one place it was clearly suggested that we ought to agree to a price for natural gas in excess of the break-even point with fuel oil.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not suggest that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member did not; the Leader of the Opposition in another place said it. If the honourable member reads his questions he will see precisely what the Leader of the Opposition in another place is proposing: that we should agree to a price in respect of natural gas that is in excess of the break-even point with fuel oil because there will be benefits for us from the royalties.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I have always argued to the contrary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I know the honourable member has, but the Opposition speaks with two voices on this matter. On the one hand, it tells us that we ought to agree to a price that is in excess of the break-even point with fuel oil and that we are bad not to agree so that we can have natural gas quickly. On the other hand, Opposition members say that if we do agree to a price in excess of the break-even point with fuel oil we are doing harm to the Electricity Trust and we should not do it. Then, Opposition members go about the countryside saying, "Why haven't these negotiations been completed: why aren't you getting on with the job?" They want it both ways: they want to have their cake and eat it too. They only want to make criticisms of the Government, no matter what the result to the State. The plain fact is that the negotiations have been carefully conducted. The Electricity Trust will not, and I do not believe it should, accept a price for natural gas that is not competitive (and by "competitive" I mean somewhat better than the fuel oil price), and I believe that a competitive price will be obtained very soon.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We have heard that before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well—

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier not to reply to interjections when he is answering a question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that an announcement will be made very shortly that will be of great benefit to the people of this State, but evidently it will disappoint the honourable member for Gumeracha.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Does not the Premier think that the Electricity Trust is a competent authority to decide what is a proper price for it to pay in regard to its fuel contracts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no doubt that the trust has a proper appreciation of its own needs and prices, and those have been communicated to me. It is on the basis of these that I have been negotiating.

Mr. HEASLIP: On July 4, I asked a question of the Premier as follows:

Following the Premier's recent announcement that South Australia was entering a period of industrial boom previously unknown in the State, will he allow the trust to continue bargaining so that it may obtain gas at as low a price as possible and so that industries in this State will be able to compete with those in the Eastern States that are already receiving electricity more cheaply than South Australia is receiving it at present?

The Premier replied as follows:

My only concern in this matter is to get a speedy conclusion to the negotiations. I have not at any time suggested that I am not prepared to back the Electricity Trust in what seemed to me to be its just requirements in the provision of fuel.

As a result of the question asked today by the member for Flinders, it appears to me that the Premier has now taken over and is negotiating for the price of gas and not allowing the Electricity Trust to consider it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is now expressing an opinion. He must ask his question.

Mr. HEASLIP: Is it a fact that the Premier is now negotiating a price for gas, or is the Electricity Trust still free to negotiate a price which would be economical and which would enable this State's industries to compete with the industries of the Eastern States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The trust is involved with me in the negotiations with the producers. I would be entirely failing in my duty if I did not endeavour to bring those negotiations to a speedy conclusion. Obviously certain members opposite do not want the matter concluded, so that they can charge the Government with failure and delay. We do not intend to be open to the charge; our duty will be done.

AGRICULTURE COURSE

Mrs. BYRNE: While speaking during the Address in Reply debate I drew attention to the need for a course that would train boys to become practical farmers. As the developments

at Roseworthy Agricultural College have left a gap in agricultural education in this State, can the Minister of Education say whether anything is being done to meet this need?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. This question was raised by the member for Barossa and it was also referred to by one of the members opposite during the Address in Reply debate. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that a new fourth and fifth-year course with a central emphasis upon agriculture will open at Urrbrae Agricultural High School in February next year. This course will be conducted by the high schools branch of the Education Department and lead to an Urrbrae certificate in agriculture awarded under the authority of the Director-General of Education at the end of the fifth year.

With the change in function of Roseworthy Agricultural College to virtually that of a college of advanced education a gap has been left in the agricultural education of this State. There is no longer a place where boys interested in preparing themselves for a life on the land or for employment in agricultural firms may go in order to round off their final years of secondary schooling. It is to explore the possibilities of filling this gap for boys who do not intend to go on to tertiary study that arrangements are being made to begin the new course in 1968. It will be on a pilot basis and, because individual and small group work will be a feature, the opening enrolment will necessarily be restricted to between 20 and 25. If it proves successful and the demand warrants, this number will be progressively stepped up until the limit of the facilities at Urrbrae is reached.

The new course is not to be confused with the secondary school subjects of agricultural science and agriculture currently being taught at Urrbrae and at certain high and area schools. These are single subjects in the general secondary curriculum. The new course represents a full secondary school programme in the fourth and fifth year consisting of the core subjects of agriculture and animal husbandry, farm management and rural economics, farm engineering, and statistics; and it will also include the general subject areas of English and social studies. Science will be taught as scientific principles desirable for the better understanding of agriculture and animal husbandry and of farm engineering. Similarly, the social and practical aspects of

English will be stressed, and in social studies the twofold aim will be on the one hand to give the student an appreciation of the physical and cultural environment likely to be met in his chosen career and on the other hand to present a comparative study of the methods of agriculture adopted in different communities.

The course is essentially practical. It is realized that to give a better understanding of the principles and practice of agriculture, and in particular of farm management, the student himself will have to participate in many field and laboratory exercises. If he is to understand the environment of machinery and power in which he will live as a farmer, he will have to achieve as much practical competence as possible in vocational skills associated with agriculture. The course is not vocational but it is prevocational in a way unusual for a high school. It is also terminal in the sense that it is not meant to be a preparation for higher study at Roseworthy or any other agricultural college.

There will be two main requirements for enrolment: one is evidence of three years' satisfactory schooling at a secondary school, and the other is the production of satisfactory evidence of an opening for work on the land or for a possible position in a stock or similar firm. Because of its pilot nature, and the necessity to fix the class size at between 20 and 25 boys, it may be necessary to restrict enrolments from schools other than Urrbrae itself in 1968.

The award of the certificate at the end of the course will be made not on the results of a single final examination but by use of methods of continuing assessment in which examinations will have a due place. Further details regarding the course and enrolment of students can be obtained by those interested from the Headmaster, Urrbrae Agricultural High School, Fullarton Road, Netherby.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am delighted to hear the Minister's report on the intended new pilot course at Urrbrae, for which students will be issued with a secondary certificate in agriculture. In view of the fact that this is a pilot course, can the Minister say whether consideration has been given to the establishment of further courses and whether he has any idea at present where other similar courses may ultimately be established?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: We shall consider that matter when we have found out how the pilot scheme operates. I think it

would be premature at this stage to consider definite details of an extension of the course. However, if it works well, I think we shall be favourably inclined towards extensions elsewhere.

STONEFIELD WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand the Minister of Works has a reply to the question I asked on July 26 regarding the Stonefield water supply, and I take this opportunity of thanking him for his promptness in investigating this matter.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports as follows:

The standpipe referred to is a private service plus standpipe in the name of J. A. Leibig to enable Mr. Leibig to cart water to his section 223, hundred of Anna. Mr. Leibig also had the right to sell water from this standpipe. The service and standpipe have been in Mr. Leibig's name since 1936, but by letter to the Regional Engineer, Central, dated July 20, he stated that he did not require the standpipe any longer and would not accept responsibility for it after that date. The meter was accordingly removed on July 21, and the service shut off.

On July 26, the Regional Engineer received a letter dated July 24 from the District Council of Truro making application for the standpipe to be transferred to the council. The Regional Engineer contacted the District Clerk and advised him of the conditions under which the council could assume control of the standpipe, and the District Clerk stated that these conditions would be acceptable. The Regional Engineer has accordingly arranged for the meter to be restored today, July 27, and for the standpipe to be put back into service.

FISHING REGULATION

Mr. CASEY: Earlier this week the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) asked a question of the Minister of Marine about a certain proclamation published in the *Government Gazette* of July 20. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the matter referred to by the honourable member was in hand before the Select Committee, which is investigating the fishing industry, was formed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The matter has been under consideration for some time. I have received a report that states:

The proclamation revokes an old one made in 1950 and substitutes a new proclamation defining an area in Venus Bay where netting is prohibited. The first request to vary the 1950 proclamation was made by the Port Kenny Areas Professional Fishermen's Association in October, 1960. However, it was not until October, 1966, that a meeting was held

at Port Kenny between officers of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department and local fishermen. At this meeting agreement was reached on the revised area to be proclaimed and it was agreed that the department would submit a proclamation. The revised area was, in fact, already in operation by gentleman's agreement between the professional fishermen in the area.

The former Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation (Mr. A. C. Bogg) made a formal recommendation on February 17, 1967, for the issue of a proclamation. The delay since that date was caused by the need to have a Surveyor-General's definition prepared. This became available recently and the proclamation was submitted to Cabinet on July 11, 1967.

The closing of areas to netting is frequently the result of disagreements between net fishermen and hook fishermen and of an impasse that may be reached. In this instance, however, both sections of fishermen have been working under a gentleman's agreement for some time, and there has been common understanding between them. There has been no disagreement concerning the proclamation. In fact, the matter was discussed at a meeting, arranged by the Chief Inspector of Fisheries, at which there was unanimous agreement on the action to be taken. There is no quarrel in respect of the proclamation.

DRAINAGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My attention has been drawn to criticism of the Government's decision to proceed with the south-western suburbs drainage scheme made by the Mayor of Glenelg (Mr. Parkinson) and reported in a recent edition of *Community News* (a local paper circulating in the Glenelg area) as follows:

Mr. Parkinson said, "When the Premier made this statement at the opening of the new Marion civic centre, I did not understand whether he was referring to Sturt Creek or the Patawalonga being widened. Either way, I am fearful of the consequences if this project is brought to a head.

He went on to give the reasons why it would not, in his view, be in the best interests of his town for this work to proceed. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Local Government whether the objections voiced by Mr. Parkinson have been considered by the Government in the decision that has been made? If they have not, will that decision now be reviewed in the light of the comments to which I have referred?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report.

Mr. RODDA: My question, to the honourable member for Frome (Mr. Casey) in his capacity as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee, arises out of the visit he and his committee made to my district recently, when the committee looked at certain drainage work in and around Mosquito Creek. Some concern is being expressed locally at what is proposed for final construction works in connection with Drain M and the ability to dispose of the water that will inevitably flow when the floods from Victoria come through. I think that the flow at the road bridge on the Naracoorte to Mount Gambier road is about 3,500 cusecs, and of course this water still has to get under the railway bridge, which has not been altered despite the construction of the drain. When the floodwaters cannot get under the bridge they flow north, and now, via access to a culvert known as Gericke's culvert about a mile north of the bridge, this water will get on to the plains that the drain now cuts off. Can the honourable member say whether the committee, within its present terms of reference, is considering that local aspect of the blockage of the railway bridge?

Mr. CASEY (Chairman, Land Settlement Committee): The honourable member is correct when he says that the committee was in the South-East a little over a week ago looking into the question of proposed extensions to drains, including Mosquito Creek. The committee made that visit merely to familiarize itself with the proposed drainage works. On the visit we were accompanied by members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. I point out that we cannot make a decision of any kind at this stage. We shall be visiting the South-East later and taking evidence from landholders directly concerned with any drains that will be extended within the scope of the committee's reference. The drain we are concerned about at the moment is Mosquito Creek, to which the honourable member has referred, as well as three subsidiary drains in the Killanoola area. However, until we visit the area again and take evidence nothing can be done about the matter. Before anything is finalized and made known to the public the committee always reports on these matters to the Minister of Lands.

LAND BROKERS

Mr. HURST: Recently it was reported in the press that Judge Gillespie had awarded \$1,300 damages to an English migrant couple against a licensed land broker who, it appears, had taken a deposit from them on an allotment

that was heavily mortgaged and paid it to a building contractor who had gone into liquidation, thereby leaving the couple without finance. This necessitated their taking legal action to obtain damages and recover their money. This is an undesirable practice that should be stopped. Has the Premier read the judgment in this case, and can he say whether the Government intends to introduce amendments to the legislation to prohibit land brokers from entering into contracts such as in the case I have mentioned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen the judgment in this particular case, although I know something of it. The Land Agents' Board has no power over land brokers: they are licensed not by the board but by Executive Council on the recommendation of the Attorney-General. As Attorney-General, I saw the land broker in question, and it appeared to me that he had done nothing unlawful but had followed an undesirable practice that some brokers in South Australia had generally followed. I warned him that if anything like this occurred again I would make a submission to the Executive Council in relation to his licence, and I circularized brokers through the Real Estate Institute to the effect that I would take action against any land broker who proceeded in this way in regard to future settlements. I believe it is desirable to alter the law, and legislation will come before the House later this session that will, I believe, get over the difficulty of land agents and land salesmen selling uncleared titles on contracts for sale and purchase where the purchaser does not realize the effect of the transaction into which he is entering and has no adequate protection in respect of a mortgage title, which in fact is what he is buying. The Government has the matter in hand: legislation is being drafted and will come before the House later this session.

GRAIN DIVIDENDS

Mr. McANANEY: A fortnight ago, because of the position some farmers were in, I asked a question regarding future payments by the Barley Board. The reply was that the board would not make another payment until November. It paid a 20c dividend on May 6, 1966, and I understand it paid a 5c extra dividend on the first payment this year. In the circumstances, will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the Barley Board why it is not able to make payments this year as great as those made last year?

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

STRATHMONT CENTRE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the progress being made at the Strathmont Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proposed work at Strathmont has been treated as an urgent work in the department and has reached a stage where detailed plans are nearing completion for the first stage, for which it is proposed to call tenders towards the end of 1967, subject to provision being made on the Loan Estimates for the year 1967-68. Following the recommendation of the project by the Public Works Committee, Cabinet approval was given for the preparation of working drawings. Shortly after this approval, further overseas developments in mental health accommodation concepts became known, and as a result approval was given to send the supervising architect for the project overseas in order that full advantage could be taken of new developments. As a result of this overseas visit, design modifications have been introduced and these have been incorporated in the working drawings now nearing completion. These modifications do not depart from the principles, accommodation and facilities recommended by the Public Works Committee but do allow for greater flexibility in the management of patients by varying the type of villa accommodation originally planned. Shortly after the visit overseas of the supervising architect, the Director of Mental Health also viewed latest developments during the overseas study tour, and the design and modifications have been fully discussed and agreed with him.

Mr. Coumbe: It will still be able to attract the Commonwealth Government subsidy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, we are within the time to claim that subsidy.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: As a proposal to erect a new school at Surrey Downs in my district has been referred to the Public Works Committee, can the Minister of Education give details of this new school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The proposed primary school for Surrey Downs, expected to cost about \$240,000 and to be erected in Samcon construction, comprises 12 classrooms and ancillary accommodation. The building will provide for evaporative cooling and warm-air heating. The school is urgently required to relieve the pressure on the Banksia Park Primary School and to cater for children living in the Surrey Downs subdivision and the adjoining subdivisions of Redwood Park and

Fairview Park. The enrolments at Banksia Park have increased from 218, when it was first occupied in February, 1964, to 734 at present.

PROSPECT INTERSECTION

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands obtained a report from the Minister of Roads on the Highways Department's plans to continue the widening of Regency Road, Prospect, to overcome the narrow bottleneck at the intersection of that road and Main North Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the intersection of Main North Road and Regency Road presents a formidable problem in regard to land acquisition. Although a design has been prepared for reconstruction of the intersection and some negotiations for land acquisition have commenced, it does not appear that any finality in the matter will be reached for some time. No funds have been included in the 1967-68 programme to enable any roadwork to be carried out.

PEKINA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. HEASLIP: On May 1, when I asked the Minister of Mines whether boring in the Pekina area had been completed, I was informed that testing of this bore had not been completed but had indicated a supply of around 16,000 to 20,000 gallons an hour when pumped, although it would flow naturally at only a few hundred gallons an hour. I was also told that further pump testing and developmental work on this bore was planned for May, 1967, after which the department would be in a better position to assess the costs of delivering water there. As I have received further inquiries from residents of the Orroroo area about the result of the May test and whether it is an economical proposition, will the Minister of Agriculture obtain this information from the Minister of Mines?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I ask leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: On Tuesday of this week, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) asked a question on notice about the Commonwealth financial contribution toward the costs of certain school buildings.

Owing to a misunderstanding, in the answer figures were given which were incorrect in four cases out of six. In order to correct these, I should now like to give the House the correct figures. The percentages stated were in order, but four of the amounts related to the expenditure up till June 30, 1967, instead of the full estimated cost of the buildings. The full estimated cost of all the buildings is as follows:

	\$
Radio and Electrical Trade School (Kilkenny Technical College)	615,000
Laurel Park Technical College	1,080,000
Whyalla Technical College	450,000
Port Augusta Technical College	330,000
Roseworthy Agricultural College	620,000
Northern Teachers College	2,400,000

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that I have received the following intimation from the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott):

I wish to inform you that I intend to move today that the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday next at 1 o'clock to enable me to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, that an immediate approach be made by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government for a special grant to provide assistance for farmers suffering from the disastrous drought in South Australia, and that such grant be sought on the same principles as provided under Commonwealth State Grants (Drought Assistance) Act No. 31 of 1966.

Does any honourable member support the proposed motion?

Several members having risen:

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday next at 1 o'clock, to enable me to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, that an immediate approach be made by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government, for a special grant to provide assistance for farmers suffering from the disastrous drought in South Australia, and that such grant be sought on the same principles as provided under Commonwealth State Grants (Drought Assistance) Act No. 31 of 1966. I thank honourable members for giving me the opportunity to discuss this matter, although we regret the need for such a motion. The drought is having disastrous consequences in this State, and urgent action is required by both the State and Commonwealth Governments to relieve the position. Last November I approached the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Adermann) with a

request for assistance for parts of my district that were suffering from drought. As honourable members know, last year was disastrous for farmers in that area and this is the third year that farmers in the northern part of my district have suffered the ravages of drought. The Minister said that it was a matter for the State Government. I spoke to the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh), following which correspondence flowed from the Government suggesting that if I should supply details of persons suffering from financial hardship, the Government would try to obtain assistance from financial houses or stock and station firms. In some instances, assistance has been given. However, time has passed and no rain has fallen.

A meeting was held at Karoonda last week at which 161 farmers were present and, at another meeting at Wunkar (in my district) on Tuesday of this week, more than 350 farmers from throughout the district urged that something be done to relieve the situation. The problem is desperate for many share-farmers in this area, because they cannot pledge land to a bank as security for an advance to carry on. Even if rain fell now and follow on rains occurred in the spring, these share-farmers would not receive income until January or February because, even with a good harvest, the wheat payments would not be received until then. Consequently, they need an income in order to carry them and their families through. At the Wunkar meeting the type of assistance needed was discussed. Through the co-operation of the Minister of Agriculture, a committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. McAuliffe, was appointed by the Government to consider drought assistance, and this committee attended the meeting.

We tried to ascertain from those present what assistance they wanted. Some, particularly share-farmers, needed a straight-out grant; others wanted assistance from banks or through the State Bank for a long-term loan at a low rate of interest. Others required fodder, and we tried to find out how much grain would be required. Out of the 350 present, 80 farmers said they would need grain to carry their stock through. No hay is available. Many farmers, having reduced their stock numbers and retained breeding ewes only, need feed so that when the season breaks they can build up another flock. When the chairman asked how much grain would be required to feed the starving stock, one farmer said, "Well, what will I be able to buy it with?" That was a pertinent answer,

because that farmer has no money following three years of drought. Even farmers who own land need a special grant in order to buy feed to carry on.

Members will recall that prior to my entering Parliament in 1933 there was a drought period from 1927 to 1929 in this area and also on Eyre Peninsula. Then the good years came again, from 1930 to 1933, where in much of this area at present affected the farmers were reaping nine to 10 bags of grain to the acre, for which they recovered only about 15c a bushel; so they suffered from two bad things—drought and bankruptcy prices. That led to the debt adjustment legislation during the depression, but that will not happen this time. This area has had droughts before and will probably have them again. There will be a return of good seasons and, on the averages, next season should be good. Then, if these farmers who are asking for financial assistance to carry them through get a good season next year, they will get the guaranteed cost of production of their wheat under the wheat stabilization scheme, which will enable them to repay loans more quickly than loans were repaid in the 1930's; so the present position is different from what it was in those bad times.

I put this to the meeting: "We have to face up to the fact that the weather pattern is bad and the rain is not drifting here; until the weather pattern alters we cannot expect much rain. Let us look at this from the worst possible angle. Supposing the drought weather continues and there is not much crop return, how many farmers in this audience will require financial assistance to buy seed and superphosphate next year?" Nearly every farmer in the hall put up his hand. That should indicate to the Government that, because of the three successive dry years, the farmers will be unable to buy seed and superphosphate next year and repay advances from their banks, because they have practically reached the end of their financial resources. Some weeks ago, in May, the banks were chary in their attitude to farmers needing further advances. I approached the Premier and Cabinet on this matter, and they took it up with the banks. I have a report that, since representations have been made to the financial institutions and to the stock and station firms, they have been much more generous than hitherto. So I am not attacking the banking structure. I am pleased that the banks have become more generous than they were in May.

These farmers need assistance. The motion carried at this meeting was that I be authorized to ask the Government to make representations to the Commonwealth Government for a special grant to provide drought relief for farmers in need in South Australia. At the meeting, I quoted from a speech made by the Commonwealth Treasurer when introducing into the Commonwealth Parliament, on May 5, 1966, the States Grants (Drought Assistance) Bill, 1966. He said this, which is pertinent to the present debate:

The fact that the Bill specifies certain amounts for payment in 1965-66 does not mean that the Government has placed any limit on the assistance to be made available to the two States—

that is, New South Wales and Queensland—for drought relief purposes. We have made it clear that we will continue to assist the States to finance their drought measurers as far as necessary and for as long as necessary. Accordingly, the Bill provides for the payment of such further amounts of assistance as Parliament shall, from time to time, appropriate. Clearly, further assistance will be needed next year, although at this stage we cannot predict how much will be required. We will, I expect, be making provision for payment of further assistance in the annual Appropriation Bill.

This is another point:

The Bill does not set out precise terms and conditions for the Commonwealth assistance, but leaves them to be determined by the Commonwealth Treasurer. This will provide flexibility to deal with any circumstances that might arise. As regards the measures currently being undertaken by the States, however, the terms of assistance have been agreed between the Commonwealth and the Premiers of the two States concerned. In general, the Commonwealth assistance will cover expenditure by the States on drought relief measures and also on certain drought rehabilitation measures. The assistance falls into the following five categories:

	Estimated Requirements in 1965-66 \$ million
(i) Loans for carry-on and restocking purposes where credit is not available through normal commercial channels	14.50
(ii) Rebates of rail freight, remissions of road transport fees; and other road transport subsidies in respect of the transport of fodder and water to drought-affected areas, the transport of starving stock out of drought areas, and the transport of stock to areas that have recovered from the drought	4.75

Estimated
Requirements
in 1965-66
\$ million

The next category is most important:

(iii) Grants to local councils and other authorities to provide relief work for those affected by drought and to maintain employment in rural areas	4.60
(iv) Assistance in respect of the Queensland sugar industry. (The Commonwealth has agreed to contribute a total amount of \$1.75 million.)	0.75
(v) Interest on treasury-bills made available temporarily to finance drought measures and minor miscellaneous items of expenditure in relation to the drought	0.40
Total	\$25.00

That was, by the Appropriation Bill, increased later to \$8,000,000 in New South Wales and \$2,750,000 in Queensland. The Commonwealth Treasurer continued:

The assistance provided by the Commonwealth to the States of New South Wales and Queensland will take the form of outright grants except in cases where the funds are used by the States for making repayable loans. In terms of the States' estimates of their requirements in 1965-66, nearly \$10,000,000 will take the form of outright grants and just over \$15,000,000 will take the form of repayable advances. The Commonwealth will make these advances available on an interest-free basis, repayable over a period of 10 years but without any repayments in the first two years. The States will be charging interest at concessional rates on their loans but they will be meeting the administrative costs and, within reasonable limits, any losses which may arise. If, however, such losses prove to be beyond the financial resources of the States at the time, the Commonwealth has undertaken again to come to their aid.

This is a point that refers to us in South Australia. The Treasurer continued, a little further on:

Unfortunately, in north-west New South Wales and to some extent in south-west Queensland, the drought still persists. In other areas, some relief rains have fallen in recent months but, unless further rains fall soon, the position could again become serious. For our part, we will continue to do all we can to alleviate the effects of the drought to the greatest extent possible. From the outset, we have viewed the drought as a national problem; we will continue to view it as such, I commend the Bill to honourable members.

If it is good enough for New South Wales to receive a special grant for drought-stricken farmers, it is good enough for South Australia.

We need such assistance. See how it will affect the State's revenue! There will be a loss of rail freight in respect of grain. I said, during my speech in the debate on the Address in Reply, that I could not see how the Treasurer of this State could balance his Budget with a loss of revenue in that direction. Again, unfortunately, we can see no relief from the present drought: the rains do not seem to be coming. Storms hit the coast of Western Australia and then seem to drift down to the South Pole, leaving us without rain. This has been the weather pattern for some time. I do not believe in making weather forecasts (I do not have much faith in long-range weather forecasts either), but I believe that this weather pattern will not alter until the monsoon season changes the present drift of disturbances to the South Pole.

I do not wish to use up all the time available for the discussion of this motion (the debate must conclude at 4 p.m.), because other members may wish to speak and I shall be glad of their assistance. However, I reiterate that the situation has now become so desperate that we must have money so that we can tide farmers over this difficult period. An interest free loan, supplied by the Commonwealth Government to the State, becomes an investment because, as soon as farmers are again producing wheat, both the Commonwealth and the State Governments will receive more in taxation. Figures I have taken out in regard to the money provided by the Commonwealth Government for the wheat stabilization plan show that over 30 per cent of that money flows back into the Commonwealth Treasury by way of income tax and other types of revenue received by the Commonwealth when primary producers are doing well. It is unnecessary for me to emphasize that point. All members in this Chamber know perfectly well that unless the State can obtain revenue from primary producers it is in a bad position. Therefore, it behoves all of us to do our best so that these farmers can start producing again. When that happens, the farmers will earn money from which the State will ultimately benefit.

I apologize for making this a motion of urgency. I could have put the motion on the Notice Paper but, had I done so, discussion on it could not have commenced until next Wednesday, subsequent adjournments would have been necessary, and no conclusion would have been reached for some time. However, this matter has become so urgent that I moved the motion in accordance with Standing Order

No. 60 so that the House could debate the issue immediately and so that the Government could raise it urgently with the Commonwealth Government. I commend the motion to the House, believing that members will be only too happy to support it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): The honourable member need not apologize for moving his motion. Indeed, nearly all members stood in their places to signify their approval of his action. Had I doubted that four members (the number required by Standing Orders) would signify their approval, I would have been the first to rise. The honourable member has no need to worry about the success of his motion, as I believe all members will support it.

The facts behind his motion are also agreed by members. I appreciate the opportunity given members to debate the matter but, in fact, it was already being considered. However, his motion will draw to the attention of the people of South Australia and to the attention of the Commonwealth Government the fact that this is a matter of urgency and of great concern to South Australia. Recently, the honourable member suggested that a committee be established to inquire into the ramifications of the matter and to ascertain the best way to assist. I was only too happy to recommend to the Government that such a committee be appointed. On the following Monday, Cabinet approved the establishment of the committee and, within a few minutes of that approval, it had commenced its work. As I had told members of the committee to be prepared for Cabinet approval, they were waiting to hold a meeting immediately after approval had been given. As a result of the meeting, they submitted to me suggestions regarding terms of reference for the inquiry that I immediately sanctioned.

All that happened last Monday week and, on Friday of last week, the committee met again to consider the matter further, knowing that a meeting was to be held at Wunkar Tuesday evening. The honourable member invited me to that meeting but, as the House was sitting, I could not attend. However, I made sure that three of the four members of the committee attended. Not only did they attend the meeting: they also spent two days in the area. On the way to Wunkar they examined the situation that had developed. When the Commonwealth Government was considering providing drought assistance for New South Wales and Queensland, I thought

it would be wise to send one of my officers (Mr. Pearson, the Chief Agronomist) to see how the matter was being tackled. At the time, I believed the information obtained might be necessary some years hence. Little did I realize that South Australia would experience a drought so soon.

I am sure that the information Mr. Pearson acquired will stand this State in good stead. He learned about the approach of farmers to the assistance provided by the Commonwealth Government and brought back a comprehensive report, some of which was most interesting. I was surprised to learn that some farmers who appeared to need assistance from the Loan money provided did not take advantage of it. It remains to be seen how farmers in South Australia will react. The information gathered by Mr. Pearson will be useful in drawing comparisons.

The situation in Loxton, Waikerie and other places in the area has existed for some time. This area does not receive the best rainfall in the State by any means: it is drought-prone and possibly farmers in the area expect a drought for one or two years but, in this case, the drought has lasted for three years and there is little prospect of any improvement in the conditions. Of course, other areas in the State are also feeling the effects of the drought. In my district, and in the district of the member for Stirling, although there had been a need for rain, there was no panic, but the worst dust storm in history took place last Sunday week. Good arable land, previously productive, has turned into sandhills, and the change has to be seen to be believed. Although this problem is probably different from that raised by the member for Ridley this afternoon, it is associated with the drought that South Australia is experiencing. Some farmers in the area who had sown have lost their entire season's seed and superphosphate. Some had not sown, as they were waiting for rain to fall. In fact, the rainfall in that area this year has been less than two inches, possibly the lowest rainfall on record for this time of the year. How conditions will compare with those of 1914 and 1944 is still to be determined, but at this stage things are grim.

I sent the committee to which I have referred to Wunkar, as that was the first meeting that came to our notice. Another meeting, at Summerfield, was attended by about 200 people, mainly from the Murray Plains area. I sent Mr. Williams, my adviser for the district, to represent the committee and me and to obtain

first-hand information. I have today received a report of both meetings. I have all the suggestions that were made at Wunkar and Summerfield and the resolutions that were carried. A committee has been set up in the District of Ridley which will be in close liaison with the Drought Relief Committee.

The situation is different in the Murray Plains area where the district councils themselves are providing liaison. It was suggested at the meeting, and this has been agreed to, that we should send out a questionnaire to every landowner and every share farmer in the area; the replies to this questionnaire will be collated by the district councils.

So, I can inform the House that the Government is particularly anxious about the situation and is taking every step to see that the best is done for those who are suffering hardship. Of course, situations differ—even in the areas referred to. One farmer at Palmer has been spending much money in buying oats from Victoria, and he has already completed sowing. Perhaps he has not had as much wind erosion as some of the other farmers have had. Nevertheless, it is costing him much money. Others, of course, have not sown at all. Some have been established for many years and have experienced good seasons, but those young people who have come into these areas recently and taken over land will be in a different situation. Each farmer will have to be treated on his merits as was done in New South Wales.

I have instructed two officers of the soils section of my department to go to those areas that have been affected severely by wind erosion and offer advice on the best way farmers can recover from this severe blow. I have found that some of these farmers are confused because they have never experienced anything like this before in that type of country. Consequently, they need to be informed of the right steps to prevent further drift and to achieve a soil cover when the opportunity occurs.

I do not know whether there will be rain in the near future but I am hoping for it. Nothing would be better to give confidence and encouragement to these people than two inches of rain spread over the whole area. Of course, we do not know how long the drought will last. Dairy farmers along the Murray River swamps who have fodder under irrigation appear to be in a reasonable situation at present. However, they normally buy much cereal hay from farmers; most of them have their regular customers

and, because of the shortage this year, it appears that there will not be very much cereal hay and that the farmers will have to look further afield for their supplies. During the winter months when they need supplies of fodder they will be very short indeed.

So, many problems have been caused by this drought. The member for Ridley was quite right when he stated that many of these people have had three years without a worthwhile crop; indeed, in some cases they got only four to six bushels an acre, which is not very much. While most of the members of the committee were at Wunkar, the member from the Treasury and the member nominated by the Minister of Lands have been active in Adelaide in regard to another aspect. I have a report from the member from the Treasury, which states:

I have spoken to the State managers or senior officers of all of the banks operating in South Australia and have been advised that all of them accept the responsibility for providing and have either provided or expect to be asked to provide reasonable carry-on finance for their customers whose incomes and finances have been affected by droughts. I have been assured that any such person who can show that, with the provision of some additional finance, he will be able to carry on until he is able to recommence earning income and then will be able to proceed, with normal seasons, to rehabilitate his position will receive sympathetic treatment from his bank in respect of requests for carry-on finance.

Mr. Joy has also spoken to the stock firms operating in the area, and they have given similar assurances. The committee has been very active indeed. I was about to say that it has not allowed the grass to grow under its feet, but this would not be the right time to say that, because there has not been much grass anywhere. Parts of Eyre Peninsula have had reasonably good rains and follow-up rains would enable good harvests to result. However, the position in the rest of the State is not promising.

The position regarding fodder supply is therefore acute. I have asked the wheat and barley boards to set aside grain in the areas worst affected, and they have done that. Grain is being brought from other States, but this involves a serious danger. I have been told that some oats in the Palmer district contained skeleton weed seed. In other drought periods, such as in 1944, many noxious weeds were brought in with fodder from other States. An embargo has now been placed on bringing in lucerne, and care must be taken.

Some people along the Murray River who have irrigation schemes are growing much lucerne. Because of the need to protect the

river and because of the cessation of granting of licences, some people who could otherwise have increased production this year will not be able to do so. However, some people had applied for a licence before cessation took place. I have asked the Minister of Works to speed up this matter so that no delay will take place.

I assure the honourable member and the House that the Government is fully conscious of all the associated problems. This committee, which was set up by the Government, is devoting its full time to the situation and every effort will be made to obtain all the assistance possible from the Commonwealth Government. During the drought in New South Wales the State Government had to give help before the Commonwealth would do so, and I guess that the same will apply here.

I have informed the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry that this State will be seeking assistance this year, because I thought at that stage (two weeks ago) that it would be necessary. I believe that all members of the Agricultural Council were sympathetic with South Australia's position, particularly the representatives of New South Wales and Queensland who had had a similar experience two years ago. I do not think I need to add anything more at this stage other than to say that everything possible is being done to meet the situation.

Efforts are being made to persuade lending firms to continue to finance farmers, and promises have been received that farmers will be assisted over this difficult period. However, some people may find it difficult to increase their liabilities further, and they will be treated on their merits. So, I add my support to the suggestions and recommendations of the honourable member and I assure him that we will do everything in our power to see that farmers will not be displaced and that they will be given the opportunity to carry on. My earnest prayer is that rain will fall soon.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I know that we had all hoped that by this stage the weather patterns over South Australia would have significantly changed and that a break in the season would have occurred. However, such a break has occurred only in a relatively small part of the State. We are looking with anxious eyes at the weather systems approaching South Australia now in the hope that they will bring rains that will retrieve the position in some areas. However, we know that in the areas being discussed today it is too

late for any rains to turn this season into a good one. This situation has been building up for a number of years, and earlier speakers have said that the problem has grown over the last three years, during which we have had this unusually long dry spell in an area that can expect to have a variability in the weather. The result is that some landholders in these areas have received no significant income in this period. In the face of the expenses of modern farming, this represents a disaster to these people and it has caused much discussion in the areas and in this House.

I should like now to refer to an article in *River News* of May 17 which circulates in the areas that members have referred to in order to illustrate the concern that farmers there expressed at an earlier stage in the season. The report states:

Mallee seasonal outlook critical. Drought area claim farmers. Farmers in the Murray Mallee are wondering how much longer they will have to hang on before the Government takes action and provides some form of drought relief assistance. Only last week the Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. (Mr. T. C. Stott, M.P.), was reported as saying there was no reason at this time to declare any part of South Australia a drought area.

This wide statement must have stirred some action from farmers in the Upper Murray, because a few days later Mr. Stott said he would ask the Government to provide drought relief "if rain does not fall by the end of the month." The position in the Murray Mallee is now critical. Vast areas have not received good soaking rains for over two years. Consequently, feed and crops have been almost non-existent, while stock in many cases have been reduced to the minimum.

Farmers in these areas must find it difficult to follow the statement by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Bywaters) that, following talks with the Director of Agriculture (Mr. A. G. Strickland), he would have to think twice before declaring the Murray Mallee a drought area.

Those references have little significance today, because I acknowledge that the Minister has taken a proper interest by giving attention to the matter in the last few weeks. The report continues:

Mr. G. A. Blight, the endorsed L.C.L. candidate for Ridley, is concerned at the lack of interest shown by the State Government in surveying the Murray Mallee of South Australia, and having it declared a drought area. He said that the good season experienced by most of the State last year has lulled other people into thinking that everything is all right for the present. This is not the case in the Murray Mallee.

The lack of winter rains last year resulted in a very limited amount of feed available for stock, and this has long since disappeared.

There are many farmers throughout the area who have exhausted their reserves of fodder and are at present purchasing hay and cereals from other parts of the State in an endeavour to hold on to their breeding stock until such time as useful rains are received. For these people the position is critical.

There are other references to the need to retain grain, and so on, in those areas. Subsequently, questions were asked in the House and, after one such question was asked by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), the Minister appointed a committee to deal with the situation, to keep details of progress or otherwise before the Government and to provide a case on which an appeal for drought relief could be based. I consider this urgency motion well based and that an appeal to the Commonwealth Government for drought assistance for these areas ought to be made. We can say this with confidence, because we know that the Commonwealth has provided assistance in relation to drought-affected areas in other States recently. I think the conditions in parts of South Australia today are as bad they were in the worst-affected areas of New South Wales and Queensland.

When we are making this appeal to the Commonwealth, we must not ignore the action that the State Government can take. We on this side of the House are becoming accustomed to the Government's tactics of blaming the Commonwealth Government for the shortage of funds and for the State Government's inability to carry out certain works. I draw attention to the need to take all necessary action in this crisis and not to blame the Commonwealth Government. Almost daily we hear of the inability of the State Government to take certain action because it has not received Commonwealth funds. We ought to appeal to the Commonwealth Government for funds for drought assistance, but we must also examine carefully what action can be taken in the State sphere. The Minister today referred to matters in which the Government could be involved. He mentioned the transfer of grain from other States for stock feeding and also the need for farmers and graziers to have carry-over finance.

Can any concession be given in regard to the registration of vehicles that have not had much use on properties because little seeding has been carried out? What is happening about the road tax on grain carted between the States? I hope that the Government and the committee will consider these matters. There is also the matter of retention of grain,

particularly barley, in the areas affected by drought. The State Government could have an important influence on the policies of the wheat and barley boards in regard to this retention. After all, the Barley Board has the duty of selling our barley.

What happens regarding the local sharefarmers, for instance, who might want work, possibly on Government projects? Only recently employees were dismissed from the Peterborough meat works, and I understand that the Government took action to see that extra money was channelled to the local council so that these employees could be actively engaged on alternative work. Where will the superphosphate and seed come from for next year's crops to provide a return for these farmers? All these are matters with which this Government could be and should be involved, especially if the drought continues and the worst predictions for this year are realized.

I firmly support this urgency motion, and I consider that every honourable member in this House should support it. At the same time I remind the House that the Government should in no way ignore its responsibilities in this matter, although I am not charging it with ignoring its responsibilities now. The Government has these responsibilities, and in some weeks we may be able to see how it has coped with them.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): Together with other honourable members, I endorse this urgency motion and assure the House that as far as the Government is concerned it is well aware of what is happening in some parts of the State. When this Government first took office it gave relief to the drought-ravaged people in the Far North of this State who had been in the throes of drought for about seven years.

Mr. McKee: What did the Liberal Government do for them?

Mr. CASEY: Nothing. That is the point. This Government is aware that South Australia is a drought-prone State in a drought-prone country. One need only look at the newspapers to see whether we are getting floods, fires or famine of some description. South Australia appears to be more drought prone than do the other States, and an area, such as that represented by the member for Ridley, deteriorates very quickly without moisture. It is for this reason that these people are hit particularly hard, and it is not only this year that they have been hit: they have been hit for three consecutive years. They have my sympathy, because as a practical man of the land I realize the difficulties they are experiencing.

They have to make up their minds and gamble on holding or selling their breeding stock, which is a difficult decision to make. If they hold on to their stock they have to buy fodder. They have to decide whether it would be more economical to sell their stock and buy other stock at a later date, or keep and feed them. This is the basis of these drought problems, because in the small areas that rely on cereal growing particularly they do not hold the stock for long unless they have a great number of them. Nevertheless, in many areas people are reverting to breeding ewes instead of carrying dry sheep, and it is perhaps more economical for them to do that. That is the biggest problem that is facing farmers in these drought-prone areas. It does not seem humanly possible for the Leader of the Opposition to get up without having a shot at the Government.

A member: This is not the time.

Mr. CASEY: Of course, this is not the time to do this sort of thing; when the Government is doing the best possible for these people who are in such dire circumstances. What has been outlined by the Minister of Agriculture today shows how aware the Government is of the position.

Mr. McKee: Why didn't he tell us what his Government did.

Mr. CASEY: He couldn't. I made representations to the previous Government on many occasions for drought relief in the Far North, but I was ignored. The question before the House this afternoon is: can we help the people in the area that is represented by the member for Ridley? The Minister outlined exactly how the relief committee was set up, and how it had gone into the problem immediately. The recommendations that have been made to the Minister have been put into effect as far as practicable, even up to this particular stage, and representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government for money that could alleviate the position even further. Of course, there is one thing the Government cannot control or influence in any way, and that is the weather. We are subject to the elements, and the sooner we realize this the better off we shall be as far as the political aspect of this matter is concerned. It has even been said that the Government is causing the dry season. Of course, that is tommy rot. It is just as well that we have no say regarding the weather, because if the member for Ridley wanted an inch of rain and the member for Rocky River did not and

they called on the rain-making devices and the rain fell on country where it was not wanted, it would cause an uproar.

I hope that, when the Commonwealth Government is approached on this matter (and I suggest the sooner the better) for help for these farmers, it will be stressed that other States of the Commonwealth, particularly New South Wales, have been granted relief on not one occasion in the past 10 years but on many occasions. Queensland, and to a lesser extent Victoria, have also received assistance from the Commonwealth Government. I understand that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent in the world. What we are attempting to do this afternoon is to adopt a unanimous attitude that we are all in favour of helping to the utmost the people in these drought areas. I believe we all want the Commonwealth Government to help in any way it can, in order to minimize the hardships of the farmers in the Loxton-Waikerie area. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I am pleased to support the motion. I was interested to hear the member for Frome refer to the time when the Labor Party first came into power. He had been speaking for five or 10 minutes before I realized that he was talking not about 1930 but about 1965. The honourable member was reluctant to reply to any interjections made by members on this side of the House; the member for Alexandra tried to ascertain from him the amount of drought relief the Labor Party had contributed in 1965, but the honourable member was not to be drawn out, because he did not know. I offer my sympathy to farmers in the Mallee area. We all realize the great difficulties they are experiencing. I am happy to say that farmers in my own district are slightly better off. However, there is no doubt that this year is one of the worst years (if not the worst) on record. Northern New South Wales and southern Queensland were almost rainless in 1965 and 1966. A farmer friend living near Armidale, New South Wales, wrote to me that, having been forced to sell all his stock, he had received no income for 12 months. He was merely filling in time on the farm by fencing, etc., and waiting for the rains that never seemed to come. There is no doubt that farmers are vulnerable to droughts. I appreciate what the Minister of Agriculture is trying to do, but no amount of extension services can really replace the capital that is needed so much by farmers to keep going. The member for Ridley referred to the debate on the

States Grants (Drought Assistance) Bill in May, 1966. To illustrate the difference in the approaches of the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Parties and the Labor Party in this regard, I shall quote what the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Adermann) said when speaking to that debate:

The States are the administering authorities in matters relating to drought relief.

I compare that with the Labor Party's approach, as a result of which all aid and control are centralized and emanate from Canberra. Mr. Adermann continued:

They determine the methods by which relief shall be given, the manner in which loans are to be made and rebates on freights, for they control the railways. Indeed, they determine all matters relating to drought relief. Applications for assistance are submitted to local authorities and passed on to the State authorities who determine the action that is to be taken. The Commonwealth merely says: "You may have loan moneys free of interest for 10 years and free of repayments for two years." A grant is a grant. We do not get it back. There is a grant for \$10,000,000. A loan for \$15,000,000 is provided, without interest, for 10 years. This is more reasonable treatment than has ever been given before, in spite of what the honourable member for Lalor (Mr. Pollard)—

a former Socialist Minister for Agriculture—says, because any assistance that the Government of which he was a member gave was on a £1 for £1 basis. The States had to find their £1 before they got £1 from the Commonwealth.

That indicates Labor's thinking when it was previously in power in Canberra. Had it been the attitude of the Liberal and Country Party Government, New South Wales and Queensland possibly would have received no grant at all, because in the financial difficulties forced on them by the drought they would certainly not have been able to match the grant.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Is this all you can talk about?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I should like to hear the contribution the Minister of Education could make. I do not think he has any real interest in the farmers in the Mallee area of South Australia. Not satisfied with making one major grant, the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Government followed it up with a second grant. Mr. Howson, the Minister assisting the Treasurer, had the following to say on September 15, 1966, when introducing the second States Grants (Drought Assistance) Bill:

The purpose of this Bill is to authorize the payment in the current financial year of an amount of \$10,750,000 to the States of

New South Wales and Queensland to assist them in meeting the adverse effects of drought on their revenues. Of this amount, it is proposed that \$8,000,000 be paid to New South Wales and \$2,750,000 to Queensland.

A little later, he said:

The amounts payable under the present Bill would be additional to those paid in accordance with earlier legislation and would increase total estimated Commonwealth payments for drought assistance in 1966-67 to \$35,000,000, of which \$23,000,000 would be payable to New South Wales and \$12,000,000 to Queensland. The additional assistance of \$10,750,000 will be made available in the form of non-repayable grants. As these grants are designed to assist the States in meeting the adverse effects of drought on their revenues, they do not carry any conditions as to the purposes for which they may be spent.

That illustrates the Commonwealth Government's sympathy for the State Governments in relation to drought relief. Indeed, we are fortunate that the Commonwealth Government thinks this way and is prepared to assist on a straight-out capital grant basis, not asking for a matching contribution. If the Commonwealth required such a contribution South Australia's Socialist Government certainly would not be able to accept any aid. I support this motion and hope that it will receive the support of all members.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I would not have risen but for the fact that the member for Light, when I interjected to the effect, "Is that all you have to talk about?" (seeing that he was trying to make political capital out of this issue), said, in effect, "I cannot understand what the Minister of Education knows about drought relief or how he would be interested in people in the Mallee." I was in the Mallee during the depression years and experienced drought, and I probably know much more about drought conditions than he ever will. I take great exception to his remarks. He just does not know what he is talking about. In fact, I have probably had more experience of conditions in the Mallee and droughts therein than he is ever likely to have.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I am pleased to support the motion. Farmers in the Murray Plains area of my district are in a plight similar to that outlined by the member for Ridley. I therefore welcome the steps that he has taken to bring this matter before the House. I appreciate, too, the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that the Government has the matter in hand with a view to saving the position of many farmers at present in desperate circumstances.

I agree with what the Leader of the Opposition said, namely, that strong representations should be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial aid, in order to meet the situation. Aid was given by the Commonwealth authorities to the States of Queensland and New South Wales when those States found themselves in a desperate position only a few years ago. The farmers in the most desperate plight were those in some of the western areas of those States.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the Government itself should take every possible step to save the situation for those that are in need. I recall that in 1945 a very large portion of this State was suffering from serious drought. In that year, many farmers were in desperate circumstances, for they were unable to provide the feed and fodder necessary to maintain the stock on their farms. I can recall, too, that in that same year the Playford Government lost no time in introducing appropriate legislation. I refer to the Drought Relief Act of 1945, which was assented to in November, 1945. That legislation at least gave the Minister (I think the Minister of Agriculture) particular powers, and no doubt if the present Minister of Agriculture could have similar powers the Government itself could deal effectively with the plight in which some of these farmers find themselves. It may be necessary in due course, if the present condition persists, to pass legislation to provide the Minister with the necessary powers. Section 5 of the Drought Relief Act, 1945, provides:

(1) Where the Minister is satisfied that any farmer is in necessitous circumstances, and has sustained loss by reason of the drought prevailing in the State during the year nineteen hundred and forty-five he may—

- (a) make a loan of money to that farmer;
- (b) sell or supply to that farmer any commodities which in the Minister's opinion are required for or in connection with the carrying on of farming operations by the farmer or for or in connection with the maintenance of himself and his dependents.

(2) Every such loan, sale, or supply shall be upon such terms and conditions as to payment, interest, security, and otherwise, as the Minister thinks fit.

(3) No money shall be lent and no goods shall be sold or supplied under this section after the twenty-eighth day of February, nineteen hundred and forty-seven.

That legislation, of course, is not applicable to the present time. Section 8 went further still, for it gave the Minister power to buy any hay, chaff, or any standing crop capable of being harvested as hay. It also gave him

power to harvest or cause to be harvested any standing crop purchased by him. That year was a desperate one for many primary producers. When the position is desperate, one has to resort to desperate remedies, so such remedies were resorted to in 1945 by the Playford Government. If the present position continues to deteriorate, it may be necessary very soon for appropriate legislation to be passed by this Parliament so that the Government will have adequate power to deal with the situation.

I trust that every possible step will be taken to safeguard the interests of the primary producers concerned so that they will be able to continue their operations on the land. I also earnestly pray that the position will be eased by an early downpour of heavy rain. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The Hon. T. C. STOTT moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the debate to be continued until 4.20 p.m.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I agreed to 4.15 p.m.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the debate to be continued until 4.15 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I wholeheartedly support the motion, because I think it is most important that something be done in this matter. The opening of the season in my own area is the driest on record. The records show that sometimes when we have a dry opening we have a good finish. The really bad drought years in 1914 and 1944 and others in the past were generally ones in which we had two or three inches of rain or even more in April and May but very little later in the year. However, people could at least keep their stock going through the early part of the year and get their crops in so that there would be some coverage.

However, this year so far is the driest year on record. In addition, we had a record wind last Sunday week. I know of at least three instances in which dust blew against sheep huddled in a corner of a paddock and the owner had to dig them out before they could be moved. One can realize the amount of damage that was done. I commend the Minister for so promptly setting up a committee. I do not want to be accused of being political about this, but I point out that many

committees that are set up take a long time to achieve anything. Let us hope that this is not the position on this occasion. I would have liked to see a farmer with some practical experience of this type of thing appointed to that committee. Without wishing to reflect on the ability of the departmental officers on it, I think it would be a much better-balanced committee if it included a primary producer member. Also, it might result in a report being brought down more quickly.

Many farmers have had a difficult time overall in the last three or four years. Prior to that, the deposits of the farming community as a whole always exceeded the liabilities of farmers. However, we have seen a change in this position, and perhaps it has been accentuated by the drought in New South Wales and Queensland. At present the farming community as a whole owes about \$500,000,000 more than it has in deposits in the banks and the various financial institutions. In a bad year such as the present one most farmers generally rely on some assistance from the financial institutions, the stock firms, and so on. Normally, many of them would have 1,000 sheep at \$8 a head, so they would have \$8,000 worth of assets on their farms and therefore could secure a reasonable amount of finance. However, they have had to sell half their sheep at \$1 or \$2 a head, and I know of a specific instance in which the lending authority would place a value of only \$1 a head on the remaining sheep. Therefore, they do not have the financial resources to carry on.

One of the most urgent needs is for finance at a low rate of interest to enable those farmers to carry on. An approach to the banking institutions and the stock firms will assist only those that are at present in a reasonable position. Those in the most difficult position and requiring the most urgent assistance should receive any money that is available. It has been suggested that some farmers may not know how to handle drifting country, but those who have been in this area for some years should know what to do. Some people think that when crops are re-sown the ground should be left ridgy; others say that the culti-pack method by which the ground is left smooth—

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that, whilst I have been most liberal in allowing the debate to proceed, Standing Orders require that it be limited to the terms of the motion, which is that the State Government should make an application to the Commonwealth Government

for a grant for relief as provided under the Commonwealth State Grants (Drought Assistance) Act, No. 31 of 1966. I know that several members are anxious to speak in this debate and, as time is limited, I ask members to confine their remarks to the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: A few days ago I was told by a Commonwealth member that, before the Commonwealth Government would assist, the State Government must make assistance available. Two years ago the New South Wales Government, and this year, the Victorian Government both declared certain areas drought areas, so that Government assistance and various concessions would be available. The Government should immediately supply whatever assistance is needed so that it can, with confidence, expect to receive assistance from the Commonwealth Government. It must take the initiative before it can expect Commonwealth Government assistance.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): It is regrettable that this motion has to be discussed, but we realize that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent and that people are suffering hardships because of the present situation. The Government readily acknowledges the action of the member for Ridley in seeking a grant from the Commonwealth Government in an attempt to relieve the situation in the Murray Mallee. All members sympathize with these farmers, and hope that when the application is made to the Commonwealth Government it will contribute generously to assist this worthy cause. A precedent has been set, particularly in relation to Queensland and Victoria, and we look forward to a similar contribution by the Commonwealth Government. As strongly as I can I support this motion, and hope that the Commonwealth Government will assist this State.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the motion and I am pleased to see the widespread support of honourable members. Drought is a terrible thing, as every member understands. It is a tribute to the strength of the agricultural situation that this drought has not caused more disaster than it has. With the same climatic conditions 20 or 30 years ago, the consequences would have been more disastrous, particularly concerning stock losses, than they are today. Improvements have been made but, in spite of them, there is no substitute for rain, and the Murray Mallee is suffering most of all from lack of it. An approach to the Commonwealth Government is

unlikely to be successful unless some assistance is forthcoming first from this Government. The assistance given to New South Wales and Queensland amounted to \$25,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 was an outright grant and \$15,000,000 an interest-free loan. This Government will have to provide assistance.

The member for Frome spoke about the assistance that his Government is alleged to have given two years ago, but I remind him that it amounted to less than \$5,000. In the main, it was a remission of railway freight on the cartage of hay, which had been supplied by other people.

Mr. McKee: There were rental remissions.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Rental remissions did not exceed \$1,028, according to an answer I received. The total of that relief amounts to almost nothing when the conditions of the present drought are considered. Whatever assistance the Commonwealth Government provides, this Government will have to find money and the present Leader of the Opposition may be the one to provide it from the Treasury next year.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): As a member living in the Murray Mallee and representing part of the drought area, I have little time, without the permission of the House to continue my remarks, to support this motion. The present drought area is limited, but a large area of the State is suffering from the same conditions. I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to complete my remarks.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No. I have an agreement to the contrary.

Mr. Millhouse: Haven't you heard about the drought?

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and there being an absolute majority of the Whole I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The House divided on Mr. Nankivell's motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell (teller), and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Shannon, and Teusner.

Noes (20).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1967. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act which are mainly designed to effect certain changes in the administration of the Act and in the administration of racing so as to assist the various racing and trotting clubs to improve the standard of racing in this State and to provide a better service to the public. Section 19 of the principal Act sets out the present limitations on the use of totalizators by the various clubs. At present there are 49 meetings at which the totalizator may be used within 15 miles of the General Post Office in any year. These meetings are allotted as follows: 17 to Morphettville racecourse, 16 to Victoria Park racecourse, and 16 to Cheltenham Park racecourse.

The Gawler Jockey Club uses the totalizator at the Evanston racecourse, Gawler, on eight Saturdays in the year, but that club now desires to forgo Saturday racing dates and race on mid-week dates, which would leave those Saturdays free for re-allocation to Morphettville, Victoria Park and Cheltenham Park racecourses. It has also been agreed between the racing clubs concerned that, subject to the passing of the necessary legislation by Parliament, the final three meetings of the 1967 racing year which are presently allocated to the Gawler Jockey Club would be conducted on one or other of the metropolitan racecourses, the actual venue of each meeting to be as approved by the Chief Secretary.

As section 19 in its present form needs revision to give effect to these changes, clause 3 of the Bill repeals and re-enacts the section. The effect of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (1) of the section as so re-enacted is that the racing dates for the year 1967 allocated to the three metropolitan clubs will be unchanged but from 1968 the eight Saturday racing dates previously allocated to the Gawler Jockey Club will be allocated as follows: three days permanently to Morphettville racecourse; and three and two dates alternating each year between Victoria Park and

Cheltenham Park racecourses, with Victoria Park being allocated the three dates for 1968 in accordance with an agreement reached between the clubs concerned. Paragraphs (d) and (e) of subsection (1) of the section as re-enacted correspond in substance with paragraphs (a1) and (a2) of the present section. Paragraph (f) of subsection (1) will make it possible for mid-week racing to be conducted at Gawler on 13 days in the year as from 1968. It is proposed that, of those fixtures, the Gawler Jockey Club will be allotted 10 days and the Barossa Valley Racing Club three days.

Paragraph (g) of subsection (1) corresponds in substance with paragraph (b) of the present section except for the proposed separation from that paragraph of the Gawler fixtures as from 1968. Subsection (2) of the section as re-enacted corresponds in substance with the first proviso to paragraph (a) of the present section. Subsection (3) of the section as re-enacted corresponds in substance with the second proviso to paragraph (a) of the present section. Subsection (4) of the section as re-enacted corresponds in substance with the third proviso to paragraph (a) and the proviso to paragraph (b) of the present section. Subsection (5) of the section provides for the transfer of the final three meetings of the 1967 racing year allocated to the Gawler Jockey Club to the metropolitan courses.

Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act which deals with the use of the totalizator at trotting races. Under that section at present trotting clubs in the three zones outside the metropolitan area, namely, Eyre Peninsula, the South-East and the Murray area, are permitted to conduct meetings only on Saturdays and public holidays. This has in the recent past proved to be an undue restriction in that the clubs concerned have not been able to plan their programmes to take advantage of local conditions. The country clubs concerned have, through the South Australian Trotting League Incorporated, requested the Government to introduce legislation to remove this limitation so that they may lawfully conduct trotting meetings on any day of the week.

In support of this request, the clubs have also submitted that removal of the restriction would enable them to take advantage of carnival periods in the respective areas and the consequent gathering of large numbers of trotting enthusiasts on those occasions, and to make provision promptly for the holding of meetings which have to be postponed on account

of inclement weather. Some of these country clubs are unable to hold a Saturday meeting in substitution for a postponed meeting because other clubs also race on Saturdays at present. It is also probable that, because the Totalizator Agency Board is providing T.A.B. facilities to the South Australian Trotting Club on Saturday nights, such facilities would not be granted to any other trotting club on Saturdays for some time at any rate. Accordingly, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of clause 4 remove the limitation imposed on those country clubs restricting them to racing on Saturdays and public holidays only. In addition, paragraph (a), while limiting the use of the totalizator on Eyre Peninsula to an aggregate of 20 meetings in the year 1967, raises that limit to an aggregate of 40 meetings a year in any year thereafter. This increase has also been recommended by the South Australian Trotting League Incorporated.

The Eyre Peninsula zone covers the whole of the State which lies west of the west coast of Spencer Gulf and south of a line across the north-western corner of Port Augusta. At present three clubs are registered in this area, namely, Port Augusta, which conducts 12 meetings a year, Whyalla, which conducts seven meetings, and Kimba, which conducts one meeting. These three clubs at present absorb all the trotting dates available for the whole of the zone. The rapidly increasing population of Whyalla and Port Augusta has created a strong demand for more dates for the zone. In addition, the Franklin Harbour Trotting Club (Cowell) has made an application for registration with the South Australian Trotting League and formal approval was granted by the league on July 3, 1967. This would mean that some of the dates normally allotted to previously registered clubs would have to be transferred to this new club unless additional dates were sanctioned by Parliament. There is also a move to form a trotting club at Port Lincoln. Persons interested in trotting in Port Lincoln and Cowell experience great difficulty and hardship in conveying their horses all the way to Whyalla and Port Augusta. For these main reasons the league has recommended the increase in the aggregate number of trotting meetings in the Eyre Peninsula zone from 20 to 40 meetings a year.

Clause 5 amends section 28 of the principal Act which deals with the mode of dealing with moneys paid into a totalizator used by a club. Both the South Australian Jockey Club and the South Australian Trotting League

have made representations requesting the amendment of the principal Act to provide for a return to the practice whereby the clubs retain on-course totalizator fractions for distribution to various charities approved by the Commissioner of Police. The Government is agreeable to meeting this request and paragraph (a) of the clause provides, in effect, for the amount derived by a club through off-course fractions to be paid to the Totalizator Agency Board for crediting to the dividends adjustment account. Paragraph (b) re-enacts subsection (5) which guarantees a totalizator dividend equivalent to the amount of the stake except in cases of dead heats.

The re-enacted subsection enables the stake to be made up from fractions held by the club or if the amount held by the club by way of unpaid fractions on any day is insufficient to make up the guaranteed stake any deficiency will be paid from the dividends adjustment account which will consist of unpaid fractions derived from off-course investments with the T.A.B. When redrafting subsection (5) advantage has been taken to clarify the existing provisions relating to dead heats the effect of which has not been changed. Paragraph (c) of the clause authorizes a club to distribute its unpaid fractions to such charitable purposes as are approved by the Commissioner of Police (new subsection (6a)) and authorizes the refund to the clubs of amounts paid by them into the dividends adjustment account which are attributable to on-course fractions for payment to charities (new subsection (6b)).

Clause 6 amends section 31n of the principal Act which deals with the application of moneys invested with the T.A.B. The amendment made by paragraph (a) of the clause is consequential on the re-enactment of subsection (4) of section 28 by clause 5(a). Paragraph (b) of the clause re-enacts subsection (4) of section 31n so as to bring the dead-heat provisions into line with section 28(5) as re enacted by clause 5(b). Clause 7 amends section 31n of the principal Act which deals with the calculation and payment of dividends and the determination and disposal of unpaid fractions where off-course betting is conducted on a totalizator used by a club. Paragraphs (a) and (c) are consequential on paragraph (b) which requires all unpaid fractions which are attributable to off-course investments to be paid by the T.A.B. into the dividends adjustment account.

Clause 8 amends section 67a of the principal Act which prohibits the broadcasting, by

means of wireless broadcast, of certain betting information. The clause exempts from the prohibition the broadcasting, after the determination of a race or event, of the totalizator dividends declared in respect of that race or event or any other information relating to the betting on any horse that took part in that race.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from July 26. Page 884.)

Clause 13—"Exceptions to application of Act."

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Premier.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the file on this matter, and it was on the file long before the Premier's amendment. Therefore, why is his amendment called on first? It is to the same general effect:

The CHAIRMAN: It has always been ruled in this Committee that preference is given in relation to the place in a clause to which amendments refer and not in relation to the time that an amendment has been on the file.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Both the Premier's amendment and my amendment relate to lines 6 and 7.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the Premier's amendment relates to an earlier part of those lines.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What will happen to my amendment? Is my position safeguarded?

The CHAIRMAN: On the surface, it appears to me that it will be safeguarded, having regard to the vote that will be taken on the Premier's amendment.

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

In subclause (5) II. to strike out "in any premises established".

I am indebted to the member for Mitcham for calling my attention to this particular clause because, whilst I appreciate what he is trying to do by his amendment, the clause as it is drafted is unsatisfactory and I am afraid his amendment does not make it better: it makes it worse.

Mr. Millhouse: Yours makes it worse still.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; I shall explain it. As the clause stands it states, in part:

(5) This Act shall not apply . . . to the sale or supply of liquor in any premises established by or under the authority of the Commonwealth.

On the face of it, that would mean that if any normally illegal supply of liquor took place in the foyer of the General Post Office in Adelaide, the legislation would not apply. We cannot allow that to continue. The honourable member wanted to alter the clause so that the legislation would not apply in any area under the authority of the Commonwealth, but that still does not cure the objection; it widens the matter so that, if it is in a field under the authority of the Commonwealth, it still does not cope with what would otherwise be an illegal supply. If we simply cut out the words "in any premises established" and say, "This Act shall not apply to the sale or supply of liquor by or under the authority of the Commonwealth"—

Mr. Millhouse: We are giving a lot away.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; we are giving away much less than before. In fact, of course, we have no legal power to enact any law as to liquor sold or supplied by or under the authority of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Millhouse: This is done.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is open to doubt. I have endeavoured to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government on this, but my advice is that we have no effective means of controlling it if it is by or under the authority of the Commonwealth, and consequently the Commonwealth can, and in fact it has intimated that it will, establish a liquor outlet at both airports in South Australia. It has undertaken that these liquor outlets will be established and operated in accordance with the provisions of our legislation, but that is by agreement and not, in fact, by force of law.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Does that mean they could do what they liked in a Commonwealth office?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Commonwealth Government gave authority for it, yes.

Mr. Millhouse: That is why we are giving a lot away.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The point is that if the Commonwealth has provided for such an authority to be given, then there is little that we can do if that authority is ancillary to a function of the Commonwealth.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It puts them in the same category as an oversea consulate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Very largely. What I am proposing here narrows down the clause, but what the member for Mitcham is proposing widens it, because the effect of his amendment is to cut out the words "premises established by or", so then the subclause will read, "to the sale or supply of liquor in any area under the authority of the Commonwealth". In that case, any area under the authority of the Commonwealth would be an area where this legislation would not apply. We cannot do that. The effect of the honourable member's amendment would be that if one went to the Adelaide Airport and went in for a bit of sly-grogging, the legislation would not apply. What my amendment does is to confine the sale or supply to a sale or supply by or under the authority of the Commonwealth. "By or under the authority of the Commonwealth" in my mind applies to the sale or supply—that is the important thing. That, of course, is an area in which we have little authority. In effect, it re-enacts the section of the present Act referring to these matters.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not quite sure whether the Premier is stating the position completely accurately. In the past I received opinions from the Crown Solicitor's Office that the State would have no authority in connection with any constitutional function of the Commonwealth to supply or make provision for the supply of liquor. For instance, no-one would argue that, in connection with the military camps of the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth would not have jurisdiction. The same would apply in an Air Force camp. The Premier's amendment, whilst it seeks to limit the provision in one way, expands it in another way, because he gives the Commonwealth power to enter into places where it has no constitutional jurisdiction.

The matter that has been in dispute is the Commonwealth proposal to establish liquor facilities at the Adelaide Airport. The Commonwealth's authority in connection with air control is limited by a reference of power by the States to the effect that the Commonwealth shall have power to make regulations for the safety of air navigation. That is all the jurisdiction the Commonwealth has in connection with the Adelaide Airport. When the Commonwealth approached the State Government some years ago, it was not prepared to consider any State law whatever. In other words, it was proposing to establish a licence of its own which would enable it to open a bar at any time it decided to have it open without paying

fees and without recognizing any control by this State, and that is what it will be able to do under the amendment.

I said then that there should not be exceptions in connection with the licensing of premises and that premises under the control of the Commonwealth should come under the same rules. I said that if it went ahead with its plans we would challenge it in the High Court. The proceedings were dropped immediately. So, I do not believe that the Premier's amendment would cover this position. I do not believe that the Commonwealth should have the authority to establish a licence which would not be subject to a State decision and which would involve selling to the general public, not only to passengers.

Mr. Coumbe: Anybody could walk in.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. In addition, no fees would be paid to the State and no State law would be recognized. I did not consider that to be a valid exercise of Commonwealth power in regard to air safety regulations, and I told the Commonwealth Government so. I do not disagree about some arrangements being made with the Commonwealth. However, any extension of Commonwealth power should be by proclamation on such terms and conditions as the State Government determines. Otherwise, we should be giving away the authority of this Parliament.

Every other licensee will have to make a contribution to the State. The Premier's amendment covers an obvious weakness, but something more is required. There is no need for an amendment to meet what the member for Mitcham desires to achieve. Military areas are under the control of the Commonwealth, which can provide facilities without our being able to interfere, and we have no authority over naval or air establishments, such as those at Woomera. Any drinking facilities made available at the Adelaide Airport should be under the control of the State Government, because the Commonwealth powers extend only to air safety. I suggest that this matter requires further examination.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I acknowledge the defect, which the Premier has referred to, in my proposed amendment. Obviously, if my amendment were accepted, any one of us would be able to set up, at the General Post Office, a booth for the sale of liquor and be immune from State law. The present Act provides:

This Act shall not apply to the sale or supply of liquor to any member of the defence forces in any canteen established under a permit issued by the proper authority.

I think that provision was obviously beyond our constitutional power and meant nothing. I think that is at least arguable (I shall not say which way I should come down), but this placitum of subclause (5) is surplusage. In connection with the Citizens Military Forces, the Army has an extensive training area between Whyalla and Port Augusta. There is no permanent accommodation. We go out on bivouacs and frequently hold barbecues in the field. Liquor is supplied in moderation. I wanted to cover that situation. It was obviously not covered in the amendment, as drawn.

However, the difficulty about the Premier's amendment is that it is notorious (and I am sure the member for Gumeracha can tell us about this, because he has collided with the Commonwealth in the past) that the Commonwealth exercises many functions that are not strictly within its constitutional powers. One example is the Snowy Mountains Authority. I think there is a good chance that some of its activities in the field of education would, on challenge, be declared *ultra vires* (although I hope they will not be). The Commonwealth exercises, by general consent, powers beyond those in the Constitution. The Premier said that the Commonwealth could not exercise any authority regarding liquor. However, it could exercise power in a way similar to that in which it does in relation to the Snowy Mountains Authority and education. That may be challenged, but it could not be challenged if we passed the amendment in the form I have suggested. We would be estopped from complaining, because we would have abdicated our authority by carrying the Premier's amendment. The provision would read:

This Act shall not apply to the sale or supply of liquor by or under the authority of the Commonwealth.

If the Commonwealth sells the liquor or if the liquor is sold under the authority of the Commonwealth, whether the Commonwealth has constitutional power will not matter: our Act will not apply and, by this placitum, we shall have given our assent to that non-application. That would give the Commonwealth *carte blanche* authority to go ahead in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It has shown some inclination already to go into this.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has.

Mr. Casey: Does that mean that at present we could control what was going on in the canteen at Woomera?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. We should be forever estopped from attempting to control anything if we passed this. We should be saying to the Commonwealth, "If it is done by or under your authority, the Act will not apply." That is giving away a lot. I think a further amendment is required so as to limit it in some way to some function that the Commonwealth can undertake constitutionally. As the member for Gumeracha has said, the most controversial example at present is the Adelaide Airport. I think that, with a little ingenuity on the part of the Premier, of which he is more than capable, we can put his amendment right. If we pass it in this form we are giving away a lot and possibly inviting a good deal of trouble in the future.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: With great respect to the honourable member and his leading counsel on his right, I cannot agree with the views expressed. This clause does not, and cannot, give the Commonwealth any power. When we say "by or under the authority of the Commonwealth", quite clearly we refer to the Commonwealth as constituted by the Commonwealth of Australia Act, because that is its only existence that it can draw from. Therefore, we are talking of the Commonwealth as delimited by the provisions of the Constitution. There is no transfer of power here; the authority the Commonwealth can exercise is its authority in accordance with its constitutional power. The member for Gumeracha has referred to the specific placitum of section 51 relating to air navigation. However, another portion of section 51 refers to the necessary incidental matters relating to the various heads of power, and in these circumstances the Commonwealth has obtained power, which has been upheld in the Privy Council, to establish airports and the facilities on them. If the honourable member likes to read a whole series of High Court and Privy Council cases as to the effect of the incidental power, he will see that these can run fairly widely in the provision of the necessary facilities to persons engaged on activities within the Commonwealth Government's power. In this, we are not transferring power to the Commonwealth but are making it clear that we do not intend to intrude the provisions of our Act in an area where the Commonwealth is able to exercise its

power and we cannot intrude. We are simply stating the obvious.

Mr. Shannon: It is saying something that is redundant.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would not mind taking the placitum out altogether.

Mr. Shannon: I think that's the sensible thing to do.

Mr. Coumbe: What is the position in the other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the other States where liquor facilities have been established at airports, the Commonwealth is not considered to be subject to the State's powers in relation to liquor laws, and in no case is the Commonwealth paying taxation.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you know how the various States' licensing laws are worded?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not, but I know what the position is in relation to facilities already established.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Unless they have been amended lately, they have been silent on this aspect.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and I do not object to our legislation being silent on it. If honourable members opposite prefer it, I am prepared to strike out the whole of the placitum. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving to strike out all words after "authority" first occurring in subclause (5).

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is at least arguable whether it is worth having this provision. I would have thought, before the Premier sought leave, that the best way out of the difficulty, and to reconcile all the views (because I have exercised some ingenuity while he has been speaking) would be to add to the end of the placitum as amended by the Premier the following words: "in the proper exercise of its constitutional powers". That would make quite clear the fact that we were not allowing the Commonwealth to do what it has done in other fields. Does the Premier not consider this to be a better way out, in view of the opinions expressed by other members that this placitum has some value?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not think it is a better way of putting it. If we are to keep it in the Bill I think the clause, with my original amendment, is better. I do not think there is any necessity to insert the words mentioned by the honourable member. I

think that if the clause is taken out altogether the constitutional position obtains, and if there is any dispute it can be litigated.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (5) to strike out all words after "authority" first occurring.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Subclause (2) continues the cellar-door trade, as we know it, for wineries for a period of one year from the commencement of this Bill's operation. Assuming the Bill is passed, vigneron's will, if it becomes necessary, obtain a vigneron's licence pursuant to clause 26. As certain clauses refer to "imperial gallons" and others merely to "gallons", can the Premier say whether there is any significance in the use of the word "imperial"? The Commonwealth standard of measurement seems to be the gallon, as defined in the Commonwealth legislation. For the sake of uniformity, I think the word "gallon" should be used throughout the Bill, and I intend to move an amendment to this effect in relation to subsequent clauses.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it is probably a good idea to take the word "imperial" out of this clause, and we can perhaps recommit the clause at a later stage for that purpose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to raise a matter of controversy, but there is a reference in the Commissioner's report to the matters contained in this clause. This, of course, is a fairly touchy matter, because it concerns the Parliamentary refreshment room, and I mention it now so that the Government can keep it in mind. The Commissioner's report states:

The exemption of Parliamentary refreshment rooms and defence canteens should be retained, but not because my opinion is that their activities should be more extensive than those permitted to other citizens but because the control of members of Parliament and Parliamentary staff in Parliament House is in the long standing traditions of our law a matter for Parliament itself and because the Defence Forces are now under Commonwealth law and therefore beyond the scope of my recommendations. In my view, however, for what it is worth, those who are responsible for the control of places where liquor is sold in South Australia but not controlled by the Licensing Act, should voluntarily abide by the laws and customs of this State in that respect.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 14—"Nature of licences."

Mr. QUIRKE: I have to vote against this clause because the objectionable features of it cannot be separated. Subclause (3) provides that the annual fees to be paid for the licences enumerated in subclause (1) shall be as provided in Division III of Part III. If I voted for this, it would indicate that I favoured the licence fees prescribed in Division III. However, I think they provide a complete departure from accepted principles of taxation in these matters.

I shall provide amendments in this respect for the consideration of the Committee. At present, the fees paid for cellar-door, distiller's storekeeper's, vigneron's, and wholesale storekeeper's licences (all of which are listed in this clause) are based upon the wholesale price of the goods sold. Under this Bill, the licence fee is now to be paid upon the gross amount of money received in payment for the wine or spirit sold in such places under these licences.

I cannot agree to this, because it is in the nature of a profit tax and is entirely different from what it was before. Apparently the wine industry is to be singled out for the imposition of this tax. No other licence carries it. Hotels pay a licence fee on the amount they receive. Apparently, wine is considered as something beyond the pale and has to be battered into the ground at every opportunity. The customer pays for the wine he receives, but the company has to pay tax on the money paid to the winery, in which is included all costs.

The CHAIRMAN: Although I do not wish the honourable member to curtail his remarks, I suggest it may be more appropriate for his remarks to be addressed to clause 36. If he amends that clause would he not agree to clause 14 (3)?

Mr. QUIRKE: I accept the point, Mr. Chairman.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—"Wilpena chalet provision."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:
Before "publican's" to insert "full".

This is a consequential amendment, and gives a full publican's licence and an unrestricted licence to the Wilpena National Pleasure Resort.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16—"Leigh Creek Coal Field."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

Before "publican's" to insert "full"; after "Field" to insert "subject to such conditions and restrictions as the court thinks fit. Section 165 shall not apply to the Trust."

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17—"Licences for premises in Aboriginal institutions."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

Before "publican's" to insert "full"; after "institution" to insert "subject to such conditions and restrictions as the court thinks fit. Section 165 shall not apply to the holder of a licence under this section."

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 18—"Special licence for Barossa Valley Vintage Festival."

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

After subclause (1) to insert the following new subclause:

(1a) Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, but subject to this section, a licence may be granted by the court once in any calendar year to Sud Australischer Allgemeiner Deutscher Verein Incorporated authorizing the said Association to sell or supply liquor of any kind in any quantity to the public at such times during one day excluding Sunday upon such conditions as the court shall approve.

This is to provide for what I understand is the Schutzenfest at Hahndorf, which has become of increasing importance to the German community in South Australia. Some thousands of people attended the last festival. The German community at Hahndorf is an important tourist attraction for South Australia as a whole. In view of the facilities being granted to the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival Association, it is reasonable that a similar provision be made for this festival.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I am pleased to note that provision has been made for the granting of a special licence to the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival Association and that its status has improved, because in the original Bill it was incorrectly referred to as the Barossa Village Vintage Festival Association. The Royal Commissioner refers to this festival in his report when he says that he discussed the granting of such a licence with representatives of the Tanunda District Council, the Angaston District Council, a former police sergeant who was for some time in charge at Tanunda, representatives of the festival committee and of local church and temperance interests.

It appears from what the Commissioner says in his report that no objection is raised to the granting of such a licence, and that all parties, including local church and temperance interests, agree that this festival is properly run and well conducted. There have been 10 or 11 festivals since 1948, and the attendance this year was over 20,000 people. The Director of the Tourist Bureau (Mr. Pollnitz) supported the application, pointing out that this festival has great publicity value not only for the State but for the whole of Australia, because it is the only festival of its kind held in Australia. It is similar to festivals held in Europe annually, and I believe in South Africa there is a similar festival, modelled upon the Barossa Valley festival.

I support this amendment, which will enable the organization concerned to provide every year for refreshment and food requirements at the Hahndorf Schutzenfest. This festival has

been held for several years past, and it is well patronized and conducted. As the Premier has said, it is of great cultural value. I commend him for accepting the suggestion of the organization to include a provision in the Bill for a licence to be granted annually in connection with this festival.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (2) to strike out "prescribed"; after "form" to insert "prescribed by the rules of the court"; to strike out "said"; and after "Association" to insert "to which it is granted".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 1, at 2 p.m.