HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 2, 1969.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ABSENCE OF CLERK ASSISTANT

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, in accordance with Standing Order No. 31, I have appointed Mr. J. W. Hull, Second Clerk Assistant, to act as Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms during the temporary absence on account of illness of Mr. A. F. R. Dodd, Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery the honourable Speaker of the Singapore Legislative Assembly, Mr. Punch Coomaraswamy, and Mrs. Coomaraswamy, both of whom we warmly welcome to the State of South Australia in general and to the House of Assembly in particular. I know it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that our visiting Speaker be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the Premier and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to introduce our distinguished visitor.

Mr. Coomaraswamy was escorted by the Hon. R. S. Hall and Mr. Corcoran to a seat on the floor of the House.

PETITION: EDUCATION

Mr. CASEY presented a petition signed by 37 residents of Peterborough stating that there was a crisis in education and praying that the House of Assembly would act to resolve the crisis by requesting the Commonwealth Government to provide more finance for education in South Australia.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

INTELLIGENCE TESTS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It has been reported to me that five-year-old children who will be due to attend school in 1970 have, when seeking enrolment, been subjected to what might be called, for want of a better name, an intelligence test. For instance, one child was asked whether an article in the form of a triangle or a rectangle would roll in the same way as a circle did.

Mr. Clark: How old are those children?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Five years old. One child, being in a strange atmosphere, was confused and, not understanding the question, could not answer it. It has been alleged that the parents were told that the child was mentally undeveloped and could not be accepted. Another child was asked to draw a straight line and, because he could not do so, the same thing was said. I want to make clear that these are alleged reports. Does the Minister of Education know whether such tests are being given and, if she does not, will she ascertain whether such questions have been asked at a certain school, if I give her the particulars?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about the sale of railway houses?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Some South Australian Railways dwellings are at present unoccupied. It is inevitable that a proportion will be vacant because of the movement of employees throughout the State following promotion and transfer. Additionally, retirements and resignations will have a certain effect on this position. In the past three years the South Australian Railways has disposed of 20 surplus dwellings in the metropolitan area, and it is intended to arrange through the South Australian Housing Trust for the disposal of others. The Minister of Roads and Transport has informed the Railways Commissioner that special attention must be given to this matter in view of the Auditor-General's Report and the concern expressed by honourable members from time to time.

TEACHING AIDS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about teaching aids?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As the honourable member will recall, working drawings of some mathematics aids have been supplied to school committees in the past to enable handymen to construct the aids at a minimum cost. The department has also explored the possibility of the aids being made in labour prisons, but this was found to be impracticable. Provision has been made in the Estimates for the supply of minimum mathematics equipment to all primary and area schools on a scale recommended by the Primary Schools Mathematics Committee. Schools have stated their requirements, and these are now being collated into a single list to be forwarded to the Public

Stores Department for procurement. The usual method is for the Supply and Tender Board to call for tenders. This would reduce considerably the prices at present being charged to schools. Specifications of aids are also being prepared in preparation for the calling of tenders.

MURRAY BRIDGE ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the adult education centre at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am informed by the Public Buildings Department that sketch plans have been completed and funds approved for the erection of the Murray Bridge Adult Education Centre. It is intended to engage a firm of private consultants to prepare contract documents for the calling of tenders. The proposed building will be on the site of the existing welding shop and toilet block and work is hoped to commence in mid-1970.

GOVERNMENT TENDER

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about book tenders?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Following the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, I have examined a report from the Chief Storekeeper. The report makes clear that it is not correct to say that the conditions of the tender were varied. The board examined the tenders on the basis of the original call and decided that the tender of Westgate Library Services was the most favourable offer from the Government's point of view. Most books required are of United Kingdom origin, and Westgate's tender gives the best overall discounts for books from this source. The offer of Westgate Library Services on the basis of the call was far more favourable than that of two South Australian companies that made representations to me. True, the successful tenderer offered two alternatives to the call, and after consideration the board decided that the most attractive proposition was a proposal to supply on a basis of bulk into store. As honourable members are well aware, the Government has a policy of preference to South Australian manufacturers and suppliers. However, there must be a limit to which this policy can be extended. The offer accepted by the Supply and Tender Board will result in a gross saving to the Government of $37,750 compared with the tenders submitted from South Australian suppliers. Against this saving the board will incur the cost of distribution of the books, estimated at $3,000. Furthermore, the Chief Storekeeper has pointed out that his department operates regular delivery services to the schools, apart from these books, and the additional cost in the actual delivery of these books is therefore marginal.

GAS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Mr. Ron Nicholas, who is associated with Red Ru Pipeline Company that constructed the 24-mile natural gas spur line to Angaston to serve industry there, is reported to have said that many more such off-shoots will eventually support economic expansion in South Australia. Does the Premier agree with that statement, and can he say whether the availability of natural gas has precipitated any negotiations for future industrial expansion?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I look forward to the day when we will see industries coming to South Australia simply because of gas alone. In other words, I foresee the situation in which the raw material offered as a chemical base will provide a basis for new industries to establish. Having had talks about chemical products with two companies during my trip around the world in April-May, I believe that the ethane, available from a particular part of the field, could represent the basis of an industry to establish in South Australia in the future, concerning not only gas but also another important chemical, namely salt. With the climate experienced in the hinterland we are able to produce salt in quantity, and, as ethane and methane are gas constituents, I hope that at some time in the future a company with the necessary capital backing will be able to put these things together and to produce the sophisticated chemical range now required by industry in Australia and overseas. There is no doubt that gas availability in this State is an extremely valuable tool in the promotion kit of the Industrial Development Branch that will help me when I interview prospective industrialists.

PORT PIRIE ROAD

Mr. HUGHES: Recently the Clerk of the Bute council told me that the council had been most disturbed to learn that the proposed route of a new highway between Port Pirie and Adelaide via Port Broughton might by-pass the township of Bute and that the new road would probably be two miles west of the town.

The proposed new portion of road is from section 71, hundred of Wiltunga, to section 98, hundred of Kulpara, and then south-easterly to section 145, hundred of Kulpara, to rejoin the bitumen road. The Clerk has told me that, since the Second World War, about 50 new houses and business premises have been built in Bute. The Council believes that the by-pass of Bute by the proposed new road is a reflection on the confidence in the town of business houses several of which cater for the travelling public. It is stated that people living in Bute who desire to travel south will still use the present route. Similarly, the council feels that motorists going north will tend to take the short-cut from Kulpara. This will mean that the present road will have to be maintained in good condition, as well as the new road running parallel to it and only two miles away. It is also considered that, if plans proceed to alter the present route, about three miles of new road will have to be constructed to link up with the Yorke Peninsula road through Maitland, as people travelling north or south will not go up to Kulpara and back to get from one road to another. The cost of construction of this new road alone will probably equal the cost of any purchase of land, etc., to up-grade the present route. Therefore, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to reconsider the proposed new route and consider maintaining the present route?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

BARLEY

Mr. VENNING: Already about half of the total estimated deliveries of barley have been delivered by growers in this State. Also, it is pleasing to note that some of the new season's barley has already been shipped away from South Australia, this having made space available for further deliveries of barley. The Barley Board has not yet announced the first advances on the various grades of barley received from producers. As growers of low-quality barley are considering, having regard to the value of the barley, whether they should deliver their barley or keep it for use as stock food, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to obtain from the Barley Board the prices to be paid this season for the various grades of barley?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask for that information.

UNIVERSITY FEES

Mr. HUDSON: Members will be aware of the Government's decision to require Flinders and Adelaide universities and the Institute of Technology to raise fees for 1970 by 20 per cent. Members will also be aware that these institutions have asked the Government whether, if they are forced to raise fees, it will expand the scheme by means of which assistance is given to students and liberalize the means test currently applied under that scheme. What has the Government decided in relation to this matter and how much additional finance will it make available to support the liberalization of the fees concession scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the Premier last week commented on this matter in reply to a question. He told the House that the Fees Concession Committee had been asked to make recommendations to the Government for the liberalization of the basis on which fees are remitted under the fees concession scheme. I checked with the Premier while the honourable member was asking his question and he says he has not yet received a report or recommendation from the committee, nor have I heard of any intimation coming from the committee. At present, I am unable to answer the question fully but the Government has indicated to the committee that it would be prepared to look somewhat more generously at both the amount and the basis of the concession to be allowed. So, until the committee has submitted to the Government its views on these matters, I cannot answer the question any more fully. However, regarding the increase in fees, if similar assistance were given to students who are qualified now the cost would rise substantially by about $30,000 a year.

KALANGADOO SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: I believe that arrangements will be made early in the new year for the Minister of Education to declare open the Kalangadoo school. I regret that the school cannot be opened this year for the sake of Mr. Hugh Abbott, the Headmaster, who has given sterling service to the people of Kalangadoo, because it is largely as a result of his efforts that the school is what it is today. As the school committee is anxious to improve the facilities, especially the schoolgrounds, and as I understand that the Minister has information to give the House on the development of the school oval, which will be a necessary adjunct to the school early next year, will she now give the House that information?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I, too, am sorry that I was unable to fit in the opening of the Kalangadoo school this year, particularly as the present Headmaster is being transferred. However, I am looking forward very much to visiting the honourable member's district early next year, not only to open the Kalangadoo school but also to visit other schools in the area. The Public Buildings Department advises that the site for an oval has been formed and graded and that top soil to a minimum depth of 6in. has been spread on the surface. An officer of the department's Contract Construction Division will visit the school tomorrow to consult with the committee regarding any work necessary to complete the oval.

ELIZABETH T.A.B.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to my recent question regarding the increasing of T.A.B. facilities at Elizabeth?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The South Australian Totalizator Agency Board is continually reviewing areas throughout South Australia and extends facilities when it is economic and practical to do so. The area to the immediate north of Adelaide was re-surveyed recently and as a result, an additional service was established at Para Hills. The Elizabeth area is currently under review. Further detailed studies are planned, and will be carried out shortly. Additional facilities will be considered following this survey.

ALDGATE CORNER

Mr. GILES: In the last 24 hours there has been another accident at the Aldgate Hotel corner. A few weeks ago the Aldgate Hotel had tomatoes in the bar and on the verandah as a result of an accident, and three months before that an accident occurred at the same spot. All these accidents involved a semi-trailer travelling from Adelaide towards Murray Bridge turning over on the corner. The road is leaning the correct way on the left side coming from Adelaide, but immediately the centre of the road is crossed the camber leans towards the hotel, so that immediately a vehicle crosses the centre of the road it leans the opposite way to which it should when turning left. The signs that are at this corner do not indicate that it is a dangerous bend. Will the Attorney General approach the Minister of Roads and Transport with an urgent request that construction work be carried out so that the camber on this corner is made to lean the correct way? Further, as a temporary measure could warning signs be erected so that drivers might be warned that it is a dangerous corner? Perhaps a maximum speed limit could also be indicated on the sign.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I do not hold myself out to be a good driver or a sensitive driver (in fact, I prefer not to drive at all but to walk or run), I have driven around this corner many times and it has never struck me as being as bad as the honourable member has suggested.

Mr. Casey: You've been sober when you've gone around.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is a fact.

Mr. Broomhill: Nor have you driven a semi-trailer.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That, too, is true.

Mr. Corcoran: How often has the corner struck you?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The corner has never struck me nor have I struck the corner: I have always gone around the corner. I know that the honourable member for Gumeracha takes this matter very seriously, as one would expect because it concerns his district. I will therefore refer again to the Minister the specific suggestions he has now given me.

PARTY INITIALS

Mr. CASEY: Last Thursday I asked the Premier why his colleagues had been reported in the press during past weeks as being members of the L.C.P. instead of the L.C.L. as they have been in the past. For some reason known only to the Premier he refused to answer my question, so I ask the usually well-informed member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) if he could give me the information I sought from the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Adelaide wish to reply?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think the House should have a reply, as one was not forthcoming last week. The reply is not solely related to the debacle of the Liberal and Country League at the recent Commonwealth election, although some members may think that it is. As members know, about 30 years or 40 years ago the Liberal Party swallowed the Country Party and became known as the Liberal and Country League.

Just before the 1968 State election, the Country Party decided that it was time for it to re-form in South Australia, and it did re-form. On November 4, the Party held a meeting at Hamley Bridge to discuss whether it could establish a branch there, and hundreds of people from the Light District and the Rocky River District, as well as surrounding districts, attended the meeting and unanimously decided to form a branch of the Country Party at Hamley Bridge. Mr. Lance Marshman was elected President of the branch, Mr. Colin Hocking Vice-President, and Mr. Roger Smyth Secretary-Treasurer. Messrs. John Pillar, Syd Bell and John Searle were elected to the executive. The State President of the Party (Mr. Harry Schiller) flew from Cowell to attend the meeting, and Mr. Matheson (State Secretary of the Party) also attended. The State President and State Secretary addressed the meeting, stressing that rural areas were not receiving adequate representation from the present L.C.L. Government and that a Country Party was badly needed, specifically to look after rural interests. Realizing that at the next State election he will lose some districts to the Australian Labor Party and may also lose some to the Country Party, because that Party intends to contest the Districts of Light, Rocky River, Victoria, Ridley and Eyre, as well as other districts, the Premier has asked the press to refer to his colleagues in future as members of the L.C.P. rather than as members of the L.C.L. Of course, the Premier realizes that, called by any name, a stinkweed smells the same.

BORDER SIGN

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of November 18 about a sign on the road from Nelson to Mount Gambier telling travellers of the South Australian law about bringing into this State plants, stock and fruit?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the Mount Gambier quarantine road sign and all South Australian border signs are maintained by a private contractor, who reported recently the deteriorated condition of the Mount Gambier sign and stated that he intended to repair it. A replacement should be erected soon.

COMPASSIONATE LEAVE

Mr. VIRGO: On October 1, when asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, about the granting of compassionate leave to weekly-paid employees, I said that I thought an anomaly existed in respect of this matter. As the Minister, when replying on October 8, said there was not an anomaly, I have examined the matter further and have found that the former State Labor Government granted compassionate leave of up to two days on the death of a wife, husband, father, mother, child or stepchild (and I emphasize that stepchildren were included). In 1966, the Government extended the provision by providing for one day's leave on the death of a brother or sister. The Labor Government instructed that a wife or husband be deemed to include a *de facto* wife or husband, and this shows the breadth of the decision. Unfortunately, the decision does not cover the death of a stepbrother or stepsister or, as in the case I raised, a half-brother or half-sister. Therefore, will the Attorney-General find out whether compassionate leave can be granted to stepbrothers, stepsisters, half-brothers and half-sisters?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: While the honourable member was explaining his question I was trying to work out the difference between a half-brother and a stepbrother.

Mr. Virgo: There's a significant difference.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot pick it up at the moment, but I will consider the matter again.

CEDUNA DENTAL SERVICES

Mr. EDWARDS: The Secretary of the Ceduna Area School Welfare Club has written to me, asking that I make representations about the provision of dental services at the school. In 1970, more than 600 students will be enrolled at the school and the only dental service they have is conducted by a Port Lincoln dentist who consults in Ceduna for four and a half days every six weeks. People from as far as 100 miles west of Ceduna must attend during this time if they require dental services. In an emergency people must travel 300 miles to Port Lincoln. As schools less than 100 miles on the Adelaide side of Ceduna have access to school dental services, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether the School Health Branch can provide a dental service at the Ceduna Area School?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will take the matter up with the Minister of Health and, if necessary, the Minister of Education.

MILLICENT NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question about the establishment of a dental clinic at the Millicent North Primary School?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is intended to establish a dental clinic at the Millicent North Primary School early in 1970. The second group of school dental therapists will complete their training early in April, 1970, and the clinic is planned for completion by that time.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As recent press reports have referred to the possibility of daylight saving being introduced in the Eastern States and as our Premier has become noted as a progressive Premier, can he say whether the Government is considering introducing this progressive idea of daylight saving in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although the Government at present has no plans to introduce daylight saving, the Treasurer will this month attend, as a Government representative, the conference being held between representatives of Victoria and New South Wales. I am not certain whether Queensland also will be represented at the conference. I have asked that South Australia be allowed to send a Government representative as an observer to find out what is being done and what are the implications.

MOUNT GAMBIER NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about ablution and drinking facilities at the Mount Gambier North Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Public Buildings Department issued an order on November 18 to a local firm to provide additional ablution and drinking facilities at this school. The estimated completion time is four weeks from the receipt of the order by the firm.

KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. ARNOLD: It seems that excellent progress has been made on the causeway roadwork part of the approaches to the new Kingston bridge, and this project is of immense interest to the people in the Upper Murray. Recently, the Highways Department released a pamphlet giving statistics of the bridge and the causeway and, as this matter is of interest to the people on the river, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when tenders are expected to be called for the three bridges required in this project?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the honourable member has raised this question, particularly as he has referred to the brochure put out by the Minister concerning the Kingston bridge. I think it was excellent, and helpful to all concerned.

Mr. Corcoran: Can you judge that?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think that I am in a good position to do that, and I think that everyone who considers the matter impartially will agree with me that it is a good publication. I will seek the information the honourable member has asked for.

DESALINATION

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question about equipment available to be used for desalination?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: From information supplied by the manufacturer of these units, which were advertised, only one model is available for sale at this time, that is, the unit producing up to 450gall. a day. The principle of operation of this unit is quite different from that of the unit now operating at Coober Pedy, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to seek approval to purchase one of the units for trial and evaluation purposes.

BLACK FOREST LAND

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education further information about the acquisition of additional land for an oval at the Black Forest Demonstration School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As the honourable member knows, efforts have been made by the Education Department for some years to obtain the land to which he refers. The previous owner died and her estate is in the hands of the Public Trustee for administration. Because there are still difficulties facing the department in obtaining this quarter acre, and as its acquisition would enable the 2½ acres already held to be developed as a playing field for the Black Forest Demonstration School, I have approved of action being taken to acquire the land compulsorily.

SOLOMONTOWN BEACH

Mr. McKEE: Has the Treasurer, representing the Minister of Marine, further information concerning the problem confronting the corporation of Port Pirie with regard to the swimming area at Solomontown?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a further report that follows an earlier report from the Director, Marine and Harbors Department. It is agreed that sustained exposure to the sun would probably kill the weed if the area concerned could be drained and kept clear of sea water for several weeks. However, the crest of the embankment is about 1ft. above half-tide level, and whilst sluice gates could be designed sufficiently large to let out all the impounded water during a falling tide, they would be useless in preventing the incoming tide overtopping the crest of the embankment for its entire length and filling up the area twice a day. In other words, sluice gates would only enable the area in question to dry out briefly twice a day, which would be insufficient to kill the weed. In any case, seaweed killing by means of sun baking causes a most offensive smell as has been proved in the upper port reach at Port Adelaide when the Bower Road embankment was constructed.

A rough estimated cost of providing sluice gates of the type the honourable member has in mind (that is, gates sufficiently large that the impounded area would completely empty during the last three hours of an ebb tide) is $100,000, or nearly twice the cost of the embankment. The engineer who reported on the matter made some suggestions regarding how the situation might be controlled, namely, poisoning the weed, removal of the stranded weed, covering soft patches with shellgrit, and diversion of drainage waters from the impounded area. The engineer said that more investigation was necessary and this should be undertaken by experts in marine botany and river pollution. The use of sluice gates in the manner contemplated would have objectionable results in causing dangerous currents in the small-boat mooring area and also in sluicing mud into the boat haven and nearby shipping berths and channel.

DRUGS

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent questions concerning drug sales, following a report I referred to him of an oversea medical authority when I pointed out that, because of the over-the-counter sales of Relaxa tabs and pep pills, they were more dangerous than narcotics because they were more readily available to the public?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a reply to the two questions asked by the honourable member and I will give first the reply concerning the question of drug sales. The group of drugs to which Relaxa tabs belong is included in Schedule 3 of the Poisons Schedules. That is, they may be sold only by registered pharmacists, and an appropriate cautionary statement is required on the label. The question of the need for, and likely effectiveness of, further restriction is currently being considered by the Poisons Schedule Subcommittee of the National Health and Medical Research Council. The committee has before it representations from trade associations, State advisory committees, the General Teaching Hospitals Psychiatric Association, and the Mental Health Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

The committee has also been awaiting the extension of its terms of reference by the council to include the advertising of scheduled substances; this was done at the recent November meeting of council. The Mental Health Committee has been asked to supply statistics and evidence regarding admissions and treatment at mental institutions for drug abuse of all types in order that the position with the organic bromides may be reviewed in proper perspective. This report is expected to be considered at the February meeting of the Poisons Schedules Subcommittee, and it is hoped that a firm recommendation for consideration by State advisory committees will then be made.

Concerning pep pills, this term is usually used when referring to drugs of the amphetamine group. These may be sold in South Australia only on medical prescription. Because it seemed that some supplies were becoming available without medical prescription, the Police Offences Act was amended in 1967 to make illegal possession of these drugs an offence. However, these drugs are causing a serious problem in some parts of Australia. Stricter controls have recently been recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council and the National Standing Committee on Drugs of Dependence. With the concurrence of the Commissioner of Police, additional controls have been recommended by way of amendment to the Dangerous Drugs Act. A Bill to give effect to these additional controls is being prepared to be considered by Cabinet.

FAMILY-PLANNING CLINICS

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 22, when speaking in the debate on the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill (Abortion), and later when I asked a question on October 23, I advocated establishing free

family-planning clinics in this State, and I suggested that the Minister of Health should inquire about the way such clinics were conducted elsewhere so that the Government could establish them in this State. Has the Premier a reply on this matter from his colleague?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As far as can be ascertained, no State Health Department in Australia conducts family-planning clinics, although there is a clinic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital restricted to patients already attending that hospital. Professor L. W. Cox has trained doctors in recent years to fit them for work in this field. A meeting of those interested has been called for December 2, 1969, for the purpose of setting up in South Australia a family-planning association.

BEACHPORT ROAD

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the order of priority in connection with sealing the road between Robe and Beachport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Highways Department advance construction programme provides for the reconstruction and sealing of the Robe-Beachport road to be commenced by both the District Councils of Robe and Beachport in the 1971-72 financial year. The latest review of the programme indicates that the work cannot be commenced earlier without detriment to works already in hand or immediately proposed on main roads already carrying heavier traffic volumes than the Robe-Beachport road carries. Accordingly, it is not proposed to alter the programme concerning this road. Although boundary surveys and land acquisition are almost completed on the Robe-Beachport road, other preconstruction activities, including engineering survey and design for construction purposes and the location of construction materials, still have to be carried out. These latter activities are expected to occupy most of 1970-71, so that the year of 1971-72 for commencement of construction also represents the most practicable time.

WHEAT POOL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about winding up the 1965-66 wheat pool?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has obtained the following report from the Assistant Manager for South Australia of the Australian Wheat Board:

The accounts of the 1965-66 wheat pool are not necessarily finalized, although the fifth advance paid on December 10, 1968, exhausted to all intents and purposes the credit funds available for distribution to growers. A small balance of up to ½c a bushel could become available for subsequent distribution. This is dependent upon the outcome of current discussions with the Commonwealth Government relating to the basis of determination of the average export price obtained which, in turn, affects the amount payable from the wheat prices stabilization fund.

OPALS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the opal industry and about the possibility of having in Adelaide an opal-grinding and polishing centre for exhibition to tourists?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The proposal that an opal-cutting and polishing centre be established in Adelaide has been investigated. Discussions have been held with the Mines Department and with people engaged in the opal industry, but the general reaction has been that there would not be sufficient continuity of public interest at present to justify the expense involved. One Coober Pedy operator expressed the fear that the establishment of such a centre in Adelaide would reduce the number of visitors to Coober Pedy because many went there to see the cutting and polishing of opal. This fear may well prove groundless, but it is interesting to note that in the period from Easter, 1969, to the end of October, 1969, 11,119 persons visited Coober Pedy by coach, over 3,000 by private car and 200 by air. Therefore, virtually 15,000 people have visited the area in the seven months. As an opal centre could well have the effect of publicizing opals as gemstones and providing another tourist attraction, the proposal will be kept in mind and pursued as opportunity offers.

INSECTICIDES

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the safety of certain insecticides and of insecticides generally?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member referred to the toxic effects of arsenical preparations and other insecticides. First, concerning arsenic preparations, the American

reports to which the honourable member refers appeared to deal with the hazards of arsenical preparations in the home, particularly to children. It was suggested in the report that the arsenic content of preparations available for home use be limited to something of the order of 2.5 per cent. This problem was appreciated in this State many years ago when it was shown that many of the deaths of children from accidental poisoning were due to arsenical weedkiller, which was freely available at the time. The poison regulations were amended in 1953 to restrict the sale of arsenical weedkillers and ant poisons to the holders of permits to purchase. Permits are not issued for domestic use. These restrictions have been most successful in preventing the accidental poisoning of children with arsenical preparations.

Secondly, concerning other insecticides, the availability of insecticides and pesticides, both for domestic and agricultural use, and the hazards associated with their use are constantly under review by various State and national committees. At State level there is an interdepartmental committee on agricultural chemicals which is concerned with the safe use of pesticides. At the national level the Poisons Schedules Sub-Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council is concerned with the availability and labelling of poisonous pesticides both for domestic and agricultural use. This committee has, for example, reviewed extensive information and data on the insect pest strip referred to by the honourable member. It will be asked to obtain further information on recent reports concerning unexpected hazards to babies in nurseries. It is generally considered, and this pattern applies in all States, that each insecticide, its method of use and its availability for domestic use be considered individually. Recommendations are then made for appropriate cautionary labelling and restrictions on sale if required. Legislative machinery appears to be adequate at the present time for the effective control of insecticides to prevent undue hazard to the user.

FOOTWEAR

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I recently asked the Premier, as Minister of Industrial Development, a question about the price variation between imported shoes and locally made shoes. I express my appreciation of the prompt attention given this matter, for shortly after I asked the question I was visited by an officer of the Prices Branch. I wish to make it clear, because of a remark made to me during this interview, that among the shoes I examined there were some high-class shoes, well made of good quality material, and also shoes of an inferior type. I am confident that the officer, whom I told where I had seen the shoes, went to see them and to inquire about this matter. Having pointed that out, I ask the Premier whether he has a reply to my original question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Prices Commissioner states:

Imported footwear generally falls into two categories: the expensive, well-made type or the poorly-finished, often unlined, cheaper shoe. Both types are freely available in Adelaide but locally manufactured footwear is competitively priced, especially when quality is taken into consideration, and often sells at prices lower than comparable imported styles. Local manufacturers have no trouble in obtaining suitable leathers.

STAMP DUTY

Mr. CLARK: Has the Treasurer obtained a reply to my recent question about concessions made to pensioners in respect of stamp duty for motor registration that are not made to people in Australia who receive United Kingdom pensions?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The concession which entitles a pensioner to exemption from payment of stamp duty on certificates of insurance lodged with applications to register motor vehicles is limited to persons who receive a social service pension (or part pension) payable under Commonwealth law and who, by reason of receipt of that pension, are entitled to concession fares on public transport in South Australia. Persons who receive a United Kingdom pension, and who are resident in Australia, would receive also a part-Australian age pension if they satisfied the means test provisions associated with such pensions, and in this event they would qualify for concession travel and for the exemption sought. If the extent of the United Kingdom pension and the amount of the pensioner's assets are such as to disqualify him from entitlement to the Australian age pension, there would appear to be no case for giving such a pensioner these concessions.

WHEAT FARMERS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the number of persons growing wheat for the first time this year who have had wheat quotas issued to them?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Secretary of the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee has provided the following information in answer to the honourable member's question:

Quotas are not issued to organizations or growers but are allocated in relation to properties. It would take some time to check as to the precise number of applicants who receive consideration. The committee had regard to special cases where it could be shown that there was justification for a quota allocation.

RETURNING OFFICER

Mr. VIRGO: During the Estimates debate, I referred to the salary paid to the Returning Officer for the State and, on October 29, the Attorney-General replied that the Returning Officer in this State was one of the lowest-paid returning officers in Australia. The Attorney-General agreed to an interjection I made that the Returning Officer was grossly underpaid, and he said that the salaries of all senior Public Service officers were under review. Can the Attorney-General say whether that review has been completed and, if it has, whether the Returning Officer's salary has been increased to a sum comparable with that received by returning officers in other States?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think it has been completed. As I do not have the figure with me, I will seek it and let the honourable member know.

GOOLWA BARRAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the provision of fish ladders in the barrages near the mouth of the Murray River?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states:

Before construction of the barrages, estuarine conditions (that is, with reduced salinity) prevailed in the lakes and Murray mouth. Some estuarine species move about in this area and comprise the main fish population. After the barrages were built, the waters above them became entirely fresh and the waters below were marine except in times of flood. The change in the environment so brought about caused the disappearance of estuarine species from the lakes region. There is no point in putting fish ladders at the barrages as no local species of fish migrate from marine to freshwater conditions for spawning or otherwise. In any event fish are able, if they wish, to move upstream through the barrages when they are open.

BUS STOPS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about rough sections of roadway at bus stops on the Goodwood and Unley Roads that are hazardous for bus travellers?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The type of road construction carried out, or financed by the Highways Department in the metropolitan area, provides roads sufficiently strong to withstand without deformation the loading imposed at bus stops. On some of the older roads, deformations occasionally occur at bus stops but these are repaired as they become apparent. Although there are no known instances of the circumstances as described by the member for Unley existing on roads under the control of the department, the Municipal Tramways Trust has been requested to inspect all bus stops on the Goodwood and Unley bus routes and, if deficiencies exist, to report them in order that appropriate remedial action can be considered.

BANK ACCOUNT

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently in which I stated that I had been informed that employees of the Railways Department could not have their cheques paid into a savings bank account?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: For many years the practice has applied whereby salaries or wages of employees of the South Australian Railways may be paid into bank accounts or the employees may be paid in cash if they so prefer. With few exceptions, these payments to bank accounts have been to the credit of cheque accounts. In 1965, the Railways Commissioner received a letter from the Associated Banks of South Australia stating that all banks in Australia conducting savings accounts had agreed not to accept credits to passbooks, as distinct from cheque accounts, except in the case of arrangements already applied and operating at that time. Consequently, applications for credits to passbook accounts that may have been lodged since that date cannot be accepted. It would appear that this is what has applied to the honourable member's constituent.

HOLDEN HILL HOUSING

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of November 20 about the use of longer studs in timber frame houses built by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the trust reports:

You were correct in advising that studs would have to be substantially longer than 4ft. in order to make a proper assessment. It is considered that unless stumps are placed at least 12ft. into the ground in the type of soil encountered in the Holden Hill and Strathmont areas they will always be subject to soil movement and there is no advantage in increasing the depth by only 1ft. or 2ft. It is more important to attempt to obtain uniform movement over the whole area of the house and distribute the load (dead weight of the house) over a large number of stumps. (The trust requires stumps to be provided on concrete pads at not more than 5ft. centres over the whole area of the house). Experience has shown that in winter the expanding clay exerts pressure on the side faces of the stumps which is sufficient to lift them. Longer stumps would present a bigger surface area to the expanding clays and the upward movement could be even greater.

As I told the honourable member earlier, unless the studs go far enough into the ground to be firmly held by the lower stratas of soil they tend to be lifted up by the expanding clays, as the General Manager reports. Therefore, they must go deep, and not just a little deeper. The report continues:

Where seasonal soil movement is excessive and expected, timber frame construction is more flexible than solid construction, and any defects which result from it can be remedied. It must also be remembered that sewer drains, water and gas services are laid in the upper moving soil and trouble could be expected if a differential movement occurred between the house and these services. The honourable member, in October last year, asked a similar question for the trust to release the name or names of the builders of the houses at Holden Hill. The houses at Holden Hill were built to trust specification and the cracking cannot be attributed to faulty workmanship on the part of the builders. The trust accepts full responsiblity for these houses and considers that it would be most unfair to publicly name the builders.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. BROOMHILL: As the Premier will be aware that members are anxious to know what the Government intends its programme to be for the remainder of this year, can he say whether he has considered the sittings of the House and, if he has, can he give any information to the House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The sittings of the House are to a large degree in the hands of the Opposition and the length of time it might take to debate the issues the Government has introduced into the House. Certainly, the session has been lengthy and concentrated. Earlier during the session there were some very long speeches, but I am pleased to see that honourable members are not spending as much time on individual speeches as they spent earlier. I should like the House to rise as soon as possible, as I have no interest in keeping it in session for any purpose other than to accomplish the work of the Government's programme, and I hope the Opposition will approve of the Government's programme. In any case, if the House could apply itself to the legislation I hope that it will rise by the end of next week, but I should be even more pleased if it could rise at the end of this week.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: On November 18, the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, told me that tenders would be called for the construction of the Brighton High School assembly hall within the next two weeks. Can he now say whether tenders have been called for the project and, if they have, when they close and when he expects construction of the hall to commence?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain the necessary information.

KANGAROO INN SCHOOL

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question about the Kangaroo Inn Area School?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A contract was let on October 9, 1969, for repairs to the tennis courts at the Kangaroo Inn Area School to be undertaken in conjunction with a scheme for paving and drainage at the school. However, when the contractor was requested by officers of the Public Buildings Department to commence work, he advised that a mistake had been made in his tender price and requested that he be released from his contract. It is therefore necessary to review the tenders for this work. This is being done with a view to the early commencement of the work.

UNITED STATES CONSULATE

Mr. McKEE: It has been reported that the United States Consulate office in South Australia is to be closed. Will the Premier say whether he is aware of this closing and whether he is able to give the reason for it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Having been aware of this closing, I have made strenuous attempts to have the decision reversed but, unfortunately, I have not been successful. The President of

the United States of America has, I understand, ordered a 10 per cent cut in the expenditure allocated to his embassies and consulates throughout the world. I learned of the Adelaide move as an economy measure some weeks ago but, unfortunately, not as early as I would have liked to know of it. I wrote immediately to the Prime Minister asking him to take this matter up with the Australian Ambassador in Washington and I also spoke to the new United States Ambassador during his relatively recent first visit to South Australia. I have received a communication from the Prime Minister saying that the matter was taken up at the highest possible level by the Australian Embassy in Washington. However, the order has gone out and the matter has proceeded to a stage where it cannot be altered. I am disappointed; however, my disappointment is allayed somewhat by the knowledge that an honorary consul will be appointed in this State and, from my knowledge of the United State citizens resident here who have business connections in this State and from whom I assume the consul will be appointed, I believe that there are people of the highest calibre who could fill this post in an honorary capacity. I express my disappointment that the consulate is to be closed, although I have made every endeavour to have maintained. I have not been successful, but at least we will have in this State the highest level of representation on an honorary basis.

REZONING

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked concerning rezoning?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No requests have been made to councils to consider the rezoning of their areas as a result of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals. The Planning and Development Act enables those councils within the metropolitan planning area to take advantage of the regulation-making powers given under the Act but there is no obligation placed on councils to inform the State Planning Authority of any action proposed to be taken in the preparation of new zoning regulations. However, information supplied by councils for inclusion in the authority's annual report showed that some action had been taken by 27 councils at June 30, 1969. The action being taken by councils is welcomed, as the new form of zoning regulation is of considerable assistance to persons wishing to establish industry.

FOOT-ROT

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question about foot-rot vaccine?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The press release refers to commercial collaboration being sought to produce foot-rot vaccine in Australia. There is insufficient information available at this stage on which to base an opinion as to the value of the vaccine. The press report relates to its use on three properties only in New South Wales involving a total of less than 400 sheep. Details of the cost, duration of immunity produced and other factors, including its effectiveness under South Australian conditions, need to be carefully investigated before any informed conclusions could be arrived at. In short, any proposals to permit the use of the vaccine in South Australia would need to be discussed with the industry after considerably more knowledge than is available at present had been accumulated.

UNLEY DRAINAGE

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my recent question about road-widening work and the need for adequate drainage in areas adjacent to the North Unley creek?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The flooding in Unley can only be alleviated if an overall drainage plan is prepared and implemented. The responsibility for preparing such a plan is that of the local government authorities concerned. In this instance, as both Keswick and Brownhill creeks are involved, there are five local government authorities, namely, West Torrens, Unley, Adelaide, Burnside and Mitcham, which should jointly prepare such drainage plans. It is understood that these councils have had preliminary discussions in this regard but up to the present no agreement has been reached on the preparation of a drainage scheme. If and when such a scheme is prepared, no doubt the main drains therein would qualify for Government subsidy. Therefore, the Highways Department in reconstructing main roads is somewhat uncertain as to the proper size, location and levels of any culverts carrying flows from these creeks, but it cannot further delay its works pending the drainage plan. The culverts installed under Greenhill Road will not cause any flooding in the existing creek system.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. RYAN: Can the Attorney-General say when the Local Government Act Revision Committee's report will be brought down?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A report I have been given states:

The Minister of Local Government has been advised by the Chairman of the Local Government Act Revision Committee that the committee will complete its deliberations on November 30, 1969.

This report is a week out of date: it is dated November 25. I had dinner on Friday evening with Mr. Gifford, Q.C., and he told me that he had on that day finished the report. My information continues:

The inquiries and investigations of the committee have extended over a period of about four years. It was expected that the report would have been received earlier but the extent of the work involved and the illness and absence from South Australia of committee members have contributed to the delays. When the report is received by the Minister full consideration will be given to it.

The report has been received and is being considered.

ADULT EDUCATION FEES

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question on increases in fees for adult education classes?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The honourable member was correct in saying that fees for adult education subjects conducted by the Education Department rose by up to 33⅓ per cent, but overall the rises were of the order of 27 per cent because of the reduced increase as the number of hours a week taken rose. The revised basic fee structure had a sliding scale increase ranging from 33 per cent for one hour attendance a week to 16 per cent for five hours attendance a week. Most classes are of two, two and a half, or three hours' duration and the increase in fees for these are 25 per cent, 21 per cent and 20 per cent respectively. It was considered necessary to increase these fees because of increased staff and operating costs which had occurred since the present fees were fixed in 1967. At the same time it is considered that the increased fees are still reasonable and compare favourably with fees of similar kind in some other States and certainly in adult education generally. I regret that the state of our finances makes these increases necessary, and they must stand.

MARREE SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked some time ago about the Marree school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Until about five minutes before I left the office this afternoon I did have a reply, but at that time further important information regarding this question came in and there was insufficient time to incorporate it in the reply I had prepared for the honourable member this afternoon. If he will be patient and wait until tomorrow, I shall give him a complete reply which I am sure will make him very happy.

KINDERGARTENS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Local Government, a reply to the question I asked on November 26 about the section of the Local Government Act which affects council-owned reserves and their possible use for kindergarten purposes?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Local Government Act does not permit councils to use or lease public parks or parklands for the purpose of erecting kindergartens. These lands are reserved for recreation purposes and in many cases Government subsidy has been made available for their purchase. Some councils have sought the permission of the Minister of Local Government to dispose of small reserves up to half an acre and, following approval, have made these small areas available for kindergarten purposes. There is no similar power for larger areas. Generally speaking, it should not be beyond the resources of local government to make other land available for the establishment of kindergartens.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the non-payment of a medical claim?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The contributor referred to by the honourable member was not admitted to hospital as an inpatient. He attended the hospital as an outpatient for a minor operative procedure for which the hospital theatre was used. The hospital account rendered to the contributor was for a fee of $11 for the use of the theatre. The question of the payment of theatre fee benefits for outpatients has been discussed on a number of occasions by the South Australian Association of Registered Health Benefits Organizations. The rules of the funds do not provide for benefits for outpatient treatment. The brochures and the membership books of this association have always shown this exclusion. However, it has been the practice of the major funds to pay a theatre fee benefit for

outpatient operative procedures in certain circumstances, because some operative procedures, which would warrant the admission of the patient as an inpatient, are performed as an outpatient operation. No provision was made in the National Health Act for paramedical services and, in order to assist contributors, funds over a period of years introduced various benefits for paramedical services. These are known as ancillary benefits. Examples of ancillary benefits are physiotherapy, ambulance services, eye tests, home nursing, and theatre fees. There is no provision in the National Health Act for a payment of Commonwealth benefits for ancillary benefits. However, funds are limited by the Commonwealth Department of Health to a maximum payment of 5 per cent of contributions for ancillary benefits. Because an increasing number of hospitals were issuing outpatient theatre fee claim forms for very minor procedures involving local anaesthetics, claims were being made for which benefits were never intended and were not payable. For this reason the funds of South Australia restricted the issue of outpatient theatre fee claim forms to operative procedures where other than a local anaesthetic was used.

FISHING BERTH

Mr. RYAN: Has the Treasurer, representing the Minister of Marine, a reply to my question about fishing berths at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The matter concerning the rock projection has been investigated and it has been found that the toe of the rock embankment supporting the roadway leading to the east end of the new Jervois bridge encroaches a maximum of 8ft. into the fishing boat mooring area on the downstream side of the bridge. The encroachment will hinder the larger fishing vessels leaving or approaching their moorings on the south side of the mooring pontoons, particularly at times of low water or low tides. The harbourmaster has been asked to find out whether the difficulty can be overcome by confining the smaller boats to the mooring area between the pontoons and the bridge embankment, as these craft should be able to get in and out more easily than the larger fishing vessels.

PENOLA COURTHOUSE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question about courthouse facilities at Penola?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid that the reply is not quite as the honourable member would like. There are no plans for the erection of a new courthouse at Penola, but I intend to have the present premises examined with a view to improving their condition.

KONGORONG EFFLUENT

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Mines to my question about disposal of effluent at the Kongorong cheese factory?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think that the honourable member was advised on Thursday last about a reply.

Mr. Corcoran: And again today.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The reply must have been taken from my file since Thursday. I will look it up for tomorrow.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. HUGHES: During the last Commonwealth election campaign the Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) was reported as having said that a standard gauge connection between Adelaide and the east-west line would be built over a period of two years. However, he is reported in yesterday's *Advertiser* as having said during the ceremony at the Broken Hill railway station on Saturday last that the line would take three years to build and would cost about $50,000,000. People in the Wallaroo District are extremely interested in the building of this line, especially since the Minister of Roads and Transport made the following press statement:

Wallaroo potential for great industrial expansion: The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Murray Hill) said this week that Wallaroo, with its deep sea port, had the potential for great industrial expansion. It is vital that such a district should be linked directly with Sydney and the eastern seaboard, he added. Mr. Hill was commenting on agreement by the State Government to an independent feasibility study into the need for standard gauge lines with the State linking with a line to the east. The study is to be conducted by consultants approved by both the Federal and State Governments. Mr. Hill said that in view of proposals to the Commonwealth over financial assistance for building standard gauge lines there was every reason to feel confident that it would bring the State closer to agreement with the Commonwealth.

He said that the State considered the next programme of rail standardization should be an integrated plan to include a standard gauge connection from Wallaroo through Snowtown to Brinkworth, to connect with the Broken Hill standard gauge project at Gladstone. This proposal would bring substantial benefits to Wallaroo and surrounding areas.

Can the Premier say whether, in his discussions with the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister has given the reason why the time for building the line has been increased from two years to three years and, if a reason has been given, can he say what it is?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think the honourable member would be aware of the present situation. The Prime Minister has given an undertaking that the connection between Adelaide and the main east-west standard gauge railway will be made. The honourable member would also know that the State Government, in its negotiations, has insisted that further consideration be given to constructing associated lines, one of which the honourable member has referred to. Consultants have been appointed to carry out this investigation and to report, and the facets of the report to be made are in *Hansard*. A time has been set down for the report to be submitted and, when the report is received, the procedures to build the railway will be put into effect. A time for completion cannot be stated, because the exact extent of the work is not known and whether the work will take two years or three years depends on what happens following receipt of the consultants' report. I advise the honourable member not to get excited about whether the work will take 24 months or 36 months. The report will be made to the Government and then be given effect to by the Governments concerned.

DAILY DOUBLE TURNOVER

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that imposition of an extra 1 per cent levy on the daily double turnover at race meetings each Saturday is being considered, the proposal being that the extra amount received should be made available to racing clubs to increase prize-money. Can the Treasurer say whether this proposal has been made and, if it has, what is the Government's decision?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: To my knowledge, the Government has not received any such proposal. Although I have heard that the matter has been discussed, I have not received any representations or proposals from the racing clubs and, until I do, I am unable to comment further.

BUSH FIRE WARNINGS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of November 25 about bush fires?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

Copies of the small fire weather district map produced by the Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology will be included in the next issue of the Bush Fire Research Committee's press bulletin *Fire Prevention News*, with a request that it be used as a service to the public. Copies of the map have been forwarded to the Clerks of each House for distribution to members of both Chambers. This map is a miniature of the one used by channel 10 in its morning broadcast.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Previously, the Minister of Works provided me with a full report on the tender dates for the Modbury Hospital project in relation to Phase 1, Part I (the main hospital block). Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, obtain a full report setting out the companies or firms to which contracts have been let and any other available details?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain as much information as possible for the honourable member.

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUDSON: You, Mr. Speaker, have circulated to members a photostat copy of a petition signed by students at the Institute of Technology protesting against the proposed increase in fees. The petition, first expressing the concern of the people who signed it that quotas would remain on institute courses despite the rise in fees, then states:

We ask that the Government rescind its request to tertiary institutions to raise their fees, and further ask that the Government provide additional finance to the institute in order that the gazetted quotas on institute courses be eliminated.

The Government has already replied to the question on fees, but can the Treasurer say whether additional finance will be made available to the institute so that the quotas, which have been introduced for the first time this year on institute courses, can be eliminated? Many students who, previously, may have entered the university are now forced to go to the institute if they fail to be accepted in the university quotas and, in turn, this situation has had a serious impact on the number of students who can be accepted at the Institute of Technology. Consequently, the quotas introduced by the institute will prevent from attending some students who would otherwise be able to attend. Can the Treasurer say what action the Government intends to take to provide additional finance for the

institute to enable it either to remove quotas altogether or to alleviate the extent to which the quotas apply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know whether the honourable member is correct in assuming, as he seems to do, that the quotas are purely a matter of finance. I do not know whether this is the precise position. As to the general import of the question, I will discuss this matter with the people concerned to ascertain whether I shall be able to throw any further light on it.

GRANGE ROAD

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question about work being done by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on Grange Road?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The 46in.-diameter trunk sewer for the western suburbs sewerage reorganization scheme is at present being constructed in the right of way between Frederick Street and Coombe Road. This sewer will be located in Grange Road for a distance of about 250ft. and will then be laid in Frederick Street. Because of the heavy traffic conditions in Grange Road, the sewer has had to be located in such a manner that during the construction period two lanes of traffic are kept open continually. The sewer construction in Grange Road will commence within the next few days while the sewer is laid partly across the road into the right of way, and this work will take about one week. No further work will be done until after the Christmas shut-down. Work will recommence in late January, 1970, when the laying of the sewer along Grange Road, including the construction of two manholes and interconnections, will take about six weeks to complete.

DERNANCOURT SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: In an area at Dernancourt, which has been subdivided and called Glenhaven by the developer, all allotments except lots 3 to 14, Lower North-East Road, have access to sewerage and water supply, although the main mains are within walking distance. The area is not completely built up, but one block owner about to commence building a house was informed by the Mains Extension Branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that sewerage could be connected if he signed a guarantee to pay a surcharge for five years and for the remainder of the year in which the main was laid and gazetted as available for connection. The amount quoted offered no encouragement to have the work undertaken. If sewerage is not connected septic tanks will be installed, and as the land on some allotments is flat and low-lying the area could become a health hazard. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, consider extending sewerage to this area for the normal sewerage rates?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will consider this matter as soon as possible.

MINISTERS

Mr. HUDSON: We have all been concerned at the absence for some time of the Minister of Works, and we hope that he will be returned soon to full health. However, it seems to many of us that one possible reason for the Minister's becoming as ill as he did was the amount of work he was required to do. I refer the Premier to the fact that the Minister was in charge of the Public Works Department, with all the ramifications of that department; he was in charge of the Marine and Harbors Department; and he was also the Minister of Labour and Industry. It is clear that, to some extent, the load of work carried by this Minister was responsible for his difficulties. Since the portfolios of the Minister of Works have been re-allocated among three other Ministers (the Attorney-General, the Minister of Lands, and the Treasurer) the Minister of Lands is becoming more crotchety than usual, and even he seems to be showing some signs of strain. As the Premier has been consulting with a possible candidate for the last half hour or so, can he say whether the Government is considering increasing the size of Cabinet to 10, with an extra Minister in the House of Assembly, so that when the Minister of Works returns to normal duties he will not be overloaded and his health will not be again put at risk? Alternatively, if Cabinet does not intend to do that, does the Premier intend to take on more departmental responsibility than the responsibilities he has now?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is a selfless thought that the member for Glenelg brings into this Chamber, and we are overcome at his solicitude for the Minister of Works. True, the Minister was working extremely hard, but I think that this is a load that will ease in the future because the Government has accomplished a tremendous amount in its term of office. I will carefully watch this matter. Although the Government has no plans to increase the size of the Ministry immediately, I believe that this action is inevitable in the future.

The honourable member has asked a question about the position in the short term, as I think he must, for no Government can be tied down over a long period to a decision on such a matter. Therefore, I think the answer for the period of time in which the honourable member has shown an interest must be "No".

ELECTRICITY DEPOSITS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to two questions I have asked about security deposits demanded of people by the Electricity Trust?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I referred to the trust the questions asked by the member for Edwardstown and noted that he made very strong criticism of the trust.

Mr. Virgo: With justification.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Well, I accept that point as an interjection. I have a rather long reply from the trust which it has asked that I give. Therefore, rather than give it in the form of a reply to the question, I prefer to give it as a Ministerial statement. Consequently, I ask leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The reply is rather long because members of the board of the Electricity Trust were particularly concerned at the criticisms made by the member for Edwardstown when he asked his two questions about consumers. The report I have states:

The value of electricity used by any person cannot be determined until after it is used and metered. It is therefore normal to allow credit for one month in the case of large consumers and three months for small consumers before preparing and rendering an account. At the present time the trust is extending such credit to 396,400 of its 410,000 consumers and at any time the value of electricity used but not paid for is approximately $9,000,000. From the remaining 13,600 consumers who may involve some credit risk, the trust obtains a deposit as security against future accounts. This deposit accumulates interest at savings bank rates and is held by the trust until the electricity supply is no longer required or the consumer demonstrates that a deposit is unnecessary—normally by regular payment of accounts over a period of two years.

At the present time, the trust is holding deposits totalling $412,000 from 13,600 consumers. This represents 2.8 per cent of the sales of electricity per quarter and 3.4 per cent of the total number of consumers. Notwithstanding the care taken to ensure due payment of account, the trust has had to write off $141,000 arising from bad debts during the three years 1967-1969. The trust seeks a security deposit in the following circumstances:

(1) From a person starting a new business and not having an appropriate credit rating with the trust.
(2) From a person renting a furnished dwelling and not having an appropriate credit rating with the trust.
(3) Where the trust has grounds for believing that a consumer may default in payment.
(4) From a person taking over a business of a type which has a substantial risk of failure, for example, delicatessen, night club, coffee lounge, etc.
(5) From a consumer with a consistently poor record of payment of trust accounts.

It is trust policy to deal sympathetically with consumers who have difficulty in paying accounts or deposits. Arrangements to pay by reasonable instalments are readily granted and may be extensive in cases of sickness, etc. However, it is not usual completely to defer payment for long periods because, while power remains connected, additional usage and expense is being incurred. Over 1,000 requests are received each week for extension of time to pay accounts and at least 90 per cent of these are granted. The situation regarding the first person mentioned by Mr. G. T. Virgo, M.P., on November 20, 1969, is as follows:

January, 1964: Account not paid by due date and not paid after reminder letter sent. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received.
April, 1964: Account paid normally.
July, 1964: Account not paid by due date nor after reminder letter sent. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received.
October, 1964: Similar to July.
January, 1965: Similar to July and October, 1964.
April, 1965: Account paid normally.
July, 1965: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Consumer advised that owing to consistent late payment the trust would ask for a deposit of $12 if future accounts were not paid by the due dates.
October, 1965: Account paid normally.
January, 1966: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Consumer again advised that the trust would ask for a deposit of $12 if future accounts were not paid by due dates.
April, 1966: Account paid normally.
July, 1966: Account paid normally.
October, 1966: Account paid normally.
January, 1967: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received.

April, 1967: Account paid normally.
July, 1967: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received.
October, 1967: Similar to July, 1967.
January, 1968: Similar to July and October.
April, 1968: Similar to July, October and January.
July, 1968: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Consumer informed that owing to consistent late payment the trust would ask for a deposit of $15 if future accounts were not paid by due dates. (Note: the cost of the deposit is related to the normal amount of the account which had increased since reference to a $12 deposit in 1966.)
October, 1968: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected if payment not received. In accordance with previous warning, consumer asked to deposit $15 with the trust. Following representations from consumer that future accounts would be paid promptly, this request for a deposit was cancelled.
January, 1969: Account paid normally.
March, 1969: Account paid normally.
July, 1969: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Consumer informed that the trust would ask for a deposit of $15 unless future accounts were paid by due date.
October, 1969: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. In accordance with previous warning, consumer asked to lodge a deposit of $15 with the trust as security against future accounts.
On November 5, 1969, the supply was disconnected because no deposit had been paid. On the same day Mr. **G. T. Virgo, M.P.,** rang about the matter. He was informed that supply would only be reconnected after the deposit was paid. Mr. Virgo stated that he would see that the deposit was paid even if he had to pay it himself. The supply was therefore reconnected on the evening of the same day.
On November 11, 1969, a letter was sent to Mr. Virgo asking for payment of $15 as this amount had been guaranteed but not otherwise received.
On November 17, 1969, the amount was paid by Mr. Virgo.

The payment was accompanied by a strongly critical letter from the member for Edwardstown, indicating that he would take the matter further. The report continues:

In the second case mentioned by Mr. Virgo on November 26, 1969, the name of the consumer was not given.

The honourable member said that he would not give the name, because the man was a hills primary producer and the use of his name might embarrass Ministers. However, the trust has identified the person without any difficulty. The report continues:

In the last 12 months only two rural consumers have been asked for a deposit of $300 and one was associated with a deceased estate. The record of the other consumer since 1967 is as follows:

February, 1967: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received.
May, 1967: Extension of time granted for payment. Account not paid by extended date. Further extension made but account again not paid.
June, 1967: Letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Consumer informed that, owing to consistent late payment, the trust would ask for a deposit of $400 if this or future accounts were not paid by due dates.
July, 1967: No payment received and request made for deposit to be paid by instalments.
August, 1967: Cheque for $404.87 received. Dishonoured.
October, 1967: $50 deposit instalment received. Trust agreed to cancel remaining $350 deposit on assurance that accounts would be paid on time.
November, 1967: Extension of time to pay granted.
December, 1967: Consumer stated that he was on drought relief and requested return of $50 deposit. Deposit returned.
January, 1968: Account paid normally.
April, 1968: Account not paid by due date. Letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Payment made when trust officer called to disconnect.
July, 1968: Extension of time to pay granted.
October, 1968: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. Consumer informed that a deposit of $400 would be required if this and future accounts were not paid by due date.
January, 1969: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected if payment not received. Consumer informed that a deposit of $300 would be required if this and future accounts were not paid by due date. (Note: Amount of deposit related to size of account, which was now somewhat less than previously.)

April, 1969: Account not paid by due date. Paid after letter sent saying that supply would be disconnected unless payment received. In accordance with previous warning, request made for deposit of $300.

May, 1969: Deposit not paid. Trust agreed to accept deposit in instalments of $100 a month.

June, 1969: Deposit instalment not paid.

July, 1969: Deposit instalment not paid. Supply disconnected for non-payment of these instalments. Reconnected the following day, following representations from consumer and his undertaking to pay deposit instalments each month in future.

August, 1969: Deposit instalment not received. Supply disconnected; $100 received and supply restored.

September, 1969: Deposit instalment not paid.

October, 1969: Cheque for $100 deposit instalment received but dishonoured. Consumer subsequently made valid payment. On representations from consumer, trust reduced the requested deposit of $300 to the $200 already paid.

October, 1969: Account paid normally.

Following the questions asked by the member for Edwardstown, the board of the trust has considered its policy on the lodging of security deposits for payment of accounts. It has decided that the policy should be continued as a proper means of safeguarding trust moneys and of ensuring that the bulk of electricity consumers are not penalized by the small number who might constitute a credit risk. The trust administers its policy sympathetically and will give every consideration to cases of hardship. However, while electricity is supplied on credit, appropriate arrangements must be made in each case to ensure that payment is in due course received.

I have given this long detail because I want to show that the members of the board of the trust are not unconscious of or unsympathetic to the problems of people. One case involved a constituent of the member for Edwardstown and the other involved a person who wrote to the honourable member, who could be easily identified, and whose record the trust has apparently no hesitation in making available here. In neither case, however, have I mentioned the name of the person involved. I strongly advise members to rely on the good judgment of the trust in such cases.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. Corcoran, for Mr. CASEY (on notice): How many wheatgrowers in South Australia have been allocated a wheat quota of:

(*a*) less than 1,000 bushels?

(*b*) between 1,000 and 2,000 bushels?

(*c*) between 2,000 and 3,000 bushels?

(*d*) between 3,000 and 4,000 bushels?

(*e*) between 4,000 and 5,000 bushels?

(*f*) between 5,000 and 6,000 bushels?

(*g*) between 6,000 and 8,000 bushels?

(*h*) between 8,000 and 10,000 bushels?

(*i*) over 10,000 bushels?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee states that the information sought by the honourable member cannot be provided at this juncture because some quotas have yet to be allocated. Every effort will be made to furnish the required details as soon as possible following the completion of quota allocations.

SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. Corcoran, for Mr. HUDSON (on notice): In view of the Minister's statement on November 18, 1969, that in so far as schoolchildren are used as postmen "it is left to the common sense of heads of schools to use their discretion as to the kind of information sent home with the children," is it the intention of the honourable Minister to amend the memorandum to all heads of departmental schools of October 29, 1969, which requires that children "should not be used to act as postmen for conveying controversial information . . . whatever source the material comes from"?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is not intended to amend the memorandum to heads of departmental schools. In a matter of this kind the use of the head's discretion is always understood. The responsibility is on him to decide what is a fair thing and what is not. The wording of the last sentence ("I know that you agree with me on this matter and will act accordingly") invites co-operation in the use of its discretion along the lines of departmental policy.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND ACQUISITION BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is based on recommendations contained in the final report of the Land Acquisition (Legislation Review) Committee set up by the Government to examine a wide range of matters concerned with the compulsory acquisition of land; in particular, to review the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1966; and, if thought fit, to make recommendations for a new Act. It has appeared to the Government for some time that the present Act does not meet the needs of the public in that, amongst other things, it fails to provide the individual owner with proper notice of the acquisition or with an opportunity to make his views known to the authority in charge of the scheme or undertaking for which his land is to be acquired. The legal procedures governing the process of acquisition are cumbersome and antiquated (indeed, they are based on English legislation brought down in the last century and wholly inappropriate for registered land under the Real Property Act). There are unnecessary delays in making available to the owner of the acquired land the compensation, or at least a fair proportion of the compensation, to which he will become entitled, and the cardinal section (section 12) containing the rules governing the assessment of compensation have revealed over the years a number of anomalies and uncertainties which ought to be cured and resolved. The Government committee recommended that the old Act should be repealed and new legislation brought down that corrects the faults of the old Act and provides just, expeditious and simple machinery for acquisitions.

Before analysing the individual clauses it will assist honourable members if I advert to some of the new legislation's principal features. It is fundamental to the working of the new scheme that no land can be acquired by agreement or otherwise until a document of a description not previously adopted in South Australia—a "Notice of intention to acquire"—has been served on all persons interested in the land to be acquired. The giving of the notice is made to have three important results: first, it places on the acquiring authority the obligation of making a definite decision whether to acquire or not before embarking on the process of acquisition; second, it gives to the owner reasonably detailed knowledge of the land likely to be acquired; third, it gives to the owner the right to obtain detail of the scheme for which his land is being acquired, to obtain explanations or particulars with respect to the scheme and to ask, for various important reasons, to have the scheme varied; fourth, it freezes the land, for the time being, in the hands of the owner, so that he cannot subvert the acquisition by dealings with the land before ownership finally passes; and fifth, it sets a date for the commencement of what will normally be a 12 months' period before the expiration of which the authority must make up its mind whether to proceed with the acquisition or not. (It should immediately be mentioned that if the authority fails to proceed within that period it must compensate the owner for loss suffered by having to hold the land.)

If the authority decides to proceed, a proclamation vests the land in the authority, converts all interests into claims for compensation and constitutes the date with respect to which the compensation is assessed. The proclamation embodies a "notice of acquisition" which must be served on interested persons. Contemporaneously with the notice of acquisition the authority is required to state a figure representing the value of the land, and pay the amount of that value into court. That important innovation makes it possible for every person with an interest in the land—and there will usually be only one owner or one group of joint owners—to apply to court for payment out, leaving any other disputed amounts (for example, a further sum representing value, severance or disturbance) to be agreed or litigated in due course. The procedure ensures that persons interested will be able to have immediate recourse to a fund representing a substantial proportion, sometimes the whole, of the amount to which they will ultimately be adjudged to be entitled by way of compensation. After payment into court, the remaining issues in dispute (if any) between the parties can quickly be defined under the Act, and, at that stage, the proceedings then will reflect the benefit to be derived from the new Land and Valuation Court, the subject of separate legislation.

One last general comment should be made. This Bill deals, and is intended to deal, only with procedures and compensation for taking land. The Land Acquisition (Legislation Review) Committee which has recommended this Bill had before it some submissions relating to the need to provide compensation for losses suffered by persons whose land has not been taken for announced public works

projects, but who, in some way (often indirectly), have suffered other losses or disadvantageous consequences either as the result of the announcement of a project or as the result of its execution. Those other losses or consequences are not, in the opinion of the committee and in the opinion of the Government, susceptible to legislative cure of the kind embodied in land acquisition legislation. Both the committee and the Government are firmly of the opinion that the solution to the problem of the special sort of losses referred to must be found either in administrative action or in legislation of a social nature specifically directed to the social problems involved (of which monetary compensation is only one). Whether administrative action is taken or social legislation is introduced, the adequacy of the solutions attempted will best be debated as separate issues in Parliament.

I shall now turn to the individual clauses. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1966. Clause 4 deals with the arrangement of the Act. Clause 5 enacts certain transitional provisions. It provides that if, at the commencement of the new Act, a notice to treat has been issued under the repealed Act, the acquisition may be proceeded with under the old Act in all respects as if the new Act had not been enacted. Clause 6 provides certain definitions necessary for the purposes of the Act. "Compensation" is defined as meaning compensation to which persons are entitled under the Act, and includes the purchase price of land purchased by agreement. The word "land" includes any interest in land. Thus an acquisition of "land" could be an acquisition of an easement over land or any other right or privilege in relation to land. The acquisition is made by a person designated "the authority" who is the person authorized by the special Act to execute the undertaking authorized by that Act.

Clause 7 provides that the new Act is to be construed as being incorporated with every Act by which an undertaking involving the acquisition of land is authorized, and that the new Act and any such Act are to be read together as one Act. Clause 8 provides that the provisions of the new Act are to prevail over anything contained in the Real Property Act. Clause 9 provides that the new Act is not to apply to the resumption of land pursuant to the Crown Lands Act or the Pastoral Act. Clause 10 provides that where the authority proposes to acquire land for the purposes of an authorized undertaking it must serve on all persons interested in the land, or such of those persons as, after diligent inquiry, become known to the authority, a notice of intention to acquire the land. Subclause (2) provides that the authority is not to proceed with the acquisition of land until it has complied with this requirement. Subclause (3) provides that the notice of intention must define the subject land with reasonable particularity. Subclause (4) provides that the notice of intention to acquire does not bind the authority to acquire the land defined in the notice but that where any alteration or modification as to the boundaries or extent of the subject land is made the authority must serve on all persons upon whom the notice of intention has been served a notice of that alteration or modification.

Clause 11 provides that a person who has an interest in the subject land may, within 30 days after service of a notice of intention to acquire, require the authority to furnish him with reasonable details of the acquisition scheme. Subclause (2) provides that the details required under the clause may be furnished by written reply or by making available models, plans, specifications or other documents relating to the acquisition scheme. Clause 12 provides that an interested person may request the authority not to proceed with the acquisition of the land, request any alteration in the extent of the land to be acquired or request that any part of the subject land be not acquired nor that further land be acquired. Subclause (2) sets out certain grounds upon which such a request may be made, although it does not prevent a request being made upon other grounds. Subclause (3) requires the authority to consider any request made under the clause and to reply to it within 14 days indicating whether it accedes to, or refuses, the request.

Clause 13 applies to land that has not been brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act. Where a notice of intention to acquire such land has been given the owner of the land must not enter into any transaction in respect of the land without disclosing the fact that the land is subject to acquisition. Subclause (3) provides that, if a contract or agreement is entered into without such disclosure, it shall be voidable at the option of the person to whom disclosure should have been made. Subclause (4) provides that the authority may lodge a copy of the notice of

intention at the General Registry Office and may require any person to deliver up any instrument of title to the Registrar. Clause 14 deals with land that has been brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act. In this case the authority may serve a copy of the notice of intention upon the Registrar, and he is required to enter a caveat upon the title forbidding all dealings with the land without the consent in writing of the authority. Clause 15 provides that the authority may, at any time after the service of the notice of intention to acquire, acquire the land by agreement. Subclause (2) provides that the authority may decline to proceed with the acquisition of the subject land. Subclause (3) provides that where the authority determines not to proceed with the acquisition of land it shall serve notice of that fact upon all interested persons.

Subclause (4) provides that if the authority does not acquire the subject land within 12 months after service of the notice of intention to acquire, or within such extended period as may be agreed, or the court may allow, the authority shall be presumed to have determined not to proceed with the acquisition of the land, and the land cannot then be acquired without service of a further notice of intention. Subclause (5) provides that, where the authority determines not to proceed with the acquisition of the land or is presumed so to have determined, an interested person may claim compensation. The manner in which this compensation is assessed is covered in subclauses (6) and (7). Clause 16 provides that the authority may, after the expiration of three months, but before the expiration of 12 months, from the day on which a notice of intention was last served in respect of any land, cause a notice of acquisition to be published in the *Gazette*. Upon publication of that notice the land is vested in the authority. A copy of the notice of acquisition must be served on all interested persons.

Clause 17 requires the authority to serve a copy of the notice upon the Registrar who shall make such alterations to or endorsements upon any instruments of title in his possession or power as may be necessary in view of the acquisition.

Clause 18 provides that every person who, immediately before the acquisition, had an interest in the subject land that is divested or diminished by the acquisition of the land or the enjoyment of which is adversely affected thereby has a claim for compensation. Clause 19 requires the authority to append to the copy of the notice of acquisition served upon the interested person under clause 16 an offer of the amount of compensation that it proposes to pay. To the extent that such an amount is not disputed, it is binding upon the authority. Clause 20 requires the authority to pay the total amount of compensation stated in the offer into court within seven days. The court is empowered to invest these moneys where for any reason payment out of court is delayed. Clause 21 requires a claimant within 60 days after service of the notice of acquisition upon him to state to the authority whether he acquiesces in the amount of compensation offered or claims further compensation. This period of 60 days may be extended by agreement, or by order of the court. If a person fails to comply with this section he is deemed to have acquiesced in the amount of compensation offered. Clause 22 provides for the matters to be contained in a notice of claim served upon the authority. Where such a notice is served the authority must within 60 days reply to the notice of claim. The authority may admit the claim, offer to increase or otherwise vary the compensation previously offered, or dispute the claim. If the authority admits the claim it becomes liable to satisfy that claim in full. If the authority offers to increase or vary the compensation the claimant must reply to that further offer and may acquiesce in it or may dispute the amount, in which case the claim becomes a disputed claim. Of course if the authority disputes the claim then the claim is *ipso facto* a disputed claim within the meaning of the Act. Clause 23 provides for a disputed claim to be referred to court either by the authority or the claimant. The court is required to determine what amount should adequately compensate all persons interested in the subject land, where a claim has been referred to it under the Act.

Clause 24 provides that, where an interest in possession in land is vested in the authority pursuant to the Act, the authority must diligently endeavour to obtain agreement upon the terms on which it will enter into possession of the land. If it fails to obtain agreement it may apply to the court for an order of ejectment, and such further orders as may be just in the circumstances. If a person is in possession of the land after three months, he is deemed to be in possession as a tenant at will. The court may determine a suitable rental in such a case.

Clause 25 deals with the principles upon which compensation is to be assessed under the Act. The compensation is to be such as adequately to compensate a claimant for any

loss that he has suffered by reason of the acquisition of the land. The compensation is to be fixed as at the date of the acquisition of the land. Where the claimant's interest in the land is liable to expire or to be determined, any reasonable prospect of renewal or continuation of the interest must be taken into account. Certain other principles existing under the present Act are included in this clause.

Clause 26 deals with the application of compensation paid into court under the Act. Clause 27 gives the authority power to enter land for the purposes of an authorized undertaking. Clause 28 enables the authority temporarily to occupy and use certain land close to land acquired under the Act. Clause 29 empowers any person who has suffered loss from the entry, or temporary occupation, of his land to claim compensation. Clause 30 empowers the authority to require the delivery up of documents necessary for the purposes of determining compensation. Clause 31 provides for service. Clause 32 provides that where a claimant is under a juristic disability the amount of compensation must be approved by the court.

Clause 33 provides that where an amount of compensation is increased, by agreement or by order of the court, the authority is to pay interest on the amount of the increase at a prescribed rate, from the date of publication of the notice of acquisition. Clause 34 provides that compensation offered, or ordered under the Act, may consist of the execution of works on land of the claimant. Clause 35 empowers the authority to sell, lease, or otherwise deal with or dispose of land acquired under the Act which the authority does not require for the purposes of the undertaking. Clause 36 sets out the principles on which the court shall order costs. Clause 37 provides that proceedings for offences under the Act are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 38 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Petroleum Act to enable the Government to give effect to an agreement that it entered into earlier this year with Delhi Santos. Under the terms of this agreement the annual fees payable in respect of petroleum production licences are to be set off against royalty payable upon petroleum recovered from licensed areas whether the royalty was paid in respect of the licence covering the area from which the petroleum was recovered or an adjacent area. It will be necessary also to provide that the petroleum production schedule and programme that a licensee is required to submit may, in respect of contiguous production areas, cover both those areas as if they together constituted a single area. At the same time the opportunity is taken to increase a fee for the consent of the Minister to a dealing with a licence to a more realistic figure and to provide that where a transaction of a kind for which the consent of the Minister is required under the Act is made subject to conditions precedent the licensee must notify the Minister when any of these conditions has been complied with.

I shall now explain the provisions of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 35 of the principal Act. The present subsection (3) is struck out and a new subsection inserted providing that an annual fee paid by a licensee may be set off against royalty payable by the licensee upon petroleum covered during the year if the petroleum is recovered from an area comprised in the licence in respect of which the fee is paid, or from a contiguous area comprised in a licence held by the same licensee. Clause 3 amends section 36 of the principal Act. This provides for a licensee to submit a single production schedule and programme in respect of contiguous production areas.

Clause 4 amends section 42 of the principal Act. The fee for the approval of the Minister to a transaction with a licence is increased from $20 to $100. This is thought to be a more realistic figure. New subsection (5) requires a licensee who has entered into a transaction of a kind for which the consent of the Minister is required to inform the Minister of compliance with any conditions precedent to which the transaction is subject.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ROLLS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3297.)

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I support the second reading but I wish to make some passing observations, particularly in view of the

statement by the Attorney-General in his second reading explanation, when he described the Bill as a machinery Bill consequential on the alteration of the electoral boundaries of this State. If he had stopped there, my contribution to this debate would have been no more than to say that I supported the Bill. However, the Attorney-General went on to say that the Government expected the alteration of the boundaries to become law soon. I hope his expectations bear fruit, but I wonder whether they will. If they do not, we shall have been wasting our time, because the Bill now before the House permits the printing of rolls consequent on the passing of the redistribution measure.

The measure to alter the Constitution was introduced in this House on October 15, and the Leader of the Opposition supported the Bill immediately. He did not secure the adjournment of the debate. The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), deciding that he would like to consider the Bill, secured the adjournment, but the Bill was passed here on the next day. Perhaps some people will say that we handled it with undue haste. However, the measure was based on a report that all members had had for about three weeks before the Bill was introduced, so there was no excuse for a member who did not know what it provided.

What has happened in the Legislative Council is pathetic. The Bill was read a first time on October 23 and it took the Legislative Council until October 28 to get around to the second reading explanation. Members there then laboured on at the rate of one speaker a day on each of the three sitting days of the week! Then they decided to break the monotony. The Legislative Council Orders of the Day show that, although speakers were available on Tuesday, November 18, on Wednesday, November 19, and on Thursday, November 20, the Council decided not to have even one speaker on those days. The Council may have been sitting late that day. It did not adjourn until 4.29 p.m., so I do not suppose we could expect members of that place to consider such an important measure as the Bill to alter the electoral boundaries.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They were a bit extended.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. Members of the Legislative Council have had the Bill before them for 14 sitting days, yet the Attorney-General hopes that the consequential measure dealing with the rolls will be given a speedy passage with support and approval of the Opposition. I wonder whether such a speedy passage would be fruitless. One member of this Parliament said, "Do you know why the Council is taking so long to deal with the matter? It objects to Dunstan's putting on a turn in the press about it. Dunstan would be better off if he scratched their backs." However, the Legislative Council has turned its back on public opinion so many times that it deserves every word of criticism that the Leader has levelled against it for the way it has handled the Bill. The people of South Australia gave a mandate to the Labor Party to introduce electoral reform, but the rotten system we suffered denied my Party's doing that. However, the Government found one iota of conscience and introduced a Bill, although it was not in line with Labor policy. However, it received the support of Opposition members, and all Government members should use their influence to expedite the passing of that important Bill. The present measure is, as the Attorney-General has said, merely consequential on it, and I support it.

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

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 15 to 20 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of "the Solicitor-General" and insert the following definition:

"'the Master' means the Master or a Deputy Master of the Supreme Court."

No. 2. Page 4, line 3 (clause 8)—Leave out "Solicitor-General" and insert "Master".

No. 3. Page 4, line 4 (clause 8)—Leave out "Solicitor-General" and insert "Master".

No. 4. Page 4, line 14 (clause 8)—Leave out "Solicitor-General" and insert "Master".

No. 5. Page 4, lines 21 to 36 (clause 8)—Leave out subclauses (3), (4), (5) and (6) and insert the following subclause:

"(3) The Master shall make such inquiry as may be necessary for the purposes of this section."

No. 6. Page 4, line 38 (clause 8)—Leave out "Solicitor-General" and insert "Master".

No. 7. Page 4—After clause 8 insert new clause 8a as follows:

"8a. Any proceedings relating to the recovery of compensation under this Act shall not prejudice or debar any right or claim to recover compensation or damages otherwise than in pursuance of this Act, but where compensation has been recovered under this Act by any person in respect of injury sustained by him, the amount of that compensation shall be taken

into account in assessing the compensation or damages to be awarded in respect of the injury in any other proceedings."

No. 8. Page 5, lines 13 and 14 (clause 11)—Leave out the clause.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The first group of amendments substitutes the Master of the Supreme Court for the Solicitor-General. When the Bill left here, the Solicitor-General was given the responsibility, broadly, for assessing damages in certain cases, and for several other matters. The Legislative Council has suggested that the Master of the Supreme Court should be the officer upon whom this responsibility rests, and I think that this is an improvement in the scheme of the Bill. The legislation has been modelled on the New South Wales Act, under which the Solicitor-General is responsible, but there is no reason why the Master should not be responsible. The other amendments put beyond doubt the fact that the rights given to certain persons under this legislation are in addition to any other civil rights they may have against the wrongdoer.

Amendments agreed to.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DEPENDANTS)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3313.)

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): Strong opposition has been expressed to the scheme of legislation included in clauses 4, 5, and 6, because this scheme would have altered the basis of compensation and the right to it. I have carefully considered the matters raised and they have been discussed by the Government. Because of the strong opposition, it is not intended to proceed with these clauses. I suggest the Committee should vote against them.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 5 and 6 negatived.

Clause 7—"Meaning of 'workman'."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

After "amended" to insert "(*a*)"; and after "thereof" to insert "and (*b*) by striking out subsection (2)."

Because of the amendment already made by this clause, subsection (2) of the Act is superfluous.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8—"Compensation for incapacity."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "three dollars and fifty cents" and to insert "five dollars".

This clause deals with the compensation a person may receive while injured. I am proposing a watering-down of the principle in which both the trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party believe. We hope the day will soon come when the view will be accepted in South Australia, as it has been in many other States, that an injured person is entitled to the same wage as he would have received had he not been injured. In fact, one of these days I should like some of the brighter legal people of this State to consider whether, in fact, it is not illegal to prescribe a payment less than the award wage to which the person concerned is entitled. If a person goes on annual leave, sick leave, or long service leave, he must be paid the appropriate rate of pay that he would have received had he continued at work.

Mr. Broomhill: As a minimum.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes; but here we have a provision that abrogates that principle. While there may be some validity in a State Act overriding a State award, I should be interested to hear the legal argument, if it could be put in laymen's terms, concerning why a State Act should override a Commonwealth award, because that cannot happen, as the Attorney-General knows. Although we think that the sum ought to be up-graded, we are not up-grading it here: we are merely restoring the value that the $3.50 (for each child under 16 years) had in 1963 in relation to the State living wage.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Having given this matter much consideration since members spoke in the second reading debate, I regret that the Government cannot accept this amendment or any of the amendments that the Opposition has on file regarding this clause. Plainly, for every increase in benefits under this clause there must be an increase in the cost to industry in South Australia. The sums by which we intend to increase payments are substantially higher than the sums in the Act at present. The major increase provided is from $32.50 to $40. I

believe the honourable member wants to make this $47.50. We believe that, with the best will in the world, we cannot go above the sum of $40, which represents an increase of $7.50. We believe that increase is proper in the circumstances. I think that the member for Edwardstown has worked out his percentage increase on the increases that have occurred in the fitters' award since 1963.

Mr. Virgo: I did, but when I found objection to that, I got a further answer based on the State living wage.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should be happy to hear the honourable member on this matter, for I should like to be able to accept what he says, but I am afraid that I cannot do so at this stage. We believe that, in the increase we are providing in the Bill, we are going as far as we deem it proper to go at this stage.

Mr. HURST: The member for Edwardstown has said that he has related his figure to the State living wage, but what basis is the Government using for its figures? We must maintain consistency in these matters.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Attorney-General has said that the Government has proposed an increase in the weekly compensation payment. If the Government concedes that there has been some change in money values and that the weekly rate should therefore be increased, why should this sum of $3.50 for a child dependant not be increased, too? The Attorney-General seems to be inconsistent on this point.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: On the face of it, we may appear to be inconsistent, but we have looked at each figure separately. In most cases, we have considered that an increase should be made but in this case we believe that, even though the figure is the same as it was in 1963, it is proper.

Mr. McKEE: Many increases have occurred in the cost of living since the sum of $3.50 was originally provided, so surely there is a reason to increase that sum.

Mr. HUDSON: I should like the Attorney-General to explain why it was thought appropriate in the Superannuation Bill, which we have just passed, to raise the rate for child dependants to $6 a week and to extend that provision to cover a student teacher as well. If it was good enough to do that in one case, why is an increase not justified in this case?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think I am right in saying that the dependants' allowances in this section of the Act are the highest provided in Australia in this regard.

Mr. McKee: As general compensation payments are higher in the other States, people there would still receive more than people here receive.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot quite follow the honourable member's line of argument. The point I made is that this has stood for six years.

Mr. McKee: Yes, but general workmen's compensation is higher in other States than it is in South Australia.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: But this is only one aspect of compensation. Because of the factors I have already mentioned, the Government considers that there is no case for increasing this amount. The Opposition wants to increase it to $5, which the Government considers is unwarranted.

Mr. LAWN: I refuse to accept the Attorney-General's reason. For the Attorney-General to put up as his only reason why he is against increasing this amount that no other State provides this amount is unreasonable because he does not follow the other States in other matters.

Mr. McKee: The Government uses other States when it suits it to do so.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly, but that is not a logical reason why the amount should not be increased. Everyone knows about the increases in prices and wages that have taken place in the last six years. To say that they should not be passed on in some percentage in such cases as those in the Bill is unjust.

Mr. HUDSON: I should like the Attorney-General—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Not now.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not want to speak to the Minister of Lands, because he is not the responsible Minister. I want consideration to be given to what I have to propose. The position I outlined regarding superannuation is not correct: the $6 a week applies to all children. For dependent children the figure in the Superannuation Bill is $4 a week, or $8 a fortnight. If the Government is not prepared to accept $5 a week it should at least consider bringing the $3.50 a week into line with what is provided in the Superannuation Bill that has just been passed by this Parliament. If the provisions of the Superannuation Bill

apply to student children up to the age of 21 years, this should also be a provision in this Bill. I should like the Minister to explain why an assessment can be made with respect to one Bill that does not apply generally to other Bills. Since 1963, the age for compulsory attendance at school has been raised to 15 years, and every year we know that the percentage of children staying on at school for fourth and fifth years is increasing.

It seems to me that there is a case to be made on the ground of consistency that the Government ought to bring what is provided in this Bill into line with the provisions of the Superannuation Bill. I do not think it would be asking too much of the Government to say, "All right, we will do what is provided in the Superannuation Bill and provide for $4 a week and an extension to cover student children as well." The Government should consider student children, particularly in view of the very savage increase in university fees forecast for 1970. I should like the Minister to consult with his colleague and see whether there is a case for bringing this Bill at least into line with what the Government has provided in the Superannuation Bill. On the grounds of consistency, if the Government is not willing to accept $5 it should be prepared to accept a compromise with the Superannuation Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): The member for Glenelg said that he did not want to speak to me.

Mr. Hudson: If the Minister has authority to make a decision, I shall be delighted to hear him.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: After his explanation of a question earlier this afternoon when he said I was crotchety, I wonder that he wants to expose himself to the risk of an angry reply. I am very good natured about this matter. I have considered the honourable member's points and have made notes about them, even though I am not in charge of the Bill. I shall convey to the Minister concerned the honourable member's comments and, in due course, my colleague will also comment on them.

Mr. McANANEY: Why was this figure left at the 1963 figure between 1965 and 1968 when Labor was in office? Surely it must have been a reasonable figure if it was left. I cannot see the relationship between superannuation and workmen's compensation. Individuals make contributions towards superannuation, but this is not the case with workmen's compensation.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I very much appreciate what has been said during my absence from the Chamber. I cannot agree to any of the suggestions which honourable members have put; the furthest I can go, and I am prepared to say this, is to say that if the Bill is passed without these amendments I am certainly prepared to recommend to the Minister when he returns to duty that he look at the points made with a view to introducing an amending Bill next session on these matters. Personally I hope he will see his way clear to doing something next session but I cannot give an undertaking.

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General has just said that the Government has gone as far as it can go and that it can go no further at the moment. I do not know whether he has sounded out all the members on his side, but should one of his members vote with the Opposition, just exactly what does the Attorney-General mean by what he has said?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We have given much careful thought to the amounts which we can alter and the amounts by which we can increase them and we feel we have gone to the maximum we can go to. We feel that any increase or any advance over the proposals which we have in clause 8 would place an unwarranted and too-heavy burden on industry in this State and therefore we should not accept such increase. If the amendments are carried they will jeopardize the Bill because we consider they place an unwarranted burden—

Mr. Virgo: Do you mean you wouldn't go on with the Bill if the amendment were carried?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I would certainly have to go back to Cabinet if amendments were carried.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (*b*) to strike out "a mother" and insert "an adult person".

The Act as it now stands permits a person who has a wife to receive an additional sum of £4 10s. a week. The Government Bill proposes to add to this the words "or mother", and my amendment strikes out the words "or mother" and inserts "an adult person". Whilst the Government Bill is an extension of the present position, it restricts an acceptable dependant entirely to "a wife". I think the Government's Bill is an acknowledgment that many people do support in their home an adult person other than a wife and I think we have to be fairly particular in the region of the amendment where it says "or a wife". It does not include a *de facto* wife and I think it should;

it does not include a grandmother and I am sure every member would know some person who has a grandmother living with him, or he may live with his aunt or some other type of person who could be nominated. Acknowledgment of this has been made by the Government in moving the amendment to include a mother, and for this we are extremely grateful, but we feel the value of this is lost considerably by the fact that the Government has not given sufficient consideration to the situation where a man is living with some other person.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Government carefully considered the provision in the Bill and I have carefully considered the amendment. By including a mother we felt that the extension was wide enough. The honourable member desires to make a significant further extension to that and we feel that we cannot do that. An "adult person" is as wide as one can get; one can think of all sorts of relationships, both licit and illicit, which could be included if this were done. It would sometimes be very difficult to establish just what the *de facto* relationship would be and, as we do not consider this a desirable extension, we oppose it.

Mr. HUGHES: I regret very much the remarks of the Attorney-General in relation to this amendment. The expression "*de facto* wife" has crept into the debate. A *de facto* wife often bears children and she is accepted in the community as a wife although she is not legally the man's wife. There are many happy families that are united in this way although I do not say it is the proper way. I do not agree with it at all, but there are in the community many such families. These women are justly entitled to come into this category, because they accept the responsibilities of wives and mothers, and the males would wish them to receive compensation. I know that the amendment is delicate, but the Government would be justified in considering the matter further.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (*c*) to strike out "nine dollars" and insert "thirteen dollars".

This is a similar case to that of the child. It gives effect to the decreased value of money and, although I regret that the Government has refused to accept the previous amendment, I hope it will change its mind on the matter.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We have not changed our mind and my reasons for opposing this amendment are similar to those that I gave earlier. However, I will bring the matter to the notice of the Minister when he returns.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (*e*) to strike out "forty dollars" and insert "forty-seven dollars and fifty cents".

This amendment is the key to the whole clause. The Attorney-General has not explained how the maximum amount of $40 was arrived at. The figure could have been pulled out of the air as being something in excess of the total minimum wage payable. I think I recall that the Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe stated that this was the Government's thinking at that time. However, I will not pursue that line, because the Minister is not here and I do not want to misrepresent him. All the workers in the State are concerned that the Government intends to make a maximum payment less than that determined by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, which yesterday decided that as from a date later this month the minimum wage payable to enable a person to exist should be $41.90.

The Government's action in providing $40 a week is an affront to the workers. The only proper amount to fix is the average weekly earnings. This applies in other parts of Australia, but for many years Governments in this State have tried to make our workers the paupers of Australia. They have been the lowest paid and have received the lowest benefits. The South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act was the worst in the Commonwealth until the State Labor Government brought conditions into line with those applying in the Commonwealth sphere and in the other States. We had a formula for arriving at $47.50. We took the case of the base tradesman in Australia, the fitter. In 1963, when the amounts were last fixed, he received $38.90 a week. The new award gives him $56 a week, an increase of $17.10, or 44 per cent, over the 1963 figure.

It has been suggested to me that our Act covers many more categories than that of a fitter and that we ought to tie the amount to something operating in the State. The only relevant thing in the State was the State living wage. In 1963 the State living wage was $28.80. The Commonwealth commission's decision provides a minimum total wage payable in the State of $41.90. That is an increase

of $13.10, or 45.5 per cent, over the 1963 figure. This Parliament would be neglecting its duty if it did not restore the relative purchasing power of the pittance that an injured workman received in 1963. The Government will not restore that purchasing power but apparently it will legislate for under-award payments.

Despite the court's statement that $41.90 should be the minimum, and despite the Attorney-General's direction to the State Industrial Commission to reset the minimum wage on a State basis, the Government is emphatic that an under-award payment shall prevail in South Australia. Our workers are worth far more than the Government gives them credit for. It seems that the Government's policy is to use slave labour and then throw the workers on the scrapheap if they are injured during their employment. The $40 compensation is an insult. In 1963 the State minimum wage was $28.80 and the maximum compensation for a married person was $32.50. Then the niggardly Liberal Government provided $3.70 a week as the maximum amount payable over the State living wage, but it is not prepared even to retain that difference now.

Mr. McKEE: It is difficult for a Liberal Government to arrive at any other decision, because its members have not had to exist on the minimum wage. A person off work through injury has increased liabilities and more worry. When he works he usually earns more than $40 a week, and when he is sick he is caused much worry in trying to meet his commitments. As the commission has decided now that $41.90 shall be the minimum wage, I ask the Attorney-General to reconsider this matter and accept the amendment.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The increase from $32.50 to $40 is proportionate to the increase in the State living wage since 1963, without considering any increase that will be paid as a result of yesterday's judgment.

Mr. Virgo: Surely you have to take that into account now?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The only way I could do that would be, as with the other amendments, to refer the matter to Mr. Coumbe when he returns, so that amendments could be introduced next year. Although the increase contained in the Bill is 23 per cent over the present figure, it is not as much as Opposition members would like to see, but the Government must consider the increased financial weight that this will mean to industry. In view of yesterday's decision and of the action I have taken today concerning State awards, we will reconsider the matter, but we cannot do it during this session.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I do not accept the excuse that, because the Bill had been introduced before yesterday's decision, the Government cannot take the action we are asking it to take. It is unfortunate that the Government is penalizing people who are injured during their employment, but that attitude has applied, and it will continue under the present proposals. A previous Liberal Government recognized in 1963 that there should be about $4 over and above the State minimum living wage provided as compensation. We are asking only that relativity with that position be restored. I am disturbed to hear the Attorney-General argue that this is a cost to industry. Even if that were so (and I do not accept that it is), it is not a sufficient reason for injured workmen to be penalized. That pitiful line of reasoning is perhaps typical of the attitude of members opposite to workmen's compensation, but it is rejected by the community and by injured people. Perhaps the Attorney-General should ask some of his colleagues whether the effect of yesterday's total wage case decision could be considered while the Bill is before the Chamber. The cost that will flow from yesterday's decision will apply to people receiving compensation, so they should receive the benefit of yesterday's decision.

Mr. HURST: I protest at the meagre increase proposed by the Government in the weekly rate. It is not good enough for the Attorney-General to say that these matters will be considered by the Minister when he comes back. We regret that he is not here to listen to our arguments, for I am sure he would have agreed to some of them. Recognized tribunals have determined that the minimum wage in this State shall be $41.90 a week, and we know that not many people receive only that minimum wage. However, these unfortunate people who have received an injury are expected to live on the miserable pittance of $40 a week. This is not a workmen's compensation Bill: it is a workmen's starvation Bill.

The Committee divided on the question that the words "forty dollars" proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Riches.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

To strike out "forty dollars" and insert "forty-one dollars ninety cents".

I so move because I believe that it is illegal for the Committee to carry an amendment to a Bill which is contrary to the decision of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission yesterday that the minimum total wage in South Australia must not be less than $41.90.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the Committee has already dealt with the amendment and has decided that "forty dollars" should remain part of the clause. I cannot accept the amendment the honourable member has moved.

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, the previous amendment was to strike out "$40" and insert "$47.50". Any member who wanted to leave out "$40" would have done so with a view to inserting "$47.50", but the possibility of inserting "$41.90" was not canvassed. It must be possible for an amendment to be moved that has not previously been canvassed by the Committee; otherwise the interpretation that you, Mr. Chairman, are putting means that, once the first amendment has been defeated, any other alternative proposition that members may not have had in their mind previously cannot be considered. Further, if you, Mr. Chairman, insist on your ruling on this matter the previous amendment should not have been put in the way it was put. It should not have been put "That the words 'forty dollars' stand part of the clause" but "That the amendment of the member for Edwardstown be agreed to"; otherwise, you are tying the Committee's hands regarding discussion of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The position is that the Committee has tied its own hands. The Committee has decided "That 'forty dollars' stand part of the clause"; therefore, I cannot accept any amendment to alter that.

Mr. LAWN: I ask for a ruling, Mr. Chairman. This Bill, which was introduced before the Arbitration Commission handed down its judgment yesterday, was introduced when the minimum wage was about $38. I gave some thought, in the event of the amendment moved by the member for Edwardstown being defeated, to moving that the figure in the clause be $42, which would retain the same ratio over the minimum wage as did the Bill when it was introduced. How can I have that dealt with, in view of your ruling that only one amendment can be disposed of? How is it that only one amendment can be moved?

The CHAIRMAN: There may be half a dozen amendments on the file but, if the Committee decides that certain words remain part of the clause, those words remain. In this case, the Committee decided that the words "forty dollars" should remain part of the clause.

Mr. HUDSON: If in order, I will move:

After "forty" to insert "one" and after "dollars" to insert "ninety cents".

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has decided that the words "forty dollars" stand; therefore, I cannot accept an amendment that will increase or diminish that figure.

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, the technical matter is that $40 will be left in the clause by the proposed amendment to add $1.90. This does not interfere with the Committee's decision. How can it be otherwise?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the amendment to increase or decrease the amount.

Mr. VIRGO: I ask leave to move to insert "plus $1.90". Mr. Chairman, are you prepared to accept that as an amendment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to help members out of the difficulty that they foresee about legality. I do not think there is anything in the point but, if honourable members opposite would like me to adjourn the debate to consider whether it is all right to do this, I should be pleased to do that. However, I warn them that this will entail such a delay as to make it almost impossible for the Bill to be passed this session.

Mr. Hudson: You're threatening to put it up in Annie's room.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If honourable members want me to form an opinion on this, I will do it.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6.2 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In new subsection (3) (*a*) to strike out "nine thousand" and insert "eleven thousand seven hundred".

In making this calculation we have applied not the same percentage but the same principle or formula. Since the amounts for total incapacity were fixed in 1965, the minimum wage payable has increased by, I think, 30 per cent. This percentage has been applied to the total payment.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I respect the viewpoint put by the honourable member but I regret that the same reasons for opposition apply to this as applied to the weekly payment amendments. We consider that, by increasing the amount to $9,000, we are going as far as we can afford, for the present at any rate. However, because of developments yesterday in the Commonwealth sphere and developments that will take place in the State field, we will keep a close eye on the matter with a view to increasing the amount later.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo (teller).

Noes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In new subsection (3) (*b*) to strike out "twelve thousand" and insert "fifteen thousand six hundred".

This amendment is consequential and the case for it has been argued.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Despite the Committee's decision on the last amendment, I again state the Government's view that the community cannot afford it. Every increase in benefit under the Act increases premiums, and that increase must be borne by industry as an added cost. The only point we argue about is whether the increase is justified. We consider that we have gone as far as we can go in providing for an amount of $12,000. We consider that to increase it to $15,600 would place an impossible extra burden on the business community. It means that the costs of production will increase and, although we would like to give more to help those who are injured by accident and their dependants, we cannot afford to go further than we have gone at present.

Mr. Virgo: I thought you wanted to get this through.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member wants to do so I hope he will co-operate and not press for this amendment.

Mr. Virgo: You called the last two divisions on me.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know, but I hope that it will not be necessary this time and that what I have said will convince the honourable member that we cannot go to the figure to which he would like us to go.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo (teller).

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, Rodda, and Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. As there is an equality of votes I give my decision in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (i) to strike out "fifteen dollars" and insert "seventeen dollars and fifty cents".

The principle involved is the same as that previously stated, and the amendment increases the minimum weekly payment.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: For the reasons that I have already given I oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*k*) By inserting immediately after subsection (5) the following subsections:

(6) The first weekly payment made pursuant to this section shall be made on the day on which, but for the incapacity, the workman would have been paid his wages and thereafter such payments shall be made at weekly intervals during the incapacity.

(7) Any weekly payment not made as provided for by subsection (6) of this section shall be increased by one tenth of the weekly payment for each week or part thereof elapsing between the time at which it was required to be paid and the time at which it was actually paid.

(8) Where, during any period in respect of which weekly payments are payable to a workman pursuant to this section, a public holiday occurs, that workman shall be paid in respect of that holiday an amount not less than the amount he would have been paid in respect of that holiday if he had been in employment during that period.

The principle involved in this amendment should concern everyone. Many times, when a workman is injured during the course of his employment, undue delay occurs in paying weekly compensation. At present, no penalty is incurred by this delay, and some employers (not most of them) tend to play on this factor and on the normal weekly pay day no compensation payments are available. Payments to the injured workman should be made at weekly intervals and not when the employer is disposed to do so. If he fails to make the payments on a normal pay day he should incur a penalty. Also, a workman is entitled to full pay for a public holiday, but in isolated cases he is not paid the full rate.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Having given much thought to this matter, I am afraid that I cannot accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Fixed rates of compensation for certain injuries."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "nine thousand" and insert "eleven thousand seven hundred".

The $9,000 having already been amended previously, I merely move this amendment as a consequence.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose the amendment.

Mr. VIRGO: I draw the Attorney's attention to what can only be described as the stupidity of his suggestion that the Committee reject this amendment. Whether the previous amendment has been carried by design or otherwise is of no importance: the plain fact is that section 18 of the principal Act has been amended by substituting $11,700 for $9,000. If the amendment is not carried, we shall have an Act incapable of interpretation. I suggest that, the $11,700 having been adopted previously, the Committee would be insane to do anything other than adopt a similar sum here.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo (teller).

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my decision in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: In view of the Government's lack of co-operation, there is no point in my moving to amend the $9,000 as it subsequently appears in this clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Liability independently of this Act."

Mr. VIRGO: As my amendment to this clause is consequential on an amendment already defeated, I will not proceed with it.

Clause passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Application of this Act to industrial diseases."

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I suggest that the Committee vote against this clause, as it is consequential on clause 5, which was defeated earlier.

Clause negatived.

Clause 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Compulsory insurance."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "one hundred dollars" and insert "one thousand dollars".

This clause prescribes the fine on an employer for non-insurance of an employee, the present rate being the princely sum of $10 for each employee. The Bill increases this sum to

$100 for each employee. The amendment seeks to increase it to $1,000 an employee and, if anything, I believe that sum is too small because the whole purpose of the amendment is to send bankrupt any employer who fails to insure his workers.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot accept this amendment, which would mean increasing the present penalty of $10, 100 times to $1,000. Even with the penalty that we are providing of $100, if an employer has a number of workmen, this will be a heavy penalty. To increase it to $1,000 is grossly excessive, and I must oppose it.

Mr. VIRGO: The Act states, "An employer who fails to comply with this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding . . ."

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Penalties in all Acts are worded that way.

Mr. VIRGO: Then the Attorney-General should not have spoken as he did. He referred to the heavy penalty an employer would suffer if the fine were $100 for each employee not insured. However, the Act does not require that $100 be the fine in respect of each employee but stipulates a fine "not exceeding". The court may still impose a fine of $10 for each employee. We believe the court should be able to impose a heavier fine, and by moving to have $1,000 inserted we hope that the fine imposed may be $500.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In paragraph (b) to strike out "forty dollars" and insert "one thousand dollars".

The Government is scarcely consistent. Having increased the penalty for a first offence, it has not increased subsequent penalties but has merely converted the sum in the Act to decimal currency.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose the amendment. Although the penalties included in an Act of Parliament are, unless shown to the contrary, maximum penalties, the courts feel constrained to look at the maximum when fixing the actual penalty. If the penalty is increased from $40 to $1,000, the court would feel impelled to impose a penalty not of $40 but of a vastly higher sum.

Mr. Virgo: That's what we want.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know, but I think that point should be made clear in view of the comments made by the honourable member. We are content with a penalty of $40.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*c*) by striking out subsection (4).

I believe that section 108 (4) is the most dangerous provision in the Act, and what the Attorney-General has said in refusing to accept amendments to increase penalties emphasizes the danger. The subsection provides that no prosecution for a contravention of the section shall be instituted without the consent of the Minister, so a Minister can protect an employer who is flouting the law and putting his workers or their dependants in grave peril of receiving no payment for injury or death. No-one should tolerate this subsection.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose the amendment. Despite what the honourable member has said, the subsection has caused no difficulty or injustice in the past and there is no reason to expect that it will cause harm in the future.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 7a—"Amount of compensation when workman dies leaving dependants."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

7a. Section 16 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by striking out from subsection (4) the word "actual" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "continuous";

and

(*b*) by inserting in subsection (4) after the word "employment" second occurring the passage "next preceding the injury".

Section 16 (4) provides that where a workman is not employed for four years the amount of his earnings shall be deemed to be 208 times his average weekly earnings during the period of his actual employment. What it is intended to mean is that, unless a person has been continuously employed for four years, his earnings shall be 208 times the average weekly earnings. One smart employer might say, "This man has not been employed continuously for the last four years, but in 1940, 1941 and 1942 he was employed by us; that is three years. Now he has been employed for the past 12 months, so that satisfies the requirements of the Act and we can take the aggregate of the earnings for those four years." The Act never intended this. Few employers or insurance companies would be smart enough to do this, but we should tie up this matter.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am happy to accept the new clause.

New clause inserted.

New clause 10a—"Fixed rates of compensation for other injuries."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

10a. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 26 thereof:

26a. (1) Without limiting the generality of the application of section 26 of this Act, compensation for injuries not mentioned in the table set forth in that section shall, at the written request of the workman delivered to the employer or the insurer of the employer, be assessed in accordance with this section.

(2) A percentage of incapacity for work shall be determined by agreement or by arbitration having regard to—

(*a*) the nature of the injury; and

(*b*) the employment for which the workman was fitted before the occurrence of the injury and the employment for which the workman was fitted after that occurrence,

and thereupon section 26 of this Act shall apply and have effect as if—

(*c*) the injury were an injury referred to in the table set forth in that section; and

(*d*) the percentage of incapacity so determined were the figure set out in the second column of that table opposite the description of the injury.

This is an important clause the purpose of which is to provide a payment for a partially injured person who is able to return to work. The table in the Act provides a percentage payment in certain instances, but some injuries cannot be included in the table because they are often a matter of degree. Perhaps the most common case I could cite is of the workman who injures his back. He goes to the doctor and, after a time, the doctor says, "You can go back to work. Your back is not right and it will never be right. You will always have a 20 per cent disability. I do not think it will worry you, but it may deteriorate as time goes by." He goes back without having received any payment, whereas if he had had the top of his index finger or his toe taken off he would receive the compensation for the injury set out in the schedule.

Another field in South Australia is becoming more and more important for us to consider. Many girls perform modelling duties and if one is injured and as a result her face is scarred her future employment is seriously jeopardized. I hope the Attorney sees the merit of this new clause.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although this is a new concept that certainly merits investigation, I have not had time to satisfy myself that the provision should go in in this form. Therefore, I must oppose it, but I will certainly suggest to the Minister that he consider the matter, perhaps with a view to introducing an amendment later.

New clause negatived.

New clause 11a—"Right to receive medical reports."

Mr. VIRGO moved to insert the following new clause:

11a. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 33:

33a. A copy of every report of a medical examination to which a workman is required to submit himself under this Act shall be given to the workman or to a person nominated by the workman.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to tell the Committee that I think the amendment is good and that I accept it.

New clause inserted.

New clause 11b—"Settlement of questions as to compensation."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

11b. Section 38 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the passage "in accordance with this Act" the passage "and where a question arises as to the duration of compensation by way of weekly payments under this Act those weekly payments shall not cease to be payable until the matter has been so settled by agreement or by arbitration".

Often insurance companies cease paying an injured worker until the court resolves the matter. These proceedings may go on for months and the workman is left without payment in this time. The new clause requires that weekly payments shall not cease until the matter has been settled by agreement or arbitration.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose this new clause.

New clause negatived.

New clause 11c—"Question as to dependants."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

11c. Section 39 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the passage "where the sum is" last occurring the passage "and in any proceedings under this section an allegation that a person is a dependant shall be *prima facie* evidence that that person is a dependant".

This is a *prima facie* evidence case regarding dependants, particularly those overseas. As many migrants who are maintaining dependants in their native countries have extreme difficulty in providing proof to the satisfaction of insurance companies regarding compensation, the position should be made easier: in other words the onus of proof should be reversed.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot accept the new clause.

New clause negatived.

New clause 11d—"Determination of sum to be invested."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

11d. The following section is enacted and inserted in Part VI of the principal Act immediately after section 68 thereof:

68a. In determining the amount of a sum to be invested pursuant to this Act no regard shall be had to the amount by which that sum will be increased during the period of investment.

As the Attorney knows, the court often orders that a sum be invested to be paid to dependants, particularly children, at a certain age. A workman may have a child who is 10 years of age when the workman is injured and the court may order that $5,000 be paid to the child on reaching 21 years of age, and it may also order that a sum be invested. Instead of investing $5,000, the insurance company may make an actuarial calculation and find that, if it invests $4,000, by the time the child reaches 21 years the interest that will have accrued will with the principal, provide a sum of $5,000. We do not accept this as a principle but consider that amount awarded by the court should be invested and that any interest that may accrue should belong to the recipient of the principal sum, not to the insurance companies.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid that I must oppose this new clause.

New clause negatived.

New clause 15a—"Appeal to judge."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

15a. The following section is enacted and inserted in Part IXa of the principal Act immediately after section 94j thereof:

94k. An appeal shall lie from a decision of the committee, provided for by paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1) of section 94g of this Act, to a judge.

This is one of the few new clauses that I think the Attorney told me he would accept.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to accept it.

New clause inserted.

New clause 15b—"Reference of decision of board to referees."

Mr. VIRGO moved to insert the following new clause:

15b. Section 97a of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(5) An appeal shall lie from a decision of the board of review to a judge.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose this new clause.

New clause negatived.

New clause 15c—"Right of entry and inspection."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

15c. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 107 thereof:

107a. (1) Where an injury is suffered by a workman, that workman or any person authorized by that workman or authorized by his dependants may at all reasonable times enter and inspect any premises or place and do all things necessary for the purposes of ascertaining the circumstances in which that injury occurred.

(2) A person shall not hinder or obstruct a workman or person referred to in subsection (1) of this section in the exercise of the powers conferred by that subsection.

Penalty: One hundred dollars.

I know that the Attorney-General has minor objections to this new clause, but I do not think they hold water. The advantages far outweigh any small difficulties. Surely the solicitor representing a party should have full and proper access to all material evidence. At present a workman can have his union representative inspect the job, but a union representative may not see the significance of something at the scene of an accident, whereas a solicitor may.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose the new clause.

New clause negatived.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3230.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

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

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3299.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Bill. The Minister, when explaining the provisions of the Bill, said that it would place the Superannuation Fund on an automatic basis in future instead of on a fixed basis. The present Act passed in 1965 provided that after eight years' service the minimum benefit would be £14, that is $28, which was then the basic wage. However, the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission has now made the minimum wage $41.90. Under the provisions of this Bill the minimum after eight years' service will be $43.2, so that, obviously, little difference between money values has been considered with relation to the provisions of this Bill and the Act that was passed in 1965. A contribution of $456 will be increased to $675, and if members elect to accept the scheme (they do not have to) they will have to pay a minimum of three years' contributions at a difference between $456 and $675, a total of $657, in addition to whatever they pay at the rate of $456 from now until the scheme operates. Clause 7 (4) provides for a maximum contribution, as in the present Act, and some members will reach that maximum when they will be comparatively young men. When that time arrives in about 1980 members aged in their 20's when they entered Parliament in 1956 and just after will have paid for the full maximum period of 30 years. They will have paid 9 per cent of their salary, whatever it may be at that date, for no further increase in their benefits. I do not suggest that an amendment should be moved in Committee about this: I merely point it out. Some time before 1980 there will be members who will have paid in for the maximum benefit and they will still be contributing 9 per cent of their salaries ($675 a year on the present basis) with no possibility of any further increase in their benefits. At that time Parliament will have to look at the position.

No provision is made in the Bill for any increased benefit for ex-members or the widows of ex-members. This Act came into being in 1948. Since I became a member in 1950, I can remember only two occasions on which a Bill passed the House increasing the benefits paid to ex-members or the widows of ex-members. The Playford Government introduced one such Bill, and the Frank Walsh Government another in 1965. Page 220 of the Auditor-General's Report sets out the operations of this fund. The balance of funds held on July 1, 1968, was $610,309, and this fund has been going for less than 21 years. Although the Act forming the fund was assented to in August, 1948, I do not know in which particular month it came into operation. The benefits paid out from the fund to ex-members or to the widows of ex-members last year totalled $69,534, leaving a surplus at the end of the year for the following year's operations of $58,623. Had the benefits to ex-members and widows of ex-members been increased by 10 per cent during last financial year the sum paid out would have been $6,953, which would still have left a surplus in the fund of $51,670. Had the increase for ex-members and the widows of ex-members been 20 per cent, the additional sum paid out would have been $13,906, leaving a surplus of $44,717.

Therefore, the fund is in a healthy financial position. Not only in regard to this fund but in regard to all similar funds throughout the Commonwealth, I think that the time will come (although it may not be in my time) when some consideration will have to be given by the various Governments and the various funds, such as the fund for the Police Department and so on, to the position of ex-members and the widows of ex-members. Some provision will have to be made for increases according to the general scale. I am happy to notice that the member for Light is nodding his head.

Mr. Freebairn: I agree.

Mr. LAWN: I am glad that the honourable member agrees, because this is an important aspect for consideration by superannuation funds. This matter has not been greatly considered in the past. People are encouraged to contribute to superannuation or pension funds or to make some other provision for their future, and this lightens the Commonwealth Government's liability in respect of age pensions. When I first became a member, I paid £51 a year into the scheme. The sum provided by the scheme at that stage would have just stopped my wife and me (had we been old enough) from receiving the age pension. Therefore, I was really paying £51 and receiving nothing extra. People are encouraged to provide for their future, and this saves the Commonwealth Government money in age pensions.

These schemes are actuarily sound. The amount of contributions members pay and the benefits to be received are determined by the Public Actuary: members of the House do not decide this. Similarly the Public Actuary determines payments under the Victorian and Commonwealth schemes. Actually we are adopting the scheme now operating in Victoria, whereby a percentage of salary is contributed to receive a percentage of salary by way of benefit. Similar provisions have been made for Victorian Parliamentarians and, I understand, for Commonwealth Parliamentarians as well. If we accept this basis, I think the only way to provide for ex-members and the widows of ex-members is for the Government to pay in any additional sum determined by the Public Actuary to allow the recipients to have the value of the money they receive brought up to date. As I have already pointed out, if the amount provided for ex-members and the widows of ex-members were increased by 20 per cent it would still leave a balance of $44,717 in the fund.

Mr. Freebairn: How many pensioners are you working on?

Mr. LAWN: The Auditor-General's Report states that 15 ex-members and 21 widows are receiving pensions. I support the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I, too, support the Bill. When I first came into Parliament I was critical of the system of Parliamentary superannuation as I believed that the office of member of Parliament should be equated somewhat with that of a lawyer's fee so that a member was paid for the service he gave to Parliament and that when his elected period expired he resumed his previous occupation. However, having been here for some time I realize the importance of a superannuation fund to members and to ex-members. I do not believe that a member of Parliament can do his job properly unless he has some kind of economic security and the knowledge that, when he retires, he, his wife and, if he has any, his dependent children will have no financial need. It would be wrong if a member had to devote too great a part of his Parliamentary time to considering his own financial future. I am interested in what the member for Adelaide has said about former members who now find themselves on a lower scale of benefits than will members who retire in the future. I do not know what the remedy is for this, but I believe their need is probably as great as that of members who will retire in the future. It may be, as the member for Adelaide has said, that there is money enough in the fund to bring the level of superannuation payments to these ex-members and to the widows of ex-members up to the level that we contemplate for ourselves in the future.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMISSION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3328.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) spoke at length on this measure and suggested that racing clubs should be allowed to retain this money permanently in this proportion. There has been general agreement that the acceptance of this reduced amount would be acceptable to the parties concerned. It has also been suggested that this arrangement should continue for another two years so that it will give the clubs more than they expected when Totalizator Agency Board betting was introduced to give clubs the opportunity to establish better facilities on their courses and to make it more attractive for people to attend race meetings.

I think that all members consider that this is a good thing. Many times in the House I have said that the on-course totalizator had been successful in France and New Zealand and that, when people became used to all-totalizator betting at race meetings, it would be far more successful and would appeal to race-goers. In South Australia we are used to the bookmakers and tend to place our bets with them when we go to the races; but where there is a complete totalizator system on the course (as there is in some countries), racing is cleaner and it is less likely that people will profit by a horse's being stopped or not running straight than when there are all forms of betting. Possibly, the Big Philou case would not have arisen if we had had all totalizator betting. Sometimes we must decide what is best to protect people who go to races so that they may reasonably expect to win some money. We are making this extension for a further two years, and I intend to move an amendment to increase the assistance for a longer period. We know the tremendous value of racing to South Australia. We have produced the best blood horses in Australia, as has been shown by our successes in the Melbourne Cup.

Mr. Nankivell: Were they bred here or trained here?

Mr. McANANEY: Many have been bred here, but we have successful trainers who are good judges of horse flesh and who have gone to other States and to New Zealand to purchase horses that have been successful here. There is a thriving stud at Angaston.

Mr. Nankivell: And in the Adelaide Hills.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. There is a stud at Strathalbyn and the horses derive great benefit from being brought to the limestone paddocks in the south. The Government is making a concession to the racing industry for two years, and the amendment I will move will increase the period in which clubs will have the opportunity to improve facilities and so attract more people. It is better for people to go to racecourses, out in the fresh air, and mix socially and have a bet than to hurry to a Totalizator Agency Board branch before going somewhere else. It is good for people to see the beautiful animals that contribute to the pleasure of so many people. My amendment will make a further concession to the racing industry, and I hope it will enable the industry to achieve further successes.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): As the Premier secured the adjournment of this debate last week when I intended to speak, I consider that I should say something now. The member for Glenelg, and possibly you, Mr. Speaker, (I know you frequent the race tracks) know that racing in South Australia, particularly in the country areas, is at an extremely low ebb. The position is bad once one gets past Strathalbyn and possibly Balaklava, apart from the annual picnic races at Port Lincoln or Port Augusta. Even at Port Augusta galloping is just about finished. The small amount of 1¼ per cent involved in this issue would not mean much to the Government. Racing in this State is not going well, and taking this money from the industry will only worsen the situation. I realize that the South Australian Jockey Club has a difficulty mainly because it cannot offer stakes as high as those offered in Victoria and the other Eastern States. It cannot do so because our population is not large enough. The result is that the top South Australian horses are prepared here but do most of their racing in Victoria.

Mr. Broomhill: Do they do their track work here?

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The punting public gets a raw deal. Not many of these horses win races before they go to another State, so often the punter is wagering on a horse that is having only a training gallop.

Mr. Evans: But they don't have to bet.

Mr. McKEE: That is so, but the Australians like to gamble. They will pull a poker machine, play two-up, and back racehorses. I do not think any Government will prevent the Australian from gambling, particularly on racehorses.

Mr. Virgo: What about games of swy?

Mr. McKEE: That great Australian game is much straighter than the racing game. I think you agree, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot take any notice of the form of racehorses. A horse may break a track record and then, with a little more weight, not be able to win a race, but horses do not always race to form. I suppose they, like human beings, are entitled to be moody at times. Racing in this State needs to be brightened up. Otherwise, the younger generation will not become interested in the sport.

Mr. Evans: Would that be a bad thing?

Mr. McKEE: Racing has been referred to as an industry and, if it were lost to the State, the State would lose much revenue. Trainers, jockeys, strappers and many other people are engaged in the industry. I do not know what some of these people would do: perhaps they could oppose the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) in a pre-selection ballot.

Public support for racing is needed, and reasonable facilities must be provided to attract the people. I, like the member for Glenelg, consider that in South Australia the racing clubs need to spend a large sum of money to improve the on-course totalizator facilities if the clubs want to increase their turnover. At Victoria Park Racecourse there is an arrangement indicating the money being invested on a horse and the price available, and these facilities need to be provided at all racecourses. I do not believe that the Government should take the extra 1¼ per cent. It would be in the interests of the Government to encourage clubs to improve facilities because, if they did this and more money was attracted to the totalizator, the Government would receive a better return. There are three racecourses in the metropolitan area, as well as one at Gawler, which should be regarded as being in the metropolitan area, and this is too many for a city the size of Adelaide. Victoria Park Racecourse should be closed and the Government acquire the land, as it would be an ideal place on which to build the festival hall. It would provide ample parking

space and much of the remaining area could be used by other sporting organizations. With two racing clubs only in the metropolitan area, there would be more money to spend, and Morphettville and Cheltenham Racecourses could be improved. This suggestion may not be approved by those associated with Victoria Park Racecourse, but it has merit and would be less costly than building a hall in the position that has been selected. I oppose this penny-pinching attitude: it will not benefit the Government but it could do much harm to the racing industry, which needs more money for the next few years so that it can provide facilities to encourage people to use the on-course totalizator.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Mode of dealing with moneys paid into totalizator used by a club."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

Before "subsection (9)" to insert "from".

This is the first part of an amendment designed to ensure that the 1¼ per cent additional deduction from the gross revenue from on-course totalizators which was instituted when T.A.B. first started and which has since remained with the racing clubs, should continue to remain with them. If the amendment is carried the Government's deduction from metropolitan totalizators, whether on-course or off-course, will be 5¼ per cent. At this rate of deduction it becomes more difficult to obtain a reasonable percentage of profit for the on-course totalizator than it does for off-course totalizators, because for on-course totalizators there is a smaller turnover and the effect of this is that the cost of running the totalizator tends to be a higher percentage of turnover than would apply to T.A.B.

I estimate that, even with the 1¼ per cent retained by the clubs, the net return from on-course totalizator turnover to the clubs does not significantly exceed 3 per cent, whereas the net return off-course on T.A.B. is about 3 per cent at present. If the 1¼ per cent, which has stayed with the clubs, is returned to the Government the net return from on-course totalizators to the metropolitan clubs would be not significantly greater than 2 per cent, and perhaps a little less. People who work on on-course totalizators for Automatic Totalizators Limited, which is the agent for the clubs in running on-course totalizators, deserve adequate rates of pay, but under the provisions of this Bill they will be difficult to provide without cutting out profits altogether. This may cause industrial difficulties: already there has been considerable agitation among employees of on-course totalizators, because of the rates of pay and of the limited changes in them that have occurred recently.

Many employees consider that their rates of pay have not been kept in line with others in the community. The Treasury has nothing to lose from accepting this amendment because, if it is carried, clubs will be encouraged to expand on-course totalizator revenue, and it would only require an increase in that revenue of about $600,000 a year to return to the Government the expected extra revenue it hopes to get by taking away the 1¼ per cent from the clubs. If this Bill passes in its present form there will not be the same expansion in on-course totalizator revenue as would otherwise occur, and consequently the Government would not get the benefits that it could otherwise obtain. If the Government's share of on-course totalizator revenue remains at 5¼ per cent, the Government revenue is 5¼c in each dollar. It is in the interests of the Government to encourage clubs to expand on-course totalizator revenue to the maximum extent.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I cannot accept the amendment, for several reasons. First, the agreement made when the Totalizator Agency Board was set up did not originally contemplate any retention by the clubs of the 1¼ per cent. However, in the course of negotiation it was agreed that this should be allowed for three years so that the clubs could use it to improve on-course totalizator facilities. If the agreement had been allowed to run out and no Bill had been introduced, the agreement would automatically have expired at the end of March, and the clubs would not have had the right to retain 1¼ per cent, or any part of it, for any purpose; it would have reverted to the Hospitals Fund. But representations were made to the Government by the racing clubs to the effect that it would be detrimental to their interests and to the Government's interests if this concession were removed. They argued, as the member for Glenelg has argued, that the improvement of on-course totalizator facilities was advantageous to the clubs and to the Government, because it could be shown to have tended to increase patronage of the on-course totalizator and, therefore, the Government would derive its share resulting from the increased patronage of those facilities.

Therefore, the Government agreed to consider the clubs' requests. This matter was fully considered by Cabinet, and it was proposed that we should agree in principle to the clubs' request that the 1¼ per cent should not be removed altogether but that it should be phased out; that it should be phased out over two years; that we should agree to allow the clubs to retain .75 per cent rather than 1.25 per cent for two years; and that this amount so retained by the clubs would not be tied necessarily to the improvement, or the further improvement, of on-course totalizator facilities. This offer was discussed with the clubs and accepted by them. However, although they accepted it without qualification, the clubs requested the Government to reconsider the two-year period. The Government did not intend to insist that the moneys so retained should be used for totalizator improvement, because in one of their earlier letters to the Government the racing clubs said that this would embarrass some of them. Some had already materially improved their facilities, and some could not, in any case, afford to continue to improve them further. The Government agreed that the .75 per cent that it intended to allow the clubs to retain for two years should not be tied to on-course totalizator facility improvement. The clubs requested that we should remove the two-year period and provide in this Bill that no time limit should be fixed for the expiration of the operation of this provision. The Government did not consider that it could continue for all time the retention by the clubs of the .75 per cent.

The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has intimated that he intends to move an amendment to extend the further two years to a further three years, and that helps the clubs. It is a further relaxation of the original attitude adopted by the Government; indeed, it is a relaxation of the attitude adopted by the previous Government when the first arrangement was made. The amendment of the member for Glenelg is not acceptable. I think the clubs would probably like to have it, but so would the Hospitals Fund. When the original agreement was made the Government, I suppose, had every right to expect that it would be accepted and left at that; but we have made the concession incorporated in this Bill. The amendment goes even further than did the original agreement, which related to 1¼ per cent for three years: it could mean 1¼ per cent for all time. The member for Glenelg may argue that it is a good investment, because he says that, if the on-course investment were increased by $600,000, this would equalize the situation.

I do not think the Government or the racing clubs expect that the on-course investment will advance at this rate: I do not think anyone is as optimistic as that. But, be that as it may, the Government has made an offer, and the racing clubs have accepted it. The Government will consider the amendment to be moved by the member for Stirling to increase the period from two to three years with no strings attached concerning how the money should be spent. For those reasons, I believe that the Government has made a fair approach, and I therefore ask the Committee not to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: First, I point out to the Treasurer that, even as a result of the introduction of T.A.B., over the last year on-course totalizator revenue is running at a rate in excess of that for the previous year and amounts to an annual rate of about $750,000. The Treasury is already getting 5¼ per cent of that sum, and this goes into the Hospitals Fund. As the Treasurer knows, this means, in effect, that it goes into general revenue.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You didn't say that some years ago.

Mr. HUDSON: That is the point the Treasurer made. I believe that anyone even vaguely familiar with the position on metropolitan race tracks or at Gawler, Strathalbyn, Murray Bridge and so on would know that the turnover from on-course totalizators could be much improved with the expenditure of some considerable sums of money by the Government in providing better indicators of odds and better facilities generally. For example, at Morphettville from the general betting ring it is possible to get only limited glimpses of the indicator board showing the totalizator odds, and many people who might otherwise place their bets with the totalizator place them with the bookmakers. If the clubs can be induced to provide better indicators and facilities at Morphettville and at the other tracks, there will be a substantial improvement. Indeed, the improvement in on-course totalizator revenue is greatest at Victoria Park where the greatest improvement has been made in totalizator facilities.

As the member for Stirling would know, the position at country clubs is poor indeed. On-course totalizator odds are written up on a board well away from the general betting ring

at only two points of time before a race. It is most difficult for a punter at such tracks who wishes to compare the totalizator odds with the bookmakers' prices to find out what are the totalizator odds, because there are no satisfactory totalizator facilities. I completely dispute the Treasurer's argument that there is no potential for improvement in on-course totalizator revenue to the extent of $600,000 a year. An improvement greater than this sum is taking place at present in off-course totalizator revenue. During this current financial year the return will be at least $750,000 greater than it was in the previous financial year. I am authorized to point out that the Opposition has moved this amendment not frivolously but as something we are prepared to live up to as a Government. We have moved this amendment in the knowledge that the Treasury will not suffer considerably as a consequence because, once the inducement is provided permanently to the clubs to expand properly their on-course totalizator facilities, I believe there will be a sufficient expansion in on-course totalizator revenue to more than compensate for any revenue the Treasury may lose as a result of the amendment's being carried.

I believe the Treasurer has some responsibility to justify why the Treasury return from on-course totalizator facilities should ultimately be 6½ per cent while off-course it is only 5¼ per cent. What is the difference? Is it because the Treasurer believes he can get away with the 6½ per cent? If we agreed to this, would we be faced with a proposition to increase the return from off-course totalizator revenue from 5¼ per cent to 6½ per cent as well? The comparison is worse than that because, out of the 5¼ per cent coming from off-course totalizator revenue, the Government is repaying at the rate of 1 per cent a year the capital cost of the establishment of T.A.B. At present, the net Government revenue from off-course totalizator facilities is only 4¼ per cent, and the Government proposes that the figure for on-course investments should be 6½ per cent. There is no justification for this. Surely we have reached the stage where we should be telling the racing industry that we will put it on a footing where it has no argument at all about its inability to operate successfully, where it will be able to establish itself permanently as an industry on a viable basis in competition in prize money with Melbourne and Sydney, and where it will not need continually to apply to Parliament for adjustments.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Regarding the additional improvements to on-course totalizator facilities and whether or not the string was tied to the sum retained by the club, the clubs generally did not desire that it should have strings attached. They do not intend to spend the sum on on-course totalizator improvements however good an investment they may be. In a letter to me they say that such a condition would be an unnecessary burden and that the metropolitan clubs would need to spend far more on totalizators in the next few years whereas the smaller clubs might not be able to do so. The honourable member referred to an increase of $600,000 a year in on-course totalizator revenue. He suggested that the revenue from on-course totalizator facilities was increasing rapidly, and he expected that within a short time an increase of $600,000 over and above the present rate would be achieved. The total figures for 1965-66 for horse-racing and trotting at metropolitan and country clubs showed that the on-course totalizator turnover was $4,702,000. After operating for four years the total increased to only $5,276,000, which was an increase of $574,000 over the full four-year period, yet the member for Glenelg asserts that we can soon expect a further improvement of $600,000 a year. I said earlier that I thought this was extremely over-optimistic, and I still maintain that it is. The revenue movement has been fairly static: it has not shown a phenomenal increase in on-course totalizator turnover. For those two valid reasons I think that the basis of the honourable member's argument is incorrect, so I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. CASEY: I support the amendment for several reasons. The racing industry in this State is an important industry that is expanding probably as fast as any other industry. South Australia probably has the best stud facilities in Australia and many more horses are being bred at stud here than probably in any other State. We should help the racing industry. More people are becoming interested in this sport because of better facilities and better horses. When T.A.B. was first introduced the racing clubs would have accepted any proposition from Sir Thomas Playford in order to get a foot in the door, and for the Treasurer to say that his proposal is acceptable to the racing clubs is wrong.

If 5¼ per cent is taken from off-course betting, as is the case with T.A.B., no more should be taken from the racing clubs, because

they are in a worse situation than are the off-course T.A.B. facilities. T.A.B. can expand throughout the State, and it has done so very effectively. All the money pooled from off-course betting is pooled with the on-course betting money, and there should be a percentage rake-off from the pool whether the money is collected from on-course or off-course gambling. Should we tell the racing clubs that this money is to be used only for improvements to on-course totalizator facilities? Should we tie the hands of the racing clubs in this way? If we are to increase attendances at racing we must provide better facilities generally.

The racing clubs are run by committees comprised of successful business men who know that the clubs must be improved financially. That is their ultimate aim, and they can do this. We do not want to tie their hands, because they are competent men who know how to run a racing club. We should not tie their hands with this provision of 1¼ per cent if they are to improve their on-course totalizators, because they will do this in the interests of their clubs and their patrons. Flemington, in Victoria, has a good on-course betting system, with the odds posted so that the investor may follow the odds, whereas I understand that such facilities are not available at Morphettville or Cheltenham. The removal of this 1¼ per cent will not do the racing clubs a good turn, and the Government should help this industry. Merely because it is racing we do not have to consider it as a sport that is not acceptable to everyone. I think we agree that the racing industry is important to the State, and we should try to help it, but we will not do that by removing the 1¼ per cent. We should consider the likely long-term effect. We need to offer better prize money. Our racing writers have been complaining that our good horses are competing in other States because of the higher prize money there.

Mr. McAnaney: You couldn't stop that.

Mr. CASEY: No, but we could increase our prize money and improve our feature races to entice horses here. I think the Treasurer's suggestion is wrong. I know that he is trying to get revenue, because his deficit at present is probably more than $9,000,000. The member for Glenelg has used the correct figures to explain the position, and the Committee will help racing if it carries the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: I should be grateful if the Treasurer would give me the on-course totalizator turnover figures for 1966-67 and 1967-68.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have those figures, but first I remind the honourable member that the period is four years, not three years. The figures are as follows:

Year	Combined turnover $
1965-66	4,702,000
1966-67	4,749,000
1967-68	4,532,000
1968-69	5,276,000

Mr. HUDSON: I point out to the Treasurer that from 1965-66 to 1968-69 is three years.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: But it's the beginning of one financial year and the end of the next.

Mr. HUDSON: No, the Treasurer is wrong. There are four separate figures but the change occurs over a three-year period. From the beginning of 1965-66 (which is July 1, 1965) to the beginning of 1968-69 (which is July 1, 1968) is three years. The figures must refer to a full financial year.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, and they do.

Mr. HUDSON: The change between the first figure and the last figure occurs over a three-year period. The Treasurer's figures, which are not the full story, partly substantiate my case, because one of the impacts that has persisted since T.A.B. began has been a decline in attendance of from about 10 per cent to 15 per cent. In the first year of operation of T.A.B., on-course totalizator turnover declined by a little over $200,000, but between 1967-68 and 1868-69 the increase was $744,000.

Despite the decline in attendance, there has been a net increase in on-course totalizator turnover. The reasons for this are that the pool is bigger and more attractive and is being made still more attractive. My figures in respect of the current financial year make it clear that, each Saturday, on-course totalizator turnover at metropolitan race tracks averages $15,000 more than the relevant figure in the previous year. Therefore, for 1969-70 the increase in on-course totalizator turnover is likely to be about $750,000. My figure is accurate and achievable, and there will be further expansion in that turnover if the clubs improve facilities. However, my amendment does not require the clubs to spend this money on totalizator facilities.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Bill doesn't, either.

Mr. HUDSON: No, but the Treasurer suggested that my amendment might require clubs to do that.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, I said the contrary.

Mr. HUDSON: I would not suggest that that should be done by many small clubs, because it would be silly to require them to spend a small amount each year for this purpose without building up something decent. I am not impressed by the argument that the original agreement was for only a three-year period. That was the best compromise that could be reached then and I was not satisfied then and have not been since. The agreement does not justify our having differential rates of tax of 6¼ per cent on on-course totalizator turnover and 5¼ per cent on off-course operations.

The Treasurer has been getting more money from fractions and unpaid dividends than was expected when T.A.B. was introduced. Probably the revenue from those two sources amounts to 1¼ per cent of total T.A.B. turnover in any year. This is a substantial sum, and it is far greater than the measly sums we are talking about. I am not convinced by the Treasurer's arguments, and I am sure that on-course totalizator turnover for this financial year will reach $5,800,000, which is $550,000 greater than it was last year, and that the extra 5¼ per cent on that is sufficient to provide for the 1¼ per cent that the Government intends to keep.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In new subsection (9) (*a*) to strike out "but before the expiration of five years".

The effect of this amendment would be to retain the arrangement proposed by the Treasurer as a permanent arrangement, as I intend to provide that the .75 per cent should remain with the clubs permanently. My previous argument still applies: I do not believe the Treasurer has given a satisfactory reply and, if he will not agree to our original proposal, perhaps he will agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: As the honourable member for Stirling has an amendment to strike out "five" with a view to inserting "six", to safeguard that amendment I put the question "That the words 'but before the expiration of' proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause".

The Committee divided on the question:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Coumbe and Giles.

Noes—Messrs. Dunstan and Riches.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. McANANEY: I move:

In new subsection (9) (*a*) to strike out "five".

The Government has already decided to make a concession to the racing clubs further to that agreed by the previous Government and the clubs. If my amendment is carried, I intend to move that the word "six" be inserted so that this concession to the clubs will be extended for three years rather than for two years, as set out in the Bill. In three years' time, the position can be further examined. The member for Glenelg has said that on-course totalizator betting is increasing more rapidly than betting with bookmakers. I hope that the racing clubs will thoroughly investigate how much return they receive from on-course totalizator betting compared with what they receive as return from bookmakers' turnover and from bookmakers' fees. The manager of T.A.B. has told me that there is a break-even point: after a certain turnover is received, T.A.B. really begins to make money. The profit from T.A.B. will increase considerably over the next two years, because that break-even point has been reached.

I believe the same principle applies to on-course betting. If racing clubs provide adequate indicators so that people can readily ascertain the odds available, the turnover of the on-course totalizator will increase, finally reaching the break-even point, and the clubs should receive much more revenue than they would receive if people bet with bookmakers. Bookmakers who operate in the ring pay large fees, and the clubs receive a good sum in this way. Only an expert would be able to work out exactly the break-even point for the on-course totalizator. When that is reached, the profits will suddenly increase. If the term in the Bill is extended to three years, an opportunity will exist for on-course betting to increase greatly.

Mr. HUDSON: I am amazed at the generosity of the member for Stirling. What a grand gesture he has made! Instead of giving the clubs the two years' reprieve that the Treasurer proposed, he intends to make it three years. If the amendment is carried, I intend to move that "ten" be inserted instead of "six", as proposed to be inserted by the member for Stirling. If he wants a time limit, let us at least be decent about it.

Amendment carried.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of Standing Order 423, I will deal first with the amendment to be moved by the member for Glenelg, as the longer time is involved.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

In new subsection (9)(a) after "expiration of" second occurring to insert "ten".

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Riches.

Noes—Messrs. Coumbe and Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. McANANEY moved:

In new subsection (9)(a) after "expiration of" second occurring to insert "six"; and in new subsection (9)(b) to strike out "five" and insert "six".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POOR PERSONS LEGAL ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL (QUOTAS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3234.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): The Minister has said that this is the most important of three measures dealing with wheat quotas in the State, and I suppose that is so, because without this Bill such quotas could not be applied. It may be said that, if I support this Bill, I support wheat quotas. However, because the effect of this Bill will be retrospective to October 1 last, no other method can be applied this season. Those involved in the industry have decided to adopt this scheme but I do not agree with it entirely, as I shall explain in another debate. This Bill merely confers on South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited the absolute power to accept deliveries of wheat during the season that commenced on October 1, 1969, and during any season declared to be a quota season. Without this power, the whole scheme would break down and it is important that the Bill be passed.

It seems strange that most of the silos on the West Coast are full and we are giving effect, on December 2, to something that has been going on since October 1 last. Although clause 2, which provides for the refusal to accept delivery of any wheat, seems to be widely drawn, it has been pointed out to me that this provision is necessary and I consider that there is good reason for inserting it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Company may refuse to accept delivery of wheat."

Mr. CASEY: I support this measure. This clause gives the company permission to refuse deliveries of wheat which, I assume, the company classifies as over-quota wheat.

Mr. HUGHES: I, too, support the Bill, because I represent one of the best grain-growing districts in the State. However, I am concerned that, when the Government was fully aware of the importance of this legislation, this Bill has been delayed for so long. The provisions are retrospective to October 1, 1969, and this Bill should have been passed before now.

Mr. VENNING: I, too, support the Bill. The quota system throughout the Commonwealth has been introduced and will help to maintain the international grain agreement. Other countries were concerned that Australia had continued with unlimited production although they had been restricted. The industry endorses the quota system and now requests a restriction on wheat to be delivered. The Bill's introduction may be belated, but what could be done about it? It is pleasing to know that the industry has co-operated in supporting this legislation.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3234.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support this Bill, which provides power for the Wheat Board in this State to allow the cost of the quota scheme to be absorbed by the board as a cost of marketing. The first part provides that wheat can be sold for other than human consumption at a price between the export price and the home consumption price, but not lower than the export price of $1.41 a bushel. As there will be a surplus of wheat the board will have some flexibility in disposing of it but, obviously, it will not be able to dispose of all of it. The pool that covers export and home consumption wheat will be determined by the quota over the whole of Australia, but it will be interesting to see what surplus will be obtained and how much wheat remains on the farms. It is difficult to know, even up to harvesting time, what will happen that will affect the total harvest.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): The first part of the Bill deals with quotas and over-quotas and with aspects of the Wheat Board with relation to the co-operative. The co-operative's policy is to take the total crop of wheat produced in the State from the growers, irrespective of whether they have sufficient production for one year's quota or for three years' quotas. The second part of the Bill deals with the domestic sale of wheat, and the price for wheat not intended for human consumption which can be sold at a figure between the export price of $1.41 and the domestic price of $1.71. As it is in line with the opinions of representatives of the industry, I support the Bill.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I, too, support the Bill, which provides the necessary legislation for moneys to be refunded to purchasers of

wheat who use it for milling and who use the residue for animal consumption. This is an excellent provision, because the miller who purchases wheat for milling flour and finds that it is not up to standard will now be able to receive recompense. Concerning new section 20a, which deals with the price of wheat for use in Australia other than for human consumption, it was only last evening that a new price scheme was made known by Mr. Anthony, in which it is intended that the home consumption price will rise from $1.71 to $1.72½.

I do not know exactly where we are going. It seems to me rather ridiculous at this stage, when we have so much wheat on hand in Australia, that we should suddenly decide to put up home consumption prices. This will inevitably mean that the price of flour and bread will increase. I do not think this is the right attitude to take when there are wheat surpluses. I understand that the new price for bran, pollard and mash, which are manufactured from wheat, will be $1.43.5. These prices were announced last evening, and I understand they are slightly different from those contained in the second reading explanation. However, when the Minister made his explanation, the prices he gave were then the ruling prices.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I do not think any member has commented on the enormous contribution that the wheat stabilization legislation has made to the economic well-being of the wheatgrowers in Australia. I recall that, when I made my maiden speech in this place, I saw fit to pay respect to the contributions you, Mr. Speaker, made as Secretary of the Wheat and Woolgrowers Association in the formulation of the original wheat stabilization plan.

Mr. Casey: Under a Labor Government.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I also referred to your contributions to successive plans. I was interested that the member for Frome should interject, saying that the original legislation was brought down under a Labor Administration. It was brought down under a Labor Administration because one or two Independent members of the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Cole or Mr. Wilson or perhaps both of them) undertook to support the Australian Labor Party if it would legislate to set up the machinery for the stabilization of the wheat industry. Then we remember that the Labor Administration did its best to torpedo the infant wheat stabilization legislation by making its infamous deal with the New Zealand Labor Administration whereby it sold at a fraction of the price received on the oversea market.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That was 8,000,000 bushels.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I also remember that the infamous Cain Labor Adminstration in Victoria did its best to torpedo wheat stabilization when the agreement came up for ratification on the second occasion. I am happy that the Labor Party has now accepted wheat stabilization in principle and makes no attempt to damage this important legislation which has done so much to help wheatgrowers in Australia. I should like the members for Semaphore and Frome to know that the history of the Australian Labor Party in connection with wheat stabilization legislation has not altogether been a happy history.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The member for Wallaroo has suggested that we have been a bit tardy in bringing in this legislation. Actually I believe machinery to have quotas should have been included in the first wheat stabilization legislation. Anyone who had thought about the matter at that time would have known this. Orderly marketing has been a tremendous success. Australia is now a member of an international wheat agreement. Previously wheat had to be sold hurriedly and disposed of on the world market, where it got into the hands of speculators. In a stabilization scheme, we must ultimately reach the stage where there is over-production. Had it not been for the United States of America introducing acreage restrictions, over-production would have occurred here many years ago. The industry here should always have been prepared to bring in quotas. We cannot get away from the law of supply and demand. The history of stabilization has been that in the early years growers had to produce cheap wheat for sale on the Australian market, and the lower prices received did not induce greater production. Originally Great Britain bought wheat and sold it to Sweden and several other countries, making a profit out of it. In those early years the stabilization plan cost the wheatgrowers $400,000,000 in providing cheap wheat for the Australian people. At that stage a big profit could have been made on wheat. In the last two or three years stabilization has provided an incentive for growers to produce wheat. Had other countries not had restrictions, we would have had a surplus.

Orderly marketing has certainly been a wonderful thing for wheatgrowers. The international wheat agreement has worked efficiently. I know of no stabilization scheme for primary producers that will, in the long run, be of any benefit to them. The wine industry has been greatly assisted by stabilization of prices, but what will happen in three of four years' time? We will run into troubles in the wine industry. If an industry has a stabilization scheme that gives a fixed price and the other industries do not have this, they will switch over to the former. If there is a stabilization scheme for any primary products, including dairy products, there must be a quota system or it will not work. This fact must be accepted. Secondary industries and working people have the guarantee of certain standards. It is only for what they can sell that the primary industries get the guaranteed price. Secondary industries do this themselves because, if they cannot sell their products, they must stop production or accumulate stocks. With a stabilized price there must be a quota system of some kind.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): The title of the Bill is somewhat misleading. It implies that it is a Bill to stabilize the wheat industry when that is not what it actually means. Perhaps I can put right the member for Light and one or two other younger members who have not heard of Mr. Chifley, who did so much to stabilize prices for primary products. I was surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Stirling, whom I regard as a prophet of doom for primary industry. I think that his remarks will not be well received in the grain-growing areas, which have a stabilizing price, because he has indicated that it should not be so but that farmers should be standing on their own two feet.

Mr. McAnaney: You're putting words into my mouth.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not.

Mr. McAnaney: You are wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling has made his speech.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Stirling does not like to be put on the rails but he is anxious to put Labor Party members back on the rails sometimes. I want to let the House know what he really meant.

Mr. McAnaney: What rubbish! You are giving your interpretation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling is out of order. If he does not obey the Chair I will ask him to leave the Chamber.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think that the member for Stirling was really aware of what he was saying when he was speaking about the stabilization of the industry.

Mr. McAnaney: You're a ratbag.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not a ratbag.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling is out of order. I will not warn him again.

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently, I have got under the honourable member's skin by reminding him of the implications of what he has said. He does not want his words to get back to the primary producers. He implied that they should be standing on their own two feet. They would be standing on their own two feet if they could. We can thank Mr. Chifley for where the primary producers stand today. Primary producers were in poor circumstances before he took a hand. The younger farmers do not know this, but if one talks to any of the older primary producers they will say who provided stabilization of prices. The member for Light, who is fond of researching, will find out that the reason primary producers are getting the price they are now receiving is as a result of Mr. Chifley's actions. The Bill does not deal with the stabilization of prices; all it deals with is how the authorities will handle the quota wheat, the absorption of over-quota wheat, the domestic sales of wheat, and the price of wheat not intended for human consumption which can be sold at a figure between the export price of $1.41 and the domestic price of $1.71. I support the second reading.

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

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3234.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): This measure gives effect to wheat quotas for individual farmers. It amazes me to see Government members sitting back comfortably and thinking that this is a good scheme. I suppose that the industry throughout Australia is alarmed that wheat production has reached such a stage that the Bill is necessary. The member for Stirling has said that this is because of oversea market problems and over-production in other countries. However, for the past 20 years we have had a Liberal Government in the Commonwealth Parliament. Admittedly, that

Government has carried on the scheme introduced by the Chifley Government, but let us consider the situation that has led to the present position and the difficulties being experienced. Surely it would have been proper for the Commonwealth Government to foresee these difficulties some time ago.

Mr. Venning: How long ago?

Mr. CORCORAN: I will go back to the time when the first sales of wheat were made to Russia and China. Surely the Government then should have realized that those markets might not continue. I think the member for Rocky River would realize that we were put in the position of thinking we were secure when, in fact, we were not. This is a reflection not on the Australian Wheat Board but rather on the Commonwealth Government, because it should have tried harder to provide long-term credit to establish markets of the type that we needed. Many factors have contributed to the present position.

What concerns me now about the scheme is that in each State the licensed handling authority (in our case, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited) will have a quota to be taken into silos, and the remainder of the wheat will be left on the farms. I see a danger to orderly marketing, because a two-pool system (which is the policy of the Australian Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament) should have operated, one pool dealing with export wheat and home consumption wheat and the other dealing with wheat that could be sold for other than human consumption, overseas as well as in Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: What would that do?

Mr. CORCORAN: Let me develop my point. What is more important is that the Wheat Board should have had control of all this wheat. Theoretically, it now has that control by law, but sufficient permanent storage capacity should have been available, under the board's control, for all this wheat. The danger to orderly marketing in the present situation is that, when large quantities of wheat are left on farms, people will enter into black marketing arrangements. All members must recognize this danger. This will happen, and it will weaken orderly marketing.

Mr. Casey: It's happening already.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. People will be selling wheat to other States for 40c or 60c a bushel. Much feeling and concern have been expressed by people engaged in this industry throughout Australia. Differences of opinion have occurred within the grower organizations. Although United Farmers and Graziers Inc. in this State and the other organizations throughout Australia agree that this is the proper system, there has been much difference of opinion. As recently as last week well attended meetings were held in the wheat-growing areas of this State because the growers were vitally concerned and, obviously, many of them did not know what action they should take. These people are not satisfied that the wheat quota system, as it will apply here, is the answer. On the other hand, they probably have not got alternative answers and the organizations that represent the industry could see no other way to approach the problem.

Doubtless, in the circumstances these organizations have done their best to make the scheme as equitable as possible but inevitably it must lead to thousands of people throughout Australia having to leave the industry because they cannot carry on. That will apply mainly to the smaller wheat producers, because they cannot diversify as the large producer can. Consequently, unless these smaller growers are assisted or given special consideration in the quota system, they will have to leave their properties.

Mr. McAnaney: They will be able to sell as much as they have sold in the past, or nearly as much.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is not so, as I will show later by an example. I do not think that these people are going off half-cocked. They have explained their circumstances. Doubtless, the member for Stirling and every other member opposite have had approaches made to them on the matter. There may be some exaggeration but in many cases there has not been. This is the disquieting situation in the industry today because of the overall position. I have received from Mr. J. C. Burdett, of S. B. von Doussa, barristers and solicitors, of Mannum, in the District of Murray, a copy of a letter sent to the Minister of Agriculture, and I think copies have also been sent to several other members. I intend to read the letter, because it is an example of the situation that people face. We have heard that insufficient consideration has been given to people in areas more susceptible to drought than any other areas and that the five-year average did not take into account all that it should have taken. This letter states:

We have assisted a large number of clients with applications for quotas, applications for special quotas, and representations on their behalf concerning what they consider to be inequities in the scheme proposed. We also

prepare the income tax returns for most of these clients and feel that we have an insight into the problems associated with the allocation of quotas which warrants our passing on our views to you. Our concern is for producers in the area which we will broadly call "the Mallee" as including all of the mixed farming lands east of the Mount Lofty ranges. All farmers in this area to whom we have spoken on the matter are quite convinced of the need for the quota system and are quite satisfied that 45,000,000 bushels is an equitable quota for South Australia. They also realize that the quota system must involve restrictions on delivery of wheat. Many farmers have said that they would be quite prepared to accept a reduction of 10 per centum of a true average yield. However they complain that the last five years have been far from average years in the Mallee, containing as they did, one year when most crops were a total failure and two very lean years. They complain that the sample period taken does not give them a reasonable average figure from which to deduct 10 per centum. It would appear that the Mallee farmers are at a disadvantage in the selection of this particular five-year period as against most other areas. One farmer for instance states that his average yield for the five seasons 1960-64 both inclusive was 23 bushels an acre and for the period 1964-68 both inclusive 8 bushels an acre.

The Mallee is a drought-prone area where farmers expect some severe droughts and some gluts. This makes the assessment of a fair average difficult, but at the same time it makes it most important. Because of droughts there undoubtedly will be seasons when Mallee farmers will be unable to fill their quotas. This makes it doubly important that they be able to deliver a fair percentage of their grain in good seasons. We have taken a number of sample financial statements based on deliveries of the amount of the quota and actual expenditure and these indicate that a very high percentage of good competent Mallee farmers will be unable to survive financially if the quota pattern in the Mallee remains unchanged.

It is not being dramatic but simply a sober assessment of actual figures to say that many farmers from this important farming area will be forced out of business unless the quota pattern is radically and drastically changed. The debt structure of a lot of these producers is very high, partly as a result of the 1967 drought. We appreciate that this is not an equalization scheme and cannot and ought not to be used to achieve greater equality between farmers in dry areas and those in good areas. However, in order to protect farmers in drought-prone areas it is essential that they at least get a just quota based on an average which applies fairly in their district. Farmers in this area expect an occasional kick in the backside from nature but they feel that the quotas which have been allocated to them have added insult to injury by adding a kick in the backside from the quota system to that already administered by nature. They do not expect the quota committee to redress the difficulties created in this area by nature but they resent the fact that the committee has exacerbated these difficulties.

The writer and a member of the office staff attended the Waikerie meeting held on the 17th of this month as observers. We heard at the meeting from Mr. Max Saint (and had heard before) that the hundred and county figures indicated that the taking of an average over a greater period than five years would not materially increase the average yield in the Mallee. (The figures given, quite naturally, as the meeting was in Waikerie, did not include the county of Sturt—our own area.) We do not know the source of the figures but we challenge their accuracy or at any rate their validity in proving that individual growers would not benefit from a longer period in determining the average.

Every traditional wheatgrower in this area to whom we have spoken and who has taken out figures says that a longer average period would have benefited him substantially. The 1963 season was a bumper year in the Mallee. It seems unfair to include in the average period a year of almost universal total failure in the Mallee, then to ignore that year in determining whether or not special consideration should be given, and to exclude from the average period the last bumper year.

We might say that we have no doubt that the South Australian quota advisory committee has acted in good faith. We acknowledge that its task has been a difficult and an unpleasant one and that it has probably had to rely on inexperienced staff. The fact remains, however, that the inefficiency of the whole organization has reached mammoth proportions. The loss of 1,800 applications for quotas has delayed the allocation of quotas to a point where the whole matter has become desperate. The number and extent of clerical errors has been alarming. It has been pointed out that clerical mistakes may be rectified without the necessity for the grower to appeal.

The rectification of these errors will further reduce the contingency reserve. Moreover, there are many errors which have been made in favour of isolated individual growers. We doubt whether these errors will be corrected and the fact that they have been made has reduced the contingency reserve below what it would otherwise have been. While the number of the errors is alarming, we think that the basic problem is that the formula which has been evolved does not achieve equity in this area even when correctly applied.

One of the alarming features of the administration of the quota system has been the inability of the committee to give any accurate figures of the extent of the contingency reserve. If it is sufficiently large, doubtless the review committee can go a long way towards giving redress to farmers who have been unjustly treated. We cannot understand why an accurate figure for the reserve cannot be given. It is only a matter, after all, of adding the total bushels allocated and deducting this from 45,000,000. Even conceding that there were 11,000 applications, this task should not be too difficult.

We should have thought that a running daily balance of unallocated bushellage would have been kept. At the Waikerie meeting, the Chairman of the committee gave the amount of the reserve as about half a million bushels. However, varying estimates have been given.

If the reserve does stand at 500,000 bushels then we think that the reserve is grossly inadequate to allow justice to be done in the Mallee and the review committee will not be able to give full redress.

At the Waikerie meeting, growers were urged not to take political action, to allow the Bill to be passed in its present form and to let things be sorted out later. Surely this is not the right approach to draft legislation. Legislation should be just for the existing situation at the time when it is passed. It is notoriously hard to have an existing Act amended, particularly in these times when Parliament is so busy. Surely the typical role for amending legislation should be to adjust legislation to meet new situations. Amendment is not a substitute for having the legislation just and equitable in the first place. Our main quarrel is not so much with the draft legislation as with the method of applying it adopted by the committee. However, we do query the following aspects of the Bill:

(1) Is it justifiable to direct that one adverse season should be disregarded in considering special quotas?

(2) Is it just that diminution of the amount of wheat produced as a consequence of frost or disease shall be disregarded in considering special quotas?

(3) Is the term "advisory committee" appropriate? This is not an advisory committee but an executive committee which fixes the actual quotas and whose determinations have the force of law unless they are varied by the review committee.

Further, is it just that the prescribed period for the whole of the State should be the seasons 1964 to 1968 both inclusive?

The main reason for the differentiation which has occurred against Mallee farmers has been brought about by the formula which has been adopted by the committee in determining what is an "adverse season". The definition of "adverse season" in the Bill is unexceptionable. However, the committee has decided that it will only treat a season as adverse if the deliveries in that season were less than 50 per cent of the average. This formula, which is not obligatory under the Bill and is not referred to therein, has been the reason why many farmers have been deprived of special consideration when, in fact, during the five-year period, they have experienced not one but three seasons which, in all conscience, and within the definition set out in the Bill, must be called adverse. In the first place we do not think that the committee should have absolutely bound itself to a mathematical formula. As it did do this it might as well have ceased to exist after it prepared the formula and allowed the work to be done by computer. In special cases we think that the committee should have been prepared to exercise individual human judgment. What is the point in having a committee otherwise? The formula is far too rigid. In the second place the figure of less than 50 per cent of the five-year average as determining an adverse season is far too low. Most Mallee farmers experienced seasons which did not qualify but were indeed adverse. The following sample figures will serve as an example. Farmer A had the following deliveries: 5,000 bushels, 5,000 bushels, 2,000 bushels, 2,000 bushels, 5,000 bushels, total 19,000 bushels; average 3,800 bushels. There were two deliveries of less than half this figure and therefore he qualified for a special quota. Farmer B had the following deliveries: 5,000 bushels, 2,000 bushels, 2,000 bushels, 1,000 bushels, 5,000 bushels, total 15,000 bushels; average 3,000 bushels. There is only one delivery of less than half this figure so he does not qualify. However we say that he is far worse off than farmer A. He has, in all conscience, had three adverse seasons. This demonstrates that the formula does not provide a just basis for special consideration. If this formula is to be continued the 50 per cent figure must be raised. It appears to us that professional actuaries or statisticians trained to relate statistics to realities have not been consulted.

In demonstrating that Mallee farmers have not been justly dealt with we would point out that the State quota is 45,000,000 bushels and the estimated delivery for 1969 is 65,000,000 bushels. Thus the quota is approximately 70 per cent of the estimated yield. From the best appraisal we can make the quota of Mallee farmers will not amount to 50 per cent of the yield. In many cases the quota is only 30 per cent of the estimated yield. We claim that farmers in other areas are being favoured at the expense of the Mallee. We do not suggest that this has been deliberate but it has been brought about because the prescribed period and formula used has in fact put the Mallee at a disadvantage.

One method suggested by farmers in this area for at any rate the 1969 season is to apply a quota of say two-thirds of the yield for that season. We mention this as a matter of interest and suggest that it would be at least as just in operation as the formula in fact used. Two big disadvantages would be that it would be difficult for the authorities to determine what the actual yield was and that it would place the farmer who had a poor crop in the 1969 season through disease at an unfair disadvantage in being able to deliver only two-thirds of an already poor yield. Farmers are particularly irate because they say that when the quota system was proposed they were assured that every consideration would be given to such matters as the pattern of seasons in the Mallee in the last five years. Many wheat producers lodged carefully prepared applications for special consideration but the only so-called "consideration" given was the devising and application of the above formula.

Unless the contingency reserve and the total amount of short-falls is much greater than at present estimated the only chance which we can see of making Mallee farmers bear only their equitable proportion of the burden of quotas is to endeavour to arrange for a part of the unfulfilled quotas of Queensland or Western Australia available to the contingency reserve for this year only and to completely reassess individual quotas within the confines of the overall State quota for next year.

I should be interested to hear comments from people engaged in the industry who know more about this than I do, but this statement is obviously made by people vitally concerned in this matter. I consider it sets out clearly the position in which people in this area find themselves as a result of these quotas having to be applied. I believe that, inevitably, many people in the State will be forced off their properties. For instance, let us consider people in the Mallee who were subject to droughts, particularly in 1967, and who obtained relief from the Government in the way of carry-on finance. They have to make those repayments as well as other payments. In the case of some people in the Mallee area of whom I know, I request the Government to consider waiving repayment of those loans provided under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967.

Certainly, waiving of interest could be considered, because the Minister has discretion in this regard. I know that the money lent by the Commonwealth Government for this purpose was lent over a seven-year period. While I was Minister of Lands, I would not lay down any set pattern for repayment. I left the position flexible, and I did so to meet the type of contingency that is involved in this case. As these people are already in difficulty if some assistance is not forthcoming, they will be bankrupt and will have to sell their properties. Not only is concern being expressed in the Mallee area. I have received a letter from a person who attended a meeting at Cleve last Wednesday evening, as follows:

You will note that statistics from the forms filled in—

and he has given samples—

show that 93 farmers in counties Jervois and Buxton are in severe financial difficulties as a result of quotas. Together, they would have a combined investment in land and plant of between $4,500,000 and $9,000,000 and would support approximately 300 people. Under present circumstances, bankruptcy would appear inevitable for many, and loss of property and many years' work for many more. Surely in the name of justice and humanity these people deserve better than this, for they have helped to build this State and this nation. Their sweat and toil has provided the base on which the foundations of this country were laid, and now it appears they are to be trampled underfoot as reward for their efforts. On their behalf, I appeal to you to assist our campaign to have the rights of those afflicted in this way recognized, and to help us secure a better deal for them.

The notes of the meeting, which I think show the difficulties facing growers, are rather interesting, and state:

Desperate is the only word that could describe the atmosphere at a public meeting of wheatgrowers in Cleve on Wednesday, November 26. At first the reaction of those present was to seek somewhere to lay the blame, and motions of no-confidence in the Wheat Quota Advisory Committee and the quota system were moved. No-confidence motions in the C.B.H., its manager (Mr. P. T. Sanders) and its Chairman (Mr. Max Saint) were also suggested. After some discussion it was considered that circumstances and Government policies were to blame for the present position, rather than the committees and boards concerned. However, growers believed that the present system of quotas was not satisfactory and a motion to abandon it was carried.

A number of different schemes were then discussed, all having drawbacks and pitfalls; thus, a number of resolutions were defeated. Only two resolutions received much support. One, asking for present quotas to be reduced 5 per cent, with this being used for distribution among severely hit growers, was narrowly defeated. The second, requesting Government grants to make up the financial deficit for hard-hit growers, was carried.

It is natural for people to call on the Government to carry them through their difficulties. The notes continue:

During this debate it appeared that most growers who were largely unaffected wished to remain that way and wanted a solution that did not upset the present position. On the other hand, those in distress required an urgent solution, and, providing it worked, did not particularly care where it came from.

One speaker alleged that the quotas protected those who had caused the present position. The insurance companies, stock firms and the like, who were growing millions of bushels, could continue, while those who had developed the industry sank into oblivion. After further discussion, a motion calling on the Government to allow wheat to be grown only on properties registered in the names of *bona fide* growers was carried. A second motion asking the Government to examine the situation in regard to wheat production on pastoral leases, with a view to curbing production on such areas, but protecting the traditional grower, was also passed.

The failure of the State Government to live up to the promise of restoring the previous land rent system was noted, and a motion that Mr. E. C. A. Edwards, M.P., be asked to press the Government to reduce land rents was passed by a big majority. It was noted that share-farmers were in a sad plight, seemingly having no rights, after helping the owner to build up a large delivery record. It appeared that many owners were sacking share-farmers, to enable them to be better off than before quotas were introduced. The motion "That, if a wheatgrower has employed a share-farmer and now dispenses with his services, his quota be reduced by the percentage the share-farmer would otherwise have received" was passed after some discussion. It was agreed that, if a share-farmer was employed for only part of the five-year period, a sliding scale of reduction should be used.

Apologies for non-attendance were received from Mr. E. C. A. Edwards, M.P., Mr. Arthur Whyte, M.L.C., Mr. T. C. Stott, M.P., Mr. Wallis, M.H.R., and Hon. C. R. Story, M.L.C. During the evening a questionnaire was distributed among the 180 people present, the purpose of which was to determine the impact of quotas and the quantity of extra wheat needed to remedy the plight of those hardest hit. The Chairman (Dr. Wittwer), urged growers to be honest and accurate in filling in the forms and to state only the minimum additional grain required, since the survey would have no value on any other basis. The survey results were as follows:

129 forms returned;
33 can manage by diversifying;
63 suffered a serious impact from which they cannot recover. They will be in financial difficulties without help. 195,200 additional bushels are needed by these growers;
30 suffered a calamitous impact and will lose their properties if they cannot get speedy assistance. 152,368 bushels needed by this group;
3 from share-farmers who feel that they need another 10,000 bushels to live and meet cost of running their own plant.

This is the picture from growers in the counties Jervois and Buxton. No wonder they are desperate.

From the conduct of that meeting we can see that people are in desperate need of something to be done. I am particularly concerned about the smaller wheatgrower, because I do not see that he can survive under this system. True, the larger wheatgrower has a better chance. Both the larger and the smaller wheatgrower will be hit, but one can stand it and the other (the smaller wheatgrower) will not survive unless drastic measures are taken. The smaller wheatgrower relies on what he can plant to meet his commitments. This situation has come upon us gradually, and the Commonwealth Government has been remiss in carrying out its responsibility. Had it taken certain steps, part of this situation could have been avoided. However, we are faced with the fact that we have a quota of 45,000,000 bushels, and we must be as fair as possible to everyone. We must be careful to see that people are not put off the land. Members have spoken about the value of the orderly marketing system; to protect it we should have a crash programme of permanent storage throughout Australia.

Mr. Venning: We have had it.

Mr. CORCORAN: It has been insufficient. Does the honourable member think that all the wheat will be stored and that nothing will be left on the farms?

Mr. Venning: Yes.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is not the situation in other States, particularly New South Wales. I realize that the Commonwealth Government embarked on a crash programme to install additional silos in this State, but I was not aware that those silos would be sufficient to store the whole of this year's harvest.

Mr. Allen: We won't get 65,000,000 bushels.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Millicent.

Mr. CORCORAN: The other step that should have been taken is to look for some other way of disposing of over-quota wheat. In France wheat is impregnated with a dye when it is sold for other than human consumption. We should be exploiting both oversea and home markets. The Bill does provide for some flexibility in regard to price structure. We must protect the orderly marketing system. The Bill is largely a Committee Bill. I indicate my support for the measure, with reservation.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support this Bill, realizing the need for the introduction of a system. I should like to comment on what the member for Millicent has said, particularly in his earlier remarks. It is all very well to criticize the Australian Wheat Board and the Commonwealth Government. However, in 1966-67 there was a world shortage of wheat and last year this country had two crops in one. This year South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales have had a similar situation. It is not fair to criticize the board by saying that the board should have got additional sales overseas, because we know that this year the board has gone quietly on getting such sales so as to allow other exporting countries to get a share of the market.

It has been proved that the board has done a mighty job to get oversea sales. The Commonwealth Government has made possible the allocation of 60,000,000 bushels of storage as a crash programme for South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. At this stage it seems that South Australia may not need the allocation of the 20,000,000-bushel storage that the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has made. About 13,000,000 bushels of storage has been allocated so far in the programme and it seems that South Australia will be able to take in the total production of wheat by the end of June at the latest. It is expected that this may be done by April or May.

I know that there are difficulties in the industry and that someone will feel the pinch, but it is not possible to introduce a plan that does not affect someone. We know that to preserve orderly marketing and to keep our wheat production within reason and within the ability of the Wheat Board to sell it, something had to be done. I know the committee established to handle quotas in South Australia has had an extremely difficult job. I regret and am disappointed that, in many aspects, mistakes have been made.

Mr. Hudson: Did the committee make mistakes in your area?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, the committee has made mistakes with my quota and tomorrow I have to appear before it to straighten out my quota, so I did not miss out in this situation. However, something had to be done about a basis for the regulation of quotas. The industry as a whole realized that something had to be done regarding production and delivery. The authority in this State has indicated that it will take in the total production, irrespective of the quota, this year and that short-falls will be indicated and allocated to those with over-quota wheat. Those providing a short-fall will be paid $1.10 but this portion will be subtracted from their quota next year.

This will assist the State's economy by ensuring a delivery in South Australia of 45,000,000 bushels and $1.10 will be paid as a first advance. Growers have expressed some concern that, although the co-operative will take in the entire crop by the end of June, there may be a storage charge. That is not correct. The wheat will be taken into the pool and treated in the usual way. The additional storage in the crash programme will be paid for by the Australian industry. I realize that there have been difficulties in bringing this matter forward, but the industry's plan is now submitted as legislation and I support the Bill at this stage.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill but is is rather unusual to be debating such an important measure at this hour and so late in the season. This Bill should have been introduced at least a couple of months ago to give the wheat farmers the opportunity to have the quota system rectified so that more equitable distribution of our allocation of 45,000,000 bushels could be made possible. However, at present some farmers have reaped all their wheat. Wheat is pouring into silos in increasing quantities every day and, if this Bill were not passed, chaos would exist in the wheat industry in the State. This legislation must be passed in some form, because there is no time left to rectify some anomalies that have occurred in the quota system in the past few months.

As early as last July, when I spoke of the general situation of the wheat industry in Australia and in South Australia in particular, I warned the House of the distinct possibility of chaos resulting from the introduction of this quota system. There did not seem to be anything else for it. Therefore, I think that, in the first place, the Commonwealth Government must take the blame for a complete lack of initiative regarding the future of the grain industry of Australia, whether coarse grains or wheat. I make no apology for saying that lack of initiative has resulted in the present situation.

[Midnight]

The Commonwealth Government had all the facts before it. It has a department in Canberra known as the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, where all the information possible regarding rural matters is available. An officer of the bureau whom I heard speak on this measure some months ago made no secret of the fact that competent officers were available within the bureau to make an exhaustive analysis of the wheat situation in Australia and to see how we would be affected by the situation existing throughout the world. However, the Commonwealth Government apparently went on in its leisurely fashion until it was suddenly hit as though it were by a bolt out of the blue.

We find ourselves in this present position, and men will be driven off the land. This has been proved by the evidence referred to this evening by the Deputy Leader. I have received letters similar to those received by him, and I recently attended a meeting at Loxton at which similar problems were discussed. I heard about it first-hand, but I was not surprised by the statements made, because I knew this would happen, and I referred to it in the House earlier this year. How did many of the farmers concerned get into this difficulty? I do not blame the quota committee for it; I think it had a lousy job to do, to put it mildly. The quota committees throughout Australia have had a difficult job indeed, and these committees are all finding it difficult to arrive at a satisfactory solution to the quota problem.

The problem in South Australia is that we are trying to get this legislation through at such a late stage, when it could and should have gone through five or six weeks ago. I cannot see why it was not considered earlier although, here again, we come back to the human element. One of the astonishing things about the quota system and the way in which the quota committee has worked out the details is not so much the fact that it has arrived at certain formulae that will be applied in certain instances and that quotas will be referred to the farmers who receive them: in hundreds of cases a simple exercise in arithmetic has not been carried out properly, and farmers have been informed of incorrect quotas. This is absolutely scandalous; it is responsible for one of the biggest problems confronting many farmers today; and it should never have occurred.

Only the other day the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), of all people, received a letter from a farmer whose quota was only 700-odd bushels and who gave details of the whole five-year production of his property. Having looked at this letter, I said that I was sure that the person should receive more than that, and when I applied his figures to the formula that had appeared in the newspapers I found that the quota should have been 1,100-odd bushels. The people responsible had forgotten to take into account the three lean years, in which case one year is disregarded; production in the other two years is brought up to the average (if it is below 50 per cent of the average); it is divided by five; and the figure is then added on to the average, less 10 per cent. These are the mistakes which have been happening in increasing numbers right throughout the State and which should not have been happening.

Mr. Hudson: It is gross inefficiency.

Mr. CASEY: Exactly. Surely, this should not happen when a committee has been set up to carry out such a mammoth and most important task, which is so essential to individual growers, particularly the grower with a small property who is absolutely hit to leg under this quota system. There must be hundreds of these people who will walk off their land, and we have evidence here this evening to substantiate this. I do not know how this country will stand up to the calamity facing farmers right throughout Australia. The situation does not apply to South Australia in isolation; it applies throughout the Commonwealth. I do not know how we are going to solve the problems at this late stage. We cannot throw this quota committee overboard and say, "Your formulae are no good; let's have another look at the position." It is too late for that. Simple mistakes are being made not only in arithmetic: there are also double quotas, some farmers having received two, and even three, quotas.

Mr. Nankivell: And they don't all agree.

Mr. CASEY: This is what is causing such chaos. We cannot find out exactly under this how much wheat will be available to the review committee so that it can consider people in necessitous circumstances. Having asked the Chairman of the quota committee last week how much wheat had been kept out, I was told that it was about 3,000,000 bushels.

Mr. Hudson: That wasn't true.

Mr. CASEY: I do not know; that was what I was told. However, I should say that if a quantity of wheat was kept out it should be about 3,000,000 bushels (probably 2,250,000 or 2,500,000 bushels). New South Wales kept 7,000,000 bushels out of a total of 130,000,000 bushels, and Victoria kept 3,000,000 bushels out of a total of 65,000,000 bushels. However, I cannot find out exactly what quantity of wheat has been set aside in South Australia. It has been said by way of a reply to questions asked on the matter by both the member for Glenelg and me that the quantity available at the moment to be considered by the review committee is about 500,000 bushels.

Mr. Hudson: At least one-third of a million.

Mr. CASEY: Yes. I have a letter asking for over 300,000 bushels so that 30 farmers can remain on the breadline: at present, they are completely wiped out. Also, it refers to 63 farmers who, if they get what they have asked for, will be able to maintain themselves as a farming unit, if they are not wiped out, too. That is only in the two counties of Buxton and Jervois. What about the Murray Mallee? As I heard these farmers from that district the other night, they are in a bad way, and many country towns will be ruined if farmers have to leave their properties. Will they get full value for them? One cannot exist on the land today unless one has a fairly good income. Today's basic wage, which was announced this morning, is about $2,000 a year.

Mr. Venning: That's not too bad.

Mr. Hudson: You wouldn't know whether it's bad or not: you wouldn't have a clue.

Mr. CASEY: I wonder how the member for Rocky River would get on if he had to live on $2,000 a year. However, let us consider how much wheat, at $1.10 a bushel, which he is guaranteed, a farmer has to deliver to silos in order to earn $2,000 a year. He has to put in about 2,000 bushels. I wonder how many farmers in this State have less than 2,000 bushels as their quota. I have been trying to get that information for months.

Mr. Allen: The average is only 2,800 bushels.

Mr. CASEY: When I asked what amount of wheat had been allocated for quotas I was told by the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee that the information sought could not be provided at this juncture, because some quotas had yet to be allocated. Some farmers have reaped all their crops, yet others have not been given a quota. I was told that every effort would be made to furnish the required details as soon as possible following the completion of quota allocations.

Mr. Broomhill: You won't get them until this Bill is out of the way.

Mr. CASEY: For some reason, any question that I have asked concerning the wheat industry in this State has been side-tracked by the Government. I do not think that it has played cricket, as I would call it, under these conditions. It has been scared stiff that Opposition members would ask embarrassing questions and the Government has said to itself, "We have to be careful; there is no politics in this one." One thing the Government cannot accuse the Opposition of doing is playing politics with this measure, because it is too serious a matter to do that. In no circumstances has an Opposition member attempted to do so.

Mr. Venning: You do that sometimes, do you?

Mr. CASEY: I am stating a fact, but I tell the honourable member that, if we were the Government and Government members were in Opposition, I can imagine what politics would be played on this measure. Government members played enough of it during the drought a few years ago: the Lord only knows what they would have done with this measure. The Government would have arranged meetings all over the State at which it would have criticized the Labor Party for the wheat position. I defy any Government member to contradict that statement.

Mr. Broomhill: They know it's true.

Mr. CASEY: Of course: it has been said to me in private by members opposite that this would have happened. The Opposition is proud of the fact that at no stage has it attempted to make capital out of the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Evans: Are you saying that it was the Commonwealth Government's fault?

Mr. CASEY: Yes. For the benefit of the honourable member I repeat that I still blame the Commonwealth Government for today's situation. If he considered the history of the wheat industry in the last few years he would find that that was true. The Commonwealth Government has done nothing: it has sat like an old hen on a dozen rotten eggs hoping they would hatch in the future, but it has got nowhere. It has shown no initiative or foresight. I made a speech last year about the Canadian wheat agreement with Red China. For the benefit of the member for Light, I ask him where we would be today without sales of wheat to Red China, a Communist country.

Mr. Freebairn: They call themselves Socialists, actually.

Mr. CASEY: When referring to China, the member for Light, apart from dealing with the purchase of Australian wheat, refers to it as Communist China, but when he speaks of it as a customer for Australian wheat he refers to it as mainland China. This is done in the Commonwealth Parliament and, if the member for Light is true to form, he will emulate his Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. Hudson: If China would buy more wheat the member for Light would make the Chinese Ambassador a Q.C.

Mr. CASEY: We are in a stupid situation: we are at the mercy of some oversea countries which have been buying our wheat for several years but which are now producing more wheat than they have done in the past. This is a problem confronting not only Australia but also other countries that have been major producers of wheat throughout the world. Canada is in a similar predicament to Australia, and in America wheatgrowers are subsidized to the extent of $3,000,000,000 not to grow wheat. This measure attempts to rationalize the quantity of wheat that growers can put into the silos this year. Unfortunately, hundreds of farmers will be so affected by this measure that they will have to look elsewhere in order to make up their income to enable them to live as a normal family should live. For present convenience, I see no other course open to

me than to support this measure and hope that we can at least do everything possible to bring some equality into the situation, as should be done. Indeed, every individual has the right to see that it is done.

The other evening I heard an officer of the United Farmers and Graziers say, "Farmers should stick together." I agree they should, but they can stick together only if they play it fair amongst themselves. If there is to be dissension within a body of United Farmers and Graziers growers at this stage, it will weaken the whole structure of the body that has been set up. Unfortunately, unless we can bring some equality into this quota system to make it fair and equitable for all, we shall not preserve the harmony that has prevailed for so many years. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) was the first President of the United Farmers and Graziers. I sincerely hope that members of this Chamber will appreciate the position and see whether they cannot do something practical in Committee. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1968. Read a first time.

The Hon D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main objects are to remove from the principal Act any provisions requiring personal residence in relation to leases, agreements and land grants, to include a power to fix a reserve price for auctions of land under section 229, and to clarify the provisions of section 272 of the principal Act. The opportunity has also been taken to bring up to date all obsolete references in the principal Act to the Commissioner of Crown Lands by altering those references to references to the Minister of Lands. This will enable the Act and its amendments to be consolidated under the Acts Republication Act.

Clause 2 alters all references to the Commissioner of Crown Lands to references to the Minister of Lands. Clauses 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 16 repeal the provisions of the Act relating to the allotment or sale of land on conditions of personal residence. The Government considers that in present-day circumstances the need for a lessee to reside on the land frequently does not exist. Methods of management and facility of transport are such that a property can be efficiently worked from a distance.

Clause 7 strikes out from section 66h the references to provisions of the Act that are no longer in force. Clause 11 repeals section 229 and re-enacts it with a power conferred on the Minister to fix a reserve price at which lands referred to in the section may be sold at auction and, where the reserve price is not reached, to sell the land by private contract at a price less than that reserve price. The existing method of publishing an upset price restricts the return from the sale of land by auction because it publicizes the minimum acceptable price at which the land can be purchased. Where the number of blocks available for sale is equal to the demand, it allows prospective purchasers to agree beforehand which blocks they will bid for; this really inhibits competition. Furthermore, where the upset price is not acceptable to any would-be purchaser, it involves the department in unnecessary work in withdrawing and re-offering the blocks at a lower upset price.

Clause 13 enacts a new section 249b, which provides, in consequence of earlier clauses of the Bill, that, where an agreement or a lease or grant contains a condition or covenant requiring personal residence on the land which is the subject of the agreement, lease or grant, that agreement, lease or grant shall be construed as if no such condition or covenant was contained in it.

Clause 14 amends section 272 of the principal Act, under which power at present exists for the removal, sale or disposal by the Minister of buildings, structures, etc., erected "unlawfully" on land belonging to the Crown. The word "unlawfully" has presented the Administration with some difficulty in that it is not at all clear what it means. Accordingly, the clause substitutes "without the authority of the Minister" for the word "unlawfully" with a view to clarifying the provisions of the section. The clause also contains a power to remove, sell or destroy a building, fence or structure that has been erected with authority granted subject to the condition of removal within a specified time or upon termination of occupancy, where the condition has not been complied with.

Under the principal Act at present there is no power for the Minister to remove, or cause the removal of, chattels left behind on Crown land on the termination of occupancy. The clause confers on the Minister power, by notice in writing, to require such removal within a specified time and, if the chattels are not removed as required, to remove, sell or destroy the chattels and recover the cost of so doing from the lessee.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.31 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 3, at 2 p.m.