

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, December 3, 1969.

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

QUESTIONS

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Previously, there has been discussion about the report of the committee established under the Planning and Development Act to advise on redevelopment of the Hackney area. Will the Attorney-General obtain this report from the Minister of Local Government and either table it or make it available to members?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will speak to my colleague with a view to acceding to the request.

TAXI-CAB BOARD

Mr. JENNINGS: Once upon a time I asked the Attorney-General to obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport details relating to the sacking of an inspector of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board despite the attempted intervention by a trade union and the promised intervention of the under Parliamentary Under Secretary, but, despite proddings of the Minister, I have not yet had a reply. I spoke to the Minister of Roads and Transport last evening and he said that questions were never delayed in his office. I understand that a reply is now available, but I wonder why it is necessary to delay the reply to a question of this nature, unless the reason is that Cabinet Ministers know that Parliament is likely to be prorogued soon and that a follow-up question, if one seems necessary, is not possible in these circumstances. However, I shall not proceed further with my explanation, as I gave a full explanation in my first question, and I now wait to hear the Minister's reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member mentioned this matter to me privately yesterday, I made special arrangements to have a reply for him today. I have it here but, in view of what the honourable member has just said, I think I should remind him and other members of the House that he asked this question on November 18, only a couple of weeks ago; it was sent to the Metropolitan Taxi-cab Board for consideration on November 20; the board had its meeting on November 26; the Chairman was then requested to draft the necessary reply to the

Minister so that he, in turn, could prepare a reply for me to give the honourable member; and that reply from the board, drafted by the Chairman, was received, I understand, only today. There has certainly been no delay by either the Minister of Roads and Transport or me, and I think there has been no delay for which any blame could attach to any person regarding the way in which the board has handled the matter. I wished to make that clear before I gave the reply. The Minister of Roads and Transport has received a report from the Chairman, Metropolitan Taxi-cab Board, concerning the employment of Mr. J. Campbell, and because the report is most comprehensive I will quote it *verbatim*, as follows:

Mr. J. Campbell was engaged by the board as an inspector on February 19, 1964, and his services were terminated on July 3, 1969. It is known that during his service with the board Mr. Campbell sought employment elsewhere. All members of the board's staff are paid as far as possible in accordance with a similar classification in the Public Service, and for this purpose the Public Service Commissioner conducted a work study and survey of the duties performed by each member of the staff, and made recommendations, which the board has accepted. In addition, inspectors are paid penalty rates for overtime and afternoon shifts and enjoy the benefits of Public Service conditions in regard to sick and long service leave. The statements made by Mr. Jennings, M.P., about the board's dealings with the Federated Clerks Union of Australia are inaccurate. Copy of correspondence between the board and the union following Mr. Campbell's joining the union is available. It appears from this correspondence that the board was willing to consider any matters the union cared to bring forward, but not to enter into negotiations at large. Nothing came from the union. In about January, 1969, Mr. Campbell complained that wounds in his legs caused by bayonet and bullets whilst on active service were causing him some concern. In March, 1969, he entered hospital and was operated on for an excision of a bunion on his foot and osteoarthritis of the metatarso-phalangeal joints of both big toes. These were classed as war-caused disabilities.

As Mr. Campbell had previously taken 18 days' sick leave before this illness (not nil days, as Mr. Jennings stated) he still had 54 days' accumulated leave. He was paid for the full 54 days but at the expiration of that time he was not fit to return to work. His doctor reported that he would still require about two months' further sick leave and a further two months on light duties. As the board's staff is small and is fully supported by the industry, it was found to be impossible to carry on with one inspector short. The work was too heavy for the other inspectors, who had carried the burden of Mr. Campbell's absence for about 3½ months, and it was decided to replace

him. Mr. Campbell's service was terminated on July 3, 1969, when he was paid two weeks' salary in lieu of notice, pay in lieu of holidays due, and superannuation, all in addition to the payment of 54 days' sick leave already mentioned.

No inspector has been requested to clean the motor vehicle used by the secretary for more than two years, but it is the practice that an inspector cleans the vehicle he is driving once each week, and proper clothing is provided for this purpose. Each inspector once every six weeks brings a cup of tea to board members at night meetings during his evening and night tour of duty. No objection is made to this by any of the inspectors, as it enables them to take a cup of tea themselves during this late shift. The board appreciates the good service given by its staff and has paid a week's pay as a Christmas bonus each year. It has no reason to believe any of its inspectors are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether the board will give Mr. Campbell a reference or, as it probably would be more accurately described, a record of his service or employment with the board?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall pass on the request.

MURRAY PARK TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. RODDA: I know that all members have the education of our young people very deeply at heart. A few weeks ago I was privileged to visit one of the State's old buildings which is situated on a fine site in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide that will ultimately become the Eastern Teachers College. Can the Minister of Education say what progress is being made on the final plans to establish this site as a training centre for young teachers?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Public Works Committee has recommended the building of the new Eastern Teachers College at Magill. I have been provided with some information, which I believe will be of interest to the House, regarding this latest complex in the development of our teachers colleges. This will be the first replacement teachers college to be built in South Australia and the first teachers college to be undertaken by the Government. It will provide places for 800 students in infants and primary courses of training, and the buildings have been planned so that secondary course students can also be accommodated if the need arises. The plans, which have been approved by the Public Works Committee, have been sent to the Department of Education and Science in Canberra for consideration and approval for funding in the 1970-73 triennium. I have approved that the

name of the new college should be the Murray Park Teachers College, for the site is the home of a former distinguished South Australian, Sir George Murray, who was once Chief Justice of this State. It is probably one of the loveliest localities in the whole metropolitan area. The siting of the proposed buildings has been arranged so that they will not detract from the beauty of this lovely site, and many of the beautiful gum trees will be retained. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of students attending teachers colleges from 382 in 1951 to 4,022 in 1969. Obviously, the first concern of the Education Department has been to provide additional accommodation for students in training to be teachers.

Mr. Virgo: This is a Dorothy Dixier.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Dorothy Dixier or not, I believe we have reason to be proud of the development of this, the most recent of our teachers colleges. The present two-storey building, which is a lovely one, will be retained and renovated so that it can be used as lecturers' offices, and seminar, tutorial and conference rooms. The new main buildings will have warm air heating and ventilation. The assembly hall and four large lecture rooms will be provided with summer cooling. The buildings are ducted so that it will be possible to air-condition the whole complex later if it is desired to do so. The great majority of students at Murray Park Teachers College will be taking internal courses leading to the Diploma in Teaching. Some students will take subjects at the University of Adelaide. All students will be undertaking at a minimum three-year courses. The target date for the completion of the new college is June, 1972, but the academic buildings are expected to be ready by February, 1972.

TEACHER ACCOMMODATION

Mr. McKEE: Recently the Minister of Education told me that the Education Department intended to construct teachers' accommodation at the corner of Balmoral Road and The Terrace at Port Pirie, and that tenders had been called. As I understand that the department considered that the prices tendered were too high, can the Minister say whether negotiations are continuing about the tenders or whether satisfactory agreement has been reached?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Naturally, I have not this information with me but I will certainly call for a report and try to give it to the honourable member tomorrow.

LAKES DRAINAGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am most grateful to the Minister of Lands and members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board for the information they have given me about the possibility of draining south-eastern waters into the Coorong. Because of the Minister's interest and the interest of many people in the Younghusband Peninsula and Coorong area in redevelopment of this area, can the Minister extend the studies and consider the possibility of providing a barrage between Ewe Island and Younghusband Peninsula and the provision of a channel linking the southern end of Lake Albert with the Coorong, to enable this lake to be flushed out and so that the Coorong and the lakes may be linked together and the area used for further storage, if not of fresh water, at least of brackish water that may have some effect on the development of the area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will certainly ensure that this matter receives the serious consideration it deserves. Some time ago the honourable member asked about the possibility of diverting water from the Blackford drain into the southernmost point of the Coorong. This seemed to be an extremely costly process, although in many ways it would be attractive, because it would restore the marine life and general biological balance in the Coorong area. I have not previously heard precisely the proposal now made by the honourable member, but I have heard variations of it, and it, too, warrants careful consideration.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How much would the former proposal be likely to cost?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot remember the figure, but it would have been extremely expensive. The matter is not completely closed, because it was submitted to me by a departmental officer. I think the cost may have been stated in the letter. In any case, the matter warrants further consideration, having in mind the new proposal submitted by the honourable member. Although we may well talk about freshening the water, we still must consider the yield of the river system, as well as whatever drainage yield there is in the South-East, in relation to whether irrigation is economic, and we must balance that consideration against the enormous attraction that the Coorong would be if retained in its natural state. I think that the next generation will realize that areas that we do not at present fully appreciate are extremely valuable. I have had

recent experience of this when I was able to assist several distinguished people, including Sir Russell Drysdale, the artist, to visit Younghusband Peninsula and they came away really thrilled with the uniqueness of the whole area. Whatever investigations are carried out, I should like to see that the value of this asset is considered. However, the whole matter will be examined.

RADIO ADVERTISING

Mr. RYAN: At a meeting I attended last Thursday evening in my district I was asked whether action could be taken regarding a commercial advertisement that is used on the radio each morning in which the advertiser deliberately breaks the law. I realize that broadcasting comes under the control of the Commonwealth Government, but this advertiser is apparently breaking the State law. The commercial is sponsored by a motor vehicle firm that advertises the sale of new cars and, if the Attorney-General will take up this matter, I will supply him with the name of the radio station and the name of the company concerned. During the commercial, one man asks another man whether he enjoyed his holidays, or something to that effect, to which the man replies, "Yes, I went in such-and-such a motor vehicle and I cruised the whole journey at over 80 miles an hour," which is a deliberate breach of the law. Will the Attorney-General say whether action can be taken against a company that advertises in this way and deliberately flouts the law of South Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This sounds akin to the matter that was raised by the member for Hindmarsh the other day, although I think in that case it was a television commercial. As I seem to leave home too early to watch television in the morning, I have not yet had an opportunity of seeing the television commercial.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It's repeated in the press now.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Is it? I will look out for it in the paper. However, until I see it I cannot make up my mind, although I am hoping to watch television when the session ends and to make up my mind. I will do the same regarding the matter raised by the member for Port Adelaide, if he gives me the details, so that I can follow it up.

FINANCE COMPANY

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A legal firm rang me yesterday and told me that a finance company registered in Australia and in South Australia was lending money at 8 per

cent to 9 per cent a month interest to people who, in the main, were facing unsatisfied judgment summonses. The company has a foreign influence. I have already given the necessary names to the Attorney-General, but I consider that I should not make these public at this stage, because I do not want to commit an injustice. Having raised the matter, I hope I am not committing an injustice to all finance companies. This is far from my intention but it is considered that this action may be an evasion of the Money-lenders Act. I ask the Attorney-General, in order that the public may be protected, whether this is an evasion of the Money-lenders Act and, if it is, he will take the necessary steps to correct the position. I think he will agree that it is an exorbitant interest rate. Even if it is not an evasion of the Money-lenders Act, I ask him to consider bringing down at the earliest possible moment an amendment to that Act to give protection where I consider it is warranted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has been kind enough to give me the relevant information so that I can follow the matter up, and I shall certainly do so. If there is any action that should be taken I will take it; in any case I will let him know.

BANK ACCOUNT

Mr. CLARK: Yesterday afternoon the Attorney-General was good enough to give me a reply to a question I asked recently regarding the fortnightly salary cheque of railway employees which has to be paid into a cheque account. I understand that the Attorney-General told me that, following an arrangement made a few years ago, the associated banks had asked that this be done. In explaining my previous question I have said that for some employees this creates a hardship because it means that they are forced to have a current account, even though some of them cannot possibly afford such an additional expense. Will the Attorney-General consult with the representative of the associated banks to see whether moneys can be paid into a savings account where cases of hardship are shown?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will do that.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Yesterday the Premier replied to a question about railway standardization. Has he anything further to tell the House after his visit to Broken Hill at the weekend for the official opening of the standard gauge line?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I cannot add anything regarding the time tables for the standardization of the two railway lines in South Australia. The visit was a pleasant one, and the opening was witnessed by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), who I think was applauding loudly when I hit the spike into the sleeper. The opening was well received and the friendly crowd realized the importance of the line, which links the Indian Ocean with the Pacific Ocean. I told the audience that we should very soon link the Southern Ocean with that complex of railways. The whole ceremony was conducted in a spirit of great optimism which I think augurs well for carrying out the works in South Australia.

Mr. CASEY: I was in Broken Hill last Saturday, but the line was officially opened about a week before: a bottle of champagne was broken over an engine when the two lines were linked together but unfortunately the workmen had to pull up a section of the track and re-lay it for the ceremony last Saturday. As I do not wish to take kudos away from the Premier, I admit that he did a good job when he struck the final blow to drive that fine spike into the large hole. Now that Broken Hill and New South Wales have had their celebration with regard to the joining of the Pacific Ocean and Indian Ocean by a rail link, I understand that there will be celebrations in Peterborough, my home town, on January 12. I have a stake in the standardization of these railway lines, because some time ago I seconded a motion in this House calling for the Commonwealth Government to expedite the construction of the line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. I remember that the motion was supported by every member. As member for the district, I ask the Premier, first, not to forget that I am the member for the district when the celebrations are to take place on January 12 and, secondly what form the celebrations will take on that day?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: How can I forget! The honourable member has been in my sights for a long time. I do not have all the details planned—

Mr. Casey: I can give them to you if you want them.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know that Standing Orders will not permit me to ask a question without formally giving notice, and even then I am not sure whether that would be the correct procedure. However, I will obtain the details for the honourable member to

ensure that his information is the same as mine. I appreciated his assistance at Broken Hill, and his presence added to the scene considerably.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Enormously!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I did not say that, I said "considerably". He was notable for the fine upstanding stance he took during the ceremony, and he was present when I laboriously hit the spike into the sleeper. I was proud that the honourable member was there to witness the ceremony, and I am proud to know that he will attend the Peterborough celebrations. I will ensure that, whatever his standing in the community when the rail link between Port Pirie and Adelaide is completed, he will receive an invitation from me, as Premier, to attend that opening.

ALDGATE CORNER

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General a further reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the question I asked recently about the dangerous corner at Aldgate?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The junction of Arkaba Road with the South-East Main Road No. 1 in Aldgate is planned for improvement during the current financial year. Work will be carried out by the District Council of Stirling with commencement expected after the Christmas period.

KONGORONG EFFLUENT

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about disposing of effluent at the Kongorong cheese factory?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Mines Department was not consulted on the construction of the drainage bore for the Southern Farmers cheese factory at Kongorong. The Health Department followed its usual practice of seeking the advice of this department before permitting the disposal of factory waste in the bore. The advice given to the Health Department was to the effect that the use of the bore for such purposes could result in pollution of both the shallow and the deep aquifers. It was also pointed out that, if the effluent could be satisfactorily treated, disposal into the bottom 87ft. of the bore could be tolerated, provided that the bore was cased to 300ft.

KIDNEY MACHINES

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to an article which appears in the *News* of November 26, under the heading "Doctor seeks kidney clinics" and which states:

Machines could save most of the 600 young Australians who die annually of kidney disease, Dr. John Stewart said today. Dr. Stewart, head of Sydney Hospital's artificial kidney unit, said all available machines in Australia were committed to the transplant programme. "Special clinics could restore these 600 to new normal lives," he said.

I refresh the Premier's memory by drawing his attention to a question I asked him last year concerning kidney machines and the reply I received on September 3 that the only six kidney machines in South Australia were all at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital renal unit. Will the Premier again ask the Chief Secretary whether there are sufficient kidney machines in South Australia to meet the present demand?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will bring the question to the notice of my colleague.

MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: It is realized that there has been a delay in installing a new toilet block planned for the Murray Bridge Primary School because of the nature of the grade of soil on which the building is to be placed and that the block had to be specially designed rather than be based on a standard design. It was expected some months ago that work would commence late this year and that the block would be ready for use early in 1970. As some problems seem to have occurred in relation to the design, will the Minister of Education obtain a progress report on this project?

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

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed that authorities of St. Mark's College have purchased what were the headquarters of the South Australian Institute of Teachers situated in Pennington Terrace, but that since then the Education Department has exchanged its old Correspondence School building for the former headquarters of the Institute of Teachers. It seems that the area of accommodation in the institute's building is less than the area available in the former Correspondence School, and that, although an acre of parking space was available at the old Correspondence School, none is available at the institute's old building. Can the Minister of Education say what has taken place concerning this matter, which seems to be a bad exchange, detrimental to the Correspondence School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not know whether the Government has been informed, but I have not been told whether the actual transaction has taken place and that St. Mark's has purchased the institute's property in Pennington Terrace. However, negotiations have been taking place, and a comprehensive report has been submitted on the institute building and its suitability for conversion. As it is a fairly lengthy report, and I do not have the particulars in my bag, I should prefer to obtain a report and let the honourable member know the details in that way.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

Mr. VIRGO: The Treasurer will recall that on numerous occasions I have raised in the House the rather vexed question of the replacement of the South Australian Railways Institute building and ancillary buildings. The Treasurer has been good enough to get me several replies but, possibly because of certain factors occurring in the intervening periods, the replies do not completely tie up with each other. Will the Treasurer therefore review the whole matter and provide me with a complete statement of the Government's intentions in relation to the whole of the project, and will he include in this statement details concerning not only the institute building proper but also the ancillary buildings, including tuition classrooms for railway employees' instruction, the Returned Servicemen's League clubroom, and other associated buildings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know why the honourable member asks me for all this detail, because the detail of it is not actually a matter coming under my jurisdiction. However, I know that much discussion has taken place between officers of the departments concerned and that a plan has been considered to implement the work to which the honourable member refers. This matter is largely in the hands of the Minister of Works, who is in control of the Public Buildings Department.

Mr. Virgo: He's not here at the moment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Exactly; I appreciate that. However, the planning and design work, and so on, is a matter for discussion between the Director of Public Buildings and the Railways Commissioner's officers. Much discussion has taken place and, although a tentative programme has been outlined, it is still being discussed. I do not know more than that or whether or not the discussions have reached a point where a decision can be made. Maybe if I refer the matter to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works,

he will be able to take the matter a stage further tomorrow. However, he has an appointment at present and has had to leave the Chamber. I will bring the question to his notice and see whether there has been sufficient progress to enable a decision to be made.

PORT PIRIE ROAD

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the proposed route of the road between Adelaide and Port Pirie via Port Broughton?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The existing road between Kulpara and Bute is substandard in regard to width, geometric alignment and strength, and at some time in the future, as traffic volumes increase, it will be necessary to undertake reconstruction. The existing alignment through the township of Bute also contains several substandard curves, which, although tolerable at present, will not be acceptable with higher traffic volumes on what is essentially a high speed rural road. Accordingly, it will be necessary also eventually to realign the road in the vicinity of the town so that through-traffic is separated from purely local traffic. Highways Department engineers have had a preliminary look at the situation, but at this stage no approvals have been given for any detailed investigations to be carried out, and there are accordingly no definite proposals under consideration. When a planning investigation commences (and this could be soon), the council may be assured that it will be made fully aware of thoughts of the department and will be given ample opportunity to present its views.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the West Lakes scheme and about the exercising of horses on the adjacent foreshore?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The western boundary of the West Lakes Development Scheme ends at the frontal dunes abutting the beach foreshore. The foreshore itself does not therefore come under the West Lakes planning regulations but remains under the control of the Woodville council. As houses are erected in the adjacent West Lakes area, however, it is possible that the residents may complain to the Woodville council about the horses being exercised along the beach, and this could eventually lead to some restrictions being placed on this activity. There is a trotting track within the West Lakes area

which operates on a monthly lease from the Marine and Harbors Department and which will ultimately be closed down once development eventuates in this vicinity.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier obtained a reply to my recent question about alterations to the Mount Gambier Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The sum of \$40,000 shown on the 1969-70 Loan Estimates relates to the estimated expenditure for commencing work during the 1969-70 financial year on providing geriatric accommodation at the Mount Gambier Hospital. Sketch plans have been completed and approved by the Director-General of Medical Services. A submission will be shortly made to the Government for approval of funds to allow the preparation of detailed contract documents.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr. HUDSON: Members on this side of the House have been puzzled by the fact that the Attorney-General now runs the House, as he controls the business on the Notice Paper and determines the order in which matters are to be debated, whereas this, in my opinion, has usually been the prerogative of the Premier. Not only has this happened but, in addition, the Attorney-General's Bills seem to have received priority in drafting and in their passage through the House. Has the Premier delegated his responsibilities in these matters to the Attorney-General? If he has, has he done so because he (the Premier) has too many departments under his control to manage and must pass on some of the work to someone else? Is the Premier aware that the Attorney-General has been doing very well on his own Bills?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased that the member for Glenelg has noticed the Attorney-General, because he is worth noticing. He is a most efficient law officer and a most valued member of Cabinet and, therefore, a valued member of this community. The Attorney-General is extremely busy and, as he handles his colleague's Bills from another place, this adds to his responsibilities. I believe the honourable member's question in itself is a commendation of the Attorney-General.

HILTON INTERSECTION

Mr. LAWN: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the Hilton Road and South Road intersection?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This intersection will be improved in conjunction with the approved Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposal for the realignment of Hilton Road to over-pass the Noarlunga Freeway. This work is programmed for construction to commence in 1974-75. The traffic signals at this intersection have been improved and up-dated, and the traffic situation is being kept under review.

MOUNT BURR RENTALS

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Housing has had some dealings in the matter of the adjustments made in rentals of Woods and Forests Department houses at Mount Burr. The circular sent around to occupants of these houses in Mount Burr, and I presume in Nangwarry, states that rents have been adjusted downwards and that the sum paid while the rent increase operated from June 2 to the time when the adjustment was made will be refunded. As this sum amounts to \$15 in some cases, and as Christmas is approaching, the tenants are anxious to obtain the money they previously paid. In the absence of the Minister of Lands, who represents the Minister of Forests, will the Minister of Housing see whether a refund can be made before Christmas?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will certainly refer the matter to my colleague and, if I can assist Father Christmas in any way, I shall be happy to do so.

LUCINDALE COTTAGES

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about railway cottages at Lucindale?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Both of the cottages referred to are required by the South Australian Railways and are at present occupied by railways staff.

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about Whyalla local government?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The evidence given to the Whyalla Local Government Inquiry Committee by Mr. A. K. Johnke was his own personal view of a situation as he believed it existed. Mr. Johnke was under the misapprehension that half registration fees were paid by residents of Whyalla.

This view was not held by other officers of the Highways Department responsible for the formulation of grant assistance to councils. An investigation of grants since 1946 has indicated that grants to Whyalla were formulated on the same basis as other grants. Quite clearly the erroneous impression held by Mr. Johninke was not necessarily held by former incumbents of the position of Commissioner of Highways. Grants for the current financial year were based on recommendations made by responsible officers in the Highways Department and were in no way altered as a result of Mr. Johninke's personal mistaken belief.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I find the reply given by the Attorney-General most unsatisfactory. He said:

An investigation of grants (that is, to the local government body in Whyalla) since 1946 has indicated that grants to Whyalla were formulated on the same basis as other grants.

This is an ambiguous sentence and I am very much dissatisfied with it. The reply continues:

Quite clearly the erroneous impression held by Mr. Johninke was not necessarily held by former incumbents of the position of Commissioner of Highways.

In other words, we do not know whether or not the former incumbents had the same opinion as that of Mr. Johninke. The reply continues:

Grants for the current financial year were based on recommendations made by responsible officers in the Highways Department and were in no way altered as a result of Mr. Johninke's personal mistaken belief.

That refers only to the current year and I regard this as a most unsatisfactory reply because officers of the Highways Department have repeatedly refused to tell the City Commission the basis of the grants made to Whyalla. If this is to be a properly open matter, satisfactory to everyone, I ask that the Minister of Roads and Transport be required to make available to Mr. Ryan and the City Commission the exact basis on which this grant has been made since the commission was formed and that the Chairman of the Commission be given access to the records of the Highways Department so that he might see whether the grants have been made on the same basis as those to other towns where full motor vehicle registration fees have been paid. I think the Attorney-General will agree that justice not only should be done but should be seen to be done and, in order to obtain proper satisfaction in this matter, the City Commission should have access to the records of the Highways Department, particularly in

view of Mr. Johninke's most firm statement that this matter has always been taken into account. He does not say that he believes it has been: he says that it has and he repeats that several times in his evidence.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Obviously, I cannot give the undertaking the honourable member requires without reference to the Minister, but I will certainly discuss the matter with him again.

BURNING-OFF

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question in explaining which I stated that the opening of the standard gauge line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill would take place shortly but, in the meantime, while diesel-electric locomotives were being converted to standard gauge, steam locomotives would be used on northern lines, with the consequent need to burn off on railway land?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: True, steam locomotives will operate as an interim measure between Port Pirie and Peterborough pending conversion of existing narrow-gauge locomotives for standard gauge operation. The steam locomotives in this service will burn fuel oil exclusively, and it has been established that the hazard arising from such operation in relation to fires on railway or adjoining land is very low. No problem is expected by Railways Department officers. The steam locomotives will cease to operate after January 12, 1970.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked about railway crossings at Ascot Park and, in the district of the member for Glenelg, at Oaklands Park?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Investigations for the provision of rail-road grade separations at Oaklands Park and Parkholme are proceeding and at present five alternative schemes are being developed. These are being examined with a view to minimizing the disturbance the embankments of the structures will cause within the areas. The Highways Department and the South Australian Railways are jointly investigating the feasibility of altering the levels of the railway tracks without the closure or deviation of the line during such a process. Commencement of the

construction work on these two over-passes has been provisionally scheduled for 1972 and, although they are of a complex nature and the departments concerned lack adequate planning staff, it is expected that this target date will be met.

GREENHILL ROAD TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. LANGLEY: Work is progressing well on the widening of Greenhill Road between Goodwood Road and Glen Osmond Road. Indeed, work is already being carried out at the intersection of King William Road and Greenhill Road and beyond. As the Glenelg tram runs parallel to the King William Road, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether traffic lights can be installed at the intersection of King William Road and Greenhill Road where the tram crosses, in a way similar to that in which lights have been installed at the intersection of South Terrace and King William Street?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. HUDSON: Reports have been received over the last few weeks of extensive mistakes being made by the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee in the allocation of wheat quotas. I have been told of people who have received double quotas and even treble quotas. In addition, many applications have been lost and all sorts of arithmetical mistakes made. Generally, the situation appears to be none other than would result from completely incompetent administration. Even though the Premier has tried to say that the Government has no responsibility at all in the matter, can he now say what the Government has done with respect to the sloppy, inefficient and incompetent administration in the allocation of wheat quotas? If nothing has been done, will he call for a report urgently, bringing it to the House no later than tomorrow?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member has made serious allegations about the advisory committee that are not substantiated. His own references, to use his own term, were "sloppy", because he did not instance any cases.

Mr. Hudson: All members know about them.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Some publicity has been given to the loss of several claims for quotas, and that is the only matter in respect of the management of the committee of which I have heard and to which the honourable

member has referred. No person has contacted me about having been allotted a quota above that which he could have expected to receive. My contacts have been from people who are disappointed that they cannot, for one reason or another, obtain a larger quota than they have obtained. Having stated that, I can say I am not personally aware that the work of the committee has been sloppy and inefficient. I believe it has had a most difficult job to do in a limited time. I am sure that if the honourable member knew the type of detail that the committee has had to consider he would be more sympathetic to it in the great job it has had to do. It is far too early to condemn the committee, because a right of appeal is provided. The type of criticism that the honourable member has voiced today serves neither the wheat industry nor the committee members in discharging their responsibility.

Mr. CASEY: I consider that the member for Glenelg was justified in asking the question. Last evening, during debate on the wheat quota legislation, the situation was amplified admirably. I suggest that the Premier read what was said then. I, like the Premier, agree that the committee has had an extremely difficult job to do but that does not explain why so many mistakes have been made. Probably, the mistakes were legitimate arithmetical ones, but they should not have occurred. The member for Glenelg was not reflecting on the wheat quota committee itself. I think he realizes that the committee has a difficult job. However, the trouble began administratively when working out the quotas under the formula. Last evening I gave instances of people writing to members on both sides because they had received a quota that was worked out incorrectly. I think that, in fairness, particularly to the hundreds of farmers in the State whose quotas have been incorrect, whether because the calculation has been done incorrectly or because they have been given two quotas or three quotas—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to debate the question. There will be opportunity for debate later this afternoon.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Premier bring down, not later than tomorrow, a report from the committee, reflecting the Government's concern about the difficulties arising from quotas already allocated and ensuring that incorrect quotas already allocated will be corrected as soon as possible?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The best way that the House can help the committee is by passing the legislation. I repeat that the committee has had a difficult job, and I am pleased that the member for Frome recognizes this, even if the member for Glenelg does not. No system is infallible and in that regard I challenge the honourable member to deny that in any large organizational work involving a grouping together of information and statistics for the first time the work has been accomplished without error. The honourable member knows that mistakes must occur, and he agrees with me when I say I suspect that any mistakes that have occurred have been legitimate and made in all honesty and sincerity. That being so, there is no point in pursuing the matter. The honourable member has expressed regret, and I think we are all concerned about a person's having received an incorrect quota, whether above or below what he should have received. We must assist as much as we can a committee that has had a most difficult job to do. It is not pleasing to have to adjudicate in this way. Where the quota is determined by automatically applying the formula, the work is easy but, where discretion must be used (as the honourable member realizes it must be in relation to drought areas) the matter becomes one of making an important decision. I compliment the committee on its work. I am sorry about any errors that may have occurred, but this type of operation must produce such errors, and I hope that the committee will be able to finish its work satisfactorily and without any great inconvenience to individuals.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: The new South-Eastern Freeway bisects the Education Department's Raywood property and an under-pass has been provided under the freeway, giving to people at Raywood and to those who visit it the opportunity to use both sections of the property. However, the freeway has split the community somewhat. Although there are not many people on the northern side of the freeway, it would be an advantage to people of the Bridgewater and neighbouring areas to be able to use the under-pass for pedestrian purposes only. It seems a pity that the under-pass can be used only by Raywood residents or visitors, although I understand that it was provided by the Highways Department mainly for this purpose. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to negotiate with the Education Department about making avail-

able a pedestrian path for people who travel between the northern and southern parts of this area, because otherwise in future these people will have to travel a long way to an under-pass or over-pass when going from one side to the other? I realize the difficulties involved in persons' travelling on Government property but I consider that the people should have the right to use such a path. I hope that in future, when private properties are divided, the Highways Department will provide under-passes similar to the one provided at Raywood so that farmers, for example, can go from one section of their land to another.

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

SOCIAL WORKERS

Mr. McKEE: Very early this session, in reply to a question I had asked about the appointment of a social worker at Port Pirie, the Minister of Social Welfare told me that other country centres had priority over Port Pirie. Can the Minister say how many social workers have been appointed to these other country centres and when the claims of Port Pirie will be considered?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will get a considered reply for the honourable member.

KINDERGARTENS

Mrs. BYRNE: On November 26, I asked a question about a section of the Local Government Act affecting the use of council-owned reserves for kindergarten purposes, and yesterday the Attorney-General, in replying, said:

The Local Government Act does not permit councils to use or lease public parks or park lands for the purpose of the erection of 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.

Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to amend the Local Government Act to extend this power to include larger areas, as mentioned in the reply?

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

RAIL PASSENGER SERVICES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Edwardstown shares my desire to see the efficiency of the South Australian Railways increased and some curtailment of the ever-increasing deficit sustained by that department. Some weeks ago, the honourable member drew the attention of the House to a survey that was being conducted by the Railways Department on evening suburban passenger services to determine whether these were being sufficiently well patronized to warrant their continuation.

Mr. Virgo: The suburban passenger services pay better than the country!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am pleased that the honourable member supports my application for information. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Railways Department has resolved the future of evening suburban passenger services and whether the department will take the unprecedented step of letting me have a reply by tomorrow?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to discuss this matter with Mr. Hill. If I am unable to obtain a reply by tomorrow, I will write the honourable member.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The section on the Railways Department in the Auditor-General's Report for 1968-69 shows that it incurred a working deficit of \$3,314,000 in providing suburban passenger services and, when debt charges are added to this figure, the losses amount to \$4,116,000. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague by what degree the working deficit of the suburban passenger services would be decreased if all metropolitan passenger services were abandoned after 6 p.m. on each week day and at weekends?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

HILTON BRIDGE

Mr. LAWN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of November 20 about the Hilton bridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This project has been approved by the Government under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan and will be implemented in conjunction with allied projects of this scheme. The work is programmed for construction to commence in 1974-75.

POINT PEARCE RESERVE

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently, I read in the press that the Point Pearce Reserve would probably be taken over by the Aboriginal

Lands Trust. If that is the case, it will be the first large-scale agricultural venture to be undertaken by the trust. Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say when the takeover is likely to occur and, if the reserve is taken over, whether fewer departmental officers will be employed there?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Aboriginal Council on the reserve has requested me to transfer the reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. This is the first step in the process set out in the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act. In my view, this is a milestone in the progress of integration of Aborigines into the community, and I know that it is generally regarded by all as a very great step forward in the process of land rights for the Aborigines. I am delighted to think that I have had some part to play in the process. However, several matters (and the honourable member has mentioned some of them) must be resolved before the transfer can take place: the questions of the precise area, and the staff and services, if any, that must be supplied by the Aboriginal Affairs Department after the transfer has taken place. All these things have to be worked out before I can make a final decision on the matter, and I expect that this process will take some months to complete. We have already started examining them: I have had informal discussions with members of the trust and with the Director of Aboriginal Affairs and I have had correspondence with the council. I have received a letter from the council making the request and the Director has been to Point Pearce to discuss the matter in detail. The whole process is in train, and we must make sure that all the details involved are taken care of before a final decision is made.

MARREE SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of November 20 about the Marree school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It gives me as much pleasure to answer this question as it gave me to tell the House about the Murray Park Teachers College because, having recently visited the remote parts of South Australia, I realize how much the children in those areas need the right kind of accommodation so that they can be provided with education. The Director of Primary Education (Mr. Dodd) visited the Marree school a fortnight ago with an architect and an engineer from the Public Buildings Department. The problem of water supply to the school has been solved and the

siting of the building in the grounds has been fixed. Resulting from this visit several important matters have been taken up with the Public Buildings Department.

The proposed new school is to be of Samcon construction, and I have specifically asked that it be air-conditioned because of the extreme climatic conditions. There have been some technical difficulties in this connection because refrigerated air-conditioning is excessively costly and an evaporative system is not a reasonable proposition, because of the salinity of available water, which would result in severe maintenance problems. A new type of cooling system known as the rock-bed regenerative system has been developed by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and it is considered very likely that it will be satisfactory at Marree. At present, it is being tested. It is hoped to have design details on the RBR system of cooling resolved in time to enable a start to be made on the school in about March or April, 1970. If this proves practicable the school should be available for occupation about August, 1970, in which case the current summer is the last in which the present buildings need to be occupied. I am delighted to give the honourable member the information because I have taken a personal interest in this school.

HILLS HORTICULTURAL ADVISER

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of November 18 about the Adelaide Hills area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that applications for the position of horticultural adviser for the hills districts in the Agriculture Department closed on December 17, and are at present being considered. The Personnel Officer of the department is at present on a visit interstate during which he will interview an interstate applicant for the vacancy. Pending an appointment to the position, essential duties are being undertaken by the Southern District Horticultural Adviser and a research officer working from Adelaide.

GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question concerning better lighting at the old Goodwood Primary School?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: An investigation has been carried out of the lighting conditions in the classrooms at the Goodwood Primary School. I am pleased to say

that approval has been given to up-grade the installations throughout all rooms as soon as practicable.

ARDROSSAN SCHOOL FIRE

Mr. FERGUSON: It was with regret that I learned from the press this morning that a fire destroyed part of the Ardrossan Area School yesterday. I have since learned that the local emergency fire service did a marvellous job in saving part of the school. Has the Minister of Education anything further to report on the matter, and will she do what she can to have replaced, without delay, the part of the school that has been destroyed?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I share the honourable member's regret about what occurred yesterday at Ardrossan. I was told yesterday that fire had completely gutted the girls craft centre. Members of the emergency fire service performed a magnificent job. I was told by the Headmaster that they were there within three minutes of the call and it was only their efforts that saved the boys craft centre, which adjoins the girls craft centre. This is the first time that a fire has occurred when children have been at school and the emergency fire drill, which was put into effect immediately, was carried out with the greatest facility. Its success was a matter of great pleasure for everyone. It will take some time to replace the building destroyed by fire. Officers of the Education Department are working on this matter already and, although I cannot say when the work will be finished, it is hoped, with the school holidays intervening, that it will be ready some time in the first term, if possible in time for the commencement of the first term in 1970.

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to improve its present policy on travelling allowances for schoolchildren for the 1970 school year?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Like many policies of the Education Department these provisions are frequently reviewed and I cannot say at this stage whether any change will be made to the policy on travelling allowances for schoolchildren, but I will call for a report.

SCHOOL BUS ACCIDENT

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Education anything further to report on the recent school bus accident about which I have already asked a question? She said earlier that the

owner of the bus (Mr. Johnson) had been driving the bus without its having first passed a mechanical test and without being authorized by the Transport Control Board. As the Minister said the board was to consider the matter at its next meeting, I now ask whether she has a further reply.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Transport Control Board, after perusing a copy of the police report concerning the accident involving a school bus, has referred the matter to the Solicitor-General regarding a possible breach of the Road and Railway Transport Act.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. JENNINGS: On November 19, I asked the Attorney-General to obtain information from the Minister of Roads and Transport on a matter regarding railway employees, but I have not yet had a reply. I do not reflect on the Minister's attitude, except in relation to the delay in replying to the question, because it referred to the Minister's giving a decision that would help engaged drivers who were shifted from main line duties because of some sort of ailment such as a heart ailment. It seems that the Railways Commissioner has found the Minister's decision to be ambiguous and, consequently, that certain employees who have been placed in this category have not been able to avail themselves of the Minister's rather generous offer, which is a shame. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether I will be able to receive a reply tomorrow?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

EUDUNDA SCHOOLS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Some months ago the Minister of Education was kind enough to visit Eudunda, and it was suggested to her that it would be desirable to split the Eudunda Area School into separate primary and high schools. To do this a new site would be needed on which to build a high school. The department has continued surveying the area to ascertain whether a high school would be feasible and land was available, and I understand that the department is investigating a site north of Eudunda. Representations have been made to me by one of the landowners with whom the department has been negotiating, and he has told me that he wishes to sell his property in order to go to another State to begin farming there and that he would like a decision on the sale of his property to the department.

Can the Minister say what plans the department has for the new high school, so that information can be given to this landholder in order to assist him?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I recall having discussed this matter with members of the school committee when I visited the Eudunda Area School some months ago with the honourable member. I do not know what stage negotiations have reached, but I will obtain a report and tell the honourable member when I have it.

GOODWOOD ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Since the rebuilding of the Keswick bridge the erection of traffic lights at the intersection of Goodwood Road and Greenhill Road has been discussed many times, and different times have been given regarding when these lights would be installed and operating. However, no finality has yet been reached between the council and the Highways Department, which has done a magnificent job in improving Goodwood Road as far as Panorama, in the District of Mitcham. As this is a busy intersection, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when these lights are expected to be installed and operating?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Local Government to one of my recent questions about the Garden Suburb?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will recall that he asked me what assessment of public opinion was to be taken within the Garden Suburb regarding amalgamation. The Government will not act unless at least 50 per cent of the rate-payers of the Garden Suburb assent to any change in administration of the suburb. It is not intended to hold any poll within the city of Mitcham, but close liaison has been and will be maintained with the corporation concerning this most important matter.

NURSES

Mrs. BYRNE: A letter I have received from a constituent states:

There are new operating theatres and expensive equipment lying idle at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for want of theatre staff. There is a waiting list of patients needing operations and, further, some new wards in the Royal Adelaide Hospital are vacant because of lack of staff.

As this is a serious matter, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to inquire into it? If the shortage of nursing staff is as serious as outlined in this letter, will the Premier ask his colleague whether the Government, through the Hospitals Department, will immediately undertake a recruiting campaign for nurses to which all possible publicity can be given, especially as young women will soon be leaving school and seeking employment and careers for the future?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

MIGRANT ACCOMMODATION

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the building of migrant flats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A letter from the Commonwealth Minister for Housing states that the answer in the short term to both the honourable member's questions (first; whether or not the plans for the flats would be submitted for approval by the appropriate councils, and, secondly, whether the Commonwealth would pay rates on the properties) is "Yes".

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General has informed me that he has a reply to the question I asked recently about long service leave in the building industry. Will he give that reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have had this reply for several weeks now.

Mr. Virgo: Why didn't you tell me?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did. I gave the honourable member my usual courteous little slip I think the week before last, and I have been waiting ever since for him to ask me to give the reply. I hope he agrees that it has been worth waiting for. It has often been contended that employees in the building industry do not become entitled to long service leave, because of the instability of the industry and the nature of the employment of building workers. While this is true of most employees, there are tradesmen in the building trades who have worked for private employers and Government departments and who have given the necessary period of continuous service to their employer to qualify for long service leave. Long service leave is an obligation placed upon employers by legislation or by industrial awards or agreements to grant extended leave to those employees who serve continuously with that employer over a long period. Long service leave encourages workers

to remain with one employer and hence promotes stability in employment. In most industries the long service leave provisions are readily applicable on the principle that it is the employer's obligation to grant such leave. However, in some industries conditions are such that, although a worker is engaged only in that industry, he cannot be continuously employed by one employer for a long period and hence become entitled to long service leave.

The stevedoring industry is the best example of that type of industry. Only waterside workers who are registered with the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority may be employed in that industry, and they must be continually available for employment as required. Until recently they were rostered for work between the various employers in the industry, depending on the requirements of the industry. In these circumstances, until new arrangements were entered into in the industry under what is known as the Woodward Scheme, waterside workers were not employed continuously by one employer for any length of time. However, a scheme was devised for the granting of long service leave to such workers on the basis of continuous service to the industry. This scheme was possible because the employees rostered to the various employers came from a common labour pool. The existence of the Stevedoring Industry Authority means that there is a controlling authority for the industry which can administer the provision of long service leave in these circumstances by means of a levy on employers in the industry.

However, the diversity and size of the building industry is such that it would not be practicable to provide a long service leave scheme on the basis of service to the industry, as is done for the stevedoring industry. There is no readily identifiable common pool of building workers, to some extent owing to the wide range of skills required for the various building occupations and the preference of the building unions for employees in the industry to be engaged on an hourly contract of hiring and so to have greater mobility than workers on a weekly contract of hiring. Also, the diversity and size of the industry reduces the possibility of setting up a controlling authority similar to that in the stevedoring industry. Although this matter has been considered in the past, it has been concluded that no feasible system can be devised. Presumably the possibility of introducing long service leave for casual employees in the building industry was

considered by the previous Government, as one of the promises made by the late Hon. Frank Walsh in his policy speech before the 1965 election was that long service leave for casual workers similar to that which applied to waterside workers would be provided.

Mr. Virgo: So we would have, if we had had the chance.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Virgo: Why didn't you just say "No", instead of giving all that waffle?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown is out of order.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Mrs. BYRNE: I have received from a school welfare club correspondence concerning religious instruction in schools asking me to bring to the Minister's attention the suggestion that the situation would be much improved if a common syllabus were decided on. Will the Minister of Education comment on this matter, saying whether the department has ever considered a common syllabus?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The question of religious instruction has been drawn out over the past year. Although I have been given a copy of the committee's report and informed that it has been set up by the Methodist and other non-conformist churches, the committee has made it clear that it has not considered the matter and therefore cannot tell me what decisions have been arrived at. I still have had no further information from that committee. In the meantime, several religious instruction schemes that apply in other States and other countries have been sent to me for my information, and I have studied them. At present, there is nothing I can do about the matter. As Minister of Education, I am carrying out my obligations under the Education Act as it applies to religious instruction, and any move must come either from the churches or from the body of public opinion.

MERRITON CROSSING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about flashing lights at the Merriton railway crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The installation of flashing light signals at the Merriton level crossing has received due consideration by the inter-departmental committee. However, priorities allocated other crossings,

based upon observable hazards, indicate that such installation is unlikely to be carried out in the immediate future. Since the erection of "stop" signs at this crossing in 1955 the safety record achieved has been quite satisfactory. Because of the proximity of the Merriton station yard to this crossing, the provision of flashing lights will require the installation of rail traffic signals as well. Subsequently, the cost of the installation will be about \$12,000. It is pointed out that, as a result of the necessary link between rail and road traffic signals, it is certain that interruption to road traffic will occur while shunting is taking place in the yard. The delays to road traffic from this cause could conceivably exceed those imposed by the observance of the existing "stop" signals.

SCHOOL CLEANERS

Mr. CASEY: The Peterborough school now has attached to it a dental clinic that has to be kept clean at all times. In fact, the dental clinic requires more cleaning than do other schoolrooms, because the floors must be washed and polished several times a week in order to maintain the standard required by dentists. I do not know whether the Minister of Education knows this, but I understand that cleaners of departmental schools earn about 21c an hour, which seems meagre pay indeed, even though it may be arrived at on a contract basis. Can the Minister obtain information about the duties of these cleaners at schools that have dental clinics and also about the duties required of cleaners in primary schools? If the Minister desires further information, I will give her a letter setting out what is happening in the matter.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The wages paid to cleaners at schools are governed by an award, and the department naturally pays the award wage. As I do not know the position regarding schools that have dental clinics, I will try to get the information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 2. Page 3491.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I do not intend to speak at length other than to make reasonable comment on the measure. There are certain differences between our legislation and that in other States. The number of members on the committee varies, the Western Australian and Tasmanian committees having three members, the Victorian committee four, and the New South

Wales committee five. All of those States, except Tasmania, have a bigger delivery of wheat than has South Australia, yet they have not considered a committee of the size of the one appointed here to be necessary to carry out the allocation of quotas. Although I consider the size of our committee unnecessarily large, I would not choose to alter the size or content of the committee, because the legislation is urgent. The present situation has arisen from a multiplicity of factors. The following table sets out the South Australian acreage and production figures, as taken from the *Chronicle* of October 3, 1969, at page 14:

Year	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Total
1960-61	2,027,008	1,581,418	907,250	4,522,676
1969-70 (intended) ..	3,581,613	1,517,120	925,955	6,024,688

Those figures show that an additional 1,500,000 acres has been sown to grain since 1960. Why has this happened? One has only to consider the sequence of seasons since that time and the increasing cost structure in rural industries to realize that the relative profitability of wheat was reasserting itself over other forms of production, such as barley, wool and meat. During 1959-60 a major drought occurred. People faced with the alternative of re-establishing themselves after the drought realized that it was much cheaper to go into cereal production than to incur the capital expense of re-establishing themselves in livestock. In all States the pattern has been an increasing tendency to grow more grain, in particular more wheat.

This has been largely the reason for the problem in Australia arising from the doubling of our production in the last eight years or nine years. Whereas we have had a reasonable outlet for surplus grain above home requirements, we are suddenly faced with a vast surplus, no markets, problems of storage, and the problems of the farmer in trying to assess how to cope with the situation. I commend the industry leaders for their action. They said that a quota must be introduced and they determined the quotas for the various States. In obtaining agreement on quotas, they achieved something important.

It is interesting that South Australia has exceeded the quota allocated five times in the last five years but, notwithstanding that, the quota is equitable and fair. Farmers who are asked whether they want quotas and whether they consider 45,000,000 bushels for South Australia to be fair and reasonable will

reply "Yes" to both questions. I believe the industry is facing up to the problem but, because of the inexperience in Australia of establishing production quotas, especially in a State such as South Australia which has such a diverse variety of cereal-growing areas, unlike the other States, it was difficult to arrive at a fair and equitable formula for distribution. Before anything could be done in the way of distributing this 45,000,000 bushels a formula had to be devised, and authority is given in this Bill for a formula to be devised. Most of the problems that have arisen subsequently have been as a result of the application of the formulae. There have been mistakes and there are anomalies, but I believe that the industry will put these right, although it cannot take any action until this legislation is passed.

I should like to see this whole matter resolved as speedily as possible. In discussions with my constituents I have told them that, in supporting the Bill, I wished to stress the necessity for quota revision to be completed before April 1, 1970, so that farmers will be advised of what their acreage potential for seeding next year is in advance of carrying out the normal activities to sow such a crop. I think it is important that a review be undertaken as expeditiously as possible to distribute fairly the quota to this State's wheatgrowers and that all misunderstanding be resolved, if possible, before the end of March, 1970, so that farmers can be given fair warning of what their prospects are for sowing wheat in the coming year.

There has already been an indication of people retrenching their production, and I believe that this will take place even further.

The *Australian Economic Review 3rd Quarter, 1969*, states:

In 1970-71, we have forecast that wheat production will fall to 400,000,000 bushels as farmers adjust to the lower returns which will make wheat less profitable relative to other possible uses of their land. . . . Thus over the next two years, we expect a substantial switch out of wheat production. While there is a wide range of rural products which are short-run alternatives to wheat, including wool and meat, we expect some switch into other grain crops.

This is one of the ways in which the problem can be solved. Except that we can control our production, that we can find new markets, or that there is a calamity elsewhere in the world that will enable us to dispose of our surpluses, there are few courses left for wheat-growers other than to find alternative forms of production. Unless they do this there is no question that, financially, their debt structure will place them in jeopardy. There is a challenge to the people who advise the farming community to consider this question as speedily as possible, to establish what other alternatives there are in the various areas of the State, and to try to help the people concerned take up alternative forms of production. It is a major tragedy that we have to hang the whole future of the rural industries on the price stability of one grain commodity. Except for sugar, and dairying to a lesser degree (both of which are specialized industries), we have no avenue of production at present that will give a stable return in an average year.

One of the things that I am most anxious to see is the appeals form that is to be issued to people who apply for special consideration. The form has been referred to by the Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers (Mr. Andrews), but I have not yet seen a form in detail. I understand that the form will require certain information that was sadly lacking in the original application forms, that is, the total arable acreage of the property and the amount of grain sown in each year, not just the last year of the five years.

Many anomalies have undoubtedly arisen as a result of not having sufficient background information on the cultural practice on the property concerned. I understand that it is also intended that certain confidential information similar to that required under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act will be required by the review committee in considering special cases to see whether there is a possibility of helping such cases. None of this is set down in the Bill.

Mr. Hudson: Has the review committee been appointed?

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is contingent on the Bill's being passed.

Mr. Hudson: Is the review committee known?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No.

Mr. Hudson: How do you know what it will require?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have been told what form the appeal form, which is to be sent to growers immediately the legislation has been put into effect, will take.

Mr. Hudson: Who will determine that?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The industry presumably. The information I have had has come from the Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers. I join with the member for Glenelg in saying that I think that we should have the information that will be taken into account. The conditions set out in clause 42 (2) are hopelessly inadequate to deal with the situation. If we want to redraft the Bill this session, we should take into account what is contained in clause 34 of the Victorian Bill, which was passed only last evening. It was introduced on October 14. Clause 34 of the Victorian Bill provides for special application in respect of absence on National Service training, for a serious reduction in wheat deliveries during any of the six seasons immediately preceding 1969-70, illness or death of a landowner, and hail or fire damage. It does not refer to insurance policies. Clause 34 (3) of the Victorian Bill provides:

Heavy financial commitment in respect of land—

- (i) in a traditional wheatgrowing area on which a developmental programme to improve or establish its wheatgrowing capacity commenced prior to the nineteenth day of March, 1969, or
- (ii) where the economic viability of the land is dependent on consistent wheat production.

This is one of the factors to be considered in Victoria. I have already suggested we should look to diversification to try to make up for what we will lose under wheat quota restrictions. Special provision is made in the Victorian Bill for instances where the economic viability of the land depends on consistent wheat production.

Mr. Hudson: That is a very good point.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is a very pertinent point. Clause 34 (b) of the Victorian Bill provides:

For an application in respect of seasons subsequent to the season 1969-1970—

Hardship due to causes not ascertainable or operative at the time of the allocation of quotas or special quotas for the season 1969-1970.

These are the special conditions to be considered by the Victorian review committee as a result of the legislation that was passed last evening, and this is one part of our Bill which I consider is inadequately described. There are many clauses setting up the machinery and the personnel of the board, but there is too little detail as to the factors to be considered when making an assessment of whether or not an appeal is fair or unjust or whether special consideration should be given to special circumstances.

My other criticism is that in this State no special quantity is set aside for special circumstances whereas the Victorian Bill specifically sets aside 3,250,000 bushels for this purpose. I understand we are supposed to have set aside five per cent. There was a 10 per cent reduction on last year's deliveries; five per cent to bring it back to quota; and then five per cent to be set aside for contingencies.

Mr. Hudson: I understood that was four per cent, not five per cent. There are so many stories floating around you don't know what to believe.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My information was that it was 5 per cent. In New South Wales they deducted 15 per cent and in Victoria they set aside a fixed quantity of 3,250,000 bushels to be put into a contingency pool and I think this is where error may have crept into the operation of this Bill: we have not set aside sufficient. Circumstances have arisen which have confused the quantity that is in this contingency reserve and, at this point of time, no-one knows precisely what quantity will be left in the contingency pool after clerical and other anomalous errors are corrected. I believe that the most important thing is to get the machinery of this Bill into operation so that it is legitimate to deliver quotas and so that quotas can be corrected and adjusted by a review committee to be set up under this Bill. Then, if there is any necessity to look at the Bill again—

Mr. Corcoran: The Bill that will operate in respect of deliveries has been passed.

Mr. NANKIVELL: That Bill permits quotas to be delivered, but it does not allow me to deliver anything unless I have a quota card in my possession.

Mr. Corcoran: What if the silos are full?

Mr. NANKIVELL: If the silos are full, that lets the whole thing down. Up to now no permission has been given for quota wheat to be received. There are still people without quotas and I question whether or not until the passing of this Bill the quotas referred to in the other Bill are legitimate: we have accepted quotas in principle, but we have not passed them in fact. If, under the review of the wheat quota system, the committee finds that that 10 per cent is not adequate to fairly adjust the wheat quotas delivered over this State, it will review the matter and, if necessary, take a further percentage from the whole so that it can provide for special circumstances and for special consideration to be given to those areas that can now fairly and honestly support the argument that the five-year sample period over which this exercise was taken was not an average five-year sample period over the recorded history of wheatgrowing in that area. In this respect I refer to the Murray Mallee. I support the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I was pleased to hear the member who has just resumed his seat say he was anxious for this legislation to be put through the House to enable the machinery to be put into operation. Opposition members have for some time asked questions about this matter, but they have not been able to get much information. I was concerned this afternoon when, in reply to the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), the Premier said that the quickest way to assist the wheatgrower was to pass the legislation quickly. I agree with that, too, but apparently this is only the catch-cry of the Premier today. The second reading of this Bill was given in the House on November 25. The usual thing is for a Bill of this type to be adjourned by a member opposite to enable him to examine it, but it was only last evening that the Government saw fit to bring the Bill before the House once again. It was not the intention of the Government to do this even as late as the time when the Notice Paper for the proceedings of the House yesterday went to press because the Bill we are now discussing is fifteenth out of 25 items; therefore, I do not think that the Government was as greatly concerned about this matter as the Premier would have the members of the

Opposition believe. If the Government was so vitally concerned about this matter, it would have been no problem for the Leader of the Government to have had this measure placed at the top of yesterday's Notice Paper.

The Government professes to look after the man on the land but, following the Premier's suggestion today that we should pass this legislation immediately, I have taken the trouble to read what happened in another place. The Bulk Handling of Grain Act Amendment Bill was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture on November 6 and was then adjourned until November 11 when the Hon. Mr. Kneebone spoke in the debate: he was the only speaker. On November 12 the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan was the only speaker; on November 13 the Hon. Mr. Hart was the only speaker; on November 18 the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was the only speaker; on November 19 the Hon. Mr. Geddes was the only speaker; and on November 20 the Hon. Mr. Whyte spoke and the Bill passed through its remaining stages. The Government wants us to think that this is an urgent measure, even though it took three sitting weeks for a Bill to pass another place. How concerned are Government members for the welfare of primary producers in this State? This is one of the most important industries not only in South Australia but in the Commonwealth, and the Premier and Government members should have ensured that this legislation should have been passed quickly. Members of the Legislative Council should have discussed this legislation during the evenings: we discussed it at midnight last evening.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will decide to come back to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I am speaking on the Bill and on the urgency of this matter, but I shall not be rushed.

Mr. Venning: The growers are waiting for their quotas.

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad to hear the champion of primary producers say that. Growers in my district and throughout South Australia are waiting for this legislation to be passed, but if the honourable member were genuine he would be the first to urge the Premier to ensure its passage through both Houses as quickly as possible. On September 22 last, the Governor of Western Australia, Sir Douglas Kendrew, was reported in the *West Australian* to have said, when opening the Royal Show, that conditions were bleak for small farmers, and that much progress had

been made in secondary industry, particularly mineral production, banking, commerce and housing. The report continues:

We can withstand shocks and bumps that even five years ago would have upset our standard of living.

I agree with that statement, but this is no consolation to small wheatgrowers in South Australia, some of whom told me last Saturday that if the quota system is passed as they think it will be, several of them will be forced off the land.

Mr. Evans: Are you going to vote against it?

Mr. HUGHES: I shall be happy to vote for the second reading, but with reservations that I will explain in Committee.

Mr. Wardle: Another half-hour speech.

Mr. HUGHES: I was hoping that the member for Murray would look after some of the primary producers in his district and speak about this measure.

Mr. Wardle: I will do just that.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member had any decency he would allow me to continue.

Mr. Wardle: You are showing appalling ignorance.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not, but the honourable member is doing that, because he is trying to make fun and politics out of an important measure that affects many primary producers. The world wheat shortage in 1967 is the basic reason for the present predicament of many young farmers. I am greatly concerned for the small farmer, who has been operating on a tight belt up to this stage and who, as a result of the quota system, now finds himself having to tighten the belt still further. On the other hand, the big wheat producer must be in an infinitely better position under the quota system as it has been formulated. With the mass production of goods, whatever they may be, the costs must naturally be less.

As I have said, I was approached over the weekend by farmers who are far from satisfied with their quotas and who claim that they will be forced off the land because their quotas are insufficient to cover their production costs. These farmers have been on their own for perhaps two or three years, having probably worked on their fathers' properties over a long period previously. With the world shortage of wheat in 1967, they could see that the opportunity existed for them to launch out on their own to try to improve their situation in life, only to find that they now have

a quota that will embarrass them. Farmers in the Lameroo area also are dissatisfied with the quotas allocated. In last Friday's *Advertiser* there appears the following article under the heading "Farmers Stop Work and Discuss Problems":

Lameroo, November 27: More than 150 wheatgrowers, in the middle of barley harvest, attended the regional conference of the United Farmers and Graziers, at Parilla.

I think every honourable member will agree that, when 150 farmers stop work in the middle of harvesting in order to attend a meeting, they have a legitimate grievance. Having been associated with farmers ever since I left school, I know how they think and act. The article continues:

Queues at the Lameroo silo have exceeded 100 vehicles during the past few days. The zone president (Mr. H. Philbey) presided at the meeting. The South Australian representative on the Australian Wheat Board (Mr. M. Saint) explained the need for quotas, and gave details of the past year's sales. He criticized over-the-border trading, and said that this could jeopardize the whole quota system and mean a lower price in future years. There had been a movement by some buyers suggesting prices from 60c to 90c.

The Chairman of the Wheat Quota Advisory Committee (Mr. E. C. Rooke) explained the full workings of the quota system. He warned of the severe penalties from frivolous appeals. Although the meeting was orderly, this aspect of his speech did not please growers.

Indeed, I should not think it would please them. This goes to show that throughout the State there is concern at the quota system and the manner in which it has been applied. This situation is worse as it applies to the small grower, because he is the one who will suffer most. It has been reported that the Victorian Oatgrowers Pool and Marketing Company Limited, through its General Manager, had arranged to dispose of a large quantity of wheat in a denatured form, but he was refused permission to do so by the Australian Wheat Board. Representations were made to the Commonwealth Minister for Trade and Industry (Mr. McEwen), asking why the Australian Wheat Board rejected the request, and Mr. McEwen gave a fairly lengthy reply and, I think, ironed out the situation fairly well. There was some justification for his saying what he said, namely:

I know something of this matter. Mr. Cooper, the Managing Director of the Victorian Oatgrowers Pool and Marketing Company Limited, telephoned me the other day and sought to see me about the proposal that he explained to me on the phone. The proposal was that he could sell a substantial quantity of denatured wheat (20,000,000

bushels was mentioned) if the Wheat Board would agree to sell it at \$1.01 a bushel. I pointed out two things to him. It was not my province to tell the Wheat Board what sales it should make and at what prices it should make sales, but Mr. Cooper seemed to be under the impression that I did not comprehend that denatured wheat could be sold outside the minimum prices of the International Grains Arrangement. I also pointed out to Mr. Cooper that I was completely familiar with this aspect right from the point when this proviso was negotiated into the International Grains Arrangement. When I questioned him about how he intended to denature the wheat, he told me that he intended to do this by mixing oats and wheat. I pointed out to him that in my opinion this would be challenged all around the world as a valid means of denaturing wheat. Anybody would merely need to run the mixture through a screen—and this would be a cheap process—for the wheat and oats to be separated out again. I said that I thought that this would never be accepted.

I think Mr. McEwen was correct. The member for Rocky River would agree this would not be the way to try to get rid of this type of wheat. Any member who has had farming experience knows that there is no problem in segregating the oats from the wheat. This was not a good way of getting rid of the additional 20,000,000 bushels. I know that the Australian Wheat Board must have been tempted to accept this offer but, in the interests of the industry, it acted correctly. Mr. McEwen continued:

One thing that Australia has to do, as every other wheat exporter has to do in the existing very difficult international circumstances of wheat marketing, is never to leave any doubt concerning its good faith in what it is doing. I pointed this out to Mr. Cooper when he pressed to see me. I said, "You go and see the Wheat Board. They are the people who are responsible for selling the wheat." I had taken the precaution some weeks before of ensuring that the members of the Australian Wheat Board knew that there was a provision within the International Grains Arrangement under which wheat could be sold outside the minimum prices if it were denatured. My understanding is that denaturing would involve not less than staining the wheat in such a manner that it could never be converted to a condition in which it would be acceptable for human consumption.

Perhaps that is one way in which we can get relief regarding this wheat problem. Wheat can be denatured by a colouring process and it is not able then to be used for human consumption. Here again, I have confidence that the Wheat Board knows what it is doing. I greatly respect the Australian Wheat Board as I also respect South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, because both these

bodies have done an excellent job in the past for the wheat industry. Although I have criticized both bodies at various times, I know that they do not mind criticism given in the right way. I believe the Wheat Board knows what it is doing with regard to denaturing wheat. A person who belongs to the Australian Labor Party advocated this very thing before the Commonwealth election. He talked to me about this privately, saying that he believed we could get rid of some wheat if the appropriate steps were taken to have it denatured by way of the colouring scheme. However, Mr. McEwen stated:

The Wheat Board is fully aware of this situation. The Wheat Board is fully aware that if it is prepared to sell wheat at a price that makes it competitive with other feed grains no doubt it can find a market for such wheat. But as to a proposal that wheat should be sold to Mr. Cooper at \$1.01 a bushel when the growers' organizations are proposing that it should be sold for feed purposes for local consumption at \$1.45, this would produce a situation quite difficult to justify, I think that this is what the Wheat Board has in its mind.

I believe the board was correct in knocking back the offer regarding the purchase of 20,000,000 bushels of wheat to be sold under these conditions. As I said earlier, it would be no problem to separate the oats from the wheat in the normal way, and then the good, clean wheat would be in the hands of these people. Mr. McEwen continued:

The highly competitive atmosphere in which wheat is being sold today is such that we would be very ill advised to rock the boat internationally. We were close to the point where the International Grains Arrangement was really destroyed. The position has been recovered.

I remember that situation well. No-one was more pleased than I was to know that the arrangements had been brought back into proper perspective again, because it would have been to the detriment of the Australian wheat industry as an exporting industry if this international arrangement had really been destroyed. Mr. McEwen continued:

The situation was that certain terms of the Arrangement relating freight to selling prices turned out to put Australia in a particularly favourable position and we were, indeed, selling more wheat to Europe than we had customarily been selling and the United States of America and Canada were finding it extremely difficult to sell. I know, because I went to the Wheat Board before I went to Washington, that the Wheat Board knows that if we tried to sustain that situation the only thing that we would achieve would be the breakdown of the International Grains Arrangement. The General Manager of the Australian Wheat Board in Washington has been reaching an

understanding on prices that will ensure the agreed objective, that is that the great sellers within the Arrangement each receive a fair share of the existing market. At the present time selling under the International Grains Arrangement is settling down very well. Canada and the United States have found it necessary to make very substantial reductions in their prices.

We all remember the great concern in this State some time ago when it was reported that the United States was breaking down these relationships. Mr. McEwen continued:

I cannot speak with exact precision but I would think that the average selling price of Australian wheat since the Washington agreement under which we have been getting our share of the market is about 5c below the Arrangement minimum. I would not like to be held with precision to that figure; I am merely saying that it is not 20c or 15c below the Arrangement price. The Arrangement is standing up pretty well and I do not think we should engage in any transaction that would seriously rock the boat.

I agree with that entirely. When Ben Chifley was Prime Minister he was a great advocate of the wheat industry. He brought to it a stabilized price that the farmer had never experienced before.

Mr. Freebairn: Would you care to comment on the New Zealand wheat deal?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know what deal the honourable member is referring to. The Australian wheatgrowers owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Chifley. The older farmers know this but the younger generation has not been told. Our young people think that these prices were always in operation, but that is not so. Every member knows that we have had a stabilized price in the wheat industry since Ben Chifley was Prime Minister. Sir Thomas Playford gave credit to Chifley for his action in this matter.

This is one of three important measures giving effect to a legal restriction on wheat deliveries by the allocation of quotas. Regarding the wheat crisis that has brought about the need for this legislation, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry said on April 30 last that quotas would be introduced during the 1969-70 harvest to regulate the delivery of wheat. He is reported as having said that he explained to the growers the problem resulting from the intake of wheat from the 1968-69 harvest. I compliment the Commonwealth Government on allocating money for the crash programme for the storage of wheat, because if that money had not been forthcoming times would have been harder for the primary producer and there would have

been storage difficulties. The Commonwealth Minister said that these problems were serious and were related to the storing and marketing of the harvest.

He also predicted another big crop in the 1969-70 harvest, and this prediction has materialized, particularly in South Australia. The Minister is also reported as having told the industry that it could not expect the Commonwealth Government to guarantee unlimited finance to the industry. He went on to say that the industry had proved that it was fully alive to the situation by agreeing that some system of quotas should be introduced for the 1969-70 season. The industry, because of lack of sales of wheat, had hardly any alternative but to accept a quota system. The Commonwealth Government indicated that it would guarantee finance to the Australian Wheat Board to enable the board to pay a first advance of \$1.10 a bushel on wheat in the 1969-70 season delivered within the quotas established and not exceeding an aggregate of 375,000,000 bushels. We all know that South Australia's share of that is 45,000,000 bushels.

The Australian Wheat Board is the only authority that can, under the law, engage in wheat marketing. The board operates through a licensed receiver, which in this State is South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The Commonwealth Minister has said that, to enable the board to meet expenses such as those for storage, handling and administration, a further sum would be made available, but the board's drawing limit with the Reserve Bank would be \$440,000,000. The Minister made plain that this limit must be observed and he was also reported as having said that the industry, through the board, was now heavily indebted to the Reserve Bank and was likely to have an overdraft of as much as \$200,000,000 when advances on the crop would be at about their peak. In other words, there may be as much as \$640,000,000 advanced to the industry in the early months of 1970.

The Minister then said that, if quotas were not implemented and if the quantity delivered to the Wheat Board exceeded 375,000,000 bushels, the first advance would have to be something less than \$1.10 a bushel. This shows that the wheat industry was under fairly heavy pressure to accept the quota system. Surely anyone who knows anything about wheat appreciates that the farmers were faced with a problem this year as a result of what had happened last year, and some earlier action should have been taken to let wheatgrowers

know that they would be operating on a quota system. They should have been given some idea of what their quotas would be.

Mr. Hurst: It's been badly handled.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know that I would say that, because I know that the committee has had an unenviable task regarding allocations. However, the Government of the day should have been more concerned about this matter. It should have seen the writing on the wall. The Government should be concerned about all industry and, although I do not want to criticize the Government if it has done something that I do not know about, any action that it took has not been brought to my notice.

Mr. Evans: Do you think the Government should have interfered more?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not saying that, but the Government should have prodded someone into doing something earlier, because several months ago the Commonwealth Minister gave a warning about what would happen. Here we are with legislation before the House, yet some farmers have already delivered their quotas. That is holding Parliament in contempt. The Premier is smiling, and I do not profess to be an authority on this matter but I am honest and I am giving the situation as I see it. I think the Premier would be the first to admit that I am justified in doing that. I have not been assured that the Government took any substantial action to get machinery operating earlier so that farmers would know the position.

The delay in announcing quotas must have resulted in enormous difficulties for many individual farmers who, because of the confusion and the late knowledge of what the quota might be, took a risk and went ahead. When all is said and done, wheat farming is a risk, because a farmer has to rely on the season being good if he wants to recoup himself. I know that some farmers went ahead and sowed wheat during the sowing period because they were willing to take the normal chance that this season would be favourable.

I know that we do not expect to achieve the earlier estimate of production for this year, because in some situations the crop is not turning out to be as good as was expected before the harvest began. Nevertheless, we still have a fairly good crop. We have been told that this season will be second only to the record season of 1968 and that the crop is estimated at 67,000,000 bushels. I heard a person speaking the other evening who said that he had talked to a

person high up in the wheat industry who was talking about 10,000,000 bushels almost as though it was a couple of bags of wheat. I do not think that such men should talk like that at functions and jump from 67,000,000 bushels down to 53,000,000 bushels. That is not good for the industry. When an estimate is given and it is then ascertained that it will not be reached, a statement should be made, but I do not think it should be done in a back-door manner.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has one minute to conclude.

Mr. HUGHES: South Australia's quota of 45,000,000 bushels was fixed on the basis of the average over five or six seasons, less 5 per cent. As a result, we have 22 000,000 bushels of over-quota wheat, much of which will have to be stored on individual farms, with the attendant risk of contamination by weevils, mice and other vermin. I have already given the Commonwealth Government credit for the sum it has made available for this crash programme and I think that interjection last evening—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): The member for Wallaroo has made some extravagant remarks in this debate. Anyone who has any detailed knowledge of the wheat industry such as you have, Mr. Speaker, would no doubt be horrified by some of the extravagant remarks he made. I regret that he saw fit to introduce Party politics into this most important debate. The claims he has made for the Chifley Labor Government are absurd, but I shall not develop that theme. This will be interesting—

The SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately, I have not been present during much of this debate, because I have been otherwise engaged in an important conference with the Speaker from Singapore. At this late stage of the session I ask members to confine themselves to the clauses of the Bill, the relevant part of which is the wheat quota. I ask members to cease indulging in matters not contained in the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that observation. In world terms, Australia is a large producer of wheat: our production last year was about 535,000 000 bushels, which was more than one-twentieth of the world's production. It is interesting to note that the annual Australian production of wheat has been increasing rapidly, and this has made this legislation necessary. Page 3

of the current issue of *The Wheat Situation* states that, in the 10 years preceding the 1958-59 season, Australia's average production was 176,656,000 bushels, and in the next five seasons it increased substantially. It is germane to the Bill that this kind of information should be laid before the House. In 1964-65, Australian production was almost twice the average of the preceding 10 years: it amounted to 368,000,000 bushels. In 1965-66, our production was 259,666,000 bushels; in 1966-67, it was 466,610,000 bushels; in 1967-68, it was 277,289,000 bushels; and in the last recorded harvest, 1968-69, it rose to the enormous total of 535,420,000 bushels.

As the Australian consumption is only a fraction of this figure, it is evident that our wheat crop must be exported if the operation of the pool is to be satisfactory. It is this enormous production that has been responsible for the legislation now before us, which is an important measure to the wheat industry of Australia. Page 13 of the publication sets out Australia's role as a major world exporter, and I am proud to know that Australia ranks third in terms of importance as a wheat exporter. In the period 1959-63, the United States of America was the biggest exporter of wheat, with 18,359,000 metric tons. Canada was next with 10,175,000 metric tons, and Australia was in third place with 5,408,000 metric tons. In the last recorded export year, the United States of America figure had increased to 20,500,000 metric tons; the Canadian figure had dropped to 8,907,000 metric tons; and the Australian figure had increased to 7,026,000 metric tons.

It is a curious economic circumstance that Australia's two major markets should be the Socialist countries of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and mainland China. I do not know whether it is a reflection on Socialist ideas of agricultural production that these two countries should have fallen so far short in their production as to be unable to supply their own people. It is interesting to observe that, since the U.S.S.R. has started to use Western-type techniques of production, it has been able to lift its domestic production to a level where not only can it feed its own people but it also has a substantial quantity for export. I will quote again from *The Wheat Situation* to indicate that country's declining role as an importer of Australian wheat. When a country ceases to be one of our major wheat clients a great strain is placed on members of the Australian Wheat Board, who have done a magnificent job, in selling wheat overseas.

On page 17, when referring to the Soviet Union, the publication states:

In 1967-68 the Soviet Union was a net exporter of wheat after a period of some years in which imports exceeded exports. The U.S.S.R. had been a net exporter in the years up to and including 1962-63. In the intervening period, 1963-64 to 1966-67, a succession of poor crops led to very large wheat deficits. Imports exceeded exports by 8,000,000 tons in 1963-64 and by 7,000,000 tons in 1965-66. However, net imports fell to 600,000 tons in 1966-67 and it is estimated that in 1967-68 exports exceeded imports by 4,000,000 tons.

Obviously, the situation in one of our former major markets has declined to the point where we cannot look toward the Soviet Union as a purchaser of Australian wheat. The other great Socialist country, mainland China, continues to be a market for Australian wheat: that country now purchases more wheat from Australia than it purchases from any other of the great exporters. An article in *The Wheat Situation*, referring to mainland China, states:

Mainland China's wheat harvest in 1968 has been estimated at 24,000,000 tons, 1,000,000 tons more than the estimate for the previous year and 12 per cent above the estimated average of 21,400,000 tons for the five years ended 1966. Exports to mainland China were an estimated 4,200,000 tons in 1967-68 (July to June) compared with 5,000,000 tons in 1966-67. Australia and France increased their exports in 1967-68—Australia supplying 57 per cent of the total—but shipments from Canada and Argentina were lower than in 1966-67.

Mainland China has taken from Australia more than half its requirements of imported wheat, and there is no doubt that, but for the market available in that country, the Australian wheat producer would have been in a much worse situation today. Australian wheat production has increased markedly in the last five years in a progressive and substantial fashion, and in this way the Australian wheatgrower is an example to the industrial sector, because he has increased his personal output more than has any other sector of the Australian economy. Perhaps our trade union friends could emulate the wheatgrower and increase the industrial sector's output as he has done. Over-production and the lack of sales has caused the need for a wheat quota restriction. I am sure that no-one likes the principle of wheat quotas.

Mr. McAnaney: Quotas are inevitable with stabilization.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I suggest that they are not: there would be no quotas if our export sales had been maintained. Wheat consumption in Australia is a small part of the

Australian gross production, but it is the lack of oversea sales that has caused a quota system to be imposed. Perhaps the member for Glenelg can give some idea of how to overcome the present crisis facing the industry. He is a knowledgeable theoretician on this subject, and I look forward to hearing his views.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not see any clause in the Bill referring to the member for Glenelg.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Quite so, Mr. Speaker. There will be, and are, difficulties associated with quotas: it is difficult for any quota committee, however zealous and conscientious it is, to be scrupulously fair to everyone. Always someone is treated harshly under a quota system and, generally, he is the person who purchased a farm in the last year or so to grow wheat, whereas the previous owner either had not been a wheatgrower or had not made wheatgrowing a major facet of his farming plan. I will now quote from a letter sent to the President of the appeals board of the quotas committee on behalf of a farmer who lives in the northern part of my district, and who bought a farm more than 12 months ago from a man who had specialized in pig raising and had grown and sold barley, not wheat. The purchaser is in a difficult position because, although he had a good harvest last year, his quota has been based on an average of the good harvest last year and almost nil for the four previous seasons. This letter, which illustrates the enormous problems that quotas can force on farmers if the quota system is applied too rigidly and without sufficient latitude, states:

In April, 1968, this bank entered into an overdraft arrangement with our customers which stipulated that annual reductions of \$2,000 were to be made for the next seven years. A budget of receipts and expenditure was compiled then, with assistance from the local farm advisory service. This budget included as a major item \$5,320 from the first advance on wheat. A comment received from our officer controlling advances at that time reads, "The budget is a very tight one and will be dependent upon continued income as stated being received. Any reduction on the figures supplied would make it well nigh impossible for debtors to cover interest, running expenses and principal reductions."

In April, 1969, when we conducted the annual reviewal with these customers, the estimates of wheat proceeds were discounted 25 per cent from eight bags an acre, the district average down to six bags an acre, in the knowledge that it seemed probable wheat quotas would be in force for the coming harvest. Comment was also made on this budget by the officer controlling advances that it was an extremely tight one and could not

afford to have reduced income below that shown, or debtors would be unable to continue farming the property and meet their commitments.

The letter sets out the farmer's budget, and continues:

I understand that our customer's wheat quota has been set at 1,440 bushels, which figure is some 2,880 bushels down on the estimates. As can be seen from the above figures the overall surplus, not allowing for any unforeseen expenses, is only \$1,350, which, if the quota as set is allowed to remain as a final decision, would place these customers with a loss of some \$1,350. This, I feel, would have the effect of causing them to declare themselves bankrupt in a short time with no likelihood of being able to sell the property, as with such a small wheat quota, no-one would be interested in its purchase . . . in an endeavour to meet their commitments—

Mr. Langley: To whom was this letter written?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As I indicated earlier, it was written by my constituent's bank manager to the President of the appeals board.

Mr. Corcoran: Who is the President, and who are members of the appeals board?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member well knows the background of this legislation. If he has not read the Bill, after speaking to it for at least an hour last evening—

Mr. Corcoran: I asked you who was the President and who comprised the appeals board?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: You, Mr. Speaker, in your wisdom, did not allow me to reply to the member for Wallaroo and, quite properly, I shall not reply to the member for Millicent.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am asking the member for Light to use his wisdom and not reply to anyone.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Thank you, Sir. The letter continues:

In an endeavour to meet their commitments they have been most frugal in their expenditure and I have never encountered any other couple who have denied themselves of a few of the pleasures in life by living on only \$50 a month. In my view these people are to be commended on their attitude and should not be further degraded by being forced into liquidation which would be inevitable should the present wheat quota as allocated be allowed to remain unaltered.

I have quoted the relevant extracts of the letter to show the position into which some farmers will be forced if the appeals committee cannot make proper allowance for such cases. This farmer, who had been on the

property for one year, had invested all his life savings in the farm as a wheatgrowing proposition. He had had only one harvest and, whereas the farmer before him in the four preceding seasons had delivered only a small quantity of wheat, his five-year average quota is based almost entirely on the proceeds of one harvest. I will have an opportunity in Committee to speak in detail on the clauses of the Bill. I regret that some members opposite have introduced politics into this debate, and I hope that the Australian Labor Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is no reason why the honourable member should do the same.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: —will be a little more co-operative regarding the wheat industry than it has been in the past.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): First, I refute completely the last statement of the member for Light, for it is a complete untruth.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It's a lie.

Mr. HUDSON: I would not say that, because that would be unparliamentary.

Mr. Freebairn: What about the rubbish that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light is out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: He does not know what he is talking about in relation to the views of the Labor Party.

Mr. Corcoran: The member for Light told me that I hadn't read the Bill, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Millicent is out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: No member can be happy about the fact that quotas have become necessary concerning wheat production. I think we can agree that the basic reason for these quotas is the combination of the effects of reduced sales from exports and of increased domestic production. In one respect I agree with the member for Light: that the major part of the trouble that we have encountered has been caused by reduced exports, and increased production in other parts of the world. I think that much more forward planning in this matter could have been done than has been done. I regard this Bill as a sad commentary on the situation that faces this State. We are being asked to legalize an arrangement which has already been in operation and which has already produced a situation where there are serious doubts whether the reserve wheat will be nearly sufficient to meet the appeals that will be made, and wheat is already being delivered into silos.

What sort of administration do we have in relation to this whole problem in South Australia, whereby this matter can be delayed for so long before it is given legislative effect? The Government says that it is not responsible because it is leaving it entirely to the wheat industry to administer. It is the Government's responsibility: any scheme that can affect the livelihood of any section of our community is the responsibility of government. For the Government to say that it is not prepared to take the responsibility in this matter is a sorry state of affairs because, as a consequence, we are being asked to approve legislation with the gun pointed at our heads, knowing full well that the scheme we are approving will mean that some farmers will be forced off their land, and knowing that sufficient has not been kept in reserve to meet all contingencies and appeals that are likely to arise.

Mr. Evans: Do you think they would have got off their land if—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I am saying that this scheme should have been before Parliament and passed by it two months ago. How can anyone give effect to the views of wheat-growers, particularly those from your district, Mr. Speaker (that growers must be assured that the contingency reserve is sufficient to see that justice can be done in the area known as the Mallee and other areas unjustly dealt with, and, if the contingency reserve is at present inadequate for this purpose, steps should be taken to make additional special quotas available for this year to the extent that no efficient farmers are forced to relinquish their farms because of financial difficulties), when the horse has already bolted? This is the appalling situation with which we are faced. That this scheme should not have been considered by Parliament before now is in my view a complete condemnation of this Government and of the Minister of Agriculture, who is the one mainly responsible for it. To produce the situation where we in Parliament are approached to ensure that the contingency reserve is adequate when we already know that it is inadequate is a shocking state of affairs.

I believe that for the Government to say that it has no responsibility in the matter, because it has left it all to the industry, is an argument that simply cannot be accepted by responsible members of this House. I have no doubt that in one way or another the Government intends to force this measure

through, and it will be forced through with various unsatisfactory features, about which we will not be able to do anything. If the Bill becomes an Act, amendments will be necessary to ensure that next year the same mistakes are not made. The amending legislation will have to be introduced not in November but before the start of the next season and harvest so that a decent scheme can be introduced and we can ensure that no farmer is forced off the land because of the way in which the quota scheme operates; that is something we cannot ensure at present, as the member for Stirling knows.

There are certain difficulties that a farmer may have faced over the last five years which are no fault of his own and which the quota committee is directed not to make any allowance for. In the case of all the farmers on Eyre Peninsula whose crop this year was destroyed by fire, unless they had insurance their deliveries to the board for next year's quota determination will be treated as nil; no allowance can be made under any special quota if they did not insure against the loss of that wheat crop by fire, because that is an insurable risk. Under the provisions of the Bill, if the crop was not insured they cannot get a special quota, because in the 1969-70 year they lost all their crop by fire.

What sort of injustice is that? I suppose we will be told by members opposite that the farmers should have insured against it. What if some of these farmers were like the farmer who was referred to in the letter read out by the member for Light and who was receiving a domestic allowance of \$50 a month? Would such farmers be in a position to insure their crops? It is only the tall poppies that are looked after in this legislation. That is the way it appears to me to be. This business that only insurable risks that are insured against shall be taken into account is the reverse of justice, because any farmer who is in difficult economic circumstances and has not been able to afford insurance is thereby penalized by this legislation. These things have to be said now although, whatever we say, this Bill will be pushed through in the form it is in at present. However, if we cannot ensure justice for this season, we must make it clear to members opposite that amending legislation has to be introduced next year that does ensure justice.

Mr. McAnaney: Then come up with something constructive.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling may care to examine the provisions of the Victorian legislation. Despite whatever else

we say about Victoria (that it is not a State but a condition), and despite what else we might say about Sir Henry Bolte and his crew, the Victorian legislation with respect to the matters that are to be taken into account regarding special quotas and on appeal leave our legislation for dead. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) referred to the provisions of the Victorian legislation. Clause 34 of that Bill provides:

(1) A special quota shall not be allocated unless the review committee is satisfied that one or more of the following grounds has been established:

(a) For an application in respect of the season 1969-1970:

1. Absence on National Service training of the landowner or partner or son causing reduced wheat production during any of the six seasons immediately preceding the season 1969-1970.
2. Serious reduction in wheat deliveries during any of the six seasons immediately preceding the season 1969-1970 due to one or more of the following abnormal circumstances—

(i) illness or death of the landowner or partner or son which adversely affected production;

(ii) hail or fire damage;

There is nothing about its being insured against. Honourable members opposite have been sold a pup by this Government. The clause continues:

(iii) localized adverse seasonal conditions resulting directly in the average of wheat deliveries in any two of the six seasons immediately preceding the season 1969-1970 being reduced below 30 per centum of the average for the other four seasons.

Although we might superficially think that this works out similarly to the formula prepared by our advisory committee, it is better because in many instances 30 per cent of the average for the other four seasons will bring in situations where the deliveries are above 50 per cent of the average for the whole six, because the average for the other four seasons which were not affected, say, by drought will be considerably higher than the average for the whole six. Without checking in detail (and I will do that before the Committee stage

is reached), it seems to me that that provision is more generous than the formula applied by our committee. Clause 34 continues:

3. Heavy financial commitment in respect of land—

(i) in a traditional wheat-growing area on which a developmental programme to improve or establish its wheat-growing capacity commenced prior to the nineteenth day of March, 1969, and

(ii) where the economic viability of the land is dependent on consistent wheat production.

What is the provision made in our Bill for people who, in the last two or three years, purchased land to develop it as a wheatgrowing area and to develop a viable wheat production unit? How are they catered for? Can they be kept going?

Mr. Casey: I think it is a survival of the fittest.

Mr. HUDSON: They will be lucky if they last, because clause 23 covers them and, for example, a "class B production unit" means a production unit from which wheat was, during the prescribed period, delivered to a licensed receiver only in respect of one or more of the last three seasons comprised in the prescribed period where, in the opinion of the advisory committee, all or portion of the land comprised in the production unit was being developed for wheat growing. In respect of a class B production unit, a grower is to get 6,000 bushels or one-half of the estimated yield, whichever is the less. If his property is capable of matching the estimated yield, he gets one-half of that as his wheat quota. However, the whole financial basis of his operation may depend on his getting a quota close to his total production. The financial basis of his operation may be completely destroyed by this provision, yet it is a hard and fast provision, for there is no appeal against it, as far as I can determine. There is no way in which that farmer can get redress from the review committee, unless I have misread the Bill. Are we to contemplate forcing someone out of wheat production altogether? A person in the Eyre District might not have a property of sufficient area or his property might not be suitable for other uses.

Some people on developmental farms have units that are viable only if all the land is used for wheat production. There are such cases on Eyre Peninsula and elsewhere, and the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) knows it. He knows that clause 23 will mean that, if the person concerned has a production unit that is viable only if he gets fairly close to a quota that covers all his production, he will be forced off the land as a result of its operation. Why should there be this additional penalty on someone who entered the industry two or three years ago?

Why is the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) a more preferred wheatgrower than someone who entered the industry two or three years ago to develop a property? What happens to people who entered the industry two or three years ago without any knowledge of the likelihood of quotas, over-production and export problems? What happens to people who purchased areas that were of a size that could be effectively used only for wheat production and who are now prevented from establishing production on their properties on a viable basis? The size of their properties may not be sufficient to enable such people effectively to diversify into other forms of agricultural or pastoral production.

Mr. Evans: What would you say about someone who purchased a property from now on?

Mr. HUDSON: Any such person should consult the honourable member to have his head read. We are talking about people who come into the category dealt with in clause 23, people who could not reasonably have known what was lying ahead and who purchased land on the reasonable expectation that they would not have the capital value of their land cut in half by an act of the industry now to be ratified by this Parliament. What sort of justice is this? It is not provided for in the Victorian legislation, so why should we mete out this sort of justice? Let us recognize, too, that even if we make the provisions in clause 23 more appropriate there is no guarantee that the committee will have enough left in reserve to do anything about these people. There should be a requirement placed on this committee that it must have a contingency reserve set aside right from the start which, in the committee's opinion, will be adequate to meet all conceivable circumstances.

Mr. McAnaney: Can you nominate the size of it?

Mr. HUDSON: I would have thought that a contingency reserve of 3,000,000 bushels was reasonable for South Australia. After all, if a mistake is made and there is too much in the contingency reserve, there is no problem in giving wheat farmers a little extra on a proportionate basis. However, if there is too little, a problem certainly occurs, and it is a problem associated with people's livelihood. I know that the Premier says it is nothing to do with the Government, that the wheat-growers can run their own affairs, and that this is their scheme. He says, "It has nothing to do with us." Of course, the Government does not take this line when it is dealing with the building industry. That industry will not even be allowed to have an advisory committee that is advisory, but the wheat industry will have an advisory committee that is clothed with administrative and quasi-judicial powers. This is different! The wheat industry can run its own affairs, but the building industry is different: it involves those terrible people in the city, those trade unions, those terrible Socialists whom the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) refers to with such venom. The member for Stirling is so filled with the desire to protect his own Party that he cannot see the wood for the trees any more. I can understand his desire to protect the Government, because it seriously needs protecting.

Mr. McAnaney interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): Order! The member for Stirling will please stop interjecting.

Mr. HUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am glad that we have such a firm hand in the Chair at present. I am sure that you will see that justice is done in this House even though it is not done on other occasions and even though the Government is not doing justice in connection with this Bill.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address himself to the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON: We have an extraordinary situation in connection with this advisory committee, because it is top-heavy; it does not even have an accountant, which it certainly needs. The best thing that could happen would be for the committee to obtain the services of the member for Stirling. I think we could trust the honourable member not to make the continual arithmetical errors that this committee has made. What is the conception of the Government? It is just getting together a

collection of men who are all too busy with other things. The committee has one representative from the Wheat Board, one from South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, and one from the Agriculture Department. The Government just hopes that the committee works.

I have no doubt that if the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) has made an appeal to the committee he has been well looked after. He was worried yesterday, but he is pleased today. I do not know the result, but I have no doubt that the tall poppy gets well looked after. The advisory committee is unwieldy, excessive in numbers and not available to give the kind of technical assistance it should give. I believe that an economist would be better than an accountant on that committee, but I also believe a lawyer should be on it because in many respects it is exercising quasi-judicial powers, is able to enter on to people's land and make recommendations about prosecutions that can affect people's livelihood.

A qualified legal practitioner should, in my opinion, be chairman of the advisory committee to ensure that these powers are not exercised arbitrarily and unjustly. The provisions dealing with the advisory committee need tightening up. While the Government may insist on the Bill being passed now in its present form, serious consideration must be given to amendments to be introduced next year to provide a workable arrangement that adequately takes into account the kind of principles that wheatgrowers want to see established and ensures that they are effectively introduced.

What has come unstuck on this occasion is that the principles that many wheatgrowers want to see established are not being taken account of. There is not enough in the contingency reserve. At the meeting at Loxton, the following resolution was adopted:

That the quota system as at present constituted should only be continued and practised for the present season and that for future years an equitable system should be devised. Work on such a system should begin immediately so that sufficient time is allowed for debate to overcome any apparent inadequacies. The great number of inadequacies and inefficiencies which have become apparent this year in the administration should be resolved immediately by whatever measures may be necessary.

I believe that resolution was adopted unanimously last Thursday night. That is a serious commentary on the situation—a half-baked measure half-heartedly prepared and introduced

into Parliament, and now to be passed without proper consideration being given to it, in the full knowledge that, even if we rectify the position by this Bill, nothing can be done at present to remedy certain problems that will arise next year.

Mr. Evans: Do you think that the majority of the industry is in favour of the Bill?

Mr. HUDSON: The majority of the industry has a gun at its head, in the same way that the Government and its back-benchers have a gun at our heads. We all know that if this Bill does not pass there will be chaos in the industry. Without this legislation there will be chaos, but we want to see not just any sort of order but a just and equitable order made out of chaos, and what cannot be produced this year, unfortunately, is a just and equitable order—

Mr. Evans: Don't you think there has been an honest attempt to achieve that?

Mr. HUDSON: I think there has been, but this Government has not participated in the process to anything like the extent to which it should have done.

Mr. Casey: It has dodged the issue.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; it has said, "The way to keep our hands clean in this matter is to say that this is the industry's responsibility. We will do what the farmers want and then, if things go wrong, we will say it is their fault and not ours." That is the attitude of the Government and of the Premier. That may be good politics but it is not justice. It is about time members on the Government side woke up to this fact and ensured that this sort of situation did not repeat itself next year.

We cannot divorce ourselves from responsibility for actions which are taken under legislation that everyone votes for, and which will cause injustice and inequity. We cannot say, "We are not responsible, because we are doing what the industry wants." Clearly, if the meetings in certain areas are any guide, the industry wants quotas, but there are many features of this system that portions of the industry do not want. I hope the Government back-benchers will tell their Premier, the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Agriculture and every other member of their Cabinet that what has happened this year is not good enough, that it is simply not proper for the Government to try to duck the responsibility for all this by saying, "You in the industry tell us what to do and we will do it, but if it goes wrong you cannot blame us." If members

of Parliament or Ministers of the Crown know that certain actions will cause trouble, they have the responsibility of ensuring that those actions are not carried out.

We on this side have no alternative but to support this Bill. I hope that certain amendments will be carried. We shall have to support the Bill whether or not the amendments are carried, but I want to see all the provisions relating to clause 24 substantially altered so that more justice and equity is achieved in the allocation of special quotas. I appreciate the fact that, even if we write in these provisions now, the quota committee may not have sufficient contingency reserve to do justice this year, but we must set a standard now that will apply next year. If we duck that responsibility, every farmer who is forced off the land as a result of this Bill can say, "I have been forced off the land as a consequence of the South Australian Parliament playing politics, avoiding political responsibility (which is a form of playing smart politics) and putting it on to someone else."

Mr. Evans: Was it to be the industry's responsibility?

Mr. HUDSON: The farmers asked for a quota scheme. Everyone wants the quota system. The question concerns the justice of that quota system. I am talking about the justice of a quota system and how to secure it. As the current arrangement has not secured justice, it must be amended.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. HUDSON: Parliament must ensure that what is done about wheat quotas is just and equitable. However, this Bill and the way in which the advisory committee has proceeded show that that is not being done. The alternatives are to agree to this Bill in some form or not to have quotas. If the gun is pointed at our heads in that way we must say that quotas, even those worked out unjustly and inequitably as they have been, are better than the chaos that would result from not having a quota system. However, the Government must accept responsibility in these matters.

The Premier has not informed himself of the position. He does not know that many wheatgrowers in various areas consider that there have been gross deficiencies and inadequacies in the operation of the system. Although mistakes have been made this year and although it may be impossible to rectify them, we must ensure that the same mistakes

are not made in the next season. The Government should give an assurance that the amending legislation next year will be introduced early in the session so that there can be proper consideration of and debate about the principles of quotas.

The wheat industry in South Australia is in a critical state and the difficulties of farmers in many rural areas will lead to a decrease of population unless adequate steps can be taken, with the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, to counteract the present trend. This State was developed on the basis that the small farmer should be given a fair go and the right to develop land, particularly agricultural land. All the main wheat areas of the State developed in the last century were developed on the basis of small holdings, consistent with the closer settlement principle that applied to the development of the State. As a consequence of that type of development, the average size of wheat farms in South Australia in terms of production is less than that in most other States and, inevitably, any system that basically provides even a percentage cut in deliveries to the Australian Wheat Board discriminates against the small man, reducing his net income much more than it reduces that of the large farmer. This quota system has been introduced in such a way that the small farmer will pay the biggest penalty in net return.

Mr. Freebairn: What do you mean by "net return"?

Mr. HUDSON: I mean net return after payment of all costs. There are some economies for the larger farm but the small farm in certain areas of the State is difficult to diversify, whereas a farmer in a relatively rich area, such as the Hills area—

Mr. Freebairn: I was thinking more of the Barossa Valley.

Mr. HUDSON: Even the honourable member may know that that area is not mainly a wheatgrowing area. My point is that the small farmer cannot spread capital and labour costs as the large farmer can. This can force many small farmers out of rural production, and this runs counter to the whole history and tradition of the development of our wheat areas. It ill behoves a South Australian Government to say, "This has nothing to do with us. We will just put through what the big poppies in the wheat industry want." That is not satisfactory, and major amendments to the Bill are needed to produce a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Opposition members have made lengthy speeches, trying to confuse the people. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) will possibly get headlines in the newspaper tomorrow and so will be misleading the people even more than he has misled them on other matters. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has said that we are delaying the Bill and the member for Glenelg has spoken about the tall poppies in the industry. However, the organizations had to call meetings to find out what the farmers wanted, and the farmers did not ask for amendments or make any suggestions.

Mr. Hudson: They did at Loxton.

Mr. McANANEY: This is all poppycock. The leaders of the industry, who are sensible people and realize that quotas must be introduced, have asked for the opportunity to find out what the growers want. It has been said that we do not need quotas but we have not been told how we can do without them. Under a stabilization scheme, which gives cost of production plus, people are keen to produce, and we must get over-production at times. Secondary industries are protected to make a profit, but they cannot go on producing as much as they like to produce. They must meet the demands of the market. The best interests of Australia are served by those who produce the things we are best able to produce in the most efficient way, and it should be our aim to help those who do that. There is now full employment in Australia, and we can be proud of this, with the exception of one State. It has been said that the Bill will force people off the land, but we cannot indefinitely go on producing something that cannot be sold on world markets.

I keep the books for a small farmer and I know the problem of farmers as a result of increases in costs. It is the increases in costs that will force wheatgrowers off their farms, not a quota system on a businesslike basis. The quotas are based on a South Australian figure of 45,000,000 bushels. Over the last 10 years the South Australian average crop has been 44,000,000 bushels, so farmers are being paid for about the same quantity as has been paid for on average over the last 10 years. The member for Glenelg says that the Bill will force farmers off the land and that it is unjust and inequitable. He cites the case of farmers who have started to develop land in the last year or two, but it is only the few fringe areas that are being developed, whereas it is the majority of the farmers, on established properties, who must be considered.

I know of a farmer just east of the river in my district who grew wheat for the first time this year on 250 acres and who will be given a quota. I object to that, but the industry says that he should have a quota, otherwise black marketing would result. Basically, it is the people who have been in the industry all along who must be looked after. The member for Millicent quoted figures for the Mannum area, but what is the position there? The county of Buccleuch, to the east of the river, in the last five years averaged 11.4 bushels an acre; for the five years before that it averaged 11.9 bushels an acre; and for the five years before that it averaged 11.6 bushels an acre, yet these people claim a special quota. In those 15 years the State average dropped from 18.5 bushels an acre to 16.7 bushels an acre. On average, therefore, these people are getting a better deal than they are entitled to; yet these are the so-called injustices one hears from people who have no knowledge of the industry.

There has been some drop in production in the county of Alford: it was 8.2 bushels an acre over the last five years; in the five years previously it was about 10 bushels an acre; in the five years before that it was 10.5 bushels an acre. So this area has dropped a little in its average production, but in the terms of the Bill many of these people, on that basis, are entitled to 20 per cent. The State average has dropped 10 per cent over this period, so on the basis of their production they are entitled to an increase of 10 per cent in the basic quota. Under the terms of the Bill most of the farmers will receive this percentage increase.

Most South Australian farmers are only small-scale farmers. I learned this 25 years ago when I was offered the presidency of the Australian Primary Producers Union Wool Committee, but I refused to take it because I considered myself only a small woolgrower; yet when I looked at the statistics, I saw that, with my 50 bales, I was in the top 3 per cent—the tall poppies. The member for Glenelg referred to the Hills area.

Mr. Hudson: I said diversified farming.

Mr. McANANEY: But the honourable member makes such statements for political purposes. In the county of Albert production was 7.4 bushels an acre over the last five years; in the previous five years it was 8.9 bushels an acre; in the five years before that it was 9.5 bushels an acre. So there has been only a small reduction in their average production. In the county of Russell production was 10.3 bushels an acre over the last five years; in the previous five years it

was 11.4 bushels an acre; in the five years before that it was 10.2 bushels an acre. As the State average has dropped 1.8 bushels an acre over this period, this area is getting more than its entitlement on a fair basis. Production in the county of Eyre was 13 bushels an acre in the last five years; 14.5 bushels an acre in the five years before that; and 14 bushels an acre in the five years before that. That is a lower reduction than the average for the State.

One can see that it would not have been possible to get a scheme that was absolutely fair, but the scheme must be as equitable as possible. Although the Bill may not cover every possible aspect, it is an honest attempt. Instead of asking us to go ahead with the Bill, the industry asked us to delay it so that it could call meetings of farmers, and 5,000 wheatgrowers (about one-half of the total number) attended in the last month and it was possible to ascertain their reactions. Their desire was to get the Bill through as quickly as possible and that there would be a board that would be able to hear any appeals. A quantity of wheat, at least 500,000 bushels or more, is held, but there will not be many people who will be able to put up a reasonable case for assistance. If, as suggested, every farm that is not viable will go out of business unless the farmer receives a larger quota, at least half of the quantity of wheat held would be used to distribute among these people. Where would that wheat come from? Obviously, it would come from the other farmers, and then some of them would not be viable. Therefore, it would be like robbing Peter to pay Paul. It seems to me that that is the basic difference between the policies of the Government and the Opposition.

The small farmer can be as efficient as the big one: if he is efficient he will be able to manage. It has been suggested that larger farms are necessary for them to be more efficient, but that is all bunkum: if the farms are bigger more labour is employed and once workmen join a union they want double time on Saturday and treble time on Sunday, and the farmer who employs them will have difficulties. The two-man farming unit is a reasonable one, and small farms, in many instances, are the most efficient and the most economical unit. As I suggested to the Commonwealth Government, the small farmer needs long-term finance at a reasonable rate of interest and, if that assistance is received and he is efficient—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling had better get back to the Bill: this is not an economic discussion.

Mr. McANANEY: I bow to your wishes, Mr. Speaker, but it has been claimed that farmers will be forced off the land because of this legislation. It will be economic conditions rather than the quota system that will force farmers off the land. The quota system cannot be blamed. When the stabilization scheme was introduced I travelled all around South Australia opposing it, but I supported orderly marketing, which with the international wheat agreement has been proved 100 per cent successful and a much better scheme than the old system of having to sell wheat quickly through merchants who would then sell it to the markets of the world. I shall not argue whether the stabilization scheme was good or bad: if such a scheme returns the cost of production people will grow a crop.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not debating wheat stabilization, because this is a quota Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I am trying to prove that quotas are necessary, because it has been claimed by Opposition members that they are not. I do not think Opposition members have brought up any particular point, except for the member for Wallaroo, who spent three-quarters of an hour speaking and I am pleased that he will not be speaking after me, because he would misquote me as he always does.

Mr. Hudson: That's what you are doing to me.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Wallaroo claimed that this Government had deliberately delayed this Bill, but I stress the point that the industry asked that the Bill be delayed so that the opinions of wheatgrowers could be obtained. They have a particular interest in this legislation and showed it by their attendance at the meetings. Two leading people in the wheat industry told me that they considered that there would be only about five per cent of wheatgrowers who would oppose the quota system. That number of people would oppose any innovation, and it is remarkable that only five per cent oppose this scheme. If that figure is accurate, and I think it is, it is a small proportion of wheatgrowers.

Possibly, about 10 per cent of the growers would oppose the system because they consider they have been unjustly treated, but they will be able to appeal to a board, the members of which are capable of analysing the position

and will do their best to cope with the present situation and try to even out the inequalities that there must be in a Bill such as this. I doubt that there will be more than 500,000 bushels of wheat that could be justifiably claimed, because there are not so many people taking up new land except perhaps those who have been sheep farming and are changing to wheatgrowing. I do not think that these people have a justified claim.

I would oppose any provision of the Bill that sought to give much assistance to people coming into the wheat industry this year, because if they had taken any interest in marketing they would have known that quotas would be introduced, until there was an equal balance between demand and supply of wheat. In the past we have tried to sell wheat and keep a supply at the end of the grain season in November down to a small quantity of 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 bushels, but under present conditions of wheat marketing in the world, at the end of the season we must retain 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 bushels of wheat so that, should a drought occur or an increase in world demand arise for wheat, we will have enough wheat on hand. A difficult situation would be created if a normal buyer of wheat had to be told that we could not supply his demand, because that buyer would look elsewhere for another market where the wheat would be available. We must have a quantity of wheat on hand so that we can meet the world's demands as they occur. It has been claimed that the Commonwealth Government is responsible for the present situation: when Opposition members use the words "Commonwealth Government" they should use "taxpayers", because when money is demanded from the Commonwealth Government that is another way of demanding money from taxpayers. Every man, woman, and child in Australia is the Commonwealth Government, and the money spent by that Government comes from taxpayers. I was at the opening of Meals on Wheels on Saturday and the leader of that organization said that the Government was a little reluctant to provide the \$2 for \$1 subsidy, and I told him that the trouble was that we had many reluctant taxpayers.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Stirling is not referring to the provisions of this Bill. He is now talking about Meals on Wheels, and that is not referred to in the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I think the point of order is well sustained. The honourable member would be better off if he got back to the Bill. The honourable member for Stirling.

Mr. McANANEY: I know that Opposition members would like me to sit down. It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government has fallen down on its job by not providing unlimited storage. However, if extra storage were provided it would have to be paid for by the wheatgrower. We cannot afford to have unlimited storage to meet circumstances that may seldom arise; years could go by where the extra storage would not be used, but depreciation of the extra storage and interest charges would be occurring. This matter must be looked at from the business point of view and not on the basis of the ivory tower arguments put forward by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I said nothing about storage. How far can the member for Stirling go in misquoting me?

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is in order in referring to storage, because the Bill relates to quotas, which have to do with storage. However, I hope the member for Stirling will get back to the specific purpose of the Bill, which is whether or not we shall have quotas.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Glenelg said there were too many members on the board and possibly, in theory, that is correct. I understand that the idea of having eight producer members was so that there would be one man to represent each area. A very learned gentleman in the wheat industry represents the Mallee on the committee.

Mr. McKee: Who is the share-farmers' representative?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Pirie is out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: The figures I have produced demonstrate that the Mallee has received a reasonable deal, except for the mistakes that may have been made. I do not think the committee asked for enough particulars to be given on the application form to enable it to determine these matters. I understand that a computer was used, and we know that computers are marvellous machines. However, these claims could have been dealt with by an adding machine in a short time. We all admit that too many mistakes have been made.

Mr. McKee: How many quotas did you get?

Mr. McANANEY: My son has received one quota for 2,780 bushels and another for 2,567 bushels. As he is an honest person he will not use them but will allow them to be used by other people. Although mistakes are made, the Bill provides for an appeal committee that can deal with these matters to the satisfaction of everyone. Possibly if there are many more mistakes of this type a bigger quota will be available for others. I do not mean that those who appear before the committee will be able to justify claims for large extensions in their quotas other than if the socialistic principle is applied of giving to everyone according to his need. In that case possibly we might start, as the member for Glenelg has suggested, by saying "This is not a viable farm; we will take some wheat out of the pool and give it to this farm." For every allocation of wheat made to someone, another farmer must suffer. If this process continues, farms that were viable in the first place will finish up no longer viable.

The wheat acreage has almost doubled in the last 10 years, and this cannot go on. Some farmers have argued that they must grow more wheat to cover their costs, but they cannot go on increasing production if the world does not want wheat. The European Common Market is making Europe independent in regard to wheat. Possibly Japan and China are the only remaining countries which are without the means of producing enough food and to which we can sell grain. We have to adjust our ideas and look at this matter from the business point of view if we are to continue in business.

Mr. Langley: Kill the small people.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member and the member for Glenelg cannot get it through their skulls that 95 per cent of farmers do not operate in a big way. The average quota is 4,000 bushels and that returns \$5,000 gross income. Many farmers operate in a smaller way than that. Of course, farmers combine wheat with other products. In most cases, small farmers are adaptable and have the facilities and manpower to change from one product to another. They love their job or they would not stay on the land. I had to decide whether to sell out and become an accountant (as I have done) and make money, or stay on the land and be happy. Apart from the question of making money, a person can be happy on the land. Provided they can make a reasonable return, most farmers are

prepared to stay on the land. However, if additional quotas are provided for one section, something must be taken away from others.

I think I have covered all the points made by members opposite, who have not contributed anything constructive at all. I repeat that I do not support people, who came into the wheat industry this year, having a quota. I do not think that is fair, because such people knew that quotas were inevitable this year. I know a big sheep farmer who put in 250 acres of crop and has a quota of 1,500 bushels. What members opposite have said would merely work against farmers.

I support the Bill, which has been introduced at the request of the industry. It has been said that the Government is not prepared to appoint trade unionists to the committee involved with the building industry. However, this Bill deals not with farm employees but with farmers, who make their own decisions. The analogy drawn by the member for Glenelg between trade unionists and members of this advisory committee is inappropriate. I reiterate that farmers will have to be paid for 45,000,000 bushels this year, which is 1,000,000 bushels more than the average for the past 10 years. Anything that forces the farmer off the land will increase costs, and the Opposition wholeheartedly supports that.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I did not think it was possible for a member to speak for so long without saying anything. I hope the member for Stirling stays in the Chamber, because I intend to refer to the constitution, principles and State platform of the Liberal and Country League.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that is relevant to the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: I am sure that I can link it with the Bill, Mr. Speaker, because it deals with agriculture.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a debate on general agriculture. We are debating only a wheat quota Bill.

Mr. McKEE: The State platform of the L.C.L. deals with co-operation between the producer and the consumer. That is what the Liberal Party sets out to achieve but, of course, it does not achieve it. The platform states:

Co-operation between producer and consumer: legislation which will enable producers to obtain a fair return for their labours.

That is exactly what we are asking for and, although it is in the Government Party's policy, the Government is acting contrary to it. No

wonder that it is not going down too well and no wonder the Country Party, to which the member for Adelaide referred yesterday—

Mr. McANANEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has what the honourable member is saying any relationship to the Bill?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Port Pirie had better get on to the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Stirling has said that there is no reason why this quota system should not be fair, but then he said that it would not suit a percentage of farmers. How many farmers will it not suit? We are concerned about those people. Doubtless, they are the small farmers. I suggest to members opposite, who are laughing and treating this as some sort of joke, that they find out from their constituents what criticism is being levelled at the Government about the quota system. If they do that they will hear adverse comments from people who have always supported them previously.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member ought to get on to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: It is hard to believe that we, in a country such as Australia, are considering legislation to restrict wheat production, when we read that half the world's population is not getting sufficient food.

Mr. McAnaney: That is not true.

Mr. McKEE: Australia is claimed to be the land of milk and honey, but the Government is restricting food production. This is how the capitalist system works: the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. If this quota system remains in operation many farmers will be put off the land by big monopoly farmers, like some members of this House, who will acquire their neighbour's property. This has been going on for years.

Mr. McAnaney: That is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stirling is not allowed to make half a dozen speeches.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Stirling said that many big pastoralists were ploughing virgin ground and planting wheat. This is happening in New South Wales and on the West Coast of South Australia. Thousands of acres usually used for grazing sheep have been sown to wheat so that the pastoralists can capitalize on the \$1.10 a bushel. I have been told that, if the right price were paid to farmers, they could do well on about 85c a bushel. These

new wheat plantings are being made by people who have been pastoralists and whose fathers before them have been pastoralists.

Mr. Venning: Have you tried—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has made his speech. If he wants to make another one, he cannot do it here.

Mr. McKEE: These new wheat plantings have caused over-production, and pastoralists have capitalized on the position in the last two seasons. I understand that in New South Wales many thousands of acres of land that had never been planted to wheat has been planted now.

Mr. McAnaney: They're cut down by this quota system.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stirling is out of order.

Mr. McKEE: These people are not entitled to participate in the quota. They are the people who have put the small man in the position that he is in under the quota system. This State, particularly the Mallee region, has had dry seasons, one being the driest on record. Until this season, we have had three bad seasons, and this is drastic in the Mallee area. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) will bear out that, when we were in Government, we spent much money to keep these people on their properties. However, the present Government will throw them off the properties.

If this Bill is passed in its present form it can result in nothing but disaster for many small farmers and share-farmers. As the member for Stirling has said, possibly only 5 per cent of the wheatgrowers will be affected adversely by this Bill, but they obtain a livelihood from their farms and have reared their families on them. Why should they be thrown off? A fairer quota system would be to give each farmer sufficient to pay his overhead and have a reasonable living wage, irrespective of whether he is a big farmer or a small farmer. The big man as well as the small man should be affected. They are all involved and should share equally in the problem. I oppose the system.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): During the past three weeks I have attended three public meetings of farmers on this matter and during that time farmers and members of the Wheat Quota Advisory Committee have reached a better understanding of the problem. If the member for Port Pirie had attended some of these meetings, he too would have a better

understanding of the overall problem and the problem on the world market. I did not find the position to be as he has stated. The Mallee, particularly the northern Mallee, is in a special category. I have heard it said that farmers are stupid to grow wheat in this area, but this is one of the traditional wheatgrowing areas of the State. It has been growing wheat for as long as has any other part of the State. There is a good reason for this and for why they should continue to crop: to maintain the stock-carrying capacity of their land. If they do not crop the country the carrying capacity falls away to almost nothing. As a result of these public meetings (one was held last week at Waikerie that was attended by about 500 farmers, and a large one was held at Loxton attended by about 500 to 600 farmers), the committee has come to recognize that there are several grave anomalies, especially in the Mallee area. Many of these farmers have visited Adelaide to have their basic formula corrected because, in many instances, the wrong formula had been applied.

As a result of the three almost drought years, the farmers qualify for the drought formula; once this is applied to them, it makes a tremendous difference. In most instances, the basic formula had been applied to them when it should not have been applied. The committee has recognized this fact and the quotas are being corrected according to the appropriate formula. The farmers realize that they must accept a wheat quota because there is no outlet for their increased production. It is important that the quotas be established on an equitable basis. Until the Bill is passed, the average farmer recognizes that it is impossible for the necessary machinery to be set up to sort out the anomalies that exist. I support the second reading.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I support the Bill, with reservations. No-one likes quotas of any kind, but if we must have them we must make the most of them in the circumstances. If we do not watch our step nature will catch up with us, as nature usually takes care of things in her own way. I remind honourable members of the old biblical saying about Joseph, who stored all the wheat from seven years of plenty and for the next seven years fed the rest of the world, because he was given a vision by God to store up in times of plenty. We have had years of plenty in Australia, but who is to say that we may not face a drought period soon? The Commonwealth quota this year was said to be about 580,000,000 bushels, although at present it has

been cut to 380,000,000 bushels. Two States are facing adverse conditions and cannot hope to fulfil their quotas, and no-one can say what damage has occurred in New South Wales as a result of recent heavy rains.

One can see that it will be difficult to work out a quota system and still provide for the years when we need wheat to carry on. I have received many letters and telephone calls as a result of the quota system. The Mallee district is not alone in this problem. After studying these problems, I believe that many farmers this year will have a bountiful harvest, although the quota system has worked out almost to their five-year average and, in many cases, they are trying to get an extra quota to get rid of their wheat. They cannot be blamed for that. A 2,000-bushel quota, which many of them have, on present-day standards would not bring them the basic wage of a city worker. Many farmers are in this category, and many of them are in my district. Most of them who are just starting off on new ground have not had much more than a 2,000-bushel quota for several years.

I commend the quota committee for the job it has done in the circumstances, as I realize that it must have been a terrific job to work out any practical system. It is difficult to try to arrive at quotas that will satisfy everyone, and that cannot be done with the 45,000,000-bushel quota that we have been allowed. Some of the quotas are so low that some farmers have said to their share-farmers "There's only enough here for me to carry on. You will have to fend for yourself." This position should be examined because in many cases the share-farmer has built up the quota for the property. Some of these owners are old men and, without the share-farmers, their quotas would not have been very high. I know of some instances where two men have share-farmed on big properties and built up big quotas but, in the last couple of years, they have started out on their own by developing land or taking up a developed farm. They have been severely treated because they have not been given a quota for the property they have built up.

Many farmers who are too old to farm their land and who have put on a share-farmer have bigger quotas than the share-farmer can meet. This problem should be seriously considered. It was suggested to me that many farmers have not grown wheat until this year. I suggest that this person should not receive a quota, because he has not been wheat farming long enough. This is another provision that

must be considered, because these people will be using quotas that should rightly belong to the small farmer who has always produced wheat. More wheat is being grown in every State: seven years ago many people did not grow wheat but, because wool prices have decreased, most of them have now turned to wheatgrowing.

The farmer who has just taken up wheat farming and the share-farmer will be the hardest hit under this legislation, but another problem has been caused because of companies in the Eastern States that grow 15,000 acres, 30,000 acres and up to 50,000 acres of wheat. What hope has the small wheat farmer of competing with this type of organization under conditions imposed by this Bill? These firms should be told to resume grazing, which was their main means of livelihood until about two or three years ago. They should not be allowed to receive the home consumption price for their wheat, and should be prevented from wheat farming, so that a farmer who has farmed wheat all his life will be able to make a reasonable living. If these large organizations are allowed to continue it will mean the end of the small farmer who has been instrumental in building up the wheat industry.

These firms have caused the present problems of over-production of wheat. Each State has the same problem, although the larger properties are situated in New South Wales, and these organizations pose the greatest problems to the wheat quota system. As far as I know these firms grow wheat on pastoral land, and this cannot be done in South Australia. If something could be done about this anomaly it would allow the true farmer a fair go. The ordinary farmer cannot return to cattle or sheep raising, because he cannot diversify his production on 2,000 or 3,000 acres, which is the normal wheat-producing area for a farm. On properties on Eyre Peninsula the biggest factor in relation to diversification is the lack of water, and this is a grave problem in many areas. Without a water supply it is impossible to carry enough livestock to obtain a sufficient income, and this is another factor preventing diversification of production. These are controversial problems and people affected by them should be considered if this quota system is to be continued.

We are reaching the position where we could have continuity of sales. Many people do not agree with me on this aspect, but unless we keep a year's supply of wheat in store we cannot have continuity of sales; however, if a

quantity of wheat is retained it is possible to retain markets. We must store wheat for the future, and about 57,000,000 bushels, or a year's supply, should be retained to allow for continuity of sales. In 1968, the Commonwealth Government held back about 50,000,000 bushels for stock-feed purposes, but by the time the Government realized that there was not going to be a drought the wheat could not be sold. Once a market is lost it becomes difficult to regain it.

It is not only the wheat farmer who is to be affected by this quota system. The local storekeepers and the local machinery firms will also be hit as hard as any wheat farmer. Many storekeepers try to help the small farmer who has financial problems until after harvest. Some farmers who have been allotted a low quota will find it difficult to meet the storekeeper's bills after harvest this year. However, the secondary industries will also suffer because, if the man on the land does not have money to spend, secondary industries are also affected. This problem is then carried down the line until it reaches the ordinary wage-earner, and then we are in real trouble. I think that we are on the verge of this situation now.

A person growing wheat cannot afford not to have some insurance on his wheat crop, because he would be foolish not to insure it. He may have to pay the premium for perhaps 20 years, but suddenly he is burnt out (as were farmers in my district a week ago) and the recompense he receives covers about 30 years of premiums. This means the difference between going under and being able to carry on. Much has been said about the wheatgrowers throughout the Commonwealth. I shall be surprised if we get 357,000,000 bushels throughout the Commonwealth on this quota system.

I have tried to find out what is the position in New South Wales since the recent rain, but no-one can give me a complete answer. Reports have come back from people who have been there and who say that things are not rosy at all, so I think there is possibly more damage in New South Wales than we are being led to believe at this stage. If some States cannot fill their quotas why should another State not be allowed to supply more wheat, so that the full quota for the Commonwealth of 357,000,000 bushels will be met and the \$1.10 payment will be circulated throughout Australia? The Minister for Primary Industry should be prepared to help

in this regard in view of the present problem throughout Australia. If the total quota is met, the guaranteed payment can be made and this money will circulate throughout Australia, and this will help the country generally.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): Although I am not from a wheatgrowing area, I support the Bill. As the effect of the quota system will rub off on other primary producers, I think I should make one or two comments. The member for Eyre's attitude is that people who normally raise cattle or sheep should not be allowed to grow wheat. However, if we find that we cannot sell the wheat we have under the quota, I wonder what will be his attitude to people who may wish to switch from wheat to sheep. Will he say that they cannot raise sheep? If the honourable member believes in this theory, he must believe that those who can grow wheat most economically should be allowed to grow wheat, those who raise sheep most economically should be allowed to raise sheep, and so on. I believe it is wrong to try to divorce one section of primary industry from another. The member for Port Pirie made a suggestion similar to that of the member for Eyre. However, I believe we should not look at the problem in this way unless we are prepared to zone the whole State and say that certain areas are for certain things. There will be a shift by some farmers (and rightly so), in areas where the climatic conditions are good enough, to raise cattle or sheep. Of course, farmers could do this now.

It has always been the trend in primary production that if one thing is not paying a farmer will shift to a thing that is paying. If we take the attitude that that practice is wrong we will bring more trouble. Supply and demand has always been a difficulty in primary production, and it is not only the wheat industry that is in trouble. Market gardeners in the Adelaide Hills have had one of the poorest seasons they can remember, but we do not hear complaints from them. I believe wheatgrowers are justified in asking for quotas, but it was not lack of Government action that caused the problem. Wheat has been a profitable product to grow and the market has been there. For this reason, some people have turned to wheatgrowing as it is a paying proposition, and they have tended to create the problem. Still, they have not asked for Government assistance other than to put through legislation that they have asked for. This legislation was discussed at a Commonwealth level and suggestions were brought back to the State executives; from the execu-

tives they went to the branches and from the branches to the growers, who agreed in the main. There is no field of industry or primary production in the State that would agree to give away 10 per cent of its normal production without some complaint. We cannot bring in formulae that will cover all aspects and care for every individual case. There have been some errors and possibly some injustices, but they will be looked at by the appeal committee justly.

The member for Glenelg has said that we should help a man who has just gone on to a farm and, up to a point, I agree. However, he cannot argue that a person who has been on a farm for 12 months needs help and that a person who goes to buy a property now and wishes to grow wheat is not entitled to a quota unless he is prepared to make that the law, and that would be the effect of the Bill. Some people will make this move thinking that they can obtain a quota. It has been suggested that the effect of the quota will be to send people off the land, but I do not think this will be the effect of the quota, but rather the effect of lost markets overseas. Our cost of production is getting so high that we just cannot compete. This country gives concessions to industry and subsidies to some forms of primary production, and it may not be far from the point reached in America where money is paid to people not to produce. It would be interesting to see people pay \$4,000 a year not to produce 400 hogs.

We know people are leaving rural areas. In 1921, 49 per cent of the population of the State lived in rural areas, whereas, in 1966, only 17 per cent lived in rural areas. I believe that percentage has probably fallen to 15 per cent by now. This has not happened in most cases because farmers have not been able to make farming pay: it has been the result of the forming of bigger units. Also, instead of having to use a horse team to do the work, a farmer can now use a tractor. Farming is much more mechanized than it was in the early days. Modern techniques are one reason that people have left the land and that bigger farms have been formed. The most popular unit is still the family farm, and that will always be the case. It has been said that some growers with quotas will not receive any more than \$2,000 a year return. I hope members realize that many dairy farmers and other small farmers in the Hills area have received no more than that for many years and have struggled through. In saying this, I

do not argue that wheat farmers should stay in that position. If we can improve their position we should do so, but let us not look at only one side of the argument.

Growers knew last March that quotas were most likely to come in. Some were honest and planted their regular acreage, but some planted above their regular acreage and that is one thing that caused concern in the Mallee area. Because of the system used there, one or two people possibly received quotas above what would have been a just quota and some received quotas below a just quota. Those errors can be rectified in the case of those whose quotas were too low but it may be impossible to change quotas that were too high. We may have to reconsider the legislation later and bring in an amended quota. I think the growers know that some quotas may have to be reduced, but they have time in which to consider going into a different field of primary production. It has been said that this Bill should have been passed about five weeks ago and, as usual, the member for Glenelg was trying to imply that someone has been delivering over-quota wheat to silos. However, the people to whom I have spoken have denied that they have done this.

What does it matter if the wheat is delivered before the legislation is passed? Everyone knows that there are problems, and the farmers have wanted to discuss the matter. We know that at Loxton a motion was passed about certain problems but most growers realize that the only way to overcome the present difficulty is to have quotas. Doubtless, quotas will affect the whole State. Land values in wheat-growing areas will drop. I would not like to be trying to sell a farm in a wheatgrowing area for the price I could have got two years ago. Council ratings will be affected also. All members know that most wheatgrowers do not want more interference from Parliament than is necessary to provide certain powers. The Government has accepted its responsibility sensibly and the industry is satisfied with the quota system and knows that the appeals committee will rectify complaints to the best of its ability.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I, like other members, represent an area that has suffered severely from drought. I am pleased that one speaker on this side has put the record straight about complaints regarding delays by the Upper House in dealing with this Bill. The member for Wallaroo would know that the Minister of Agriculture had said that the Bill

would not be hurried through until meetings had been held at strategic places throughout the State so that farmers would have the opportunity to hear opinions from officials of the committee. I think everyone in the State appreciates that these meetings have been held. It was sensible for the chairman and members of the committee to talk to wheatgrowers about the problems. That is why the legislation was not hurried. The delay was not because this Government had no interest in farmers, especially small farmers.

What the Premier has said in replying to questions is basically true and correct and, whilst there are problems in the drought areas and mathematical problems, most people are satisfied with their quotas, realizing that the quotas are based on five years of production less 10 per cent. However, this does not apply to the whole State and I hope that the committee will reconsider quotas in the area bounded by Murray Bridge in the south, Morgan in the north, the foothills in the west, and the Victorian border in the east. People in this area are at a disadvantage because two of the last five seasons have been extremely poor and one was a complete drought season. If one season was regarded as being a complete nil season throughout the whole State, as it was experienced by so many hundreds of farmers, there would have been much more equity in the formula used. It is obvious that, if a farmer had one poor year in five years and grew, say, only 500 bushels or 800 bushels, that amount would have an amazing effect on his five-year average. A man who has a nil year has virtually only a four-year average, and that reduces the average considerably. Accountants and other people managing the secretarial affairs of growers have found that, whilst it is impossible to have a formula to meet every situation, the formula applied in their clients' cases does not do justice. I hope the committee reconsiders this aspect as a result of meetings at Waikerie, Mannum, Loxton, and, probably, Parilla.

Growers in the part of the State to which I have referred consider that, whilst the quota system will bring 45,000,000 bushels into storage this year, the crop expected in South Australia is about 60,000,000 bushels to 65,000,000 bushels. This means that quotas will provide for about 70 per cent of the total wheat harvested in South Australia in 1969-70. My conclusion from studying several hundred of these quotas for the Mallee area is that the average figure the Mallee farmer will deliver under his quota is no more than 50 per cent.

One wonders how the other 20 per cent is distributed throughout the State. If there is a nil year for the farmers in this area, surely the lightest year of the five-year average for every quota could have been dropped to a nil year. This would have averaged out in a much fairer way throughout the State.

I consider that the draft legislation is adequate. I am sure that the matter of introducing quotas has been difficult and that the responsibility given to the board has been great. I am sure that it has been conscientious in discharging its duties and that it has done its utmost to bring equity to the situation. Obviously, anomalies will be specially considered by the review committee. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In the definition of "member of the advisory committee" to strike out "elected" and insert "appointed".

This is the first of a series of amendments, the purpose of which is to give the Minister power to elect a chairman of the advisory committee instead of the advisory committee's appointing one of its own members. A subsequent amendment provides that one of the members of the committee will be a lawyer with more than six years' experience in the profession. The Opposition considers that, because of the very nature of its deliberations and because of the composition of the committee, it needs something in addition to what has been provided in the Bill. Also, the chairman will be independent of the industry, and it is important that he be completely impartial. A person elected by the advisory committee could have an interest in the industry and be influenced as a result. It is generally accepted that the chairman of such a board should be independent and that the Minister should appoint him.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: This is the first of a series of amendments to alter the constitution of the committee with the idea of having an appointed chairman, probably a lawyer. I cannot see the logic of reconstituting the committee at this stage, because most of its work has already been done. Quota cards have been sent to almost every farmer. Consequently, to alter the constitution of the committee at this stage would achieve nothing.

I agree with the long-range view of the member for Millicent. I would support him next year in trying to get an independent chairman. I believe that we need a smaller committee, because it would be more efficient, although nothing can be done about that at this stage. If a new chairman is appointed and the committee is reconstituted, it can only examine the quotas; it cannot alter them. As it is too late to do anything now, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. CORCORAN: First, we should move now to put things right and not wait until next year. Secondly, I will move to add to the present number of committee members and, thirdly, everything done by the advisory committee will be accepted when this Bill is passed. For these reasons I cannot see the logic in the objections of the member for Ridley to this amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): If there were any criticism of the committee it would be that it was too large, not that it was too small. It has done most of its work for this season, and a legal practitioner would do no more than help on procedural matters at meetings. A senior officer of the Agriculture Department, who is as capable as most lawyers in procedural matters and has the advantage of many years of technical experience, is a member of the committee. This legislation has been asked for by the wheat industry, and few complaints have been received about the committee's actions. Most problems have been overcome, and I do not think we should enlarge the committee now. I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: Because of the powers of the committee and of the penalties that may be imposed, including a penalty as severe as removing a person's livelihood, the need for an independent chairman with legal experience is strong. It is necessary, as a protection for any wheatgrower who may be proceeded against as a result of an alleged offence, that this person be appointed. This is an executive committee, and perhaps if it comprised an independent chairman with legal training, someone with accountancy or economics qualifications, and representatives of the growers, it is most important, particularly at this stage would be a workable committee. I believe it of the season when legal proceedings instituted on the committee's recommendation are more likely, that the need for this independent chairman be recognized. The committee has done a big job but not a marvellous job, despite the

fact that the Minister has wanted to scratch the backs of its members. I support the amendment.

Mr. VENNING: I cannot support the amendment. Most of the work on allocating quotas has been done. Although there is certain criticism of the size of the committee, it was necessary in the early stages that all areas of the State be well represented, and I believe that has been done. Perhaps in future, now that the groundwork has been done, a smaller committee could carry on. I know mistakes have been made, but they cannot all be blamed on the committee. Mistakes were made by the clerical staff who had to process the growers' quotas according to the formula.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As the committee has already performed its work, a new chairman who is a legal man will not be able to alter what has already been done, but we can do something about this next year, when we must look at the whole question and alter this quota system. I am not satisfied that the correct formula has been used. The member for Stirling referred to production figures taken from the *Chronicle*.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think the honourable member's remarks come within the ambit of this clause.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The new chairman cannot alter that production figure. The committee has already decided to use this quota taken from the production figures. Taking production figures is wrong, because this basis must favour a farm that does not suffer from droughts.

Mr. CASEY: I agree with the member for Ridley that it does not matter what sort of committee we appoint now, because it cannot alter what has already been done. However, we have the opportunity now to deal with this matter for the future, and we do not know that a similar Bill will be introduced next year. Clause 17 sets out what the committee may do. It is an executive type of committee which can bring people before it, examine them under oath, examine audit books, and so on. Such a committee should have a legal man as chairman. All the members of the committee are farmers except the representative of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. Venning: The Wheat Board representative is not a farmer.

Mr. CASEY: Even if he is not, nine members are farmers. However, I have no quarrel with the existing committee. Most

executive committees of this type usually have a chairman appointed by the Minister. The Government has the final responsibility for ensuring that the committee operates effectively to protect all wheatgrowers. We can save time by providing now for a more efficient committee.

Mr. McANANEY: Although a person with legal knowledge may be required on the review committee, the advisory committee deals with facts and does not require such a person. The work of the advisory committee does not involve examining a grower's complete financial affairs.

Mr. HUGHES: Parliament will adjourn soon and may not meet again for six months. When a new session of Parliament begins the Address-in-Reply and Estimates debates take precedence and, if we do not make the amendment now, we will be in the same position next year as we are in now. I have no quarrel with the chairman or members of the committee, but the provisions of the Bill necessitate a man with legal knowledge being on the committee. I am sure that the industry would welcome the amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I hope that the amendment will not be pressed further. The committee, which is of an executive type, is typical of any number of committees I can think of. The criticisms that have been made against it have not been the result of its lack of legal knowledge but of other matters on which I would have thought that a lawyer could not give any special advice. The Australian Wheat Board, which does not have a lawyer, has the widest powers in the industry. The Milk Board, the Australian Meat Board and the Barley Board do not have lawyers, and they have never known the need for lawyers. When there is a review committee there is a greater need to have a lawyer. I do not think the amendment is worth pressing. This precedent has not been set before and I see no reason at this late hour when the work of the committee has, to a large extent, been completed why we should suddenly enlarge a committee with a man who probably has no knowledge of the industry.

Mr. HUDSON: I cannot understand the Minister's attitude. After all, if we do not recognize now what should be done regarding the constitution of the committee what guarantee have we that, when amendments are brought down next year, they will do what we think should be done? The Government has given no assurance on these matters or on

when legislation will be introduced. The member for Ridley has said that it is desirable to reconstitute the committee, but nothing has been said by any Minister or Government member on this matter, although in many places the Bill screams out for amendment.

There is no direct analogy between this committee and the many other boards that have been established. This board is to determine quotas, and the heaviest penalties must be provided for transgression of the law with respect to the administration of the quotas, otherwise the system will break down. If a quota system is imposed, there must be a heavy penalty on anyone who plays around with it. The advisory committee would be the initial judge of any offence committed under clause 19 and would have to take the initial steps to initiate proceedings.

Clause 19 (4) contains a substantial legal consequence that could conceivably affect a person's livelihood. That could turn on proceedings initiated by the advisory committee. Should the committee establish that a wheat-grower has not produced the full amount of his quota, who determines the short-fall? Can the member for Ridley or the Minister tell us about this? Who will determine whether or not any short-falls are being concealed and who will initiate prosecutions should this occur?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The advisory committee has the proper legal machinery and authority to carry out the provisions of the Bill, and a legal practitioner as a chairman would not alter the position.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the member for Ridley say when wheatgrowers will know whether next year will be a quota year? If it is right and proper to appoint this type of chairman, we must do it now. If it is not done now the same situation will arise next year.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: This legislation does not suit me, and I should like all wheat-growers to consider it and suggest improvements so that next year the legislation could be redrafted and reintroduced.

Mr. VENNING: The Australian Wheat-growers Federation will meet on January 6 or 7 next year to determine whether quotas will be required for the coming season, and this indicates that the industry is cognizant of the present problems.

Mr. CORCORAN: I cannot accept the assurance of the member for Rocky River and the member for Ridley that the Government will accept the recommendation and will

reintroduce the legislation next year. The Government has been silent on its attitude to this legislation and the unsuitability or otherwise of it. I intend to proceed with my amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman (teller), Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, 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 vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Common seal, meetings and quorum."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (4) to strike out "six" and insert "eight".

The provision in the clause that any six members of the advisory committee can constitute a quorum means that three members of that committee could, under the powers conferred by clause 11 (1), delegate authority and power given to the committee under the Act to any two members. In view of the possibility of this power being delegated, I believe there should be a larger quorum. If my amendment is carried and the quorum is increased from six members to eight members, at least four members will then be required to decide whether any of the powers or functions of the committee are delegated to not fewer than two members.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot accept the amendment. We have all already agreed that the committee, which comprises 11 people, is fairly large. To get to a meeting eight members out of 11 members would be extremely difficult. In the case of an outbreak of influenza, for instance, three members of the committee could easily be afflicted at the same time and not be available.

Mr. HUGHES: Although the committee consists of 11 members, important decisions can be made by only three members, and I do not think the industry would view that

favourably. If honourable members who stress the great contribution that primary industry makes to our economy are sincere, they will support the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Entry on to land."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (1) after "time" to insert "in the company of a police officer".

Both the landholder and the person inspecting should be protected when a power of the kind stated in this clause is given. A farmer may be annoyed about the actions of the advisory committee, and the person inspecting may need protection. I do not think the board will use this power of inspection frequently, but it is desirable that a police officer be present for protection and as a witness.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Although the amendment may be desirable, it is not practicable. When the police station at Alawoona is closed, there will be no police officer in the 70 miles between Karoonda and Loxton.

Mr. Casey: It isn't necessary to get a local police officer. There's no reason why he couldn't travel with the person inspecting.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I could not support the amendment. There would be no police officer for hundreds of miles in the Frome District and on the West Coast.

Mr. GILES: The amendment is not practicable. A person inspecting a property could be hindered in his work if a police officer accompanied him, because the police officer's presence would immediately upset the landholder. A police officer could be called in if an incident arose during an inspection. Also, the Police Force is already overworked.

Mr. HUGHES: Members opposite underestimate the Police Department when they say the amendment is not practicable. The Police Commissioner is most co-operative when he is asked to allocate an officer for special duty. Further, the amendment does not provide that the police officer must come from the locality. I do not think the Police Department would be called on often, because I do not think many farmers would deliberately set out to aggravate a member of the committee. Surely a property holder would be informed of the committee member's visit. Every farmer will familiarize himself with this vital legislation. I do not think that any farmer would become frustrated or fearful

because of the presence of a police officer, although this could happen if he had not been informed of the committee member's visit. It would be satisfactory to both parties if a police officer were in attendance.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think members of the Opposition have much idea of what farmers are like. I am sure that if a farmer were informed of the visit he would be there to receive the committee member and it would be unnecessary for a police officer to be present. A police officer in my area could not be expected to do this, because officers there are fully occupied now. If a police officer were taken from Adelaide to the other side of Ceduna, it would be an unnecessary expense.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot accept the amendment, which will make the committee's and the Police Force's work more difficult. Everyone has read that the Commissioner of Police has complained from time to time about the number of duties his officers must perform apart from crime detection and apprehending people who have committed crimes. It would hamper the force to have to do this routine work. Over and over again Parliament has not, where powers of entry are given, provided that police officers must accompany the person who has power to enter, so why should it be done here? It will add to costs and not achieve anything. The sparsely distributed country police stations will be overtaxed, and it is impracticable to talk of taking police officers from Adelaide to the vast wheat areas to make it possible for a member of the committee to enter a property.

Mr. HUDSON: Regarding the rights of entry provided in the Statutes Amendment (Waterworks and Sewerage) Bill debated in 1966, the Hon. G. G. Pearson said:

I do not know what the Minister has in mind, but there is always a public reaction against entering and inspecting; there is always public disquiet when an officer of the department is clothed with the right to enter . . .

Mr. Quirke and Sir Thomas Playford made similar points, as did that erstwhile gentleman the previous occupant of the seat of Rocky River. As a result, the Minister introduced an amendment to try to meet the Opposition's objections. In this case, we are dealing with farmers, and they do not have the same worries about people entering on to their properties: they are peaceful gentlemen! The member for Whyalla could tell us about certain things that happened in the 1930's in relation to the friendly farmers and how at that time they regarded the actions the Government had

taken against them. The need to enter a property will not arise often but where it does the rights of individual property owners must be protected (and it is important that they should be) and any member of the advisory committee, or a person acting on its behalf, if allowed rights of entry, must not misuse them to the detriment of the individual wheat-grower.

Mr. HUGHES: It seems that the Minister of Lands is expecting trouble, because he says it would be an unnecessary expense for a police officer to accompany a member of the advisory committee, or a person appointed by it, throughout the wheat belt of this State. There could be trouble where a young farmer was being forced, because of the wheat quota system, to relinquish his property and, also, there could be over-officious officers, too.

Mr. EDWARDS: Members of advisory committees reside in every district now, and they are well known. Why do they need a policeman? I cannot see any reason for this amendment. I have faith in the farmers, in my district anyway. These advisory committee members will be going on to properties only if they have to do so, and there will be no problem in this regard. They would be going on to properties only to help the farmer concerned, not to hinder him. I can see no necessity for overloading the industry any further by having a policeman at the beck and call of the advisory committee.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman (teller), Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, 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 vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 19—"Application for a wheat delivery quota."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (4) after "effect" to insert "but the provisions of this subsection shall not prevent such a person from making a new

application to the advisory committee and, notwithstanding anything in section 21 of this Act, the advisory committee shall deal with that application in accordance with this Act".

As I understand it, the clause means that a person who may have inadvertently made an omission or error in his application could be denied a quota for the current season. As well as being fined a maximum of \$100, his livelihood could suffer in that season.

Mr. Hudson: It's a double penalty.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, and I do not believe that that it is a reasonable penalty. The amendment will allow a person to make a fresh application so that he would possibly not be denied a quota for the season in question. I ask the Committee to provide that the person concerned will at least have the opportunity to produce the quota of wheat to which he would be entitled under a new application.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I think this amendment is worth while and will improve the Act, I am happy to accept it. I agree with what the Deputy Leader says about the effect of a conviction and its amounting to a double penalty.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does this clause deal with share-farmers? If it does, I should like to include something to cover them. If it does not, I should like to move an amendment to protect the interests of the share-farmer.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The point made by the member for Eyre has no relation to this clause or to the amendment moved by the member for Millicent.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know what the member for Eyre desires other than that he wishes to provide for share-farmers, and I suggest that the honourable member consult the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman about the matter.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 20 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—"Calculation of the basic quota."

Mr. HUDSON: The provisions in this clause relating to growers who have not had deliveries throughout the previous five seasons prior to the current quota season are savage. Obviously these quotas have already been determined. So little has been left by way of contingency reserve that it is doubtful whether someone who falls within these categories can be adequately taken care of. In the case of someone who has come into the industry over the last two or three years or of

a traditional wheatgrower who has purchased land and has developed it only for the purpose of wheat over the last two or three years, depending on what category he comes into, he gets one-half of the estimated yield, and he cannot get above that. It is difficult to see why a grower who entered the industry two years ago should be penalized in this way. He is being penalized not only through his being unable to dispose of part of his wheat but also through a reduction in the capital value of his production unit. What justification is there for imposing this harsh disability?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The application of the quota system will undoubtedly provide difficulties for many growers. The quotas could have been set on a very much lower basis, and much more wheat could have been left for allocation under special quotas. However, that would have been a hardship for the long-standing grower, because it would have reduced his quota. The line must be drawn somewhere. This has been argued over and over again throughout the State, and it has been generally accepted. The provisions in this Bill in respect of class A, B, and C production units are specifically designed to help those people who have not been in the industry for many years.

I cannot say that there is a right or a wrong method that is beyond dispute. Obviously, this is a matter of opinion and judgment. I stress that this Bill has been designed by wheatgrowers and in conference with the various Ministers of Agriculture. Our own Minister has spent very much time on this matter. Our Minister, who is experienced in bringing together differing opinions in an industry, has told me that this scheme is accepted generally in the State. Figures may be disputed, but a line must be drawn somewhere and I accept the advice of the industry.

Mr. CASEY: I, too, accept the committee's advice, because at this stage we do not know how many farmers produce a certain quantity of wheat or how long farmers have been in the industry. Subsection (3) defines a class A unit as one from which wheat has been delivered for the first time this year. This provision could create dissent in the farming community. I and members opposite know one property on which wheat had never been grown until this year, when 2,000 acres was sown. A quota of 4,000 bushels was allocated to that property, because one-third of the production would have been the equivalent of

more than 4,000 bushels. In reply to my question about the number of persons growing wheat for the first time this year to whom quotas had been issued, the Minister stated:

The Secretary of the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee has provided the following answer to the honourable member's question:

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

I find it difficult to understand how the committee can justify the quota allocation to the property I have mentioned. If the committee gives me a report, I shall be satisfied with that. When we open the gate to a class A unit, as we have in this Bill, we shall cause dissension among traditional farmers, and they are the people we are trying to protect.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am sure there are places where a class A production unit would justify a quota. If the honourable member will give me details of the place he has in mind, where he thinks that some injustice has been done or the advisory committee has been too indulgent, I will have it investigated.

Mr. HUDSON: It is not proper to discriminate excessively against someone who has come into the wheat industry in the last two or three years when the quotas and difficulties we are now facing could not have been foretold. Any production unit has, with normal average yields, a break-even point. For example, one might assess a production unit the owner of which would need to be able to sell 70 per cent of his normal production to cover costs. If that farmer has a quota less than 70 per cent of the normal average yield from that land, he will make a loss. If that land continues to carry that kind of quota, its capital value will deteriorate significantly. A farmer is in this position only because he has come into the industry in the last two or three years. It is not just that he be treated differently from those who have been in the industry for a long time. Will the Government ensure that a full investigation is made of all people whose farms come into the categories of classes A, B, and C, to ascertain the effects of this clause as applied to this season? If that investigation shows that a person has been harshly treated, will the Government ensure that the provisions are relaxed for the next quota season?

Mr. McANANEY: New farmers are allowed a quota above the average, so that I do not think they should complain. In the last two years, because there has been a large increase in acreage sown, a new farmer has an advantage over a farmer who has been in the industry for many years. I asked a question on November 4 that required a reply from the advisory committee, but I have not received one yet. If we are to legislate in order to assist wheatgrowers we must have co-operation. If the people concerned had done their jobs properly, they could have got the details out in five minutes. They must show that they are capable of running their industry.

Mr. Casey: Otherwise, we will have to replace them?

Mr. McANANEY: I believe in grower control. However, primary producers must co-operate with Parliament and give us the information for which we ask, so that we can make our own judgment in these matters. We cannot get a perfect system, and there will inevitably be some inequality. The people concerned are all practical farmers and, in actually determining quotas, I should think they had done a 100 per cent job although, had there been an accountant on the committee, they possibly would not have made any mistakes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be happy to tell the Minister of Agriculture that members of the committee raised the matter of farmers who had recently come into the industry and said they were concerned to see that these farmers got a fair go. I will ask him whether he will discuss this matter with the advisory committee. Following what he says, I shall be able to give replies to the honourable members concerned.

Mr. HUDSON: If the member for Stirling cares to take the example of someone in a class B production unit under para (c), whose estimated yield from his farm is the average for the whole State of 4,000 bushels, then this particular wheatgrower who has been in the industry for only two or three years is entitled to have a quota of one-half of his estimated yield, and he can obtain 2,000 bushels. The gross return on 4,000 bushels is not great, as the member for Stirling appreciates. If he is just going to be on the balance of viability with 4,000 bushels, he is certainly not going to be on it with 2,000 bushels. This is not equitable. The canvas blind manufacturers of Melbourne decided to form an association, and they were able to cover all the suppliers of the necessary canvas and therefore monopolize the situation. The initial members of

the association, who were the good boys, were granted an admission fee of \$10, but once they got in the association jacked up the entrance fee to \$1,000 and later to \$4,000. This was a restrictive practice designed to protect the position of those who were established in the industry, as against the newcomer. With respect to the development of new areas in wheatgrowing areas, the provisions in this clause are tougher than the provisions in Victoria. These are the toughest provisions in Australia. I think the Government has a duty to see to it that people who entered the industry a few years ago receive a reasonable go and are not forced into an unprofitable position and ultimately to take a large capital loss.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister of Lands has agreed to ask the Minister of Agriculture to place some matters before the advisory committee. The whole basis of this plan is worked on a production delivery basis, and the quota works out on the basis of five years. If a grower suffers drought in three years and is 50 per cent below the quota in the remaining two years he is increased by 60 per cent. In some cases (and we are getting a fair number) there may be a fellow who does not qualify, for if he is below the 50 per cent he gets no adjustment at all of the 60 per cent.

Mr. HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with the calculation of the basic quota and not of the special quota. This relates to the determination of the prescribed percentage of the various categories A, B and C. The case the member for Ridley is dealing with does not come under this clause.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It comes under clause 24, but the point is that the calculation must be dealt with. These borderline cases should be considered in the calculation of the quota. Where farmers have had three adverse seasons and fall below 50 per cent they get an increased adjustment. However, where a farmer has had adverse seasons and just falls below 50 per cent he gets no adjustment at all. This is unfair to some farmers. Others may have had a lucky thunderstorm or benefited from a crop rotation, as a result of which the land in that year grew a little more grain. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture to have the advisory committee look at borderline cases in relation to the calculation of quotas?

Clause passed.

Clause 24—"Fixing of special quotas."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (1) (a) (iii) to strike out "that was insured against".

Many people are not insured because they cannot afford the cost involved. People who are struggling along in a small way with other commitments may take a risk because they cannot afford to insure; they hope against hope that no natural disaster will occur. A perfect example is the bush fire that occurred in the Eyre District a fortnight ago. People who were affected by that bush fire and who had not insured against fire would not be entitled to a special quota. I do not believe that this is reasonable. Whilst it is wise for people to insure against any contingency if they can afford to do so, it is not always possible; perhaps they have a different order of priorities from that of some farmers. If a person cannot afford to insure against any contingency and if something happens to his crop, this should be taken into account when fixing the special quotas.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. I point out that we are dealing only with special quotas. There is no way in which the committee can establish the value of a farmer's loss if there is no insured value. The honourable member is perfectly correct in saying that some people do not insure, but I think everyone agrees that they would be wise to insure. I think it is reasonable for the committee to say, "You can take a risk and not insure, but you must remember that farmers' losses are considered only if they are insured." There is nothing very harsh about this provision. The difficulties that the advisory committee would face if it did not have this guide would be enormous. We are being perfectly reasonable if we say to farmers, "If you like to insure, any losses will be considered when we deal with special quotas."

Mr. CASEY: I support the amendment for two reasons. First, I do not want to see farmers in this State compelled to insure their crops, and this is the effect of the clause. Any farmer who wants to protect himself will be compelled to insure. We should not require compulsory insurance of wheat crops. The committee has indicated, through the formula, that it will accept the average for the hundred in working out some quotas. I do not think this is a good method, because in South Australia hundreds can vary greatly from north to south and from east to west. However, what is to prevent the committee from applying the same principle when an uninsured crop is

destroyed by fire? A farmer could submit a fictitious figure to the committee, and the committee has my sympathy regarding the problems, but we should consider the farmer and not compel him to insure his crop. Many farmers would be embarrassed financially by having to insure each year. Other States have not included this provision in their legislation. It is not provided in Victoria.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: How do they calculate it in Victoria?

Mr. CASEY: There is no provision in the Victorian Act stating that the crop will be considered only if it has been insured. If the committee applies this formula, a farmer who loses a crop that is insured may be at a loss, because he may be in a better part of a hundred. No doubt the committee would have considered this matter carefully. The committee was cagey about how it could be implemented. Victoria saw nothing wrong with it. Are we trying to protect the farmer or the insurance company? We are trying to do something for the farmer who is genuinely interested in producing a crop and who for some reason or other (perhaps he left it to his son to see to the insurance and he forgot) failed to insure his crop. That can be done so easily. I doubt whether there is an enormous amount of wheat so affected in South Australia. In Victoria and New South Wales they are very susceptible to crop losses, more so than we are in South Australia, yet this sort of provision is not included in their legislation. We are being too cautious here about giving the farmer the benefit of the doubt. We should help him.

Mr. HUDSON: I draw attention to clause 24 (1) (b) (i): a farmer can get a special quota if, in the opinion of the committee, there was a diminution in the production of wheat from a production unit because of a matter that—

was not within the control of the person for the time being responsible for the production of wheat from the production unit during the prescribed period.

I have been told that that covers the case of a farmer's son being on National Service and the wheat production from that farm being diminished because of that. How would the advisory committee determine a special quota in that case? It would have to make an estimate—and a reasonable estimate can be made. It can compare what was produced on that production unit with what was produced from other farms both before and after the son went on National Service.

In the case of the recent fire on Eyre Peninsula, some farmers had insured their crops and others had not. The fact that insurance was taken out in some cases would be a guide to measuring the loss in cases where there was no insurance. A man not insured loses his crop: why impose an additional penalty on him? He will get his basic quota next year and he does not get a special quota, so a double penalty is imposed. In cases of a special contingency arising, there may be difficulty in accurately measuring the crop, but it is not true to say that, because there are such difficulties, a reasonable estimate cannot be made of the diminution in the wheat produced. In other circumstances the Bill requires the committee to make an estimate. We should not impose a special penalty on farmers who cannot afford to take out insurance.

Mr. Venning: It is a taxation deduction.

Mr. HUDSON: In the taxation deduction system there is a bias in favour of the man on the higher income, and many farmers whose deductions are sufficient for taxation purposes do not pay tax, but, in many cases, the additional insurance taken out by a farmer does not get him any tax benefit. As the member for Light said this afternoon, some people live on \$50 a month and would be unable to take out insurance.

Mr. Venning: They couldn't afford not to.

Mr. HUDSON: It seems that the honourable member thinks that people living on this subsistence level should take out insurance and live below this level. I have not heard anything so pathetic or lacking in human understanding, appreciation, and sympathy. Although this amendment may mean certain difficulties in calculation, the committee can still make a reasonable estimate of the diminution of production, so that the amendment should be supported by all Government members who claim to have any sympathy for wheatgrowers.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not subscribe to the heat that is being engendered in this debate. Everyone knows that the committee has to make as accurate an estimate as possible and, only in cases where it cannot do better, does it have such approximations as have been cited. Obviously, one feature of the special quota system will be claims such as this. It seems to be only reasonable for the committee to say that people should insure their crops. Some honourable members may not be aware that insurance on crops is taken

into account in the cost of production calculation under the wheat stabilization legislation. In those circumstances, is there any reason why people should not insure their crops? If they wish to take a risk, they are entitled to do so; but I do not think that they are entitled to ask for a special quota in those circumstances.

Mr. McANANEY: This situation could apply to a fire that occurred perhaps five years previously. One might be able to assess the average yield in a certain hundred but what evidence would there be of how many acres were burnt?

Mr. Hudson: The farmer would have to produce independent evidence, say, from neighbours.

Mr. McANANEY: How would that work? The member for Glenelg based his whole argument on the sick and the poor and on being compassionate, but we are more helpful to this section of the community than the member for Glenelg or any other Opposition member is ever likely to be. Members opposite would drag those who prosper down to the level of those who are not prepared to hop in and do something. There can be no discrimination; we must get down to a sound basis of assessment and of protecting all concerned.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am disappointed at the attitude of Government members. I point out to the member for Burra that health insurance is most necessary, but many large families who particularly need it cannot afford it. If a person is not businesslike and fails to insure his crop, if it is destroyed by fire, he suffers the loss of that crop. The next season, because he had suffered the loss of the crop, his base quota would be reduced and he would not be eligible for any special quota. Not only has he suffered the loss of his crop but he has also been penalized for the next year. Presumably, wheat producers who can afford it insure their crops, but some, for a variety of reasons, do not do so, and I do not think they should suffer a double penalty.

In Victoria, losses of this sort are more likely to occur than they are in South Australia, yet the Victorian Government has seen no reason to implement a similar provision to ours in its Bill. There will be no difficulty in estimating crops. Of course, the right of entry is important in this regard. The quantity of wheat destroyed can be established on the basis provided in the previous clause. I ask the Committee to accept this perfectly reasonable amendment.

[Midnight]

Mr. EDWARDS: Because farmers who have bank overdrafts are compelled to insure their crops, most farmers are at least partly insured. If they are not fully covered, that is not the advisory committee's fault.

Mr. HUGHES: I am appalled at the attitude of some Government members toward wheatgrowers. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) referred to those who were being dragged down to the level of the people whom this amendment was designed to protect. I do not think anyone wants to be dragged down to the level of an unfortunate person. Many primary producers have incurred increased costs of production through no fault of their own; if they have family obligations to meet they may find it almost impossible to raise additional finance to insure their crop. As the provision stands at present, if a fire destroys their crop they will pay a twofold penalty: first, they will be penalized through the loss of their crop and, secondly, they will be penalized through being allocated a reduced quota in the season following the fire.

The amendment is reasonable and will not cost the Government anything. A fire destroys not only fencing and other fixed assets but also stock. Most primary producers try to insure their crop, but some would have financial hardship in doing so. Parliament should assist the unfortunate man who is banging his head against a wall financially. Crop insurance is not cheap, and few people would not insure if they could afford to do so. We are not dealing with the few cases involving people who will not help themselves. Country members could name people, who, because of hardship, could not afford to insure their crops. The Opposition is not asking for a favour. We are merely trying to assist those farmers, particularly the younger ones, who are trying to get on their feet. I hope the Minister considers the request further.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: One or two aspects of this matter have not been considered. The history must be examined because fires and losses that have already occurred must be taken into account. It is fair enough to tell people that they should insure for the future, but it is hard to say they should have insured in the past. Having listened to the argument, I am happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new subparagraph:

(vi) an amount of wheat not being greater than the least amount of wheat the proceeds from the sale of which, when aggregated with the proceeds from the exploitation of the lands comprised in the production unit directly or indirectly available to the applicant, would be sufficient to maintain the economic viability of the production unit.

The committee should have regard to this provision when special quotas are being fixed. It is by now abundantly clear that some farmers will experience difficulties as a result of wheat quotas. We should do all in our power so that farmers will not be forced off the land they have been working, either for a short or for a long time, as a result of this scheme. My amendment is to ensure not that they will have a sufficient quota to make the farm a viable proposition but that the growing of wheat together with other activities will make the property economically viable. I do not want people forced off their land because of this scheme, and I think that this is the only way to prevent that happening. We must ensure that the 45,000,000-bushel quota is shared equally, but special consideration should be given in some cases. I ask the Committee to accept this important amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot accept the amendment, because it would give the committee a most difficult task. We would have to deal with all applicants for special quotas, and this would mean reassessing about 11,000 applications. This would not be practicable, particularly as to use a new form of assessment would complicate and delay proceedings. We cannot rescue an uneconomic farm by the provisions of this Bill, although other legislation may help farmers on such properties. When the aggregation of a person's income is estimated it would be difficult to assess the wheatgrowing factor, as the use of the land might vary.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Although the object of the amendment is an excellent one, I am afraid that the member for Millicent seeks to put it in the wrong place. If it is inserted at this stage, the economic viability regarding certain other factors must be considered, and this will upset the whole basis of the calculations involving the 11,000 bushels. It does not involve the 4,000 bushels referred to, because in order to assess the economic viability of 4,000 bushels one must take something over the 11,000 bushels. It is too late now to go into that. Although I agree with the argument advanced by the member for Millicent, I am afraid that at this stage we cannot

deal with it. If I may be permitted to refer to it, the wording of my amendment is similar, but my amendment will be inserted in the measure so as to enable the review committee to reconsider the economic viability and the use of the extra amount from the special contingency fund. To do what the member for Millicent suggests at this stage would upset all the quota cards. However, in the case of an appeal to the review committee, I think that if this measure can be included as an additional consideration we can get some justice for the people whom the member for Millicent and I are anxious to help.

Mr. CORCORAN: Although I appreciate the point made by the member for Ridley, I point out that by inserting my amendment at this stage it allows consideration to be given to these factors without considering the contingency reserve. The only thing that worries me about the amendment of the member for Ridley is how much will be in this contingency reserve. There is no provision in the Bill at the moment stating how much it will be, and we may find ourselves with no contingency reserve. Although we have been told that there may be 500,000 bushels in this reserve, my fear at present is that that may not be sufficient to cater for the problems I have outlined and for the matters about which I am concerned. That is why I have moved the amendment at this stage. If the quantity to be left in the contingency reserve were fixed in the Bill, I think we could consider this particular matter with which I am concerned. I am at least pleased to receive the indication that my amendment will not be completely ignored and that the review committee, if the amendment of the member for Ridley is carried, will be able to consider the matter. However, whether that committee can meet the amendment is another matter.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The member for Millicent has used the very argument to be used in support of my amendment. Where will the quantity be obtained, if the amendment is inserted in this clause?

Mr. CASEY: There seems to be a conflict concerning where the amendment should be inserted. Although no quantity is specified in this Bill, quantities are specified in other Bills. Unfortunately, we cannot do anything about this now. We do not know what the contingency quantity is at present and we do not know what it was originally. The replies we have obtained to questions about this quantity

have been conflicting, one reply putting it at 500,000 bushels and another putting it at 330,000 bushels.

The Opposition wants to try to save country districts, because they are made up of traditional wheat farmers. The amendment we have moved is similar to that which has been suggested by wheatgrowers at many meetings. They fear that if something is not done many wheat farmers will be forced to quit. If wheat sales do not improve, many farmers will have to leave their properties, which will no longer be economically viable.

This Parliament must give as much protection as it can to these people. It does not matter where this amendment is put in because we do not know how much wheat is left to be distributed. It was said at a meeting at Cleve last Wednesday night that 30 farmers there had absolutely no hope of remaining on their properties under the quotas they had received. They will have to leave the industry and get a job to supplement their income, but that is very difficult. This is a very serious problem, and I do not know how we will overcome it. In moving this amendment we are trying to prevent an exodus of traditional farmers from the country. What will they do if they leave the country? The majority will be unskilled labourers, because they know nothing else but farming. If this amendment is not carried it will be "curtains" for many farmers. Information about quotas has already been issued; however, if farmers can get over the difficult period this year, it will be possible to do something about quotas next year.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out paragraph (b).

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 25 to 32 passed.

Clause 33—"Absence of members."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (1) after "(1)" to insert "Subject to subsection (2) of section 32 of this Act."

This amendment relates to the appointment by the Governor of a member.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 34 to 37 passed.

Clause 38—"Review committee to hear and determine appeals."

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(2a) Where the review committee is satisfied, on such evidence as it thinks fit, that the amount of wheat represented by a wheat delivery quota allocated in respect of a production unit is less than the amount of wheat the proceeds from the sale of which, when aggregated with all other proceeds from the utilization of the lands comprised in the production unit directly or indirectly available to the holder of the wheat delivery quota, would be sufficient to maintain the economic viability of the production until the review committee may direct the advisory committee to alter the amount of wheat represented by that wheat delivery quota by increasing that amount to an amount specified in the direction and the advisory committee shall give effect to that direction.

The argument on this is the same as has been used previously. This is the right place to make the provision in the Bill as it is now. As I have said, this is the type of matter that we must consider when we are redrafting this legislation, for it is important to the new basis of the legislation. Several figures have been mentioned, such as 500,000 bushels and 600,000 bushels, and I can tell the Committee that it is the opinion of some members of the advisory committee that they will be able to deal with some of these cases that can be taken in on this contingency fund; but to deal with that in the other case would have been impossible. I hope the Committee accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 39—"Frivolous appeals."

Mr. CORCORAN: I hope that the review committee will not be too harsh regarding the provisions of this clause. Contrary to what members opposite may think, I have had much to do with farmers. The farmers usually view things seriously. They may think they have a good case to put forward, but it may be considered frivolous by the review committee. Farmers may not have the formal education (although they have a good practical education) to judge whether their appeals will be regarded as frivolous by the committee. This clause provides that:

... the review committee may order that the appellant pay to the advisory committee such sum towards the cost of the appeal, not exceeding \$100, as the review committee thinks fit.

I hope the review committee will not be too tough in this matter. I shall watch this position closely. I appreciate we must have some form of control to ensure that appeals are not made willy-nilly, but I hope the com-

mittee will realize that sometimes farmers are not educated enough to know whether or not an appeal is frivolous.

Mr. HUGHES: I support the Deputy Leader in this matter. I raised this matter during the second reading debate, because a statement was made to some farmers at a meeting at Lameroo. Some people may make an appeal that is, in their opinion, just; yet the review committee may regard it as frivolous. The farming community regards its industry from its own particular point of view. It works hard to make it pay; yet there could be occasions when certain people would feel they had a just appeal to make, but the committee in its wisdom might consider it frivolous.

I regret that "frivolous" appears in this legislation, because it is out of place; I regret, too, that that word was used in the discussions between the members of the committee and the farmers, who were justified in raising their voices when this matter was placed before them. They do not wish to be considered frivolous, and I do not think they are. The use of this word is an insult to their intelligence. I should not like the committee to regard a just appeal as frivolous.

Mr. ALLEN: Many elderly people have never appeared before a court and will hesitate to lodge appeals even though they may have perfect grounds for doing so, because the word "frivolous" may deter them.

Mr. EDWARDS: Many constituents are worried about this clause, and I hope that, if the clause is not removed, much discretion will be used in interpreting it. A person would not lodge an appeal unless he thought he had a genuine case.

Mr. BROOMHILL: We are not sure of the meaning of "frivolous" and, as a result, problems may arise. Apparently, some members believe that farmers may consider that any genuine appeal may be considered to be frivolous.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Oxford dictionary defines "frivolous" as "paltry, trumpery, trifling, futile". If the Committee is prepared to allow me to bring the comments of members to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture with the assurance that there will be a wise and moderate chairman, I am sure no trouble will be caused. I can understand that some farmers may be alarmed at the way the word may be interpreted. I assure the Committee that the provision will not be interpreted unwisely.

Clause passed.

Clauses 40 to 51 passed.

Clause 52—"Certain deliveries may be approved."

Mr. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new subclauses:

(3) Where the Advisory Committee is satisfied, on such evidence as it thinks fit, that a gift of wheat has been made, with the consent of the Board, to the owner of a production unit to alleviate hardship caused to that owner by reason of a loss of wheat that would have been produced from that production unit, the Advisory Committee may, in writing, approve the delivery of all or portion of that wheat as part of the wheat delivery quota allocated in respect of that production unit.

(4) For the purposes of this Act, a delivery of wheat under and in accordance with an approval for the time being in force under subsection (3) of this section shall be deemed to be a delivery of wheat produced from the production unit in respect of which the delivery was so approved.

This amendment is moved as a result of the situation that developed in the district of the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), following a disastrous fire that occurred there recently. It seemed that in these circumstances it was perfectly reasonable for generous people who wished to make this sort of offer to be allowed to do so. I have drawn the amendment so as to provide that the advisory committee must be satisfied, on evidence, that the gift is made in order to alleviate whatever hardship has occurred, and I am confident that the committee would act wisely in this respect.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand the sincere and humane idea of the amendment, but there are some practical difficulties associated with it. The person receiving the gift may be liable for gift duty, and whoever is compiling his income tax returns may want to know the reason for the gift. It would be difficult to get these things straightened out, and there would be many difficulties and, I might say, dangers in enacting this provision. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. CORCORAN: I believe that what the member for Ridley has said is a reflection on the advisory committee. I point out that the amendment provides that the advisory committee is to be satisfied "on such evidence as it thinks fit, that a gift of wheat has been made, with the consent of the board, to the owner of a production unit to alleviate hardship caused to that owner . . .".

Mr. Venning: You can't trade in wheat.

Mr. CORCORAN: Authority must be given by the advisory committee before farmers can take any action. If the advisory committee thinks that something is improper then it will not permit it to happen. On the West Coast recently we had an example of this. If a farmer wants to help his neighbour then, with the permission of the advisory committee, he should be able to do so, but the committee will decide whether or not his action is fit and proper.

The member for Ridley referred to gift duty, but I cannot see that that is involved. This practice would not mean any loss to the overall quota and it would be properly controlled by the advisory committee. It has been said that this provision would mean an additional burden on the advisory committee and, to some extent, that may be so. However, I think people would realize that this sort of thing would not be tolerated except in a disaster. I do not see any danger of this practice getting out of hand; certainly, no such danger has been demonstrated to me.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot accept the amendment. When we deal with the wheat crop in these circumstances, we are dealing with a most delicate situation. The Minister of Agriculture and his advisers believe that this amendment would lay the whole matter open to much serious abuse. This provision would make it difficult for the wheat industry to police its affairs. In other industries where loopholes have been left, however worthy most people are, the way is left open to abuse. I strongly recommend that the Committee accept the advice of the people who have been working on this legislation.

I hope members will reject this amendment, even though it has been moved with the best of intentions. In connection with farmers who give the proceeds from the sale of over-quota wheat to their unfortunate neighbours, I point out that, technically, wheat is a taxable commodity; gift duty and income tax are involved. Because this subject can be very complicated, I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. VENNING: I could not agree more than I do with the Minister. One of my constituents had 900 acres of wheat that was so affected by rust that he could not harvest any of it. Because he had a big auto-header, he wanted to do contract reaping. He asked whether he could collect his wages from those who had produced over-quota wheat. I had to inform him of the danger involved.

Mr. CORCORAN: I accept the explanation, because I can recall similar situations that came to my notice when I was a Minister.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (53 to 61), preamble and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DIRECTORS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3297.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support this Bill, which is a result of representation by the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated to divide Eyre Peninsula into two zones and appoint two zone directors. Obviously, this is necessary because of increased grain production and development in the area.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): As Eyre Peninsula is too big for one director to be able to cope with the number of silos there, I hope that the House passes the Bill.

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

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 2. Page 3492.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support this Bill and commend the Minister for introducing it. It improves the principal Act immeasurably and will assist in the administration of his department.

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

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 5 (clause 6)—After line 24 insert new paragraph as follows:

(a1) by striking out the item—

"PART XII—Special equitable jurisdiction of Local Court of Adelaide." and inserting in lieu thereof the item—

"PART XII—Special equitable jurisdiction of local courts."

No. 2. Page 19, line 40 (clause 36)—Leave out "word "Supreme"" and insert "passage "appeal to the Supreme Court"".

No. 3. Page 19, line 41 (clause 36)—Leave out "word "Full"" and insert "passage "subject to the rules of court made under section 28 of this Act and under section 72 of the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1969, appeal to the Full Court"".

No. 4. Page 20, lines 18 to 21 (clause 37)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause 37 as follows:

37. Section 60, 61 and 62 of the principal Act are repealed."

No. 5. Page 20 (clause 38)—After line 25 insert new paragraph as follows:

(a1) by striking out paragraph (f) of subsection (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

(f) amend the grounds of appeal or of any cross-appeal;

No. 6. Page 20, lines 29 to 36 (clause 38)—Leave out paragraphs (c) and (d) and insert new paragraph as follows:

(c) by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(2) If the Full Court is of opinion that, although any ruling, direction, judgment, determination or order objected to may not have been strictly according to law, yet substantial justice has been done between the parties, the Full Court shall discharge the order with or without costs, and if the Full Court is of opinion that, although there has been a substantial wrong or miscarriage of justice, such wrong or miscarriage affects part only of the matter in controversy, the Full Court may allow the appeal with regard to such part, and dismiss it as to the other part, with or without costs

No. 7. Page 21, line 19 (clause 41)—Insert "(i)" before "that" first occurring.

No. 8. Page 21, line 20 (clause 41)—After "relates" insert "or".

No. 9. Page 21 (clause 41)—After line 20 insert new subparagraph as follows:

(ii) that the debt the subject matter of the claim had not been paid or satisfied prior to such action being brought.

No. 10. Page 25—After clause 64 insert new clause 64a as follows:

64a. The heading to Part XII of the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "LOCAL COURT OF ADELAIDE" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "LOCAL COURTS".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 10 be agreed to.

These amendments fall into three groups. Perhaps I can explain them all now because, while they are all significant, none is controversial. The first is an amendment to what we may call one of the index clauses, which

sets out the scheme of the Bill. It is consequent upon the conferring on any judge sitting in any local court of an equitable jurisdiction. At present, only a judge sitting in the Local Court of Adelaide has that jurisdiction. Amendment No. 1 is linked with amendment No. 10, which changes the title "Local Court of Adelaide" to "Local Courts". I suggest that that can be accepted.

Amendments Nos. 2 to 6 deal with the appeals procedure and, at the suggestion of the Supreme Court judges, simplify it. At present, the appeal from a local court to the Supreme Court proceeds first by way of notice and then by an application for an order *nisi* to a Supreme Court judge. The Supreme Court judge has an oversight on the grounds of appeal and, unless he agrees, the appeal cannot go forward. We intended to insert the same provisions in the new arrangements so that an appeal to the Full Court would proceed by order *nisi*, but it has been suggested that if this were removed the matter would be simplified. We think this is a good idea, and these amendments give effect to that.

Amendments Nos. 7 to 9 carry further a new principle in the Act that received the approbation of all members. Where a defendant is wrongly sued, we have provided for the payment by the plaintiff of special costs. The case we had in mind was that in which the person who was sued had been wrongly identified. That principle has been extended to provide that where a debtor has already paid the amount before the summons is issued he should receive special costs, and this seems to be a proper extension of the principle. I confidently recommend the amendments to the Committee.

Amendments agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VALUATION)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3262.)
Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): Members will recall that, previously, Opposition members had some reservations about the procedures and costs involved in having appeals heard by judges sitting in the new jurisdiction. This problem has now been solved. After representatives of the Local Government Association, which had had certain reservations, saw the Solicitor-General and discussed the whole matter with him, they wrote to me expressing their entire approval of and satisfaction with the scheme.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3263.)

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): We held up this Bill because the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) asked for time to consult constituents about the matter. That was about 10 days ago, and I understand from the honourable member that he is now perfectly satisfied with the Bill, as are those whom he consulted about it, to the best of his knowledge. Therefore, I suggest that the Committee accept this clause and the other clauses in the Bill.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 2. Page 3458.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I have learned a lot this evening about wheat. As I think I have gained a greater aversion than I have ever had to long speeches, I do not intend to speak for long on this Bill. On this occasion, the Lower House is acting as a House of Review. Generally the Upper House, which maintains the fiction that it is a House of Review (and the word can be spelt whichever way you, Mr. Speaker, like), is in the position of reviewing a Bill, but on this occasion it was the initiating House. Before the Bill was discussed in that House, my Party decided to support it. In that House the Bill was handled for the Opposition by a former distinguished Minister of Mines and, when the matter was raised at this morning's Party meeting, we heard the debate all over again from this gentleman. I support the Bill, which introduces some things which were completely overlooked when the original Act was dealt with and which also provides a more realistic licence fee.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.32 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, December 4, at 2 p.m.