

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 13, 1953.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**SCHOOL CHILDREN'S TRAM FARES.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice) —What is the total amount of revenue which has accrued to the Tramways Trust by the increase of school children's concessional tram fares?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The last increase in scholars' concessional tram fares was made in January, 1952. The trust estimates that the increased revenue derived therefrom is approximately £7,500 over a full year.

TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRICITY PROJECTS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice) —As all Government projects estimated to cost £30,000 or more are referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation and report to Parliament, is it the intention of the Government to amend the law to provide for a similar procedure in respect of projects of the Tramways and Electricity Trusts?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—No.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS).

Read a third time and passed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 938.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This Bill is somewhat a surprise, because last year legislation was passed for the continuance of the Barley Board for several years. The reasons for the introduction of this Bill are important, the main one being that the barley marketing legislation in Victoria and South Australia must be identical. Early this year Victoria passed legislation which provided for the appointment of an additional Victorian member to the board. Victoria suggested that it was not receiving sufficient information from the board meetings. However, our Government did not agree and a conference was

held. As a result of negotiations it has been decided that Victoria will be represented by an observer on the board but he will have no voting power. His duty will be to supply information to his Minister of Agriculture. The board at present comprises three members from South Australia—the chairman, Mr. Spafford, and two growers' representatives, Mr. S. Coleman and Mr. G. G. Pearson, M.P. Victoria had one growers' representative and the malsters and brewers another, and as South Australia is by far the largest barley growing State this representation seemed equitable. This legislation must be retrospective to September 1 in order to obviate a legal break in the existence of the board. Barley-growing first became a prominent feature of our agricultural operations 30 to 35 years ago, and I take this opportunity to pay a high tribute to Sir Arthur Barrett for doing so much to promote the growing of high quality barley, which in those days commanded a premium. It was then generally accepted that barley could be grown successfully only in the country between O'Halloran Hill and Willunga, on Yorke Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula and in the South-East, and I think broadly that is still the case, but in recent years the incentive has been towards quantity at the expense of quality.

Since the beginning of the last war the barley market has been buoyant, but it now seems to have reached its culminating point and a downward trend is evident. Consequently, I believe we will have to go back to paying a premium on quality. Although barley has been classified every season into grades, the same price has been paid for each grade and there has been no incentive to produce high quality. Last year the price of oats fell from 12s. to 5s. a bushel and a similar trend is to be seen in respect of barley. Nevertheless it is still quite a profitable cereal to grow because it is a splendid rotational crop in conjunction with wheat. It is an excellent stock food and a good soil builder. At one time primary producers generally held the opinion that other cereals could not be grown successfully for a number of years following a barley crop, but that opinion is no longer held. In 1937 I was criticized for ploughing in very heavy barley stubble but that piece of land produced the champion wheat crop of South Australia, and this, I am sure, convinced the critics that it was not detrimental but an excellent soil builder. Now that the Korean war is ended the Japanese demand for barley will not be so great. Korea produced an immense amount

of rice and was a great source of supply for Japan which consequently had to look elsewhere for a substitute during the war. With Korean rice more readily available our barley market in Japan is likely to fall off considerably. It all comes back to the question of supply and demand.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—That is refreshing.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Producers cannot budget for any length of time on what is the best means of producing an income, and we can see the downward trend in barley prices already.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If barley falls to 8s. a bushel, which will be the most profitable?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Wheat, and farmers will turn to it because, like the wage-earner, they want the most that they can get. If Victoria has been dissatisfied with the situation—and I had not known that the board was not giving general satisfaction—this Bill will no doubt please that State and thereby assist in the harmonious marketing of this product. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—As a representative of a district where barley production has increased enormously in the past decade, and because it plays such an important part in the diversified system of agriculture, I must support my colleague in commending this Bill to the Council. It is gratifying to find that Victoria and South Australia have, if somewhat belatedly, reached agreement over a matter that was the subject of tension. Having come to that agreement the stage is now set for the carrying on of barley marketing under the conditions which have existed for some time. Over the last decade barley production has shown a very big increase, and the reasons for it are many. One of them, which sometimes may be lost sight of, is that it plays an important part in the system of diversified farming now in general practice. When many of our mallee lands were first thrown open for agriculture it was felt that the main crop would be wheat, but experiments have shown that there is a definite place in the scheme of things for other cereals, even in areas where the rainfall was considered to be somewhat light and the soil fertility not particularly high. Another reason is that some of the lower grade types of barley, if I may use the term for want of a better, were found to have qualities which rendered them quite satisfactory for purposes other than merely stock feeding. The type I have in

mind, Californian barley, was developed in America. It is a six-row type of barley, which is a feed cereal, and not used for malting purposes as is the two-row barley. It was found by experiment that this six-row type of barley grew more successfully in areas of lighter rainfall such as our mallee lands, and that was another reason for our increase in production, although of course another very obvious reason was that the demand became so great for reasons which I need not enumerate, and the prices rose to almost extraordinary levels for our exports. Because of the accumulation of these circumstances, barley was very much favoured by growers throughout the whole of this State's agricultural areas. The Barley Marketing Board was set up and, as far as I can understand from individuals and organizations that have been associated with it, has done a satisfactory job. A pleasing feature of the administration of the board has been the finding of overseas markets for our products in places where we had not previously done business and it is necessary to retain the same set-up in order to retain those markets. In the past our barley production has been favoured by there being a sellers' market because we have not had to worry very much about looking for business, which has been coming to us, and we have been receiving high prices. Now, however, we will have to face a period when there will be a buyers' market; that is, the buyer will be more selective because he will have other avenues he can explore to obtain his supplies of barley. I emphasize the necessity for retaining this organization for the disposal of this crop for the reasons I have given.

Figures have been given of the enormous strides we have made in our production. In 1944-45 the acreage under crop for barley in this State was 359,813 and by 1951-52 it had increased to 831,613, approximately two and a quarter times as much. In 1944-45 the value per acre was £2 13s. 8d. and in 1951-52 it had risen to £16 13s. 1d. The barley growers in this State are of the opinion that the board should continue and I am sure it will give satisfactory results in the future as it has done in the past. I support the second reading.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—Firstly, I express appreciation of the work of the Barley Board. Now the Victorian Government has claimed the right to have an additional member on the board. On that question we should consider the comparative production of the two States. South Australia last year

produced 24,689,000 bushels and Victoria 4,396,000, so on these figures it will be seen that we have every right to resist the claim. As a result of a conference, the Victorian Government agreed to accept an observer as a representative of its Agricultural Department, and no doubt his services in an advisory capacity will be of value to the board. However, this man will not have the power to vote. It has been said that barley growing is jeopardizing the wheat and other industries, and in the course of the debate the Leader of the Opposition stated that we used only 800,000 bushels in South Australia, and implied that that is the only barley used in the Commonwealth. However, 7,000,000 bushels were used or processed for stock feed and I suggest a great deal more would have been used but for the fact that we have been subsidizing other industries, such as the poultry and pig industries, to enable them to use wheat, although barley is very satisfactory for stock feeding, particularly for pigs, whereas wheat is an ideal cereal for human consumption. We have subsidized the use of wheat for pig and poultry feeding, but the price of barley is reaching a reasonable level and a greater percentage will be used for stock feeding. Mr. Condon said that 80,000,000 bushels of wheat were processed in Australia in 1950 and he was alarmed that there was insufficient wheat available to meet demands. It is interesting to compare production figures. In 1938-39 we produced 155,000,000 bushels of wheat but production in recent years has exceeded that quantity. In 1947-48 we produced 220,000,000 bushels; 1948-49, 190,000,000 bushels; 1949-50, 218,000,000 bushels; 1950-51, 184,000,000 bushels; and in 1951-52, 160,000,000 bushels. The amount of wheat produced is not affecting the flour milling industry. I could state the reasons why the flour milling industry is not able to compete with other parts of the world, but I will deal with that matter when we consider wheat legislation at a later stage. Barley is a valuable cereal. An inspector recently reported that because of the dry season in the Murray mallee the wheat crop has been a failure, but that barley would produce good returns. Barley is a quick grower and can stand up to dry conditions better than wheat.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Would you like to see all our flour mills idle?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Last year 160,000,000 bushels of wheat were produced in Australia. I believe that the New South Wales silos are full and next year they will have to bag wheat because it cannot all be sold. There is sufficient wheat in South Australia.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—There were 30,000 bags of wheat at Balaklava, but the mill is idle and the wheat has been brought to the city for gristing.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I do not know the economics of the position, but it may be that it can be gristed more cheaply in the city. Our export trade has to a degree been killed because we regulate the price of bran and pollard. We have fixed the price at £21 a ton, which means that flour must carry the additional amount. In Canada the price is fixed at £25 a ton and the flour has to carry £4 a ton less than the Australian product. Canada is cutting Australia out on the world flour market and that is why our mills are not able to compete with overseas mills. The appointment of an observer will not jeopardize South Australia and may be of some advantage to Victoria. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

Committee's report adopted.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 940.)

The Hon. A. A. HOARE (Central No. 1)—Landlord and tenant legislation has been before Parliament for many years and seemingly there are always amendments designed for the betterment of its operations. There are good landlords and bad ones, honest ones and others less honest.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—What about the tenants?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—That applies to tenants also. Recently a tenant complained to me that he was obliged to pay an excessive rent but he had sublet portion of his premises at what I considered an unfair rent. Some landlords and tenants are endeavouring to enrich themselves at the expense of others, therefore a fair rents court should be established to decide rentals. The Housing Trust has undoubtedly done a wonderful job and it would have spelt disaster for South Australia had it not existed. I believe it has been strictly fair in its dealings although I did not agree with its recent action in increasing the rentals of its houses. I have been a landlord for about 23 years and the tenant's rental has remained constant. I may have been justified in increasing it but he is an excellent tenant and I have been satisfied. If landlords and tenants could be fair in their

dealings there would not be so much dissatisfaction. I agree that there must be some control otherwise landlords might increase rents unduly. If more houses were available it would offset that possibility, but many people are sharing houses and there is still a shortage. I hope that this Bill will overcome some of the problems and I support the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (General No. 1)—I support the second reading. Since its enactment the administration of this legislation has been most complex. It is really the aftermath of the war. Had the Government established a fair rents court during the early stages much of the present confusion and dissatisfaction would have been removed. The Auditor-General in referring to the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, stated:—

The South Australian Housing Trust is required by the above Act to fix rents of dwellings and business premises. Any landlord or tenant may apply to the trust to determine the rent payable. The number of rents finally dealt with in 1953 was 7,801, compared with 9,105 in 1952, and, in addition, 170 rents were provisionally determined, compared with 1,205 in 1952. The cost of administration for the year was £22,050 (£21,521 in 1952) of which £19,900 was recoverable from the Commonwealth Government.

The passage in the report indicates the cost up to the present.

Labor has always supported the control of rents and will continue to do so in order to protect tenants who constitute the great bulk of the population. The Housing Trust, which is the largest landlord in South Australia, has arbitrarily increased rents from 12s. 6d. to 27s. 6d. since 1941 and although we are supporting the Bill, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we desire equity for both sides. We do not desire to see legislation passed which will give preference to one section of the community at the expense of others. The Housing Trust has determined an economic rent but it does not apply this to a private landlord who lets a home. It has lumped all its rents and fixed an economic average value whilst at the same time pegging the rents of private landlords.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—The honourable member's contention is that the Housing Trust has treated itself better than the private landlords.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am suggesting that, and I am not holding a brief for the rapacious landlord. There are some very worthy landlords but the Housing Trust has not permitted them to enjoy the same ratio

of increase as it has permitted itself. This has been brought about, I think, by the fact that the Government, in this legislation, rushed in without reviewing all the circumstances and failed to set up a properly constituted tribunal to fix rents.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Do you call this panic legislation?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—As far as the Government is concerned, yes, because it rushed in without reviewing all the circumstances and gave the trust the power to fix all rents.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—When was the first rent control introduced?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Under the National Security Regulations.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—But they were never applied to this State.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Because we had legislation which covered the position. However, we all know that when Commonwealth regulations are promulgated they do not over-ride existing State law.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—That is absolute rubbish.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am saying that this is necessary legislation, and Labor supported it, but the Government, in its panic, rushed in without reviewing all the circumstances. Let us review them. During the 12 months ended June 30 last the trust completed the record number of 4,127 houses, including 332 emergency dwellings. This was approximately 1,000 more than the 3,119 built in 1951-52, and brings the number of houses built for the trust since its inception in 1937 to 17,192. A further 3,474 were under construction on July 1 last and the trust will have £5,500,000 at its disposal this year—£1,000,000 from the State Loan Fund and £4,500,000 under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, in which this State refused to participate at the outset—and that is where the panic came in. We passed legislation to permit the Savings Bank to lend money to the Government at 2 per cent and this relieved the Government of the necessity of drawing on the Commonwealth housing pool.

The Commonwealth and State Agreement provided that the Commonwealth Government would bear two-fifths of any rental losses on housing schemes, and this Government by its refusal to participate in the agreement denied itself the opportunity of receiving that aid from the Commonwealth in order to keep rents down. Instead it borrowed money from the

Savings Bank, to which the Opposition was a party, but we were told that the money could be obtained more cheaply in that way, and no-one envisaged the trust's arbitrarily increasing rents as it has done. Now that the Savings Bank pool has dried up the State has decided to come into the scheme which was available to it in the early stages of its huge housing programme. I do not propose to review all of the provisions of the Bill, and I do not want my remarks to be taken as an attack on the Housing Trust because it was charged with the responsibility for housing the people. At present there are 12,500 applications for rental homes outstanding, and 3,000 applications for emergency homes as well as 3,250 for houses for purchase, making a grand total of 18,750 and the number is snowballing daily.

This Bill excludes business premises and hotels and homes not let since 1939, but its provisions will apply to sub-letting. Some houses, the rents of which have been pegged, have been let for the last five or six years, but many of the tenants have been sub-letting rooms. While paying 25s. to 30s. a week to the landlord they have been making, perhaps, £5 or £6 above their rental by sub-letting, and this Bill will allow that situation to remain. This has been most difficult legislation to administer and all these phases of the question should have been considered by the Government in the same way as it is the duty of the Opposition to protect the people and see that they are not exploited.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—If the honourable member were letting a new house would he not take ordinary precautions to see that it could not be sub-let? Does he want it tied up by the Government for ever?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. I want some protection for the people who have borne the burden for many years, but I am pointing out that this legislation, while protecting the majority of the people, will permit one section to get around it. The Opposition gives the Bill its benediction because it will protect a great number of people, but we also say that all sections must be protected and that we should not pass legislation which will have a detrimental effect on some. We believe that the control of rents should remain but that it should be administered in a more equitable manner by the establishment of a fair rents court, thereby taking rent fixation out of the hands of the biggest landlord in the State.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY secured the adjournment of the debate.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 941.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I am opposed to this legislation because I think it will inflict a greater injustice than the existing law. On August 18 I asked the Attorney-General if his attention had been drawn to criticisms by a magistrate of the limitation of the powers under the Offenders Probation Act and if so what the Government intended to do about it. The Attorney-General said that his attention had not been drawn to it but he would give it consideration. This Bill was strongly opposed in another place for reasons which were very clearly expressed there. Although I am not a legal man I feel that I have had enough experience to know what has really happened in our courts over the years. This Act was passed in 1913 and amended in 1934. At present section 4(1) gives to courts of summary jurisdiction the power to release defendants on probation without proceeding to a conviction, but the Bill provides that a conviction will be recorded.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Not in every case.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, but it extends the power. Under the present law an offender may be released on a bond without a conviction being recorded so that at a future time he does not have to face the mention of a previous conviction, but under the Bill he will be convicted and such conviction used against him in the future.

The Hon. F. J. Perry—It will depend on the opinion of the magistrate.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—But magistrates differ on these things. I have known of people being sentenced to gaol for making a bet, whereas other people who have committed indecent assaults on children have been released on bonds.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Is the honourable member referring to the Supreme Court?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am referring to the present law which relates to summary jurisdiction.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Would not the person you mentioned have a conviction recorded against him?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Not under the present law, although under this Bill he would.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—The Bill provides that although convicted he may be released on a bond.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes, but the power is given to the magistrate to convict.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—The offender can still be released on a bond without a conviction being recorded.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—But it ties the matter down too tightly.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—A complete discretion is given to the court.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The legislation will take away the limitation, and will give courts of summary jurisdiction power to convict prior to releasing on a bond. Today when a man appears before a court and is released on a bond, the court does not convict him, but releases him on condition that for a certain period he shall be of good behaviour; other conditions may also be attached to the bond. If he breaks the conditions of that bond he may be called up for conviction and sentence for that offence. Under the proposed measure, no matter how innocent or trivial the offence may be, a conviction will be recorded. It is well-known that many people who have broken the law have become good citizens, and this Bill will be a hardship to them. Our aim should be to put them on the right track if that is possible, and to be a little more charitable in order to help them. I once broke the law by jay-walking across to Parliament House and probably if I had been charged I could have asked to be released on a bond under the Offenders Probation Act; how ridiculous that would have been. This legislation is getting too far away from what has been in operation since 1913 and where is the necessity for it? Although I know that it will be carried, it is my duty to outline my reasons for opposing it. The courts have powers in other directions for serious offences, but for minor offences we are going to place a stigma on young men or women, because no matter how slight their offence may be, it can be brought up against them on a future occasion. I can remember some time ago when a man was before the Criminal Court and after he was convicted one of the things brought up against him was a previous offence of riding a bicycle without a light. It is all very well for the Attorney-General to say it is a matter for the court's discretion, but we all know how the opinions of the courts vary. It is not a question of administering the law, because who makes the law? This is the place where it is made and to express our opinions, as I have done this afternoon. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—I rise to speak on this matter only because the Leader

of the Opposition, probably because he spoke without having had sufficient time to consider the matter, does not seem to realize that whilst the Bill extends the powers of the courts in some matters, it does not take away any powers existing at present. Mr. Condon's point was that under the present law the court has power, without proceeding to a conviction, to release the offender under a bond, and to call him up for sentence within a specified time if he fails to observe the conditions of that bond. Clause 3 expressly retains that right, so that where the circumstances justify a court taking such steps, an offender can be ordered to enter into recognizance without a conviction being recorded. I cannot see how this Bill takes away any right the courts previously had, so the main point raised by Mr. Condon on examination can be seen to lack substance. I therefore support the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly with amendments.

FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 913.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—This is a short Bill, which continues the power to compensate people whose gardens have been stripped of fruit and vegetables by officers of the Department of Agriculture. When this legislation was first introduced in 1947 there was no evidence of any previous outbreak of fruit fly infestation but I was informed that there are records of this fly some 50 years ago.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Where are the records?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I sought confirmation of that information but saw no written evidence. The person who mentioned it to me is a competent man who would be more inclined to support than oppose this legislation. There are two breeds of fruit fly, the Mediterranean and the Queensland. The Queensland fly causes more destruction and is most difficult to detect. Much indignation has been caused by the actions of the department during this last outbreak. I would feel indignant if my garden was raided, because it is what happens when officials, "Drest in a little brief authority," enter gardens and cause devastation. The persons concerned have

expressed themselves volubly through the press in the last few weeks. I wonder whether the department has adopted the appropriate means in eradicating this pest and whether the general taxpayer should be called upon to meet the cost. According to the Auditor-General's report, to June 30, 1953, £537,976 has been expended in stripping and disposing of fruit; £149,356 as compensation to owners of fruit destroyed, and £1,122 as expenses of the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Don't you think much good has been done?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, but I wonder whether the right means of eradication have been adopted. The Auditor-General has prepared a table relating to the number of claims received, the number disallowed and the compensations paid and it reveals:—

Number of Claims.

Season.	Received.	Disallowed	Compensation
			Paid.
			£
1947 . . .	1,066	23	18,288
1948 . . .	1,794	19	17,620
1949 . . .	4,664	138	50,167
1950 . . .	5,705	333	50,516
1951 . . .	1	—	17
1952 . . .	1,683	22	12,748
	14,913	535	£149,356

I have often wondered why the fruit fly has not attacked the commercial fruit growing areas. It appears to be more prevalent in the immediate metropolitan area. I question whether Parliament is doing the right thing in paying compensation because it has only a moral obligation. It apparently thought that as Government officers did so much damage to people's gardens it should pay them compensation. I do not think it a fair charge on the whole of the taxpayers and I would prefer the Western Australian system. In that State there is direct and continuous control. All orchardists are licensed. An orchard is defined as a piece of land regardless of size capable of producing fruit or vegetables. If a man owns a small garden and is growing fruit or vegetables he is compelled to register. The registration fee is comparatively small, about 2s. 6d. for an area not exceeding a quarter of an acre. That amount would not inconvenience any suburban gardener.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—But the fruit fly is established throughout Western Australia.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes. It is impossible to grow fruit in the suburban gardens of Western Australia and it is the same in New South Wales. I would favour

the establishment of a fund towards which interested persons contribute a certain sum annually to ensure regular inspections of gardens. In Western Australia people are compelled to clean their gardens and not to leave any waste fruit or prunings lying about. They are expected, and not asked, to co-operate. The South Australian public has co-operated with the department very willingly but in Western Australia they are compelled to notify the department of any outbreak and failure to comply with the law is visited with heavy penalties.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Isn't it difficult to detect the fruit fly?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, because the fly does not manifest itself until fruit is ripe. It is difficult for an entomologist to detect the Queensland fly, which I have been told has completely wiped out the Mediterranean fly. It is much stronger and more savage and the department is anxious to ensure that it does not become settled in this State because it would do terrific damage and would seriously affect an industry which returns millions annually. I would like the Government to consider the Western Australian system, which would ease the burden on the general taxpayer. All steps should be taken to obviate the possibility of infestation.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Wherever fruit is grown there are possibilities of infestation and I do not think inspectors could prevent it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—They could see that people regularly spray their trees and keep their gardens clean. The suburban fruit-grower has many pests to guard against. If he grows apples he must keep a close check on codling moth.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about the Apple Board?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—We are not considering that board at the moment. Another aspect is that the producer might be called upon to bear part of the burden, for I do not think it should be wholly a tax on the general taxpayer.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—You do not expect this to be a permanent thing?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I should not think any member would be optimistic enough to think that we will ever get rid of it. I believe it was here long before five years ago.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Why do you say that?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Because I have been told that by a very reliable person and I would ask, as I have before, whether the

department expects ever to exterminate the fruit fly. Nowadays we have aircraft capable of flying from England to Australia in less than one day, and no doubt aircraft passengers carry fruit with them. What supervision is there over them? We are told that inspectors examine passengers' luggage, but I have travelled fairly widely and no-one has ever inspected my luggage for fruit, either when travelling by aeroplane, train or ship.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—I have seen fruit taken from passengers.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I am told there is some supervision, but I think it impossible to supervise all passenger movements.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—An authority told me that it was here 50 years ago.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—That is what I was told, but I have never seen any written evidence of it. I think it will be here 50 years hence for I cannot see how any authority can police all the various possibilities of its introduction. The expense of the campaign is growing and now amounts to well over three-quarters of a million pounds, and it seems inevitable that we will have to face more expenditure. Therefore, I ask the Government to consider whether there cannot be some other means of compensating people than out of the general purse. I know that the department is doing its best.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Should it not reduce the proclaimed area?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I understand that the fruit fly can fly one mile; where it starts from no one knows. It must be dealt with drastically and because I feel that the department is doing its best to stamp out this very great menace I have no alternative but to support the measure.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—The Bill was brought in only to authorize last year's compensation payments, but since its introduction there has been an outbreak at Norwood and the subject has become very contentious. It is over 50 years since the fruit fly was discovered in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia and it is unquestionably the worst pest to be found in connection with fruit growing. I do not believe that it has been in South Australia for any length of time, or if so it has been very inactive. In Florida and the United States the fruit fly has been eradicated completely at a cost of 7,500,000 dollars so I think that the sum spent here so far is moderate by comparison. In 1947 the first fruit fly was found

in South Australia, and it did not come here as an adult fly, for it has a very limited flying range and therefore it no doubt came in fruit previously infected. It is very hard for any layman to detect infestation in its earlier stages. Farmers know how alarming it is to have fly strikes in sheep, and, as fruit is one of our chief foods, if the fly gains control it will affect our revenue very much. Compensation paid to owners of fruit destroyed amounted to £149,356, which is a moderate sum compared with the expense of eradication, which amounted to £537,976 to June 30, 1953. The total expenditure so far has been £687,596. I live in an area where fruit fly has been found in previous years and it is not nice to see a gang of men come into one's garden and strip everything that is likely to provide a harbour for the fly and spray with a poisonous liquid, but we know that drastic steps are necessary and that the pest has been eradicated, apparently, in certain districts. A pamphlet has been issued under the name of H. G. Andrewartha, entomologist at Waite Research Institute, which deals with the habits of the fly, its recognition, and the co-operation necessary on the part of the public in its eradication. It has been fairly widely circulated, but I maintain that it should be left with every household where fruit stripping takes place, and I would like to see it distributed to every household in the metropolitan and suburban areas. It gives all the information necessary to detect fruit that has been infested, which a layman is unable to do without some guidance.

I would prefer to see more money spent on prevention than on attempted eradication. We have six fruit inspectors and one senior inspector, who is Mr. Strickland. There are also three motor cyclist officers patrolling roads in the vicinity of Mount Gambier, Wolseley, Renmark and other places. Also the police inspect interstate trains, but I think there is little inspection of road transport, which I believe to be the main means of conveying the infection. I know people who came from Western Australia recently and brought some lemons with them. I told them they were taking a big risk in bringing the fruit into the State and they said they did not know it was an offence. This shows that people do bring fruit here from other States quite unwittingly. I have heard announcements on the Adelaide Station by the Man-in-Blue, but that often is too late, and I think greater supervision over interstate trains would be a help. On roads, however, it is most difficult. Nearly all road traffic

from Western Australia passes through Ceduna and this would probably be the best place at which to make inspections on that side, but traffic from the Eastern States presents a much more difficult problem.

According to the *Stateman's Year Book* for 1952 there are 28,598 acres under orchards and 60,426 under vineyards in this State, which is a tremendous area. Wine production amounts to 26,806,726 gallons, currants to 94,604 cwt. and raisins to 159,984 cwt. Wine and brandy exported interstate and overseas amounted to 8,639,000 gallons, so it is easy to imagine the loss of revenue to the State if the fruit industry were ruined and it is wise for the Government to take drastic measures to control this pest. Mr. Anthoney referred to the compulsory control in Western Australia. It is entirely different from our method. There, every property owner is compelled to have traps in his garden if he grows fruit and the inspectors make periodical visits. There is no need for that here because the fruit fly is not so well established, although I think it would be a good preventive measure.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—What is the market value of these traps?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I do not know. They are a simple contraption and I believe many people make their own; however, they would cost a few shillings at the most. The Minister of Agriculture, who has received much criticism over this legislation, is after all a grazier and a very worthy one too, and he is

obliged to accept the advice of experts. When he receives advice from men like Mr. Andrewartha and Mr. Strickland, who have made a life-time study of the pest, he must rely on their opinions. Mr. Andrewartha is an entomologist, and I accept the facts set out in his pamphlet. Greater control should be exercised over the fruit carried by air passengers. I know of many instances where fruit carried by air is not inspected, and if these people knew they were committing an offence they would be more considerate. The measures taken to combat this pest have not been over-drastring when it is considered that we still have sound fruit in this State. The criticism appearing in the press recently is not justified because the measures taken in the last five or six years have proved to be practically 100 per cent effective. The fruit fly is the most loathsome thing imaginable, and every step must be taken to keep our fruit free of it. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

WARREN WATER SUPPLY.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Warren water supply (new trunk main), together with minutes of evidence.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.49 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 14, at 2 p.m.