

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Tuesday, October 10, 1961.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****FISHING INDUSTRY.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the Chief Secretary obtained a reply to the question I asked on September 5 regarding fishing in the Great Australian Bight and the Commonwealth Government's proposal to sell the trawler, *Southern Endeavour*?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The report from the Minister of Agriculture is that a reply will be given to this question as soon as it is considered practicable.

**SUPERPHOSPHATE PRICE.**

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: To introduce my question I quote the following from an article in the *Advertiser* of October 6:

Although other States had had to increase superphosphate prices, the new season's price in South Australia would be the same as last year, the Premier said in the Assembly yesterday . . . The fact that superphosphate prices would be unchanged here despite increases in wages and higher costs for bags and phosphate rock was remarkable, and it was a tribute to the Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy). In the past five years on superphosphate alone, the Commissioner had saved the community £1,000,000.

I ask the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier:

1. Does the Government seriously attribute the stability of the price of superphosphate to the efforts of a Government official who has nothing whatever to do with the production of this commodity?

2. Is it not a fact that the price has remained stable in the face of rising wages and costs because of increased mechanization and other economic measures by the South Australian superphosphate manufacturers, and by lower overseas freights on phosphate rock?

3. Particularly, is it not a fact that the manufacturers have themselves not sought any increase in their selling price in recent years?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I understand that the question is based on a report in the *Advertiser*. I would expect that if that were so it would convey the facts as dictated by the Premier.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.**

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Airdale, Brahma, Vale Park, Beefacres, Elizabeth West, Mansfield Park (Additions), Newton and Whyalla North-West Primary Schools,

Brighton and Tonsley Park Primary Schools.

**COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT (ROYAL NAVAL FRIENDLY UNION OF SAILORS' WIVES AND MOTHERS INCORPORATED).**

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's resolution.

**ADELAIDE PARK LANDS ALTERATION BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**APPROPRIATION BILL.**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1075.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the Bill. In his second reading speech the Chief Secretary said that estimated payments from Consolidated Revenue Account for the year 1961-62 totalled £91,544,000, while estimated receipts totalled £91,547,000, giving a nominal budgeted surplus of £3,000. In most cases one could say it should be the Government's objective in good budgeting to get as near to balancing the Budget as possible. The Budget on this occasion comes within that category as it provides for a surplus of only £3,000; but there are times when such a close Budget would not be in the best interests of the community, and I consider that this particular year is one of those cases. I should like to see the Government's budgeting for a deficit, if need be, that would result in creating employment. We must depend upon two sections of the community in the main for a continuance of full employment, and both these are facing serious doubt as to whether their industries will be in a position to increase the number of our employed force. I refer firstly to the agricultural industries. We can all sympathize with those employed in agriculture because of the bad season that is being experienced. If agriculturists do not get satisfactory yields, this must have an effect upon the Government's receipts during the year.

The second industry essential to keep our work force fully employed is the building industry; if it is not fully engaged there is a serious effect upon the number of people engaged in other trades. During my speech I shall touch upon the unemployment position, particularly in the building industry, and point out how the Government could and should have assisted it so that its members were fully employed. During last month there were a number of contradictory statements regarding the employment position in South Australia, and I intend to point out to honourable members the differences of opinion held by people who should know the actual position. On September 25 the Prime Minister made a statement and one can visualize why he made it at that time, because he was addressing the Federal Conference of the Liberal Party. He warned that the only possible economic problem next year could be another boom. If we are to be subjected to an economic problem next year in the form of another boom, I should certainly prefer that to having about 110,000 people unemployed throughout Australia. The Federal President of the Liberal Party (Sir Philip McBride) at the same function, when delivering his presidential address, said that Australia was poised for another decade of quite remarkable development. Although the position did improve slightly during August, I am afraid that we still have a large percentage of unemployed people with us and if, as Sir Philip McBride said, we are poised for another decade of quite remarkable development, we cannot have that position and at the same time a large army of unemployed people. Of course, one can understand the position of the two gentlemen in talking to the public, because they must get the support and help required during the forthcoming election campaign.

There was a rather remarkable twist in the figures relating to the unemployment position during July and August, and it is interesting to examine them. Although they show an improvement in the number of people employed, the number of those who were registered for unemployment benefits did not correspond. It makes one wonder where the difference came in. On July 28, 1961, the number of people registered for employment in South Australia was 6,581 males and 3,472 females, making a total of 10,053. On September 1 the corresponding figures were 6,405, 3,238 and 9,643. The number of people registered decreased during August by 410, yet we find that the corresponding number of people

receiving unemployment benefits was not nearly as good. People who were receiving unemployment benefits on July 29 were 3,708 males and 1,280 females, making a total of 4,988; and on September 2 the corresponding figures were 3,615, 1,275 and 4,890, a decrease of 98. If there were 410 fewer people registered for unemployment during August, it is rather remarkable that there were only 98 fewer people receiving unemployment benefits. Apparently, those figures do not tally, for let us study another set of figures dealing with the same subject. They were prepared by the Deputy Commonwealth Statistician (Mr. D. L. J. Aitchison), who made a statement that appeared in the *Mail* of September 30. This does not correspond with the other statement. He said there was an increase of £20,736 in the amount paid in unemployment benefits, and that £91,931 was paid to 4,848 people during August. This compared with £72,667 paid out in July. It seems to me that the hardship on people who are unemployed is becoming greater. It seems wrong that people should talk about prosperity and economic booms while unemployment is still rife. The people making those statements seem to be talking with their tongue in their cheek.

Another statement by the President of the Master Builders' Association was published in the *Advertiser* of September 28. Among other things he said that the industry had not picked up much in the past two months but by the end of the year it should be in full swing. That does not help the people who are unemployed because there is still three months to go before the end of the year and they are not receiving any wages in the meantime. We know that people not employed in October and November will certainly not be employed in December or early January. This particular article was commented on by people who are in contact with the workers in industry, and the Secretary of the Bricklayers Society in South Australia, Mr. H. A. Elliot, said that the building trade had shown little, if any, improvement in the past two or three months and that the trade was in a very serious position. He foresaw some improvement in the near future. The Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of South Australia, Mr. V. J. Martin, estimated that between 80 and 100 carpenters were out of work and although some money had been released to help the building industry, it was apparent it was not affecting the re-employment of carpenters to any great extent, because the employment position had

only improved slightly from July and August, when 130 carpenters were out of work.

An article in the *Advertiser* on October 4 headed "Timber Industry Aid" stated that Department of Trade officers were investigating a national housing plan to help the timber industry. The officers had contacted the timber industry authorities at Mount Gambier in connection with the plan which had been recommended to the Minister of Trade by the South Australian Sawmillers' Association. The President of the Association, Mr. E. J. Roughana, who was a member of the deputation of timber interests which discussed housing with the Minister, said that the Minister had promised to investigate the plan immediately. Follow-in that move, Mr. Toman, Secretary of the Timber Workers Union, said there had been serious retrenchments in the South Australian timber industry over the last six months and that there were no prospects of re-employment for those who had been retrenched because of the falling demand and the introduction of new methods. He said that not many first-class machinists were out of work but that serious unemployment existed amongst unskilled labourers, mostly in forests and timber mills in the South-East.

On Friday last the Commonwealth Minister for Labour, Mr. McMahon, made apologies for the figures which will come out relating to the position at the end of September. Replying to a question in the House of Representatives by Mr. Barnes, he said that the next figures on unemployment, which would be published on October 16, would be slightly distorted, and that the reasons were the Mount Isa industrial dispute, the meat industry seasonal lay-off in Queensland, and the General Motors-Holden's lay-offs. However, he said he was optimistic that his forecast of improvement would be accurate.

In addition to these examples, there has been an incident in our own State within the last week. I refer to the suggestion of closing down Radium Hill, with the consequent effect upon the 450 employees at that town and a further 150 at Port Pirie. I shall not argue the merits of this case because I do not know enough about it. It is proposed that the mine at Radium Hill will close down early in December, although some people will be employed until early January. I do not know where these people will be employed, but I urge the Government to treat them as kindly, leniently and helpfully as possible, because after all, they did go to a remote part and did a good job in the interests of the State

during the time they were there. History has shown that these people will have extreme difficulty in obtaining employment at the end of the year because in this State from about the third week in December to the third week in January very few people will be re-employed. Industry in the State is practically at a standstill then, and although I have spoken on this matter before, it seems to me wrong that industry as a whole should be closed down for practically one month in 12 in each year.

To see the real signs of the effect of unemployment one only had to see the Labor Day procession yesterday, where a group of about 100 New Australians with no other object but to prove they were unemployed, took part in the procession and chanted, "We want work". I do not know what we can do, but I think it is a sin to have people from other countries coming here and being unemployed. There is nothing more disheartening to a newcomer to this country than to be unable to find work. To the best of my knowledge these men want to work, and most of them are decent, law-abiding citizens. For them to be out of work must be a great hardship. They have other problems to contend with, too, and I can appreciate their feelings. I would like the Government to undertake a larger programme of house-building for rental purposes. I am particularly concerned about the people who live in the western portion of the metropolitan area. The Government should have taken advantage of the number of unemployed people available for work. The Housing Trust has decided wisely that all temporary houses in that portion of the metropolitan area should be demolished and solid houses built to accommodate the people turned out of their temporary houses. About 2,000 temporary houses are situated in that part of the metropolitan area. Already about 900 have been demolished and the occupants have been transferred to solid houses. This has been done in 18 months, but another two years must elapse before the occupants of all the 2,000 temporary homes are accommodated elsewhere. During the time that these houses are being demolished and others built, irrespective of how great the need, other people cannot get a trust home. By using unemployed people the trust could have constructed solid houses in order to provide the houses that are needed, and not necessitate people having to wait until all the temporary homes have been demolished.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How many builders are unemployed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have read that there is no improvement in the position of bricklayers, and I know 100 carpenters are unemployed, as well as some painters. This information has come from the secretaries of the various unions. A man asked me to help him get a house in the western part of the metropolitan area. He is married with two children, and has a permanent job at Exeter at somewhere near an average wage. He is now living in a flat at Glenelg that has one bedroom, a lean-to kitchen and a bathroom, for which he pays £4 4s. a week. I took up the matter with the trust and was told that there was not much prospect of his getting a house in Exeter in the next two years, but that if he would go to Gepps Cross a house might be found for him temporarily, and that as soon as possible he would be given a house in the western part of the metropolitan area. Apparently he knew the position at Gepps Cross because he said he preferred to stay at Glenelg. Then I was told that if he would go to Elizabeth he would get a house in a reasonable time. To ask a person in a permanent job of five or six years standing at Exeter, content with his work and his employer satisfied with him, to go to Elizabeth to live is stretching things a little too far. He has decided to stay where he is in the hope that he will soon get a house.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: Many people come from Elizabeth to work in Adelaide.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, because of circumstances and not by choice. People who have been in a desperate housing position have had to put up with this state of affairs, but those who have done so have not thought much of it because coming from Elizabeth to the city can involve an expenditure of about 30s. a week in fares. As soon as possible these people come back to the city, and when they do that they are not considered further for a trust house. The people are getting wise to the position and will not accept houses offered in this way. Rather than keep these desirable applicants in a state of suspense for the next two years the Government should alter its policy and build more houses to accommodate them.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: You cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not a matter of having it both ways. The people who are now living in temporary houses will have solid houses built for them, but other people wanting trust houses will have to wait until people in temporary homes are accommodated elsewhere.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: Do you read the Housing Trust booklet that is published showing the number of houses built?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, I do not think there is much criticism in my remarks about the Housing Trust. I am making a suggestion to improve its housing programme.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Government said it would build more houses.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but most of them will be for sale. I was privileged, last week, to attend the South Australian Public Schools Music Society's festival of music and watch and listen to the programme. I have regularly attended the festival and it is hard to find anyone attending the festival who does not believe he owes a debt of gratitude to the people who manage it. Mr. R. S. Michelmore, the manager of the festival, had on the platform, under his control 400 children who were drawn in batches of 40 from 10 different schools. It would be hard to find a better sight than those children marching on to the platform, facing ahead and then turning to face the audience. I have never seen a better exhibition. I have been told that much work is involved in preparation for the festival. At the commencement 60 or 70 children are selected from each of the 10 schools and that number is finally reduced to 40. Some people must do a great deal of work in selecting the best students and it is to their credit that such a high standard is achieved in the final performance.

A debt of gratitude is owed to the conductor (Mr. S. J. Scoble), because he was able to hold the attention of the pupils from the time he took the stand until the festival was ended. Mr. Scoble, and the other people who train the children for the festival, take them over only after the children have reached a certain standard. Therefore, we must go back even further and thank the teachers of the Education Department from the infant schools right up to the time the children are trained for the festival of music. It would not be possible for a child to reach that standard if he were not taught and conducted in the proper manner from the start. The parents of the children who gain a place on the platform must be very proud of their children and should be thankful to the teachers who have brought them to that standard. I believe that I am expressing the views of all honourable members and parents when I say "Thank you" to the Education Department teachers and the manager of the festival of music for what they are doing for

the youth of the metropolitan area. Much work is necessarily involved in this festival because the programme extends over six nights, which means that 2,400 children take part.

The solo items also are greatly enjoyed. They are given by various school pupils and provide an interlude in the main choral items. Three of the best performers receive a bursary to further their studies and that encourages pupils to take part in the festival of music. The department should be thanked for the excellent job it is doing.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: That may be the answer to the question in today's *News*, "Why are our singers so good?"

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Many of our best artists may have had their start in the festival of music. The Appropriation Bill contains a clause that I have not seen before. I asked one authority about it and was told he thought that it was all right. I refer to clause 3 (4), which states:

The Governor may, by warrant under section 32a of the Public Finance Act, 1936-1960, appropriate out of the general revenue of the State any money required to meet further expenditure beyond the amounts provided in the estimates of expenditure for the year ending on the thirtieth day of June one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two for costs of electricity supplied to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and from bores in the Adelaide Water District, and through the Morgan-Whyalla water main. The aggregate amount of money which may be appropriated under the said section 32a for the said financial year shall be increased by the amount of money appropriated pursuant to this sub-section.

The Chief Secretary, in his second reading explanation of the Bill, said:

The necessity to provide for power for pumping varies widely from year to year according to seasonal conditions. The cost of power to pump water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, through the Morgan-Whyalla main, and from bores, reached the very high figure of £922,000 in 1959-60 because of the particularly dry season, whereas in 1960-61, following a very good season, the cost fell to £275,000. The present holding of reservoirs is well below the desirable level for this time of the year and at the moment it appears certain that the maintenance of adequate water supplies will require much more pumping from the Murray than was necessary last year. The Bill includes provision for the expenditure of £575,000 for power for pumping through the Mannum-Adelaide main and from bores in the Adelaide Water District and through the Morgan-Whyalla main.

If the present season is as bad as the 1959-60 season—and present indications are that it very well could be as bad—the Government will have

to find the difference between £575,000 and £922,000, which was the pumping cost in 1959-60. I should like to know whether this money will come from the Appropriation Bill or whether it is a further sum that has to be raised. Also, metropolitan residents can expect water problems practically every year because, although the department is doing all it can to extend catchment areas and the holding capacities of reservoirs, even in a normal year it will still be necessary to pump water. That was done last year even though we had a good winter, but, in a particularly dry season, we can expect that it will cost up to £900,000 to supply water to metropolitan consumers. I should like the Chief Secretary in reply to say whether the normal way to meet such an emergency is to use clause 3 (4), whether further money will be appropriated from somewhere else to meet the added cost, or whether it will be taken from the department as set out in the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It must be in the Appropriation Bill or it cannot be spent.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: But where does the money come from?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It is the same position as if it is voted by the House.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It means an increased deficit?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Although that is bad enough, it is the better of two evils, as it does not mean pruning expenditure in another direction, which could further affect unemployment. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I congratulate the Government on once again balancing its Budget and in providing for this State a public service that seems to operate economically and with an unvarying high standard of integrity. I note that at least one item on the income side—State Land Tax—seems to be increasing out of proportion to the rate of increase of either production or population. Although the increase does not represent a great percentage in the total receipts, it represents a real increase in the costs of business activities in the metropolitan area. I do not wish to discuss further the body of the Estimates except for a few items of miscellaneous social services. However, I should like to reply to a statement just made by the Hon. Mr. Shard. Although I am sympathetic with his desire for more low-rental houses for people needing them, I think

it is time to remember that Adelaide is no longer a small city and that we must stop thinking in a small way. In large cities men cannot live within a short distance of their places of employment. In Sydney an hour is the regular travelling time for a man to go to his employment and, if he pays less than 30s. a week in fares, he is most fortunate. The Labor Government in New South Wales, however, is not rushing around madly to provide cheap houses for workmen within five minutes' travelling time of their places of employment.

It must be obvious to all honourable members who study the Bill carefully that the policy of the Government is to give generous and well-considered help to institutions working to provide better conditions for various sections of the community. For example, the Government continues to make grants to the Royal Institution for the Blind; this year the grant is £32,000. I realize that one honourable member of this Chamber, by reason of his work as President of the Board running this fine institution, can give a more detailed account than I, but it is easier for me as an outsider than it would be for the Hon. Mr. Melrose to praise the work of the board. In recent months I visited the institution, which is run splendidly. At the end of the last financial year it was giving employment to 83 blind, partially-sighted and deaf people, and its success can be gauged by the fact that the sale of manufactured goods in the previous year had realized almost £61,000. That is no mean achievement. However, that is only part of the work of that institution. It finds places in industry for its members, it gives weekly benefits to many aged and infirm blind persons from a pension provided by the board, and, last but not least, it runs Melrose House, which recently celebrated its 21st birthday. I attended that function and found that the home was run with efficiency, skill and loving care and that it gave comfortable and happy life to, I think, 24 blind men and women who were aged or unemployable. None of these things would have been possible if the Government had not continued its most necessary aid.

A small but welcome grant of £300 is provided to the St. John Ambulance Brigade. I draw attention to the work done by the hundreds of volunteers who week after week give unselfish services to the community which are only too often taken for granted. Every week-end members of the brigade attend sporting and social fixtures, where they are on hand to render first-aid should injury befall any of

the participants or onlookers. Only two weeks ago the courage displayed by members of the brigade was demonstrated at the Morphettville racecourse after a crash at one of the jumps. The officers faced the oncoming gallopers with flags raised to indicate where a horse had fallen; this took a considerable amount of courage. In the summer particularly, members of the brigade render an important service at our beaches by manning first-aid posts. Here the minor hurts are healed and the more serious injuries are relieved pending the arrival of a doctor. In my district the last 12 months have seen the establishment of yet another division of the brigade. At Brighton a band of volunteers, under an enthusiastic superintendent, now mans a casualty room on the foreshore. This room is manned by an all-female staff of 14 members who, since the beginning of the year, have spent 524 hours on this work and have treated 326 patients. During the winter, classes in first-aid and home nursing have been conducted in order to achieve and maintain a high degree of proficiency. This has been made possible by the presence of three registered nursing sisters. I mention these details only to emphasize the type of service given unselfishly to the beach-loving public of South Australia every summer by members of the brigade.

I was particularly glad to notice that over £500,000 is allocated to the Aborigines Department. This is an increase of £97,525. I congratulate the Government on its policy in relation to our aborigines. Once more it is making generous grants to mission work and is maintaining one grant of £6,000 to the Evangelical Lutheran Church and increasing the other to that church by £2,000. It is granting £9,000 to assist in the running of the Ernabella mission, which is maintained by the church of which I am a member, the Presbyterian Church, but the item which gives me greatest satisfaction is the increase of over £12,000, making a total of £48,000, towards the maintenance of aboriginal children in institutions and homes and the payment of their boarding allowance and pocket money.

I have spoken in this House before of the excellent work being done by various orphanages and homes for babies in this State, and it was pleasing to me to see £2,500 having been granted to Kate Cocks' memorial babies home for its new buildings. I now wish to mention in more detail the work being done by the Government in the field of prisoners' welfare and rehabilitation, and in this connection to

mention the work of the Prisoners' Aid Association which the Government has recognized once more by its annual grant of £3,000. Today there is no question that aid for prisoners is necessary, and we accept it as a requirement of our modern thinking in relation to crime and punishment, that is, aid to prisoners undergoing their sentence and definite plans for their rehabilitation as citizens after completing that sentence. All honourable members know that there has been a considerable change in outlook in this respect in the last 100 years. This was the logical development of the change in attitude towards prisoners which was brought about by the work of the great Christian reformers in the 18th and 19th centuries. Social workers are appointed to prison staffs to prepare after-care plans for prisoners before discharge, and in this regard I congratulate the Government on its appointment of a psychologist for this work. The function of the 20th century prison has become not only one of punishment but also one of education, to change men's outlook and behaviour. The need for a prisoner's rehabilitation is now regarded as essential. Honourable members will remember the visit to the Cadell training centre where they saw how a modern prison can function for the ultimate benefit of the community.

The only question we have to decide is who is responsible for the aid and rehabilitation. I believe that different units of the community are responsible for different aspects of this. The Christian church and a Christian community has a responsibility in helping to rebuild the character of and to re-establish under reasonable conditions of livelihood all those who give signs of having changed their outlook or who have recognized their own faults after due punishment or penance. Again, the Government can by its policy of prison administration do its duty of protecting society by training offenders for citizenship within the limits of their sentences. Unless some change in a man's outlook can be achieved during his term of imprisonment, he is likely to leave prison with a spirit of revenge against society and so become a greater menace than before. We have in this State a Government which has made a determined effort to train and educate offenders during their term of imprisonment. I have already mentioned Cadell training centre, where a man has every chance to be reformed. He can undertake complete training courses and be fitted for a variety of occupations when he is free. Similar training programmes are in operation in other sections of our prison system.

The Government can assist, too, by helping the offenders' dependants, as has recently been done by the Commonwealth Government in granting a pension to the wives of prisoners as if they were in the same category as class A widows. This has brought about a sense of security and a measure of comfort to those who suffer most, the family. I understand that the Welfare Department in this State attends to these matters and treats all cases with understanding and expedition. However, I believe it is in fact undesirable for a Government to have too much responsibility in the matter of rehabilitation, and a grant such as I have mentioned which is made by the Government to the Prisoners' Aid Association is on a firmer basis. The things that a prisoner needs, self respect and an improved psychological outlook generally, are second only to finding employment and earning money. No matter what steps a Government takes for the after-care of the prisoners the real success of any rehabilitation lies in the attitude of the general public. An example of what can happen if the general public is antagonistic was shown recently in New South Wales. The Cumberland Civil Rehabilitation Committee this year completed its plan to establish a hostel for ex-prisoners in the Parramatta district. A property was purchased and the necessary plans made, then in July the local council received a complaint from a group of ratepayers who objected to the establishment of such a hostel in their district. The result was that the council refused the Civil Rehabilitation Committee the right to establish the hostel and this nullified the whole project.

The work of the Prisoners' Aid Association is growing. Most of its money is spent on what I call tangible welfare. The formation a year ago of the Women's Auxiliary of the Association has meant a great deal of difference to the women prisoners at the Adelaide Gaol. As I have mentioned before in this House, there is a marked difference in the treatment given to men compared with that given to women. Being so few in number, the amount spent on the rehabilitation of the women is negligible. In such small things as the issue of cigarettes, I have received a complaint. The men receive an issue; the women do not. Although a non-smoker myself, I know what a hardship it is for a smoker to be so deprived, man or woman. I hope that the department will give sympathetic consideration to this matter.

Returning to my main theme, however, one of the great needs today, as has always been in this matter, is the public relations aspect of prisoner's rehabilitation, that is, the education of the public to recognize and accept its responsibility, the education of the public to know what the correct treatment of ex-prisoners must be—this is the sphere which requires more attention and more hard work than any other. This I believe is the big work of the Prisoners' Aid Association. Honourable members know, as well as I do, that there is a high proportion of people anywhere, who, by a human and animal instinct will never, once a person has been punished, let the punishment cease. It is the difficulty of getting employment which makes the rehabilitation of an offender so fraught with complex troubles and suffering for his family. There is always a stigma; just as there is always a flock of people, official or unofficial, who run around to warn the employer of a man's past. This is the sort of thing which will defeat any rehabilitation programme.

Within the Prisoners' Aid Association there are a number of trained people who are prepared to devote themselves without reward to this work of rehabilitation. There is a vast amount of voluntary work being done. This and the ample goodwill of all those associated with it does much to boost the work of the Government in the prison field. Naturally, all new methods of rehabilitation are being studied from sources in Australia and abroad, but naturally, too, much of the work is limited by the amount of money available. I therefore believe that the Government is acting wisely in granting this annual amount of £3,000 to the Prisoners' Aid Association and I hope that this amount will be increased as soon as possible to enable the work being done so excellently to develop along modern lines.

I would like to quote the words of Winston Churchill speaking in debate 50 years ago:—

The mood and temper of the public in regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unflinching tests of any country. A calm, dispassionate recognition of the rights of the accused and even of the convicted criminal, against the State—a constant heart-searching by all charged with the duty of punishment—a desire and eagerness to rehabilitate in the world of industry those who have paid their due in the hard coinage of punishment; tireless efforts towards the discovery of curative and regenerative processes; unflinching faith that there is a treasure, if you can only find it, in the heart of every man. These are the symbols, which in the treatment of

crime and criminal, mark and measure the stored-up strength of a nation and are sign and proof of the living virtue within it.

There is also a great deal of work being done by the Government in the rehabilitation of young delinquents, as instanced in the work of Magill, Vaughan House, Struan Farm School and Lochiel Park. There are other organizations which also work along these lines. I wish briefly to refer specifically to the work of "The Pines". The Government is paying out £1,900 this year towards its maintenance, and rightly so, because many of the girls have been committed to its care by the courts. At the time of my visit a few weeks ago, the full quota of 60 girls aged from 12 to 16 were in residence. I inspected the school, which is conducted for the benefit of the younger children. I saw the encouragement being given to girls who displayed an aptitude in the arts. I saw other rehabilitation work being done, not only among the young but also among a number of women alcoholics. Delinquency is not a new problem even if it is a word very popular today.

The Order, the Good Shepherd Nuns, which runs the "Pines" came into existence because there was a need for it 300 years ago. I get very tired of the jargon continually issuing from the mouths of amateur psychologists in all walks of life, who place all the blame for delinquency on the parents. We do not find the trained psychologists making such sweeping statements. Every time that this is said, it makes it more difficult for some parents to maintain their control over already belligerent children. It is just too easy to put the blame on the person who worries most, the parent, and never have to face the fact that weakness and evil do exist. I mention this because the Mother Superior at the Home told me that a number of the children are brought in by parents desperately in need of help to control their children. If the Government could give consideration to giving some financial help towards the establishment of a separate hostel by this Order, so that the girls who have completed their time of punishment might continue to live under the influence of these good women, I believe that the result would be of lasting benefit to the community as a whole.

I feel that I have been emulating Dostoevski today. Evidently "Crime and Punishment" makes for verbosity, but I feel that this is a field in which the Government is working sincerely and earnestly, and which needs sympathetic public understanding. I support the Bill.



The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading, but shall not refer in detail to the lines of the Estimates. The Government must be congratulated on the admirable way in which it has presented the Budget with a small surplus, but some members are worried whether it will be possible for the Government to obtain the estimated revenue. Last year the surplus of over £1,000,000 was the result of higher receipts by the Railways Department and the Harbors Board following on a good season. Government revenue is closely linked with seasonal conditions. For instance, the Bill provides that if during this financial year it should become necessary to pump water from the Murray River there can be an expenditure of up to £400,000 for the consumption of electric power. If we do incur this extra expenditure, and perhaps more, and there is a decrease in revenue obtained by the Railways Department and the Harbors Board because of an adverse season the Government's accounts for this year will be different from its Budget.

Not only is the Government relying on the maintenance of this increased revenue by the two departments mentioned, but it has budgeted for an additional income of £452,000. The position will need to be carefully watched. If there is the decrease mentioned and the extra expenditure is incurred, the estimate will be out by over £1,000,000. Then, a deficit would result. Many of us look with interest at the possibility of higher receipts being obtained from land taxation than has been estimated. I join with the Hon. Mrs. Cooper in saying that it is disturbing each year to see higher amounts received from land taxation. I shall refer to this in more detail when we discuss the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill. The Government is reliant upon good seasons for accurate forecasting of revenue and expenditure.

Recent statements in the press cause me to speak about the number of judges of the Supreme Court. One statement in a newspaper last week reported a big build-up of about 576 matrimonial actions waiting to be heard. In addition to that a speculative report appeared in the *News* two or three weeks ago about the possibility of an extra judge being appointed to the Supreme Court for the purpose of exercising jurisdiction solely in the matrimonial causes field. As a result of those two reports I examined the question of whether we had sufficient judges to cope with the work brought about by the rise in our population.

In 1926 an Act of Parliament increased the number of Supreme Court judges from four to five when the State's population was 560,925. A further amendment to the Supreme Court Act in 1952 increased the number of judges from five to six when our population was 768,570. Therefore, it was found necessary or desirable to increase the number of judges by one because there had been an increase of 207,645 in our population in 26 years. I ask whether we have not now, in our development, reached a position where we could, as was suggested by the newspaper, have an additional judge in the Supreme Court, because our population on June 30, 1961, was 964,759. Since that time another quarter has passed and, although I have not the figures available, the population has probably risen by 13,000 people in each month. Assuming that only two months have passed, our population would now be about 990,000, which represents an increase of approximately 220,000 in the last nine years. This indicates South Australia's rate of population growth because what it took us 26 years to achieve between 1926 and 1952 we have achieved in the short period of nine years.

The question now is whether the Government, having considered in 1952 that an extra judge was warranted because the population had increased by 207,000, should not now consider a further increase in the number of judges from six to seven because we have achieved a further increase of 222,000 in population. Persons actively engaged in legal work in the Supreme Court or other courts agree that the amount of the work is directly related to the population of the State. That is indicated because the number of magistrates has been increased and the work of the local courts and the courts of summary jurisdiction has correspondingly increased. I have no doubt that it would be found that the work of the Supreme Court has also increased and is directly related to the increase in population.

The Government has not yet seen fit to appoint a successor to the late Mr. Justice Brazel, although two other judges will shortly reach the retiring age. The Government may be delaying an appointment until early in the new year. If it is true that there has been a big back-lag in work, particularly in the matrimonial causes jurisdiction of the court, that must inevitably increase because the court is functioning with one judge fewer than it should have under the present law. It may be that it is functioning, or endeavouring to function, with two fewer judges than it should have, if my contentions concerning our

increased population are correct. My figures are taken from the Commonwealth Statisticians' reports and I believe there is nothing wrong with them.

I believe it would be a great mistake for the Government to appoint a judge solely for the purpose of hearing matrimonial causes. I do not know, nor do I imagine, that the Government has considered this possibility, but the newspaper contained a speculative statement of that nature two or three weeks ago. I have had considerable experience in matrimonial work and if the Supreme Court figures are examined it will be found that one-third of the processes issued each year out of the Supreme Court are in relation to matrimonial causes work. It would be undesirable on this fact alone to have one-third of the court's work placed entirely in the hands of one particular judge. Apart from that, this would be extremely undesirable in the matrimonial causes jurisdiction because, if ever there was a jurisdiction in which facts and the views of facts helped to make the law, it is the matrimonial causes jurisdiction. It may be said, of course, that to some extent all law consists of, as it were, marrying facts to the law, but I think it is particularly important in the matrimonial jurisdiction of the Supreme Court that we should have the benefit of as many judges as possible giving their particular interpretations of the facts and saying how they feel the particular facts of a case meet the established law. I think it would be undesirable—and it has not been successful where it has been tried elsewhere in the world—to place the complete jurisdiction in this field in the hands of one person, who may have a narrow view and may channel the law into a rut so that rapid and flexible growth in that branch would be impossible.

I think that it is to some extent true that most judges (and magistrates for that matter) do not really like the matrimonial causes jurisdiction and that if they had a choice they would rather hear and try common law cases, with their interesting applications of the law. This, of course, is quite human. It is necessary to have, as it were, a flair for or be particularly interested in the interplay of human relations to be able to like matrimonial causes work. I do not suggest for a moment that any of our magistrates or judges have ever deliberately dodged this particular work; all I am saying is that it is perhaps not the most popular jurisdiction. I doubt if this jurisdiction is occupying as much as one-third of judges' time, as a tremendous amount of the work is done by the Master and Deputy Master of the court. However, as it accounts for one-third of the pro-

cesses issued, it represents a most important jurisdiction in which the general public has a vital interest indeed. I think it can truthfully be said that the members of the public are more concerned about their particular cases and more interested in how the judge feels about their cases and in the views he expresses at the hearings or trials in this jurisdiction than in any other. For all these reasons, I hope that the Government will seriously consider whether or not we should have an extra judge in our Supreme Court and, if it comes to that conclusion, either now or next year, or some time in the future, that it will appoint such judge as a general jurisdiction judge and not confine him merely to hearing matrimonial causes, for I think that would be a retrograde step. We have established an excellent system, and I hope it will continue.

I was interested to see in the estimates of receipts that the Government received £1,300 from the Commonwealth Government on account of the services of the Judge in Insolvency and another £500 on account of the services of Supreme Court officers. I do not know what services were rendered by the Supreme Court officers, but I take it that the contribution was probably for the work of the court when the High Court was sitting here, and possibly there was a contribution for the work of the Registrars in the High Court. However, it seems to me that the Government should be thinking of the desirable possibility of obtaining some contribution from the Commonwealth Government for the work the court is now doing in the matrimonial causes field. Perhaps it is too early for this, as over 100 actions under our old State laws are still pending, but probably within the next 12 months all the matrimonial work in the Supreme Court will be under Commonwealth jurisdiction. It seems to me that a strong case could be made out by the Government for some financial contribution from the Commonwealth Government for this particular work along the same lines as those on which a contribution is made for the work of the Judge in the Insolvency Court.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Government on its excellent budgeting. I hope that its estimates turn out to be correct and that when we meet again next year it will not have to say there has been a big deficit. This, of course, is tied up with seasonal conditions and the way in which the Government manages to extricate itself from any difficulties that may arise in the next 12 months. All in all, I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF  
ENFIELD LOAN) ACT AMEND-  
MENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

By the Local Government (City of Enfield Loan) Act, 1953, the Municipal Council of the City of Enfield was empowered to borrow £250,000 for certain drainage works. Early in this year the council asked the Government whether it would consider the introduction of an amendment to the special Act to authorize the council to borrow a further £250,000, if, of course, the Savings Bank were willing to make an advance. The council pointed out that works already completed provided for the disposal of storm waters through the land east of the main north railway and that a similar project was envisaged for the western area. The scheme would provide drainage for Croydon Park, Ferryden Park, Woodville Gardens, Mansfield Park, Angle Park and Wingfield. The council felt that it was a permanent work which ought to be done and this Bill is accordingly now being introduced. The Savings Bank has, I understand, been approached and is agreeable to making the further advance.

The Bill merely substitutes the amount of £500,000 for £250,000 in the long title and enabling section of the principal Act the provisions of which are of a continuing nature and will apply in respect of the new as to the old loan. This being a "hybrid" Bill, it has in accordance with the Joint Standing Orders been investigated by a Select Committee in another place and was recommended by the Committee. I offer the Bill for the consideration of members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1079.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I rise to support this Bill and, first of all, would like to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Densley on his very well prepared and delivered address which I think was most informative. He went deeply into certain questions, particularly the method by which the unimproved value is calculated. I do not propose to deal with that matter because he

went into it fully. I disagree to some extent with one thing he said, and that was, if I remember rightly, that he regarded land tax as a reasonable form of taxation. They were not the words he used, but he was prepared to accept land tax in that vein. I am not prepared to debate that question today because we have to accept it as a form of taxation that has been adopted and will obviously continue to be adopted. I am not in favour of capital taxes, except possibly if they are for special purposes. I suppose, in a sense, one can call council rates and water rates capital taxes, but they are for specific services that are rendered in respect of the land which is taxed and that is probably some justification for them. However, I do not propose to deal with that matter because it has no particular bearing on the Bill as presented to us, except that I would like to say that the maximum rate of taxation at present and which will remain unchanged is roughly 3 per cent of the capital value, which is a pretty substantial amount, particularly when you think that a lot of the land taxed has to earn money. Those who are mathematicians could make a calculation and would probably find that that amount at 3 per cent compound interest would mean that a man has to re-buy his land from the Crown possibly every 20 years, or something like that.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You mean economists, not mathematicians?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I mean a mathematician or an actuary, not an economist. I make it clear that in this form of taxation, while it continues, I do not oppose the Government taking into account inflation, with a reasonable increase as that inflationary process continues. I emphasize the word "reasonable," because while we have inflation and it continues, it is obvious that services and revenue have to keep pace with each other, and I do not challenge the concept that with that inflation certain forms of taxation should increase. However, it does become important that we should examine who is to bear the burden, that is, how fairly the Bill deals with the particular individuals concerned, because this matter concerns all landholders whether they are in the city, the suburbs, industrial areas, country towns or country broad acres, or any form of land. I realize it is impossible to do absolute justice in a general Bill of this nature but I think it is important to consider the matter closely, especially when amendments dealing with one section of those people are presented

to us. It is important that we should examine how the Bill bears on the particular types of individuals as classes.

I indicate at this stage that it is not my present intention to move any amendments to this Bill. I have three valid reasons for making that statement, but of course that decision could change as the debate progresses, and it may become necessary for me to reconsider that decision. The reasons I have for saying that are, first of all, that it is clear that the Government has made a real and genuine attempt to alleviate the lot of the land tax payer by certain so-called concessions that are made in the Bill. Whether the concessions go far enough is a matter which I think it will be necessary for time to tell, because it is difficult at this stage to be perfectly clear as to what the effect is going to be. I will deal with that position later. Secondly, it is a money Bill and therefore we can only make suggestions from this House, and I find myself in a rather unfavourable position to amend this Bill because it at least does give some concessions and therefore, if one does not support it, one would be denying them to the people who are to receive those concessions which the Government finds itself ready and capable of making.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That means you are not going to support the amendments on the file?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It means that I am proposing to move no amendments myself unless the circumstances change. What my attitude to other members' amendments will be, will be determined in the Committee stages in the light of the debate.

I will try to deal with the Bill in a logical sequence. I propose to deal with the history of land tax legislation in Australia because that has an important bearing on the consideration of this Bill, and I do not think it has been dealt with fully by previous speakers. Secondly, I want to refer to the application of the altered tax. Thirdly, I shall ask the Chief Secretary if he will give an assurance that there will be further consideration of the matter in the light of experience. Fourthly, I shall suggest other means that can possibly be adopted as a logical sequence of events as they have happened in relation to land tax.

I shall deal with the Australian history of this matter, because Federal and State Land Tax are linked together. Land tax came into being in South Australia in 1884 when the rate was  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. in

the pound. There was no additional tax for land valued at more than £5,000. In 1894 there was an additional tax of a  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. in the pound added for land over a value of £5,000. In 1904 each rate was altered to  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. In 1915 it came back to a  $\frac{1}{4}$ d., and in 1927 it increased again to  $\frac{3}{4}$ d. The rate has remained the same since 1952. This is the background of the matter, but I do not think that it is important. The important year to remember is 1952 when Federal land tax was abolished. In his Budget speech that year Sir Arthur Fadden (Commonwealth Treasurer) said:

Land tax was introduced in 1910 with the avowed purpose of breaking up large rural estates that were not being used to their full commercial advantage. The truth today is that by far the greatest proportion of the tax is levied on city land which is already fully developed, and which could not be subdivided even were the owners willing to do so. The Government accordingly proposes to vacate the land tax field on and from July 1, 1952. The cost to revenue in this financial year is estimated at £6,250,000.

On the Land Tax Abolition Bill he said:

It cannot be denied that the tax is a tax upon a capital asset. In the case of primary producers the tax is upon their main income producing asset. As between producers using land and producers using other types of assets, because of its particularity, a most inequitable discrimination is set up against landowners. While other capital assets, such as plant and machinery, are not regarded as proper subjects for the imposition of a tax the Government is unable to agree that land should be singled out for a special imposition.

These are fairly weighty arguments but I do not propose to deal with the matter further, because it has no real application to this Bill, except as a background as to why land tax should not be a heavy tax. I think that Sir Arthur's statement put the matter in a nutshell and I do not propose to argue the principles any further. However, when Federal land tax was abolished apparently the States did not agree with the substance of the arguments put forward by Sir Arthur, because each State promptly stepped into the field vacated by the Commonwealth, and so the landowner who paid Federal land tax (there was an exemption of the first £8,750) did not come off as well as he expected when the Federal land tax was abolished. As far as South Australia is concerned, I think I should make it clear that the total amounts received under State land tax rates ever since the Federal people vacated the field have not been as high as the total amounts that were previously leviable by both Federal and State Governments. For land with a value of over £5,000 there was a

flat State rate of 1½d. in the pound. In the Federal field the rate was 1d. for every pound over £5,000. Later the Commonwealth exemption was increased to £8,750. It went up in progressive steps until there was a super-tax levied at £20,000, and finally the rate reached 9d. in the pound for taxable value of £75,000. Then it flattened out. The person who had land worth over £80,000 paid 10½d. in the pound in those days, whereas now he pays 7½d. The land tax is lighter, and that should be pointed out in fairness to the Government. I do not know why it was made lighter. I have not looked at the debates but it could be related to the matter that I argued during the Address in Reply debate. I said that when land increased in value by inflation the rates could slide at lesser frequency and at lesser steepness, but again that is by the way. I want now to deal with the practical application of the assessment. I asked the Chief Secretary a question about the actual tax in each of the categories in the sliding scale. Unfortunately, the Chief Secretary could only indicate that he was unable to reply to the question. He said:

The information will not be available in these categories until billing is completed for 1961-62 and a complete analysis made of individual taxpayers' accounts following the application of the contemplated amendments.

It is difficult to argue today certain aspects of the application of this Bill, because the answer to my question still prevails. It is still impossible for the department to give the information to clarify the real amount that this tax under the new assessment will return. I understand that in reply to a deputation some few months ago it was indicated that the tax would be £2,100,000, less the concessions amounting to £400,000. That would give a net tax return of £1,700,000. A more recent figure, however, is £2,400,000, and if we deduct the £400,000 we get a net amount of £2,000,000. These figures are fairly significant because I worked out what the percentage increases would be. The previous amount levied under State land tax was £1,400,000. If the amount increased to £1,700,000, which was the first estimate, that would have been a rise of 21½ per cent. If the amount is £2,000,000 after deducting the concessions, there will be a rise of 43 per cent. I said that I felt that the amount levied should increase commensurately with the amount of the inflation. It would not be exactly that amount because some real rise in value takes place, but the main rise is inflationary. From 1955 to now the basic wage, which I think is possibly the best

denominator of inflation, rose by 17 per cent to the time the new assessment was made. It is now about 21½ per cent above the 1955 figure. The figure of 21½ per cent is approximately what was contemplated as a result of the present increase in tax. However, that figure is now estimated at 43 per cent, which is considerably more than the inflationary factor.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Are your figures taken over the same period?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes, I have taken the basic wage in 1955, as at June, 1961, and as at July, 1961. I have also taken the 1955 and the 1960 assessments.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The 1955 assessment had not caught up with the inflationary trend.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is probably correct. I have made certain allowances in that regard in my own mind because, from observation and from figures, coupled with some knowledge I have of land values, I believe that the 1955 assessment was on a lower scale than the present assessment. I have details of various rises in assessments between 1955 and 1960 and I find it difficult to arrive at any actual pattern in the increase. City land has increased considerably, and I bear in mind what the Chief Secretary said, because the increase in actual city values between 1955 and 1960 is nothing like the increase in the assessment. Again, in the suburbs and particularly in those parts that I have the honour to represent—and that is why I am particularly concerned in one sense with this Bill—the assessments have risen sharply. In certain major country towns the assessments, on the figures I have, seem to have gone up fairly steeply, but in small country towns they seem to have remained fairly static.

As far as country lands—broad acres—are concerned I believe, as the Hon. Mr. Densley pointed out, that although country assessments have gone up there has not been much of a rise in country land values in that period, again bearing in mind that the 1955 assessment in relation to the actual value was on the low side. I have seen principally city and suburban figures, because I have the greatest access to them, and the increases in those figures have been so steep that I consider, although the information is not yet available, there has been a far greater percentage increase in city and suburban assessments than there has been in country areas. That is not deliberate, but it is in the nature of things because that is the way the values have gone. The fact remains

that the town dweller is bearing a higher percentage of taxation than the country man. Of course, the country man has to use his land as an economic matter, whereas the city man only has to live in his house and does not expect a return from it in most instances. Nevertheless, when paying a capital tax it is probably reasonable that everyone should pay commensurately the same sort of amount.

Will the Chief Secretary, on behalf of the Government, when replying to the debate on this important Bill, give an answer to the question of whether, if the net amount levied by the land tax exceeds the Government's estimate of £2,000,000, the Government will, as soon as possible after the figures have been ascertained, consider a further reduction either in the actual direct rate of tax or in the steps of the sliding scale by widening the steps? In view of the inflation I think the latter method might be the fairer. I would appreciate an answer to that question because I feel particularly strongly on this question. If the total tax received is in any way substantially above £2,000,000 will the Government consider a further alleviation in view of the various matters I have referred to relating to land tax?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you think it would be amended within five years?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The assessment will remain static for the next five years but the Government could alter the rates of tax at any time and I think that is what should be done because, after all, everyone has the right to appeal against his assessment. It is not the assessment which in my view should be queried from this aspect, but the question of what rates of tax are raised on the assessment.

In the Address in Reply debate I said that I thought that, in view of the inflation, the sliding scale should be opened out. The tax is 3d. up to £5,000 and increases at £10,000, £20,000 and so on, and in view of the inflation and the impact that has on the landholder the steps should be widened. Let me quote an example. If a person owned land in 1955 valued at £5,000 that land might now be assessed at £12,000 without the real value of the land having risen very much. Instead of paying 3d. in the pound the taxpayer would pay that amount on the first £5,000, 1d. (after the reduction) on the second £5,000 and 2d. (after the reduction) on the following £5,000. That is where the main hardship lies. I believe that I can bear out my prognostication by saying

that I have examined the percentage of revenue to capital value. These percentages are the percentage of the tax paid to the value of the land. In other words if £6 is paid on £1,000 worth of land that would represent the same percentage as £12 on £2,000 worth of land.

Under the 1952 assessment, the percentage of revenue to the assessed value was .53 per cent; under the 1955 assessment it increased to .6 per cent; and my estimate (although I know it is different from the Government's estimate), which was made by a former senior officer of the Land Tax Department, is that on the new assessment it will probably be .8 per cent. If these figures are correct they indicate this and this only—that people, by inflationary rises in the main, are getting into higher tax groups for the same land which may well be of the same real value (as opposed to money value), because much land remains static in real value. Most land does not gain much in real value; it goes up only because money loses in value. Money is said to be worth one-third of what it was worth before the war, and even less now; thus, land in general is probably worth at least three times as much as before the war. However, unless adjustments are made in the scale, and the individual can be paying more than he should pay. I suggest that this matter should be carefully looked at. I should be happy if the Government would be prepared to say, "We regard the present £2,000,000 as a fair thing to get out of the South Australian landowner and, if it comes to more, we shall certainly be prepared to consider giving him some further consideration in the way of a reduction in tax."

I think my contention in this regard is borne out by the fact that the revenue percentage to the assessment is rising. I am not particularly arguing the case of the big taxpayer, but it is a fact that the maximum concession that anyone can get out of this Bill is, in round figures, £198. The taxes of some people have increased by thousands of pounds, so concessions to these people are not great. However, those needing the most consideration are possibly the type of people represented by the members for Central No. 2 and Central No. 1 districts. Although figures alone can bear this out, I feel that proportionately they may well be suffering more than other people when, after all, their lot is much the same.

Although I support the second reading, I hope the Government will feel that it can give the assurance for which I am asking and which I know my colleagues for Central No. 2, and, I am sure, the members for Central No. 1,

would be happy to have: merely that this tax will be reviewed. Neither the Government nor anyone else is able at this stage to say exactly how much extra revenue land tax will produce. To use the Chief Secretary's words, "that cannot be ascertained until the billing is completed", but, as I said, the estimates I have had from people in a position to estimate these things have been higher than the Government's. Whose estimate is right, time alone will tell, but it would be a great help to me in the meantime if I could get some assurance such as that which I seek from the Government. In the meantime, I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): In supporting the Bill, I say at the outset that I agree with much that has already been said, which I do not intend to repeat. The speech made by the Hon. Mr. Densley was extremely good and summed up my attitude to this problem. I also listened intently to the speech of the Hon. Mr. Bevan, who put forward his viewpoint most tactfully. However, I think perhaps he missed a point when quoting taxes in the higher brackets—that some people in these brackets have moved to a much higher tax group. I can see his point that a 300 per cent increase is important at any level, but I think he may have over-estimated the effect on the small suburban landowner, whose tax may have increased from, say, £2 to £5. I feel quite seriously about this matter, but there are ways in which this type of tax can be absorbed. None of us would suggest that this taxation in the metropolitan area could not be passed on to lessees by landowners, to consumers by retail stores, and to clients by lawyers. Taxation in all these cases can possibly be absorbed. I shall attempt to show later that this is not so for the primary producer, but, before doing so, I point out that the crux of the problem, it seems to me, is in assessments.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, in reply to an interjection, spoke about the Government's ability to alter the rate of tax. I think the interjector meant an alteration at a moment's notice to the rate applied, but it was not answered in that way. In this Bill, which gives concessions to different types of taxpayers that the Government considers hardest hit, just that state of affairs has arisen. The rates have been adjusted, no doubt honestly, according to the Government's idea of where the greatest hardship exists. Right back at the core of the problem is whether assessments, based as they are now on unimproved land values, are a just

method of levying land tax. I consider that this is a just method. I have heard many people speak about inflated values, but the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, in talking of real values, was much closer to the mark than others I have heard. In a growing city like Adelaide and in a State growing as rapidly as South Australia is at present, the law of supply and demand must be considered. There is a narrow belt of fertile land close to Adelaide with the remainder of the fertile agricultural land further afield. Near Adelaide there is a shortage of high fertility land, and the demand for it has increased. With subdivision proceeding steadily, the demand increases at a far greater rate than was normally the case a few years ago. I cannot understand how people consider the present value as being an inflated or unreal valuation of such land. If we compare the valuation for land in this State with that in other capital cities, we find that the valuation for land here is considerably lower.

It is possible that certain sections of the community are being forced out of the metropolitan square mile, but I do not think that many members of this House would complain about that. One can see the number of hotels closing or being put up for sale in this area. This is most important and seems to me a matter of progress, and although the small family-owned hotel has always been a part of our way of life their value cannot be compared with that created by the expansion and increase in real wealth in South Australia. Various honourable members have quoted cases of the effect of this tax on their constituents. May I quote a typical letter that members of Southern Division in this House have recently received. I quote it intentionally because it shows the type of thinking on this subject by people in country districts. This particular letter refers to rural lands and states, *inter alia*:

The State land tax should be abolished—that would bring this State in line with Western Australia (our sister State, where there is no land tax on rural land) giving them that advantage over us in the Commonwealth of Australia. The proposed amendment of the Premier's does not sufficiently provide an answer to our problem. We point out that unless the definition of "unimproved value" is redrafted in the Act under the Premier's new proposed amendment, it would still mean that a speculator could purchase agricultural land at a highly inflated or false figure, leaving the agricultural land adjacent thereto subject to the same definition "what land can be expected to sell for" and the subsequent land tax assessment is based on a false or inflated figure, and it remains so for five years.

That is typical of the thinking of many people in agricultural areas, but there is perhaps one point that should be considered, and that is, what represents a true value where subdivision has entered the area? Does the subdivision value represent an inflated value or is there a real increase in the value of the land? Many people think that agricultural land should be exempted from land tax, and recently I travelled with a party of prominent city landholders all of whom suggested that there should be no land tax payable on rural land. Frankly, it surprised me, and I asked them to explain their attitude. Their livelihood did not depend on rural land.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That would let them out, too?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am talking of rural land.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I understood that.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: These people were not King William Street cockies. They had no interest in land outside the metropolitan area to my knowledge, and one of them would be the largest hotel owner in South Australia.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What would be the purport of investing money in that particular land?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: In what particular land?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That agricultural land you are talking about!

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am at a loss to understand the interjection. These people have not been farming in their back yards in the metropolitan square mile. They are not people who invest in agricultural land. I believe there is some justification in thinking that people whose livelihood is dependent on production from the land should not pay land tax. I am not upholding this idea however, but am quoting what has been told to me. I consider that the primary producers of this State should pay land tax to assist the State's revenue. Only a small percentage of the total land tax revenue comes from the man on the land.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That figure is not accessible. Nobody knows how much they pay!

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: It is easily found. If the honourable member had listened to the Hon. Mr. Densley's speech he would have heard the exact figures, from a very authentic source, quoted accurately.

I regard clause 7 as being some of the most enlightened legislation to come before this House. I have discussed this matter in other States, and am certain that this is one

of the greatest things we have seen in South Australia for a long time. Clause 7 can be regarded as the five-year plan for primary producers in subdivisional areas. I was interested when I learned that this matter was coming forward, because 12 months ago I thought that Parliament should see that land was not wasted in agricultural areas close to the metropolitan area. I cannot imagine anything worse than land in subdivided areas growing only weeds. The Bill makes it possible to use agricultural land close to the metropolitan area, and the provisions of the clause do not force primary producers to subdivide their land. It is a dreadful state of affairs when primary producers within 50 miles of the city have to subdivide highly productive land, particularly when it is not necessary subdivision but subdivision that has got out of hand. I commend the Government for this extremely enlightened piece of legislation. I might even say that it is liberal legislation. Under it primary producers will be able to carry on farming and sell their land when they wish to do so.

Under the principal Act 20 per cent was added to the land tax for absentee ownership, that is, when the people owning the land lived overseas. The Government has removed that tax. I cannot think of anything better that it could have done. Anything we can do to stimulate the private sector of the economy is a good thing. This sector is doing a great job and using funds to the maximum. Australia is trying to get money from overseas countries, but I feel that it is in a race against time. I am fully in accord with the Government's move to remove the absentee tax. South Australia is not a country like the Northern Territory. We do not have large tracts of land owned by cattle people outside Australia. It is a good move to encourage the further flow of capital into the State.

I want to refer to an anomaly associated with blocks of land with a narrow frontage in dense areas like Rundle Street. It is not possible to tax equitably a block with a narrow frontage compared to a block with a broad frontage. The demand for these narrow blocks is probably greater than the demand for wider blocks. As our city develops this matter must receive further consideration. It is not reasonable to tax heavily an owner who puts an asset on a small frontage block when he has no chance of recouping any loss. We should look further at this matter. You cannot build a skyscraper on a 15ft. frontage. The introduction of



the Bill, which provides concessions in certain directions, is a sincere attempt to give relief where it is most needed. I appreciate the attitude of most people in this debate and if there should be a surplus over the amount the Government estimates it will get in land taxation the position should be reviewed with a view to giving further relief. It is not for me to say whether rural land should be totally exempted, nor that suburban land owners should get immediate relief more than any other section. To this extent I agree with what the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said. Those who need relief most should get it, and I think that is what the Government is doing in this Bill, which I support.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ARTIFICIAL BREEDING BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

#### SALE OF FURNITURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

#### CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

#### WHYALLA TOWN COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1959. Read a first time.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It effects a number of amendments, many of which are of an insubstantial character, to the principal Act. I believe that honourable members will find it easier to follow my remarks if I deal with the clauses of the Bill in the order in which they occur irrespective of their importance. Clause 3 inserts a special section (9a) into the principal Act which will enable the district council of Salisbury to present a petition for the district to be constituted as a municipality and for its division into wards, for the municipality to be declared to be a city and

for the provisions of Part IV of the Act (which deals with aldermen) to be applied. The new section will empower His Excellency the Governor in respect of any such petition to exercise any of the powers conferred by section 7 (1) of the principal Act (the general powers of the Governor in relation to the constitution etc. of areas), section 48 (assigning the name of "city" to the area) and sections 74 (2) and 76 (regarding aldermen). It is further provided that subsection (3) of section 7 (which requires the area of a municipality to be occupied mainly for urban purposes) are not to apply. Honourable members are aware of the position in the area concerned and I should say that, following discussions with the Government, the council recently passed a resolution accepting the offer of the Government for the necessary amendment to the principal Act to deal with this matter.

Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act which at present provides that where a proclamation is made uniting two or more areas the provisions of the Act relating to aldermen may be made applicable to a municipality if it contains over 20,000 inhabitants. The clause will strike out reference to the number of inhabitants in section 12 (f) as a consequential amendment to an amendment made in 1952 when all mention of the number of inhabitants was struck out in section 74 dealing with the application of the proviso regarding aldermen.

Clause 5 amends section 100 of the principal Act which now provides in relation to companies for the number of persons who may vote by reference to values of ratable property. The scale contained in section 100 has not been altered since 1887 and the amendment is designed to vary the scale to figures in line with current property values taking account of the alteration in the value of money, Clause 6 effects a similar amendment to section 115 of the principal Act which concerns elections where two or more persons are enrolled as owners. Clause 7 amends section 157 of the principal Act which now provides that a council must appoint a clerk and may appoint certain other officers. Under the **Building Act** every council within whose area that Act applies is required to appoint a building surveyor, thus ensuring the availability of a competent officer to check the design of structures involving computations. It is considered that proper investigation and design of storm water disposal systems, bridges, culverts and roads is equally essential and the amendment will make it obligatory for a council whose annual

revenue from general rates amounts to £100,000 or more to appoint a full-time engineer holding the prescribed qualifications. At this stage I foreshadow a slight amendment to clause 7 giving the Minister certain dispensations with regard to such appointments.

Clause 8 will require councils to include on assessment and rate notices an indication of the basis of assessment used in the area, that is whether the assessment is based on annual or land value. Many ratepayers are not made fully aware of the basis. Clause 9 makes a consequential amendment by introducing a new section 178a into the principal Act requiring notices of valuations and assessments based upon annual value to specify that the assessment is based upon annual value. Clause 12 introduces a similar section where the basis is land value. A further consequential amendment is made by clauses 15 and 16 relating to rate notices.

Clauses 10, 11, 13, 14 and 17 should be considered together. The principal clause is clause 17, subclause (c) of which will insert a new subsection in section 244a of the principal Act. That section makes special provision for urban farm lands the rates on which may not exceed one half of the amount of the general or special rate for other land in a municipality. The new subsection (3) will enable the Governor by proclamation to exempt any specified municipality from the foregoing provisions. The amendments effected by subclauses (a) and (b) of clause 17 and clauses 10, 11, 13 and 14 of the Bill are consequential upon the enactment of the new subsection. The reason for the proposed provision is that the special provision of a lower rate on urban farm lands can and does cause serious hardship. To take a specific case I refer to Renmark. When the boundaries of the municipality of Renmark were extended to absorb the district of the Renmark Irrigation Trust and the Cooltong and Chaffey divisions of the Ral Ral Irrigation area, the basis of assessment already in operation—unimproved land values—was retained. The municipality of Renmark previously covered 270 acres but now covers 37,700, the greater portion of which is occupied for horticultural or viticultural purposes, most of the holdings exceeding two acres in extent. Thus the greater part of the area is urban farm land and the limit of the rate to one half of the normal rate restricts the total annual revenue in the municipality. There could be other areas affected in a similar way in future years and it seems

practicable to empower exemption by proclamation rather than make special provision for each area. A proclamation would not be lightly made—it would only be in a case where the Government was satisfied that a proper case existed that a proclamation would be advised.

Clauses 15 and 16 will amend sections 214 and 215 of the principal Act so as to enable councils to declare rates either before, at the time of or after the giving of assessment notices. There appears to be some doubt as to the power of a council to declare a rate until after notice of assessment has been given. This means that two separate notices must be sent out at considerable cost. The amendment proposed would enable the council to declare its rate before or after the despatch of notices of assessment and thus in practice to send out both notices together thereby saving considerable postage. Of course the amendments will not affect the right of appeal.

Clause 19 and clause 20 (a) will empower councils to expend revenue for superannuation purposes. Section 287 of the principal Act enables the expenditure of revenue for pension funds for officers or employees or for retiring benefits (paragraph (e) and (e1)); similarly, section 290c empowers councils to provide reserve funds for retiring allowances for long service leave for officers or employees. In neither case is there express power to contribute towards the provision of benefits for dependents. About one half of the councils in the State have arrangements with assurance companies which include benefits upon death and doubts have been expressed regarding the validity of payments which have been made for this purpose. Accordingly clauses 19 and 20 (a) make provision to cover these cases and clause 21 validates payments already made.

Clause 20 (b) is designed to make it clear that reserve funds provided under section 290c of the principal Act may provide for depreciation and replacement of property, a matter on which there appears to be some doubt under the present wording. Clause 22 will make applicable to district councils powers of regulations and control of public stands for vehicles plying for hire to district councils. Clause 23 will for similar reasons apply the present provisions regarding the declaration of prohibited areas to district councils. These provisions apply only in municipalities and metropolitan districts at present and the extension is considered desirable in view of the increase in population and the increase in the number of motor vehicles.

Clause 24 amends section 399 of the principal Act to increase penalties that may be imposed by controlling authorities for breaches of by-laws for protection of works from £10 to £20, bringing the maximum into line with the provisions of Part XXXIX of the Act. Clause 25 amends section 457 of the principal Act so as to empower a council to grant leases of grounds to incorporated bodies. As the section now stands leases can be granted only to two or more persons and this means that where a sporting club desires a lease it is necessary for it to co-opt some other person as co-lessee; an unnecessary complication, I suggest. The amendment will permit the letting to a club without the need of co-option of a third party.

Clause 26 amends section 550 of the principal Act so as to bring rest homes into line with private hospitals and maternity homes, which cannot be established within a municipality except upon certain conditions, including notice to the council, submission of plans and other matters. Although the Health Act requires private hospitals, maternity homes and rest homes to be licensed by local boards of health, the powers of municipal councils in this matter are at present restricted to control of the establishment of private hospitals and maternity homes. It is felt that rest homes should be brought into line with private hospitals and maternity homes, and clause 26 accordingly makes the necessary amendments.

Clause 27 will raise the penalties for unlicensed slaughterhouses from £10 to £50. It has been found that the present maximum of £10 is ineffective. Clause 28 will add to section 666b of the principal Act the power in a council to dispose of unsightly chattels or structures. This is designed to remove the necessity for councils to retain for an indefinite period such chattels or materials from structures that have been removed. Clause 29 will add to the by-law making powers of councils a power to regulate the speed of motor vehicles along foreshores, subject to the approval of the Harbors Board. This is a desirable power.

Clause 30 will amend the by-law making powers of councils concerning the depasturing of horses and cattle by making it clear that sheep are to be included within these provisions. At present, Sir, only horses and cattle are mentioned specifically, and, to clear up any doubts, it is intended to include also the word "sheep". Clause 31 will add to the by-law making powers of district councils power to regulate the practice of cleaning foot-

ways in front of buildings. Clause 32 raises the general penalty under the principal Act from £10 to £20 and brings the general penalty into line with the specific penalties for breaches of by-laws, which were raised in 1959 to the like amount.

Clause 33 concerns the powers of the Adelaide City Council in regard to the banks and shores of the River Torrens. The present section 865 empowers the council to erect on those banks (or the park lands or any land under the control of the council) sheds, boat-houses and the like, but only for the purpose of public use and recreation. The council from time to time receives applications from rowing clubs and the like either for a lease of a site for erection of their own boathouses or for the leasing of boathouses, to be erected by the council. Clause 30 will amend subsection (2) of section 865 by removing the limitation, and this will enable the council to erect boathouses, etc., as it thinks fit. The clause adds a new subsection to section 865 which will empower the council to lease for a period of not more than fifty years either sites on which it has erected boat-houses, etc., itself, or sites for the purposes of the erection of boathouses by the lessees for their own use. The Bill provides that before any lease is executed it must be laid before both Houses of Parliament for consideration. This Bill supersedes the Bill previously on the Notice Paper which, of course, will be duly discharged. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1069.)

Clause 3—"Further offences"—to which the Hon. G. O'H. Giles had moved the following amendment:

To strike out all words after "otherwise" and to insert in lieu thereof the following subparagraphs:

- (i) any tar, paint or any substance that is black in colour; or
- (ii) any substance whatsoever, other than raddle, grease crayon or a substance prescribed as a scourable substance or as one with which a paint brand may be made; or

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): This clause is, in effect, the Bill. Different views have been expressed about the drafting of this Bill and some members have asked questions about its effect, so it would be appropriate for me to deal with them now.

The Hon. Mr. Wilson said that black, red and yellow paints were now permitted; however, purple paint is also approved. I think he also said that paints consisting of 55 per cent tar were used as a remedy for wounds. I am not sure whether he meant that, or that 55 per cent of brands were black in colour.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson: Yes.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Until August 1, 1960, 55 per cent of all brands registered were in black, but the branding fluid used was L.B.E. formula. This is similar to Siromark, but is not so readily scourable. It did not contain tar and was not used as a wound dressing. I think the Hon. Mr. Wilson referred to the severity of penalties: I say definitely that prosecutions for first offences will not be considered. An amendment was made to section 70 rather than to section 69 because the latter provided for heavier penalties. I think everyone agrees that in marketing our wool we should be rid of any suspicion that it contains unscourable substances. The purpose of the amendment is merely to give legal backing to our advice and warnings to the few people who like to use tar for wounds or enamel or other paints for placing numerals on their sheep. It could also be used to prevent the use of any wound or fly dressing that left an unscourable stain on the wool. I think this substance is little used, but I am advised that some people either thoughtlessly or wilfully use black paints or tars on other than registered brands. The Hon. Mr. Edmonds said that shearing was partly completed and that he wanted to ensure that the Bill did not come down on somebody for past shearing. I have received the following report on this aspect:

The prohibition on black branding fluids for making registered brands came into force on August 1, 1960. No black branding fluids are now on sale so far as can be ascertained. Certainly no person should now be using black branding fluid for placing registered marks on sheep.

Further inquiries indicate that the amendment is a change in form only, and it is considered by both the department and the Parliamentary Draftsman that the clause as drafted can be easily understood. The amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Giles is worded in practically the same terms as those of the original legislation.

In paragraph (i) of the amendment the wording brings this part under the penalty clause, while in paragraph (ii), the materials mentioned can be used with safety as scourable substances and would not be subject to the penalty part of the clause. The suggested amendment by Sir Arthur Rymill would not make for any further clarity. I think the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Giles covers what is desired in the Bill and I am prepared to accept it.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If that is the view of the Government I am prepared to accept it, but I think for the purpose of clarification of the section either the amendment I suggested, or that suggested by the Hon. Mr. Potter, should be inserted. As the Government is going to accept the Hon. Mr. Giles's amendment, I propose to move a further amendment using the words suggested by Mr. Potter, that is, to insert "either" after "prescribed" in the second paragraph of Mr. Giles's amendment. This would clarify the meaning of "made" used later because "made" could be interpreted in its literal sense as meaning any paint brand. The insertion of "either" makes it perfectly clear that "made" means a brand which is prescribed and not any brand which could be used. I move:

After "prescribed" in paragraph (ii) of the Hon. Mr. Giles's amendment to insert "either."

The Committee divided on the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill's amendment:

Ayes (6).—The Hons. L. H. Densley, G. O'H. Giles, A. C. Hookings, F. J. Potter, Sir Arthur Rymill (teller) and C. R. Story.

Noes (9).—The Hons. S. C. Bevan, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, A. F. Kneebone, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, A. J. Shard, and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. Mr. Giles's amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 11, at 2.15 p.m.