

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, October 3, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS.

#### DRUGS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: In recent weeks there has been a spate of publicity in relation to the ill-directed use of drugs, the properties of which are not always clearly defined. Will the Minister of Health at the next conference of State Ministers of Health bring this matter forward with the object of having established in Australia standards for the purity of drugs, both imported and those manufactured in Australia?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It will be some time before the next conference of State Ministers of Health, although there will be a conference on a specific matter in a fortnight. I will get a report from the Director-General. There is considerable collaboration between the States and the Commonwealth towards uniformity. I do not think there is any great problem. A problem existing in another State may not be similar to one in our own State. I should like to investigate the matter a little further before I indicate my views to the honourable member.

#### POLIOMYELITIS.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my question of September 18 regarding the control of poliomyelitis "type three"?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member asked a question regarding the effectiveness of, I think, Salk vaccine, for treating poliomyelitis, "type three". I asked the Director-General of Public Health for a report and he sent me not only his own report but a report from the Principal Medical Officer dealing with poliomyelitis. I think the report of the Director-General may be of interest to honourable members. It states:

In the above extract from *Hansard* the Honourable Mr. Giles has asked for information on two points; firstly, the number of persons immunized against poliomyelitis in South Australia; and, secondly, whether the vaccine gives any protection against "type three" poliovirus.

1. South Australia was the first State in Australia to give free poliomyelitis immunization injections. From the beginning of the campaign on June 28, 1956, to December 31,

1961, more than 1,250,000 injections were given free of charge to applicants. Details are as follows:

	0-14 years.	Over 15 years.	Total.
First injections	297,198	199,214	496,412
Second injections	286,240	184,807	471,047
Third injections	265,366	154,892	420,258
	848,804	538,913	1,387,717

In 1961 there was a temporary interruption in vaccine supplies. Since then poliomyelitis immunization injections have continued to be available, and the total number of injections now given in South Australia exceeds 1,500,000.

2. There was a rise, to epidemic proportions, in the incidence of poliomyelitis in New South Wales and Queensland. The prevalent virus in the New South Wales epidemic was type 1 poliovirus, and the vaccine showed a gratifyingly high protection rate. In Queensland, the epidemic was caused by type 3 poliovirus, and cases were reported in persons who were said to have received three immunization injections. The experience in South Australia so far has indicated 100 per cent effectiveness of the vaccine; and this experience has been in the face of our having had both type 1 and type 3 poliovirus in our community. As the type 3 poliovirus in Queensland has caused the most concern, it is worth stating that there were 43 proven cases, including three deaths, from type 3 poliovirus in South Australia during 1961; none of these patients had received three injections. The 1961 outbreak in South Australia of type 3 poliovirus in non-immunized people was an additional demonstration of the vaccine's effectiveness. It accorded with the South Australian pattern since the immunization campaign began in 1956. From then until today there have been 137 proven cases of poliomyelitis (including six deaths) here; but all have been in people who have received no—or less than the minimum three—injections. The effectiveness of the vaccine has been a source of satisfaction to all connected with poliomyelitis immunization in South Australia.

The Director-General of Public Health added the following comment:

A very satisfactory proportion of children have been immunized, but there are still substantial numbers of adults without assured protection against poliomyelitis. Facilities are available to people of all ages through local authorities, supplemented where necessary by the Public Health Department.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Some months ago I asked the Minister of Health a question regarding Sabin oral vaccine. I notice from press reports that the vaccine is now available. Can the Minister say whether it is being used in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: As I indicated previously, the oral vaccine is used mainly supplementary to, and not in substitution for, Salk vaccine. I notice from the press

that the oral vaccine is being used in New Zealand, and it is something that could be used here if there were an outbreak of poliomyelitis. Supplies of the Sabin vaccine are held here for emergency purposes, and for use supplementary to the Salk vaccine.

**BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.**

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

It inserts in the principal Act a new section covering the unlawful making or possession of explosives. It provides that any person making, manufacturing or knowingly having in his possession or control any explosive substance under circumstances giving rise to a reasonable assumption that he did not make or possess it for a lawful purpose shall be guilty of an offence unless he can show that he made it or had it in his possession or control for a lawful purpose. The maximum penalty is two years and the explosive substance is forfeited to the Crown. The section includes a wide definition of "explosive substance".

The Explosives Act provides by section 23 (2) that it is an offence to possess gunpowder or any explosive exceeding certain weights, but this was not designed to provide protection against the use of explosives in connection with serious offences and the Commissioner of Police has reported his concern with this matter. In both Victoria and New South Wales there are provisions along the lines of the Bill, which is based upon them. It will assist members of the Police Force very considerably in conducting investigations and will act as a deterrent to serious crime. I submit the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.**

Second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): I move:

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

It is designed to make provision for a second deputy master of the Supreme Court. Section 82 (1) of the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1960,

provides that the court shall have a master and a deputy master. A deputy master was first appointed to the Court in 1921 at a time when the population of the State was about one-half its present population. Since that year there has been a steady increase in the volume of the business of the court and, in its civil and matrimonial jurisdictions alone, its business for the current year already shows a 10 per cent increase on its business for the corresponding period of 1961, while the total business for 1961 was 23 per cent greater than the business of the court for the year 1960.

Since 1921 the work of the masters has increased to a greater degree than the general volume of court business. This is largely due to the exercise of the chamber jurisdiction conferred on the masters and their increasing administrative and statutory duties consequent on the increasing volume of court business. In the circumstances the Government considers that the appointment of a second deputy master is now warranted.

Amending legislation is necessary to make the appointment possible and clause 3 of this Bill amends section 82 (1) of the Supreme Court Act so as to provide that the court shall have a master and not more than two deputy masters. This will have the effect of enabling the appointment of a second deputy at any time and of preventing a further increase in the number of deputies unless Parliamentary approval is first obtained.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

**APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 2. Page 1171.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support this Bill, which provides for estimated payments from Consolidated Revenue for the year 1962-63 totalling £96,854,000, while estimated receipts total £96,251,000. The estimated deficit for 1962-63 is, therefore, £603,000. The original estimate for 1961-62 provided for a nominal surplus of £3,000, whereas the actual result for the year was a surplus of £507,000, which was along the lines suggested by me when the £3,000 surplus was budgeted for by the Government. The greater surplus last year was achieved following a grant of £970,000 from the Commonwealth Government and that followed the lines of policy that I expounded when speaking to the Bill last year. At the time I said there was a need for much more

money to be made available to create more employment or at least to maintain the employment situation. Although conditions are not now so bad the position should still be watched. If the Commonwealth Government had not made that grant one of two results would have justified my statement of last year. We would have had a deficit instead of a surplus, or we would have had to curtail work. I am pleased that the Commonwealth Government should have provided that money rather than force this Government to curtail work. Therefore, I have no objection to the proposed deficit for the current financial year.

Last year I was chided because I advocated that it would be better to have a deficit than a balanced Budget if a balanced Budget would create unemployment or curtail the State's progress. Apparently some members on the Government side will have to alter their view, although I do not say that the Government adopted my views. If it were right to have a balanced Budget last year it must be wrong, in the view of those members to have a deficit of £603,000 this year, and it will be interesting to see how some honourable members face up to the proposed deficit. I have always been told that the Budget debate is one of the most important debates in Parliament. However, I did not pay much attention to the Budget prior to becoming Leader of the Opposition in this Council, but since then I have given more consideration to it, and I question whether it is very important. I asked several questions last year as to how certain money reached a certain point and I did not receive an entirely satisfactory answer. Since then I have learned something, and it seems to me that it does not matter what is estimated by the various departments; provided that the Appropriation Bill is passed for a total of £96,854,000 the money can be spent in any manner and by any department that the Government desires. My research has confirmed that view.

The Financial Statement of the Treasurer for 1960-61 indicates an unexpended balance of £316,207 in the Department of Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, while for 1961-62 the unexpended balance was £101,289. Perhaps it is easier to budget for the Department of the Attorney-General, because the unexpended balance in 1960-61 was £18,062, and for 1961-62 it was only £5,423. The unexpended balance for the Department of Minister of Works was £124,759 in 1960-61, but in 1961-62 that department overspent by £305,837 which is a tremendous difference. For 1960-61 the

unexpended balance in the Department of Minister of Education was £190,243 but for 1961-62 the department overspent £390,605. Of course it is only an estimate which is made, but after looking at these figures one does not know whether the Estimates which are now before us are worth while examining. There seem to be great variations between what is estimated and what is actually underspent or overspent. It appears that it does not matter how much is allocated to each department provided that the total amount is passed: the Government can spend it where it wishes.

Last year I commented on the cost of pumping water and I am at a loss to understand the Government's intention this year. The Chief Secretary when giving his second reading explanation said:

Among payments, the Engineering and Water Supply Department exceeded the estimate by £472,000. Of this, the excess from operation and maintenance was £213,000 and the excess for power for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide and Morgan-Whyalla mains was £259,000. The excess expenditure for operation and maintenance was, in part, provided out of the special Commonwealth grant referred to previously.

The Chief Secretary also said:

Because the seasonal outlook can change radically at short notice the likely cost of power to pump water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, through the Morgan-Whyalla main, and from bores, cannot be estimated accurately. In 1959-60, because of a particularly dry season, it reached the very high figure of £922,000; in 1960-61 following a good season the cost fell to £275,000; but last year it rose again to £834,000. The present holding of reservoirs is well below the desirable level for this time of the year and the maintenance of adequate water supplies is likely to require considerable pumping from the River Murray during 1962-63. The Bill includes provision for the expenditure of £646,000 for power for pumping through the two major pipelines and from bores in the Adelaide water district, but actual cost will depend upon the outcome of the season.

According to my calculations the estimated cost for the pumping of water this year, compared with last year, shows a decrease of £188,000. For the Adelaide water district an amount of £400,000 was voted for the cost of electricity for pumping on the Mannum-Adelaide main and bores for the year 1961-62, whereas the actual cost was £600,445. It is proposed this year to spend £365,000, which is a decrease of £235,445 on the actual amount spent last year. How the Government can estimate along those lines is beyond me. We have to face facts, and unfortunately this season is just as dry as it was last year. It is reasonable to assume at this

stage that the cost of the pumping of water will be similar this year to what it was last year, and yet the Government estimates that the cost will be £188,000 below that of last year. Last year I spoke on the Appropriation Act and in section 3 (4) appears the following:

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, 1962, 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 subsection.

It appears that we are to have this position each year. I do not know that that is a good form of budgeting. I asked last year and I ask again whether this means that more money is to be appropriated or, as apparently happened last year, additional money required is to be taken from another department? If it had not been for the Commonwealth grant last year, possibly the amount to be spent on pumping would have been spent to the detriment of other departments. It could have had the effect of reducing public works, which keep so many men employed. I do not know whether notice is taken of points we raise. To my way of thinking this question needs careful scrutiny by the Government. I should like to have explained what actually happened. I consider that this type of expenditure will be with us continually. From information I have received, if all our reservoirs were full at the end of winter, before the end of summer we would need to pump water. If that is so, I do not think that a similar item should appear in the Appropriation Bill each year. In my opinion it would be better for the Government to estimate a reasonable amount that may be required for this purpose—the cost of electricity to pump the water rather than have an amount in the Bill which was considerably less than the cost of the previous year.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Is not that exactly what the Government has done?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. It has not made any provision. According to the figures I have taken out the Government is estimating this year that the cost will be lower by £188,000.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: If it had taken into account the position that did prevail at the time it could strike an average figure.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: You are missing the point. I say that the outlook as regards water pumping costs this year is as bad as at this time last year. The actual cost last year was £188,000 more than the Government has allowed this year.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What was allowed last year? This is a provision.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Last year it amounted to £834,000 for electricity costs. The Bill includes provision for an expenditure this year of £646,000 for pumping through the two major mains. The actual cost will depend on the outcome of the season.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: It appears to me that the Government has done exactly what you suggested a few minutes ago and allowed for an average figure.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It has not done that.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What would have been the position if we had six inches or eight inches of rain?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When these figures were prepared the seasonal outlook was just as bad as it was last year, yet the Government comes down with a figure which it expects will be necessary for pumping and it is £188,000 below that of last year.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: With an average figure as you suggested.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not an average figure on a bad season and the honourable member knows it. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and I hope that my honourable friend will tell me next year who was nearer the mark. Unfortunately, I think I will be nearer than he is. I do not like this item.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The average of two bad years is not really an overall average.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: You can take an average of four years, with two bad years included, and I would still be right in what I am saying. I am not happy to say that, but would be happy if no pumping costs were involved. Let the Government budget somewhere near the mark. Last year I wondered where the money came from, and have found that it goes from one pocket into another.

Another point I wish to discuss relates to hospital expenditure. The Chief Secretary said that for the Hospitals Department an increased expenditure of £568,000 was proposed, and that of the increase £278,000 was for mental institutions. At first

glance members would say that is satisfactory, but already we know it is not expected that all the money will be spent. The *Advertiser* of September 26 contained the following report, under the heading "Department May Not Use Whole Allocation":

The Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) said in the Assembly yesterday that he did not think the Department of Health would be able to spend this year all the money allocated to mental hospitals. This was due to difficulties in obtaining staff. The Director of Health (Dr. P. S. Woodruff) was doing his utmost to obtain staff, particularly nurses and other lower-paid groups, and it was hoped that he would have some success overseas. It was not sufficient to obtain numbers—the staff had to be qualified. Every member hopes that the staff at the institutions will be increased, and, if possible, fully qualified. Recently we have heard much about the standard of our mental institutions. No-one decries the good work being done, but we hear much about the lack of staff.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Tell us how to overcome it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I wish I could help. The appropriation in relation to mental institutions should be nearer the mark. It is wrong to appropriate money and then have the Premier say it is not expected that all the money will be spent. It would be better to have the amount likely to be spent. It may be padded for political purposes and to make it look all right.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: That is not right.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: One can be pardoned for saying that. When asked about the expenditure on mental institutions the Premier said it did not appear that all the money would be spent. If members want an instance of a padded Budget for political purposes they have it in the 1960-61 Budget where a terrific amount of money was allocated for departments, but not all of it was spent. From the padded Estimates that year came the £1,000,000 that was spent on supplying electricity to people in the South-East. I have no objection to electricity being supplied to them, but it would have been better if the Government had been honest with members and the public and said that as £1,000,000 was available it would be spent on providing electricity in that area.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: They were either honest or not honest.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They were not honest, for in them large sums were provided but not all spent.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: That is not being dishonest.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That was the year preceding an election in this State.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Do you know any other fairy stories?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is not a fairy story. The figures are there.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: You are drawing the wrong conclusion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is a matter of opinion. The sum of £1,654,000 is appropriated for Public Works, and again I query whether all the proposed work will be completed. The Chief Secretary said, in respect to the allocation:

The main provisions are £675,000 for education buildings, £531,000 for hospital buildings, £95,000 for police and courthouse buildings, and £318,000 for other Government buildings.

In previous years we have had the experience of all the money appropriated not being spent. I hope this year will be an exception, and that the proposed works will be at least commenced, if not completed, in order to keep the building industry in a buoyant condition. If it is not buoyant there will be a tremendous effect on all sections of the community. If the money appropriated is spent and the industry is in a buoyant condition, everybody will be so much better off. Apparently the Railways Department's administration is doing a magnificent job. It is good to have a department keeping its costs down and not requiring so much money allocated to it as in previous years. I wondered whether any money was being provided for the much-publicized State "go-it-alone" policy of gauge standardization. The Minister's second reading explanation did not mention it. I have come to the conclusion that the Government has not, as yet, provided in the Railways Department's allocation anything to meet the cost of this work.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: We cannot make provision until the Public Works Committee has completed its inquiry.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is one reason and I was about to refer to it. I was about to say that the Government would not go on with the work this year, but so long as a total of £96,854,000 is appropriated it seems that £200,000 or £300,000 can be taken for any of this work and that everything will be all right. I do not want to be accused of saying that the Government had that in the back of its mind. If what the Attorney-General said is correct and the question has to be examined by the Public Works Committee that explains that point. An amount of £617,000 is provided for the Highways and Local Government

Department, and £40,000 of that money is required for salaries and wages of existing staff and proposed new appointments of engineers, surveyors, draftsmen and technical officers. From that I understand that the present staff has had an increase in wages and that the bulk of the money is for new staff. However, I have always been told that engineers, surveyors, draftsmen and technical officers are not generally available, and I wonder whether one of the Ministers could tell me whether the department has some additional staff in view, because that would prove helpful to the State. I have no objection to £40,000 being provided for that purpose if more staff is available, because the Minister of Roads has already told us that the roads are catching up, as it were, on the surveyors, who can barely keep in front of the workmen. I would be happy to know that the Government has definitely located some of these people who could be recruited as staff to enable the work to progress more quickly. Without surveyors and engineers to do that necessary part of the work the manual section of the work will be retarded.

That is all I wish to say on that aspect of the Bill, but I wish to pay a similar compliment to that accorded by me last year in connection with the Festival of Music. I had the privilege last night of attending that festival and I rate it as one of the best shows of the year. Certain other honourable members accompanied me and we unanimously voted it one of the finest functions we had attended. I pay a tribute to Mr. R. S. Michelmore who educates the boys and girls in taking their places on the platform. I have seen several massed choirs and productions of this type, but never have I seen such a brilliant exposition as that of the boys and girls in their beautiful costumes marching on to the platform and the way in which they were arranged according to size. I doubt whether anything better could have been seen elsewhere in the world, particularly when the children turned around and faced the audience waving their handkerchiefs.

I also pay a tribute to Mr. Scoble, the conductor, for the control he exercises over those children. That is truly remarkable, particularly when we consider that he has 400 children on the platform. They all give him their complete attention. That reflects great credit on him. However, I am told that the earlier training given by Mr. Scoble is not intense, as the children are taught singing in school and Mr. Scoble visits them on odd occasions. The district schools might have a few rehearsals at

various places, and I was told that in preparation for last night's production Mr. Scoble had the 400 children on the platform together only once. I venture to suggest that it would be impossible for anyone to better the conduct and the singing of the children on that occasion. I wish also to pay a tribute to the children who rendered the vocal items between the various choir items. Their performances speak well for their parents and schools. The standard of the items was something to be wondered at and I look forward to this event each year.

The whole performance is a tribute to the Education Department, the teachers who educate the children, the children, and last but not least, to the parents who help the children in that activity. I hope that the Festival of Music will be continued for many years, my only regret being that the audience is limited. I believe that if it were possible to have a bigger audience the class of entertainment provided would attract full houses on every occasion. Once again I pay a tribute to those gentlemen for what they are doing for the children. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I rise to support the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, which, when passed, will constitute Parliament's approval of the State Budget for the current financial year. Up to date both speakers have mentioned that the total expenditure proposed for the financial year from revenue is about £97,000,000, but, curiously enough, neither has mentioned the obvious fact that it is a record Budget for South Australia. Perhaps we have become so accustomed to that year after year that it is no longer a remarkable fact. The fact that it has reached this magnitude is a tribute both to the continued prosperity in general of the State as well as to the increasing population, which means that the Government receives additional revenue and also has to expend additional money.

I mentioned that the estimated expenditure from revenue this year is about £97,000,000. It is interesting to note that 13 years ago, in the 1949-50 financial year, it was only £29,500,000, and it has now grown from that figure to one of great magnitude. However, one has to set against that the considerable inflation that we have had, so the greater amount of money is not as much greater as the actual figures would indicate.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Won't there have to be a reckoning when the inflationary spiral reaches a certain point?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: We are in days of gradual inflation, and if present Parliamentary and Governmental methods continue we can anticipate that that state of affairs will be customary. I propose to deal with a few items as they occur in the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation. He mentioned the excesses of revenue over the Budget amounts last year and the special Commonwealth grant of £970,000 which was intended, in the main, to stimulate employment. I contend, although my honourable friends of the Labor Party will certainly not agree with me, that no Government in Australia did nearly as much to alleviate unemployment as did the Government of this State.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Don't bring politics into it, or you will spoil a good speech.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This Government anticipated the unemployment position, and did so earlier than anyone else. It actually contracted to expend considerably more money than it had budgeted to expend, and it did that long before any other State did it. Undoubtedly the Government's action leavened the unemployment situation in this State. I would like to think that the Labor Party would have had the courage to do the same thing if it were in power.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: We would have done more.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Labor Party has said that it would have done more and it has accused the Liberal Government of doing insufficient, but I am merely expressing the hope that the Labor Party would have and could have done as much if it had been in power.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We might have got £2,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government if we had been in power.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I knew my honourable friends would react to what I am saying, but I am surprised that they are continuing to flog this dying horse of unemployment because I have noticed myself, and a number of my friends in industry have remarked to me, that there are signs of another boom.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is nothing wrong with that, is there?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Not at all, as long as it does not get out of control as the last one did.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It won't go too far: the banks will see to that.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: My industrialist friends tell me there is an acute shortage of skilled labour and little unemployment in the unskilled labour field.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The figures given by the Minister of Labour and Industry last week do not bear that out!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am not entering into the quarrel between the honourable member and the Minister. They had quite an argument about it last week but I regard that as their own. There is no-one who abhors unemployment more than I do. One of the worst things that can happen to any family is to find the breadwinner out of work. It is a tragic thing for any family and we would all like to see the condition that my friends of the Labor Party glibly call "full employment". I have invited them to define that phrase a number of times, but they have not accepted that invitation because it is merely a catch cry.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have quoted my interpretation of it many times.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: There cannot be such a thing as full employment because if you have everyone employed—and it does not mean that at all—then you must have a condition of over-employment because you cannot possibly have the exact number of jobs available to fit the exact qualifications of the exact number of people who happen to be out of work at a given moment. The only situation in which you can have that sort of thing is when there are far more jobs available than people to fill them. That is the position that I am afraid we all have to accept. Governments do much more today than previously to help unemployed people because they provide quite substantial unemployment benefits. None of us would care to live on these amounts, but Governments today do provide more which, to a certain extent, is one way of dealing with the situation.

The next item referred to by the Chief Secretary was the question of State taxation and he said that, as a whole, it yielded £79,000 more than estimated. Land tax rates were £388,000 more than anticipated but there were falls in the revenue from stamp duties and succession duties and in receipts from the Betting Control Board. Let me say at this stage that I do not for a moment consider that we are, in the State field, an over-taxed community, and that is all I am dealing with now. Our direct taxation in this State is reasonable. The total State direct taxation budgeted for this year is about £13,000,000

and as the population of the State is verging on 1,000,000 people, that means a taxation of about £13 a head. It is interesting to see how this amount is made up. Land tax, which I referred to previously, accounts for nearly one-fifth of the total; motor vehicle registration fees and drivers' licences account for nearly two-fifths of it; and stamp duties and succession duties each amount to nearly one-fifth. The other items of State taxation are negligible except for the revenue from the Betting Control Board which is commission on various bets and so on and constitutes just under one-twentieth of the total. Practically all of the State taxation comes from the four spheres I have mentioned.

The only tax with which I am not happy, as I said last year, is land tax. This is a matter of opinion and I know the Minister disagrees with me. I approach this problem first having in mind the fact that it is a capital tax and a tax that falls differently on different people. For instance, people who make their money out of land in various ways, such as primary producers and people using it for business purposes, also pay income tax on the profits they have made from the use of the land, so that, in effect, it is a double tax. However, the burden is to some extent lightened by the fact that in those circumstances State land tax is a deduction for income tax purposes. On the other hand, people who use their land purely as a dwelling do not pay any tax on the annual value of the use of that land as a dwelling, so that they come into a different category. To remind honourable members of what I said last year, I quote from *Hansard* my remarks in the Land Tax Bill debate. I said:

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.

Actually it was £2,388,000. The reason why I dealt so extensively with this matter last year was that I had an estimate, as honourable members know, from a very competent valuer who was previously a member of the Federal Land Tax Department, and his estimate was that the State land tax would be £2,700,000, less the £400,000. He based his conclusions on percentage increases, and he was much nearer the mark than the departmental officers. I think that the concessions amounted to less than the £400,000,

because it was announced that many people who were entitled to concessions did not apply for them.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Perhaps they did not know that they could get them.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is why I asked for an assurance from the Chief Secretary that if the tax amounted to more than the Government's estimate of £2,000,000, it would review it. I compared the increase in the tax with the inflation and said that from 1955 to when the tax was fixed last year the basic wage, which I think is the best denominator of inflation, rose by 17 per cent to the time the new assessment was made and it was then about 21½ per cent above the 1955 figure when the House was considering the Bill. That was on the £1,700,000 net estimate. I said that that figure was subsequently estimated at 43 per cent—that is the increase in land tax on the £2,000,000 estimate, which was considerably more than the inflationary factor. In fact it turned out, as I was advised that it probably would be, something around 70 per cent more than the previous revenue from land tax, which was I think £1,400,000. It rose from £1,400,000 to nearly £2,400,000. The Chief Secretary very properly interjected, "The 1955 assessment had not caught up with the inflationary trend", and I replied, "That is probably correct. I made certain allowances in that regard in my own mind." It has now turned out to be so much higher that I feel I was right last year when I claimed that the land tax was more than it should be. I again say that I know that that is a matter of opinion; that is my opinion. I also said:

Will the Chief Secretary, on behalf of the Government, when replying to the debate on this important Bill, give an answer to the question 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 his reply the Chief Secretary said:

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill asked that some assurance be given that if the concessions did not reduce the amount of revenue to the estimated figure then some further concessions should be given. When giving concessions the decision must be influenced by the necessity for the Government to pay its way, and other considerations might apply.

I then interjected, "I did not ask for an undertaking that further concessions be given, but that the matter be reviewed." The Chief Secretary then said:



I can give that undertaking easily because the Treasurer has to review his capital Budget every year. I thought the honourable member was seeking some more explicit undertaking that if the tax collected were more than £2,000,000 we should see how we could pass the change back.

The £388,000 was on top of the previous £2,000,000 estimate. The £2,400,000 was on the previous £1,400,000, and that is not exactly small change. I felt that the matter should be reviewed and the tax altered, I assumed through the Budget; and when I combine that reply of the Chief Secretary to me and when I see that the budgeted figure for land tax this year is £2,400,000, I assume that the Government has reviewed the matter and considered that it was a reasonable amount to ask for the land tax. I cannot take it any further than that. I am sorry that the same amount is again estimated, because my approach to the matter is different from that of certain other people.

I should like to make another plea that the matter be sympathetically reviewed when it is possible for it to be so. That is all we can do. This Council has very limited powers, if no powers, in regard to money matters. In general, of course, I fully support the Budget and that is all I want to say about the land tax, with minor exceptions. We have read in the press once or twice that people have appealed against their actual assessments and one or two of them have had their assessments raised. I was told that the assessment was made on a basis considerably below the actual value of the land. When you go to a tribunal it is market values that count. If the assessment was on a lower scale, you are likely to get your assessment raised. That has not been the experience of everyone. A constituent wrote to me and said he had made four appeals against his assessment. Three had been allowed and the other permitted to remain—neither being raised nor lowered. In his case the assessment was obviously based on higher than market values.

I will now deal with one or two other items. A very interesting feature of our budgeting for revenue is that the servicing of the State's public debt is costing £20,820,000—that is for interest and sinking fund. If my figuring is right, that accounts for approximately 22 per cent of the total expenditure and that of course is paying the interest and amortization on Loan moneys previously spent. I have said before today that I agree with the Government's policy on Loan moneys. We are in a

favourable position under the Financial Agreement, which enables us to get better treatment as regards loans than the other States, as I see it. I believe that the Government has been wise in taking the money as it is available and offered, because if it had not its future entitlements would have been diminished. In my opinion it has spent the money wisely, and as the inflation goes on the debt will be less than the value of the buildings for which the money was used. I think the policy is fully vindicated, and I congratulate the Government, although the amount seems to be a substantial part of the Budget.

In connection with the Hospitals Department, the Chief Secretary said that, whereas the estimate is £6,845,000 this year, 10 years ago it was only £2,700,000. He did not draw a comparison of that sort for the Education Department, but I tried to draw one because the Opposition is always moaning about insufficient money being spent on hospitals and schools. This year the appropriation for the Education Department is £14,665,000, whereas on my reckoning it was just under £4,000,000 10 years ago. When these two items are considered, it escapes me how Opposition members have any real complaint. I cannot see it. If they were in power and thought they should spend more on these items the money would have to come from somewhere, and it could be extracted only from the public of South Australia. If the Opposition is sincere in its repeated calls for more expenditure on hospitals and schools it means that it is a higher taxation Party.

The sum of £482,000 is to be spent under the item "Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous". Once again I praise the operations of the department, with which I come in contact in relation to the very small property that I have about 30 miles south of Adelaide. The help the department gives to the man on the land is wonderful, and it is freely and generously given. The people who come to help the man on the land behave as though they were being paid a high fee for their services. The man on the land needs help more than anyone else, because all sorts of things happen beyond his control, particularly the weather (about which the Hon. Mr. Shard seems to be so knowledgeable) and pests of various kinds.

I want to deal with Mr. Shard's remarks about the water situation. He said that an under-provision had been made for the pumping of water for the Adelaide supply. Every member will agree with the honourable member

at this stage, but when the Budget was prepared no-one could say what sort of season we would experience this year. The Estimates were introduced in another place about a month ago, and they would have been prepared at least a month or two before that, which takes us back to mid-winter. No-one could say then whether we were to have a good season or a bad season. In the days before the Mannum-Adelaide main the reservoirs were sometimes almost empty in September, yet I can remember at least one year in which they were filled later in the year.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That was one year in particular.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The honourable member was humorous when he questioned whether we should budget for an average good season or an average bad season. I could not get the reference, for we could deal only with the season at the time the Budget was prepared. The honourable member is backing a winner. I do not think there is much doubt about that. He has had three months on the people who prepared the Budget.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will have a little investment with you.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I neither like to bet on a certainty or against a certainty, which I think I would be doing if I had a bet on this matter. I am sure the honourable member is right, whatever the pros and cons might be. With all respect and humility, I regard this as a very good Budget, and I agree with practically every item. I have criticized one, but I do not want to appear as though I am critical of everything. One often gets publicity when he criticizes one item, yet approves a thousand. Of course, that is the way of life. I would not like to be presented as critical because I have criticized one item, when perhaps I approve of 100 actions of the Government. I was disappointed once again but not surprised to find no provision for a festival hall, but that must come, and far more will be heard about it later. I think that most members in both Houses feel that it is a real "must". However, I will not go further with it now. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL BILL.

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

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

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

It relates to the oriental fruit moth, a pest of deciduous trees, though it is not found extensively in South Australia. However, its presence has been noticed during the last few years in some Upper Murray areas. Vigorous efforts have been made to eradicate it by the Department of Agriculture and by a committee formed in the Renmark area, but it has not been eradicated. Two methods of action are necessary to achieve its eradication, the first being the application of suitable and timely sprays, and the second the strictest attention to orchard hygiene.

With assistance given to the local committee by the department, much money has been spent on sprays and their application in the last two years, but unfortunately entomological requirements have not been completely fulfilled. It is difficult in a horticultural area to secure the complete co-operation of all growers. Some persons are happy to live with a pest and do not attempt to eradicate it, but others are desperately keen to destroy it. Up to the present no direct contribution has been made by the industry as a whole. Individual horticulturists have expended much time and money, which is in accordance with the practice of most primary producers of protecting their properties from pests and animal diseases. Many individuals have spent heavily in combating this pest, but the industry generally has not been able to organize a full-scale effort.

The Government has spent about £12,000 in the last two years in combating this pest. This has certainly considerably reduced its incidence in some places, but the pest has spread in others and the area now infested is somewhat greater than previously, although the infestation is less intensive. Various organizations have approached the Government about the problems arising from this pest and from red scale in citrus trees and have asked for legislation to enable the appointment of boards to deal with them. The object is that these boards will be enabled to raise money from growers to undertake a concentrated attack on the pests. This request has been carefully considered but the Government believes that such legislation, dealing with boards in general, would be too wide in some respects, so it has been decided to deal with pests separately. It is proposed that similar legislation will be introduced regarding red scale, but this Bill deals specifically with the oriental fruit moth.

The clauses of the Bill are easy to understand. Clause 3 deals with interpretation, definitions and so forth. Clause 4 enables the Governor, by proclamation, to declare any area in the State to be a district for the purposes of the Act. Clause 5 provides for the registration of orchards within a district. Clause 6 provides for a poll to be held on the question of whether an oriental fruit moth committee shall be appointed in a district, and sets out the conditions under which a poll shall be conducted. Honourable members will note that before a committee can be appointed it will be necessary for at least 60 per cent of those persons who voted on the question to favour such an appointment, and not less than 30 per cent of all persons qualified to vote and entitled to vote must have voted on the question. The constitution of the committee is dealt with in clause 7, which provides that it shall consist of five members, four of whom shall be persons who are entitled to vote at the poll and who may, in the Minister's discretion, be nominated by such organizations or associations within the district as the Minister shall approve. The fifth member of the committee is to be nominated by the Minister and to be the chairman. The term of office will be three years. Power to make regulations dealing with appointments and other matters is vested in the Governor. Clause 8 provides for the dissolution of a committee by a poll.

Growers may request a poll on the future of the committee. It is necessary for 10 per cent of the registered growers to petition for a poll, and the Minister must hold a poll not more than once in three years if so requested by petition. The petition will determine whether the growers wish the committee to continue. Certain pro-

visions deal with the winding up of the committee should the growers vote against its continuance. Clause 9 provides that the committee shall take what steps it deems fit for the control and eradication of oriental fruit moth. It has the power, if authorized in writing, to enter upon land and premises to do its lawful task; and to paint, spray, fumigate and so on. It can establish and administer a fund; purchase and hire equipment; borrow money; appoint liaison officers; and it can demand and recover payment of fees and charges from owners, and so forth.

The committee has a number of other powers, all of which are self-explanatory. Clause 10 provides for contributions to the committee by the growers within a district following the successful holding of a poll. The committee, by notice in the *Government Gazette*, may from time to time require persons registered under this Act, in the district to which the committee is appointed, to pay to the committee contributions of such amounts or at such rates as the Minister shall from time to time approve towards the general cost of the administration of this Act. In other words, the committee has the power to levy contributions, provided it has the Minister's approval. The other clauses dealing with obstruction of the committee, protection, general penalties, and the power to make regulations are self-explanatory. I submit the Bill for the consideration of the Council.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.51 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 4, at 2.15 p.m.