

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 13, 1965.

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

### QUESTIONS

#### REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question relates to a report in today's *News* about the conference on the Referendum (State Lotteries) Bill that was held between the two Houses yesterday, and some comments about it. I have not got a copy of the article with me, but there is also a leading article. Has the Chief Secretary seen it, and, if so, does he consider that it is a factual report and that the comments are justified?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have had my attention drawn to the article. I am unable to give a considered reply to the question today, but I think the article, as expressed in general terms, is not factual. To the question whether or not the comments are fair, my answer is "No".

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: My question relates to yesterday's conference on the Referendum (State Lotteries) Bill. When the managers returned, the Chief Secretary made a statement to the Council and, according to *Hansard*, said that the managers had recommended that clause 14 be amended by inserting the following subclause (11) after paragraph (c):

For the purposes of this section it shall be a valid and sufficient reason for a failure to vote if an elector has a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum.

I emphasize the word "failure". This morning's *Advertiser* contains the following:

The objector would have to satisfy the electoral authorities that he was a conscientious objector, and if he wishes make his objection to the electoral office before the poll.

Does the Chief Secretary consider that to be a true statement of fact?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My interpretation is that, if a person had a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum and informed

the Electoral Department before the referendum, there would be no need for the department to send out a "please explain" letter. On the other hand, if an elector failed to vote at the referendum he would have to satisfy the department that his reason for not voting was that he had a conscientious objection to voting at a referendum in connection with a lottery, which I think would be accepted as a reasonable excuse.

#### PRINCES HIGHWAY.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer to the portion of the Princes Highway passing through the township of Tailern Bend. There is a 35 miles an hour speed limit on this road for a distance, at a guess, of about two miles. The road is built on a five-chain roadway, and I realize that at its southern end where the 35 miles an hour limit operates there is a school but, on comparing it with Murray Bridge, where a 45 miles an hour speed limit operates to the centre of the town, will the Minister of Roads seek a report from the Road Traffic Board on whether it is practicable to have a higher speed limit on a portion of the Princes Highway passing through Tailern Bend?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall refer the matter to the Road Traffic Board for investigation and report.

#### DROUGHT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Today's *Advertiser* contains an article stating that the Commonwealth Government has deferred consideration of drought assistance for Queensland and New South Wales until later in the financial year. In South Australia, the position in the agricultural areas at this time cannot be regarded as disastrous, but much of the country in the Far North is still drought-stricken. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture say whether Cabinet has considered seeking drought assistance for that particular area? If not, in view of the fact that Queensland and New South Wales have sought assistance, will the Government consider making such an approach to the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The matter of drought relief is under the jurisdiction of the

Minister of Agriculture, from whom I shall seek a report. I shall inform the honourable member as soon as it is available.

#### MENTAL HEALTH CENTRES.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the establishment of Elanora and Strathmont mental health centres?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I asked for information in relation to these centres so that I could give the exact details. The information I have is as follows:

Both these projects have been recommended by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. In the case of Strathmont, the Public Buildings Department is ready to commence design. Construction will be in stages commencing June, 1966. Construction time is estimated as four years. In regard to Elanora, the Public Buildings Department is ready to commence design. Construction will be in stages commencing June, 1967. Construction time is estimated as four years.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2044.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support this Bill, and I think that at the outset I should express my appreciation to the Treasurer and the members of the Government for the way in which the details have been set out in the various Parliamentary Papers tabled in this matter. I have read carefully the financial statement of the Treasurer, the Estimates of Revenue and the Estimates of Expenditure. As far as I can see, they accurately set out the position relating to the various headings they cover. There is, however, one difficulty that everyone experiences in trying to compare the statements submitted this year with statements of the previous year. This difficulty arises because of the change made in the administration of the various portfolios. In some instances new portfolios have been created, and in others portfolios have been transferred from one department to another. This has meant that expenditure or revenue that appeared under the heading of one department last year has in some cases been transferred to a different department. I make this statement by way of comment and not of criticism, because everyone recognizes that it is the right of a new Government to have new ideas, although not necessarily better ideas, about the way in which these things should

be administered. Notwithstanding that, I believe the statements set out in a factual and appropriate way the information that members are entitled to have to enable them to judge the position relating to income and expenditure.

I have made a fairly careful assessment of the position, and it is on that assessment that I intend to base my remarks. I think I could preface my remarks by saying that in the last financial year, during most of which the previous Government was in office, the Budget provided for an excess of expenditure over income of £3,172,000, from which was deducted a surplus of £1,922,000 in the Consolidated Revenue Account and the sum of £680,000 in the uranium production account, leaving a net deficit of £570,000. By using accumulated surpluses and budgeting for a deficit, the previous Government had £3,172,000 to spend in the Revenue Account in excess of what was collected from taxation, reimbursements from the Commonwealth, and other sources. In point of fact, Sir Thomas Playford's Budget, like most of his Budgets, proved to be rather conservative and there was an improvement during the year of £1,181,000 in income from various sources. Therefore, instead of finishing with a deficit of £570,000, as he had budgeted for, he finished with a credit of £611,000.

The revenue and expenditure account for the last year of the Playford Government demonstrated the wisdom that at all times the former Premier and Treasurer used in connection with his budgetary arrangements. He always seemed to have a surplus somewhere or other that could be used in the event of a rainy day, and last year that happened. Consequently, we were able to maintain the services and requirements of the State without increasing taxation too heavily. That seems to me to be a prudent course to follow but, unfortunately, on examining the present position I do not think that the new Government is following anything like as prudent a course of action, nor is it taking into account the difficulties that I consider it will encounter in the future. When we left the Treasury benches a surplus of £611,000 remained for the use of the present Government, but with no other surpluses held up the sleeve, as it were, the State must live on a more or less hand to mouth basis in future. With the rising expenditure in front of us I can foresee some difficulties approaching.

In the 1965-66 Budget of the new Treasurer (Mr. Walsh) a deficit of £1,541,000 is anticipated on a revenue-expenditure basis. From that must be taken an amount of £611,000

carried forward from the Budget of the previous Government and that gives a net Budget deficit of £930,000. It seems to me that, unlike the previous Government's conservative Budgets, this one is over-optimistic, because—and I make a forecast in this matter—I do not think that the revenue received by the new Government will reach the estimates. On the other hand, there is every possibility that the expenditure proposed by the Government will be exceeded and, in some instances, considerably exceeded. Part of that may be due to matters that are under the control of the Government, and part may be due to matters that are, unfortunately, not within the control of the Government or within the control of anybody else and about which we can do nothing except wait and see what transpires. I mention here that seasonal prospects are not as bright now as the Treasurer may have imagined at the time he prepared his statement.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I hope that the honourable member is proved to be as wrong as I was in 1959.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I sincerely hope so, because seasonal conditions affect all the people, whatever industry they are engaged in. The truth is that at the moment the position is not quite as bright as it was at the time of the fairly guarded statement that the Treasurer submitted to Parliament. I take the liberty of reading from the Parliamentary Paper on this matter. It reads:

At the time of the Budget presentation in September it is normal for a State Treasurer to make some reference to seasonal conditions, which, as well as affecting the rural community, have their influence throughout the State and of course an effect on the Budget itself. The 1964-65 season was a very favourable one. The spring rains ensured good yields of cereals, high stock carrying capacity, and particularly good intakes into our reservoir system so that the cost of pumping from the River Murray was relatively low. The present season is in balance.

They were the words that the Treasurer used when delivering his statement in September. He went on to say:

Intermittent rains have been sufficient to keep cereal crops and pastures growing, but over wide areas there is no reserve of subsoil moisture. Good spring rains would ensure an excellent season, but dry weather from now on would have serious effects on production.

That, I think, was an accurate statement of the position at that particular point of time but I emphasize two facts that were set out in that document. The first is that the 1964-65 season was favourable; the second is that the spring rains last year ensured good yields of cereals,

high stock carrying capacity, and particularly good intakes into our reservoir system. At the time of the Treasurer's statement to Parliament the season was in balance but, unfortunately, at present it is getting rather out of balance, and we cannot say that the conditions of last year will be repeated this year. In many areas there will not be good cereal returns or good stock carrying capacity, and it is safe to say now that there will not be good intakes into our reservoirs.

So that in all those three facets of the economy there must be a downturn in revenue, which will affect the Budget more adversely than perhaps the Treasurer has allowed for in his Estimates. Those are all factors over which nobody has any control; we just have to accept the position. On the other hand, I think we shall find that expenditure will exceed the Estimates in many spheres. I notice that the Government has allowed (and prudently allowed) an amount of £740,000 for pumping water this year, both in the Morgan-Whyalla main and in the Mannum-Adelaide main.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I thought that total was £800,000.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I may be wrong but, whether it is £740,000 or £800,000, I remember that in previous years the actual amount involved in pumping has been considerably more than £1,000,000, and I rather fancy that, with the unfortunate turn in the season and conditions drying up earlier than usual, the demand for water will exceed what could perhaps have been anticipated earlier and we can expect an excess expenditure on the pumping of water.

I notice also that the Treasurer in the preparation of his statement has made no allowance on the expenditure side for any increase in salaries or wage adjustments that may occur on or after August 18 of this year. In other words, the expenditure items are on the basis that wages and salary adjustments will remain the same as they were at August 18, 1965. As we all know, there are demands before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission at present for increases in salaries and, if any of those are granted (and I have no doubt that some of them will be), that will be a burden on the Budget that is not provided for at present, and it will adversely affect the position. Also, it appears to me that the Treasurer has allowed for some increased amounts that will probably be consequent upon the 1½ per cent increase in margins payable, but he has not allowed for the additional amount required

to meet those increases, because the accountancy work takes some time and all increases in margins had not been worked out and calculated at the time the Budget was presented. As I read the document, any increases still to be paid, calculated and finalized at the date of the Budget are not provided for in these Estimates.

I notice there is also a fairly considerable rise in the cost of interest that has to be met by the Government on its various borrowings. Whilst the Under Treasurer has no doubt done his very best to help calculate the cost of that increase, I think there will be a tendency for interest rates to harden and for the cost of money borrowed to increase, and therefore the amount that will have to be found to meet the increase in interest on our various borrowings will probably exceed the Estimates at present before us.

At this point of time I want to refer to what has happened with regard to the increase in taxation provided for in the present Budget. As honourable members know, our revenue comes from various sources, some being from Commonwealth Government reimbursement of income tax, and this year South Australia's portion is £42,000,000. The figure that the State collected from its own taxation imposed by Act of Parliament last year was £19,565,000. This year it is anticipated that the revenue from State taxation will be up by about £2,115,000. In other words, the taxpayers of this State have to pay into the State Treasury £2,115,000 more than in the previous year, which represents an increase of about 10 per cent per annum. I want to compare that figure of £2,115,000 with another part of the Treasurer's statement. I read from the bottom of page 8:

In explaining the Supplementary Estimates for 1964-65 I pointed out that the total cost of service pay for the six months to June, 1965, was of the order of £500,000, of which £339,000 affected Revenue Account directly as salaries and wages, while a further £16,000 met in the first instance from certain working accounts, became a recharge to Revenue Account indirectly.

This is the sentence I want to emphasize:

The cost of service pay for the full year 1965-66 will be about £1,100,000.

Out of an additional revenue collection of £2,115,000, an amount of £1,100,000 has been absorbed in service pay, which goes to a relatively small and select number of individuals. It seems to be a little unfair that the run of taxpayers generally should be asked to pay an amount of £1,100,000, which is half of the

total increase of taxation in this State, purely to benefit a small section of the community. I shall deal presently with the impact that this additional taxation makes on the sections of the community on which it will fall most heavily.

I have said enough to demonstrate that, in my opinion, the revenues are likely to fall short of what is estimated, and that the expenditure is likely to exceed what is estimated but, as I see it, looking to the future, there are only two ways in which this position can be overcome and in which the statement of receipts and expenditure and the finances of the State can be brought back on an even keel. One way is to increase the amount that we collect from the Commonwealth Government; the other is to increase our own taxation. I think the answer to the problem is to see that we get a better deal from the Commonwealth Government. I was somewhat surprised at the comments made by the Treasurer on page 4 of his statement in regard to the amount that he collected from the Commonwealth Government this year. He said:

The aggregate amount available to all States together for 1965-66 as finally arranged was rather better than may have been anticipated, and a significant improvement upon the Commonwealth's first offer. The procedure for determining future increases, particularly in relation to betterment, is a marked improvement on the previous procedure, and follows in substance the lines which the former Premier of New South Wales and I mutually agreed to propose at the first conference.

I do not agree with that statement. I think it is abundantly clear that we are still not getting as much as we ought to get by way of reimbursement from the Commonwealth Government and I repeat what I said when speaking on the Loan Estimates, that stronger efforts might have been made by the Treasurer to see that we received a larger reimbursement that would get us over some of the difficulties I see looming. I also repeat that I think it will be wise if in future the Treasurer is accompanied by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford when he is negotiating with the Commonwealth Government for increases.

What we receive from the Commonwealth Government is one of the main features determining whether this State is going to operate as satisfactorily as it should and I consider that everything possible should be done to ensure that we receive a better deal as far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned. There is one other item in regard to revenue that I cannot see being achieved. That is the

proposal in connection with the co-ordination of transport. The Treasurer said:

It is proposed to take measures shortly to protect and augment railway revenues by instituting transport control on competitive routes, with a different approach and emphasis from that which has been hitherto adopted. Rather than adopting the method of prohibiting competitive operations, it is proposed in general to permit them to continue as far as practicable, but to require the competitive services to make an appropriate payment for the privilege.

That is a remarkable statement. I think that the idea of having to pay for the privilege of operating in competition is quite foreign to people who believe in a private enterprise economy. It may be the sort of reasoning that appeals to a Socialist (I do not know), but I do not agree with the principle that we should pay for what is called (erroneously, in my opinion) the privilege of competition.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It happens in all other States.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am expressing my own opinion and perhaps the other States will come around to my opinion. Then, the most remarkable statement of all was made when the Treasurer said:

By these means it is hoped in due course to realize the Government's election target of at least £1,000,000 a year extra revenue.

All I say at this stage is that I do not know what period "in due course" is intended to cover, but if it means in the foreseeable future and if we are to have another increase of £1,000,000 in railway revenue, we are going to have severe restrictions and controls as far as railway operations are concerned, which will disrupt the economy of the State and have serious repercussions in many spheres. On the other hand, the Government's plan to obtain the £1,000,000 may not be achieved. If the Government succeeds in getting £1,000,000 by disrupting transport and by introducing controls, the result will not be satisfactory or pleasant. I cannot see that the Government's hopes in regard to that amount will be achieved.

At this point I desire to look at the rather serious aspect of where the Government proposes to obtain this additional £2,100,000 of revenue. I can come to no conclusion other than that, whereas one section of the community, the people receiving service payments, will have the benefit of £1,100,000, another section is being singled out to provide in large measure the money to enable that to be done, and that other section is the primary producers. As I see it, they are the

people on whom this Budget will bear most severely.

I want to say sincerely and honestly to this Government that I think it is a mistake for any Government to think that one section of the community can be treated differently from another and asked to bear burdens that are excessive when compared with the responsibilities of other sections. We see that the primary producers have not had a fair deal in the Government's programme.

I mention first the land tax, which is going up by 15 per cent. Whilst I know that a large percentage of the land tax is paid by people within the metropolitan area, nevertheless it is true that the primary producers, particularly those on broad acres, must own large areas in order to carry on their industry and, in the majority of instances in the Mid North of the State, on Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula and in the wheatgrowing areas generally, we find that the unimproved value of a primary producer's property usually exceeds £5,000. Consequently, he is the person who will be caught by the increase in land tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you say that a property valued at £5,000 would represent a living area?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not think it would in the better areas. I would say that the average value of an unimproved holding on Yorke Peninsula would be about £8,000 or £10,000. However, that does not mean that a person who owns such an area is wealthy; that is what he must have if he is to enjoy a reasonable standard of living.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think that the quinquennial assessment this year will result in increasing the taxation further?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That is something I have not had an opportunity to assess, but I know, from negotiating with the Commonwealth Deputy Commissioner of Taxation in regard to land values for gift duty and death duty purposes, that over the last three years there has been a considerable increase in assessed values. If the value of improvements is deducted from the sale value of the property, what is left is the unimproved value and it is obvious that these unimproved values are going to rise steeply, which will clearly affect the primary producing section.

I had not intended to mention this, but when I was talking about what had been happening as far as the primary producer was concerned, I remembered the case of a constituent who came to see me the other day. He has a Crown leasehold property on which he has been

paying a rent of about £84 a year. The lease contains a provision for a revaluation every 14 years and the time has come for a revaluation. He was most disturbed because he had been told that under the revaluation the rent would be increased from £84 to £214, which seemed to be a colossal increase. It is in rather marked contrast to the 5s. a week rental increase in respect of Housing Trust houses. We should be happy to settle the increase in his rent on the same basis as the Housing Trust rental increases and at the moment I am anxiously awaiting a reply to a letter I wrote to the Minister in which I asked whether my unfortunate constituent, who is trying to make a living on this property, will receive the same consideration as the tenants of Housing Trust houses. The increasing of Crown lease rentals by about 250 per cent will create great hardship for the people concerned. However, I suppose I should tell the whole story. The Government did offer a renewal to my constituent. He was told that, if he did not like to accept the increase in rent, all he had to do was say so, when tenders would be called and the property let to somebody else. If he does not like to pay the increase he can get off the land, but that is not a satisfactory alternative.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But that has been the usual procedure right through with renewals, hasn't it?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: This lease has gone on for many years, and I think that each 14 years the rental has been reviewed and has been either reduced or increased. I think that this is the sixth 14-year period since the lease was originally granted and that there have been upward adjustments over the period, but the leaseholder in the past has not had to face increases of 250 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There is a note on the bottom giving people the opportunity not to take on the lease any longer, isn't there?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That is so, but this property has changed hands on many occasions. When it was bought on the previous occasion, which was about five or six years ago, I think the buyer paid about £20,000 on the assumption that he would be treated reasonably by future Governments. When a man has invested £20,000 in a property he has some interest in it, and he cannot walk off and leave it for someone else to take over at an increased rental. I think an increase of 250 per cent is unreasonable, and I ask that these people be given similar consideration to that given to

tenants of Housing Trust houses. I am anxiously awaiting a reply from the Government on this matter.

Stamp duties are to be increased to bring in an additional £753,126 this year, which is an increase of 16 per cent. I believe that the main burden of this increase will fall on the primary producing section. Everyone knows that it is the farming lands that sell at fairly considerable figures and that they attract most of the stamp duties. Succession duties will bring in an additional £448,145, which is an increase of 14 per cent. I do not know whether I can find the reference to succession duties in the Treasurer's statement, but I think from memory that the exemption will be raised from £4,500 to £6,000 and that for primary producing properties some concession will be made. However, I believe that that concession is to apply only to properties valued at up to £6,000. It seems to me that many primary producing properties would be valued at more than £6,000, so that this does not mean anything to the primary producer. On the contrary, the increases that must inevitably occur on the higher values will bear harshly on that section of the community. I bring to the notice of the Chief Secretary and the Government the statement made by His Excellency in opening Parliament. He said that an amendment would be made to the Succession Duties Act, but he went on to say that it would be made principally to give effect to the Government's policy of increasing exemptions. If, when the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill is introduced, I find it is not principally to increase exemptions but is to increase rates on higher estates, I shall have some further comments to make, because I think it is tremendously important that statements made by His Excellency in opening Parliament are factual and borne out in the light of subsequent events.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think the present Attorney-General has had something to say about that.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have not the time to quote all he has said, but in relation to succession duties he said that he proposes to tighten up certain loopholes and make it difficult not to evade succession duties but to legally avoid them. In that matter, as in some others, I wish him success. Last year the Transport Control Board collected fees amounting to £22,636, and this year the figure is estimated to be £50,000, which is an increase of over 100 per cent. As we know, this board operates mainly in country areas, and I think

the burden of the increase will be found to be on country areas. Harbors Board revenue will increase to £436,788 this year, which is an increase of about 14 per cent. I have not seen a break-down of Harbors Board income but I take it that wheat, barley, wool, wine and other primary produce are the things that earn it.

The items I have mentioned are those bearing the burden of increased taxation, and, with the possible exception of land tax, the burden will fall on the primary-producing section. I am sorry that this is the section that this Government has chosen to bear the brunt of increased taxation. An increase of £2,000,000 a year on a total taxation income of £19,000,000 is an increase of over 10 per cent. If we go on at this rate we shall find that State taxation will double in the next 10 years. If it is doubled on the section of the community on which it is now imposed, it will be difficult indeed for them. If our primary producers are not prosperous and making progress, the whole State will suffer, and I am greatly concerned about this.

I wish to refer to one item of expenditure in relation to hospitals that I think indicates what is likely to happen under this Budget throughout the year. The Treasurer said:

It has been the experience for many years for underspending against estimate to emerge as hospitals and institutions have subsequently claimed progress payments on building projects at a slower rate than forecast.

Then he quite rightly said:

I wish to make it clear that no such comparable underspending is likely to occur in 1965-66. The contract work is now proceeding quite rapidly, and I am satisfied that the overall provision is a realistic estimate of requirements.

I think what he said was perfectly true. In previous years the economy has been very buoyant and contractors have found it difficult to do all the work offering. Consequently, they were not able to keep up to their schedules and there was a certain amount of underspending that showed itself in the final result. The Treasurer has said that we have passed beyond that era now.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Too far beyond!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I believe that is so. Apparently work in the private sector of the economy is drying up and people are concentrating on getting work from the Government, as they know it has been the past practice in this State—and I see no reason why it should not be the future practice—to pay as soon as the job is completed. I do not expect that we shall ever get away from that basis, but other

States have done so. In some of the States contractors have been asked to wait for unconscionable periods for payment. If we get to the situation where we have to pay as soon as the work is completed and the necessary certificates are given, we shall find that there will be an increase in the rate of expenditure and that many projects in the course of construction now will be completed ahead of schedule—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Weather conditions can have a considerable effect.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: —and that will mean more money will be needed at the end of the financial year than was budgeted for. As the Chief Secretary has just said, weather conditions have some effect. If the weather is fine and the contractors are able to work, naturally the work is completed much sooner. That is one of the advantages that oversea people find when they come to South Australia, because here there are few days in the year when work cannot proceed because of the weather. It is different in, say, Canada where for nearly half of the year weather almost completely shuts down work on outside projects, and that increases costs enormously. However, without wishing anybody ill luck, I hope that we get some rain and contractors are held up for a few days. It may be a disadvantage to them, but it would be an advantage to the State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Overall we would be much better off.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That is so, and nobody would be sorry if it happened. I now wish to refer to a matter that, if everything else I have had to say is of no interest to members, may have some interest. I refer to the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. I do not imagine that this will have a special interest to present members because I do not think one of us expects to be superannuated after the next election. However, in the Estimates of Expenditure under the heading "Parliamentary Superannuation Fund, Government contribution to Parliamentary Superannuation Act" we find that last year £26,740 was paid into the fund by the Government, and that this year the proposed amount is £25,150, a reduction of £1,590. I have no doubt that there is a proper explanation for this and that everything is in order, but I cannot see why the amount to be paid into the fund should be £1,590 less than last year.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think the answer is that some members on the qualifying line paid enough to qualify. I do not wish that

to be held against me, but I believe that is the answer.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Obviously there is an explanation, and I do not suggest that anything is wrong. If I am able to keep up my payments I have no doubt that superannuation will be available to me.

The other matter I wish to mention concerns the Electricity Trust. I commented on this when speaking on the Loan Estimates and the Chief Secretary was good enough to give me a satisfactory reply setting out the situation. It appears to me that the present position is that some time ago the then Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford), following his rather conservative approach to matters—and the older I get the more satisfied I am that the conservative approach is the correct one—suggested to the Electricity Trust that it should try to build up cash reserves because it had a capital expenditure programme in front of it in the building of the Torrens Island power station. Because of that policy, the cash reserves of the trust were built up from £6,000,000 in June, 1961, to about £9,700,000 in 1965.

The object of that, as I understand it, was to ensure that when construction at Torrens Island really got under way, and large capital payments were required, some of them could be made from the cash reserves held by the trust instead of borrowing from outside sources. That was a prudent action on the part of the former Treasurer. When a private individual wants to buy a new motor car and is able to pay cash for it it is better than buying it on the hire purchase and having to pay an additional amount in interest. That was the course followed by the former Treasurer when he suggested to the trust in 1961 that it build up cash reserves in order to have ready money available when the Torrens Island power station project was being constructed. Heavy expenditure will be incurred on that project this year, and I understand that No. 4 turbo generator and boiler is to be installed by 1970 instead of 1971. The trust is getting ready for that now; consequently requirements for capital money will greatly increase.

According to information supplied to me, about £500,000 of accumulated surplus is to be used this year. At the end of this year the cash reserves of the trust will be that much less than they are at present. I cannot say that that is an unreasonable course of action. I think it is a satisfactory course to take. However, the trust is using much of its cash reserves and when all the money has gone it will be necessary to raise further capital

money, either from the Government or by going on the market for loans, which will involve further interest payments. The alternative is an increase in trust prices, but I sincerely hope that we shall be able to maintain the position of not increasing prices of electricity. We all know that the trust has extended its services to practically all the State. Many people rely on power from the trust for their ordinary requirements, and I hope we shall never reach the stage where the trust has to increase prices. It will take careful management and judicious handling for that to come about. With the construction of the new power station at Torrens Island the production of electricity will increase, and that may save us from price increases. I hope the Government will watch the situation. I support the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I consider it my duty to put before the Government exactly what is going on in regard to agriculture. This is, I think, not appreciated by anybody in South Australia who is not actually in the farming community. It must be accepted that the disastrous drought that has so deeply affected agriculture in New South Wales over the last 12 months has spread to the west, and is now deeply involving South Australia. In the district that I represent many farmers will not harvest a grain of wheat this year. They are trying to salvage their crops by baling. I am not speaking of the future but of what is happening now. On comparing notes with my colleagues in Midland, I find that a similar position exists in the Lower North. In the Upper Murray areas the crops on fallow and on deep land are holding out amazingly well. I have heard of only one man who is confident that there is sufficient moisture in the soil to bring his crop to some sort of a grain harvest. No matter how much rain falls and how bountiful it is from now on, it will be much less, overall, than it was last year. No matter how good a farmer is, he cannot assess the present harvest. It is certain that a day such as today reduces our possible harvest in South Australia, not by thousands but probably by hundreds of thousands of bushels; and another fortnight without rain will bring us to the verge of disaster.

Unless one has been engaged in agriculture for a long time, I do not think it is possible for him to assess how a change can occur so rapidly. Even a month ago it looked like being one of our best seasons, but now the position has changed suddenly to being one



verging on disaster.—One cannot say anything else but that. Much of the district of which I am talking, which stretches from the Adelaide Hills across to Pinnaroo and down as far as Coonalpyn and Tintinara, will not harvest a single bale of grass hay this year. The position is serious. I spoke to a farmer last weekend. As late as a week ago from last Monday he thought he could cut hay in one paddock. He thought he would cut it on Thursday last. He went out on Thursday last, but drove his haymaking equipment home again. The chances of cutting it had vanished in those three days. We have had a year with practically no soaking rains. Even the crops looking good at the moment are working on moisture that has been stored for a long time. Nobody knows how long it will last. Farmers a fortnight ago were confident they were in for a good harvest, but now they are running their mowers into their crops and trying to salvage the hay.

It is most important that this alarming position is not viewed with any feeling of panic. There is no such feeling in the farming community. In these badly affected districts the farmers are not even talking about it: they are just planning what they can do to meet the position. But they do not know what the position will be that they will have to meet. The point is that the Budget now before us is one that the State would have been able to sustain in a year of great prosperity, but prosperity for the farming community has already vanished this year. It cannot be a good year: it is a doubtful year, and many farmers have experienced disastrous failure of crops. They have to try to gather in fodder reserves sufficient to carry the heavy stocking that exists in practically every district. In the past, usually when we have had an agricultural failure of this magnitude, other sections of agriculture have helped to pay the way. These are comparatively minor sections compared with the wool and wheat industries: they are the citrus and wine industries, which support about one-third of our agricultural community. I do not think there is any need to emphasize to the Government that this backstop will not be available this year, for both the citrus and the wine industries are in dire trouble. They needed an inquiry to find means of relieving their distress. We must accept the fact that we are in for a pretty tough time no matter how good the rains are and how soon they come. There is no indication in the Budget of any reserves that can be drawn upon to meet the position. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): The gathering in and spending of £121,580,000, as has been envisaged by the Treasurer, shows the advancing needs of the State. A reading of the explanation of how these moneys are to be appropriated reveals how the various departments have to provide a service to the community for the betterment of the whole.

I refer first to the lines covering the Tourist Bureau and immigration, for which there is an allocation of £339,194. I wish to say a few words about tourism as it applies to this State. I noted with interest a statement by the Treasurer in reply to a deputation that came from Tumby Bay recently to see him about its caravan park facilities. Referring to the allocation of moneys for tourism in this State, the Treasurer said the money would be used to improve wherever possible existing tourist attractions rather than to establish new ones, which would need much capital expenditure. He added that some caravan parks are not as well kept as they should be and need to be improved. That statement is fair from his point of view with regard to the allocation of moneys for tourism. "Let us get our house in order" is another way of putting it, but I hope it does not become a custom that only caravan parks that are established are to be financially assisted in the future. I hope that, even as soon as next year, grants will be made for increasing the number of caravan parks within the State. Conditions have changed much in our own lifetimes with the advent of technological advances. Today we enjoy television, motor cars, bitumen roads and more money in our pockets.

Whereas once a family was content to stay at home, read its newspapers and glean from them the import of what was going on in the world, today it is not uncommon (in fact, it is quite common) for whole families to move out and travel throughout Australia or to other parts of the world. When the South Australian Railways withdrew most of its manpower from the township of Quorn, it was thought (and commonly agreed) that the town would die, that it would become another ghost town in the north of the State; but, with the advent of a swimming pool, subsidized by the State Government, and by the provision of other facilities, a flow of tourists to the town was encouraged, and it brought continuity, which has, to a large extent, kept the town alive. It is a revelation for those who have been so worried about its future for many years to see this town today, and we could have the same position in many other areas of the

State. Within the Northern electoral district, many areas could be used for caravan parks, not only for the betterment and continuation of the towns, but also to enable the touring public to appreciate Australia to a greater extent.

I was privileged recently to be shown over a caravan park that the District Council of Wilmington had been planning. It is set amidst lovely trees on the fringes of the Flinders Ranges. Roads have already been provided by the council, application has been made to the Government for a subsidy for the provision of toilet blocks and for the electrification of the area. Unfortunately, the Treasurer has said that money cannot be provided this year.

This is a matter that must be appreciated as a whole. Although it is said that we shall maintain what we have at present, I hope that the future will reveal a gradual opening up of areas for tourists so that the whole State will benefit. For example, I understand that the oil companies aim to so locate petrol stations that the traveller will arrive at one every two or three hours. This is being done, not necessarily so that people will purchase petrol but also to provide a service to the public. If the children want to buy an ice-cream, or mother wants to powder her nose, or if there is some other reason to stop, there will be decent facilities provided in a network covering the main areas of the State and Australia. I consider that caravan parks should be provided in a similar way.

I now turn to libraries, for which £408,553 has been allocated, and refer to my Address-in-Reply speech where I drew attention to the need for the payment of greater subsidies to institute committees, particularly those in the country. Recently, the Institutes Association of South Australia has had to increase considerably the cost of boxed books. In the past, these boxes, each containing 40 books provided by the Institutes Association to be sent to country areas, cost the institutes about £18 each. Today, the cost has increased to £20 for one box, £25 for the second and £30 for the fourth and each individual box thereafter.

The committees must meet the demand for books supplied in this way in order to provide a service to the reading public and also to allow the people to have a change of reading diet. It is common for these boxed books to be changed around at the rate of about one box in three months in many small country

communities. The institute committees face many problems of finance in all its ramifications and this extra cost is being heaped upon them. I am not critical of the association, because the charges have to be increased, but I hope that the Government will view the problem of increased financial help a little more sympathetically in the future.

These committees work on a voluntary basis and raise their money in the same way. Now that television has come to much of the State, there has been a slackening off in reading. I know that this is only a temporary phase but, because people do not want to read as much as they used to, they also do not want to pay their subscriptions, and this is another problem.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You will find as time goes on that television will result in reading being increased.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, that is a pertinent point. Unfortunately, in the interim, they are receiving less income while people are watching television and paying instalments on their television sets. Another problem that institute committees have is that of maintaining their buildings. I previously made the point that consideration should be given by the Government to granting greater subsidies for approved repairs, maintenance and alterations to institute buildings. Many of these buildings have been standing for long periods, some being over 100 years old, and they have been maintained by the community for the community, but, with rising costs, the problem of looking after them is becoming worse.

There is still a need in the country for these buildings. In the event of a national disaster, they can be used for civil defence purposes or as a distribution point for the Red Cross. They can also be used by the citizens of the town as an assembly area to prepare food for bush fire workers. The institute is the common denominator. It needs more help and I hope that the Treasurer will see his way clear to be a little more generous.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think that local government should have more responsibility in the matter?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The question of local government having more responsibility is an interesting one. If local government makes a donation, the State Government pays a subsidy of 9s. 3d. for each pound donated. As I see it, one problem from a local government point of view arises, and I instance particularly my own local government area, the District Council of Port Germein, where there

are no fewer than four institutes within its boundaries.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The subsidy would apply to the library section only, wouldn't it, not to the hall?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In many instances, the library and the hall are part and parcel. The committees affiliated to the Institutes Association receive a subsidy of 9s. 3d. for each pound received and the institute includes the building. The word "library" is not used to the same extent within the Institutes Association as is the case with the Public Lending Library on North Terrace. A subsidy received by an institute committee can be used for maintaining or improving the building. However, as I said, 9s. 3d. is not sufficient in these days of increasing costs.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The only responsibility of an institute committee is to conduct the library, isn't it?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I beg to differ. I have always considered that it is the responsibility of an institute committee to maintain the library and also the building. In fact, the balance sheets of institute committees, which are sent to the Institutes Association in Adelaide, must include all assets, land, buildings and improvements. All purchases made by committees are free of sales tax—and these purchases can be seats for the public to sit on at the pictures or curtains for the stage. Most institute committees in the North care for both buildings and the issue of books.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But the only real responsibility they have is to supply a library. If they do, they fall within the concept of an institute.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The sum allocated under "Minister of Works—Miscellaneous" is £15,253. I have a suggestion to make that I think would do credit to Parliament House. Next year the next Festival of Arts will be held. The grounds surrounding this building are bare, and I hope the Minister of Works will see his way clear to beautify this area by having flowers planted, not permanently but in tins as is done in the median strip in King William Street. This would add a little colour to this already beautiful building.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The interior decoration is all right.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is difficult for the public to see inside if they are outside, and it is the outside that I want beautified. The beautification of the median strip in King

William Street is a classic example of how well this work can be done, and I see no reason why it could not be done around Parliament House. Adelaide has often been referred to as the city of flowers, and it has gained a great reputation for its annual flower day. Having the King William Road and North Terrace sides of this building bordered with flowers would add to that reputation and do credit to Parliament House.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp made some interesting observations about agriculture and the problem that not only the Government but every citizen may be facing as the days grow longer. It is an old saying that a hard and fast rule cannot be made in agriculture, and I hope the warning of possible drought given by the honourable member will be a memory next year when we read *Hansard* and that the elements will still give to the whole State a better harvest than is expected and sufficient feed until next autumn.

I wish to deal now with the need for greater extension services by the Agriculture Department. It has been said that these services are extremely good; I emphasize the words "it has been said", as I am sure that they are getting poorer than they were some years ago and that there is an urgent need for this problem to be looked at, not only in agricultural areas but in irrigation and horticultural areas.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you think we train sufficient extension officers?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The problem is a threefold one—we do not train enough; we do not pay them enough; and although we have a source of supply of practical men who go through Roseworthy and obtain a diploma there is no place for them to advance in the Public Service. People must be enticed to study as agricultural scientists, and in many cases it is a question of their having sufficient money to do so. However, if those who are trained can be sent to the country for two or three years to learn how the farmer lives and works and the problems of the soil, this will assist.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We would not get them back into Roseworthy.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The trouble is that university graduates are getting more money from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the Waite Research Institute than they can get from the Agriculture Department, so they are not going out into the country. If they do not go to either of the places I have mentioned, they go to other

States. A graduate who has been employed by the Agriculture Department for five or six years in this State gets £1,500 a year less than does his counterpart in another State. The soil complex of South Australia varies from place to place and farm to farm, and a text book cannot easily be written about it; it is a problem that must be met on the property. What we now lack badly is men who can act as field assistants to give a service to the farmer on the spot and add to the prosperity of the State for posterity. If such men could be enticed by a subsidy or by increased salaries to work in the country for a period as field assistants, we would have a nucleus of practical people who would have had a theoretical education as well. These people would be of great value because of their knowledge and experience.

Roseworthy always sends its third-year students on a tour of the country to see how farmers live and work. A few years ago I was asked to give an address to them at Wirrabara in which I had to explain as best I could how we farmed and what we did with our soil. One man said, "This is all very interesting, but what can we do when we leave Roseworthy with a diploma?" I could not answer him then, and I still cannot give an answer. I think many Roseworthy boys have the practical ability to understand the problems of the land and the technical ability to be able to assist other people in interpreting problems of the land. I wonder whether it would be constructive thinking to have an honours course for Roseworthy students that would be recognized by the Public Service so that these men would be classed as professional officers, be able to receive a salary worthy of their calling, and be able to advance within the Public Service and give their knowledge to the whole State. Turning next to the line "Minister of Local Government and the Minister of Roads, Miscellaneous, £160,597", I recall that recently His Excellency the Governor, when opening the Municipal Association's annual general meeting, cleverly brought to the notice of all of us present the problem of "Cutslashus Incendiaryus": in other words, the noxious weed, the Australian daisy. Later His Excellency described this weed as follows:

A vicious noxious weed—brown in colour, easily recognizable, drought resistant, a blight upon our lovely countryside . . . it is found standing up and lying on its side, but mostly in scattered fragments . . . it is at home on the land, in the sea and on our lovely beaches . . . the bottle.

Then he made an appeal to the municipal authorities to try to urge the public not to throw their bottles out on the road and elsewhere. I realize that this is not an easy problem to solve, but I think it would be a good idea for the Minister to consider educating the people so that they do not throw bottles away or leave them on the roadside. Perhaps it could be done by advertising in the press and on television, on posters, local government offices and town halls. Would it be impossible to ask the brewers and cool drink manufacturers to help by putting on their bottles "Don't throw me away: I hurt people" or some such catch phrase? I realize it would be difficult to bring in legislation—

The Hon. C. R. Story: Would the answer be to put a decent deposit on the bottles?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If people buy a cool drink at, say, Clare, it is probable that the drink would be made by the Clare Mineral Waters Company and it might not be possible to get the deposit back, except in Clare, in most instances. Perhaps the people concerned would pull up at the next township and obtain another bottle of drink, but they would not be refunded the deposit on the bottle they bought at Clare and often it would be thrown out of the window of the car. I am afraid that even a large deposit on the bottle does not mean much to many people who drink Coca Cola and other well-known brands of soft drink and leave the bottles by the wayside. Shall we take the advice of His Excellency the Governor and instruct the people that this is a noxious weed and a blight upon our countryside? Do we take it and leave it there or do we take it a step further? It is up to the Government to educate people who do not seem to be able to educate themselves properly. Is the cost of publicity, or the attempt at it, too much for us? Is a request to the manufacturers of these drinks to put a reminder on the bottle too much to expect? Or, further, has anybody else a better solution? In conclusion, I hope the estimates of the revenue for this State to make this Budget possible are realized in order to bring about the betterment of the State as a whole. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I do not intend to apply myself at any length to this measure. I consider that most of the points have already been ably covered by previous speakers, particularly by the Hon. Mr. Rowe. I shall comment on two points associated with the lines in the more detailed part of the Estimates. I certainly support my colleague's

remarks—on—stamp—duties, although I think he spoke generally in regard to the large increase in stamp duties as a whole.

Whilst I appreciate it is necessary for the Government to obtain additional revenue, particularly this year, I consider that stamp duty on cheques, which last year yielded £459,000 and is expected to yield an additional £450,000 next year, calls for some comment. The increased revenue this year will not be great as the increased duty will not apply for much of the financial year. My objection to this, which might be called an overall tax, can be split under three headings. First, I regard it as a class tax; secondly, I regard it as a company tax, and, thirdly, I regard it as a tax on the country man in particular. It is obvious that the wealthier person whose credit is high, generally speaking, pays his bills by cheque, and therefore it is a more direct tax on such a person than on a wage-earner who gets his weekly pay envelope and is able to pay most of his accounts in cash. As far as companies are concerned, it will particularly affect those that are associated with primary producers in such things as cream cheques that are sent out in hundreds every month and, in some cases, every fortnight.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Eggs also.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes. Inevitably that means a further increase in the cost of primary production, and it is obvious that the country man already has to handle most of his business by cheque and by post. The postage means another 5d. on his expenses each time he has to post a cheque and it is likely that it will be five cents, or 6d., shortly.

The stamp duty will be doubled on every cheque that such a person draws, and it is a considerable incubus on the country person, and this follows the usual practice when we have a Labor Government in office. It does not matter what State it is, there seems to be a general tendency for such a Government to exert pressure on the primary producers. As the Hon. Mr. Kemp said—and he nearly brought me to tears this afternoon with his discouraging speech on the present condition of this State—this is a year in which the primary producer appears to be in for a particularly tough time. Therefore, I consider it is necessary to criticize the steep increase of 100 per cent on the stamp duty applying to cheques.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: This will make ours the highest in Australia, won't it?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am not certain of that but I accept the honourable member's statement if he knows it to be correct. I turn now to the question of transport. I take up in some sense where the Hon. Mr. Rowe left off, and quote the Treasurer, who said, "It is estimated that an additional £1,000,000 will be gained from railway revenue this year, but the means by which this is to be gained are by the diversion of traffic from the roads to the railways." We do not have to go much further to imagine (in fact, to be quite certain) that, if that is so, it must mean that the rates on the roads will have to be increased to such an extent that it will be more profitable in many cases for the primary producer and the country shopkeeper to send their goods by rail. This means that an extra charge will be applied to the road haulier, and not necessarily that there will be increased freight carried on the railways. In fact, there may be reductions—I do not know. We await with interest the Bill from the Minister of Transport on that subject. But I point out to those honourable members representing primary producers that the £1,000,000 that comes through primary producers paying charges on either road or rail is going into general revenue. Presumably it will go into the Railways Department, which merely reduces the amount payable by the Government to meet the deficit on the railways. Surely, if the Government expects a more cheerful approach to this matter, not only from the haulier, who is only the middle man, but also from the primary producer, this money should go into the Highways Fund or into local government funds to maintain the channels on which these road hauliers run. Nobody can logically deny that. If we are to tax the road haulier an additional amount, it is obvious where that money should go. Certainly it should not be diverted back to some other account. That is my only point on this rather nebulous amount of £1,000,000.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Are you conversant with what they do in other States?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I regret that I am, but I am confining my remarks to South Australia. They have their problems and we have ours. Our anxieties are our own. Another point about the Highways Fund, although it does not directly touch the Estimates before us, is the tendency for the Treasurer already, though only in office for a short time, beset though he is by problems, which I do not deny, to seize on every available piece of fat (if I may use that expression) in various accounts

in order to bolster up other requirements, some of a purely social nature. When the Playford Government left office the Highways Department was in debt to the tune of some £600,000 to the Loan Account. It had been placed there for reasons into which I need not go at the moment. Because of section 31a of the Highways Act that money was always to be repayable on demand to the Treasury. It would have been my anticipation that some of that money in a difficult year like this would be repaid by request, and over possibly five or six years we might have returned the £600,000; but what do we find the actual position to be? We find that within a month or two of the Government's taking office £300,000 was requested to be paid back before June 30, and now a further £320,000 has been requested from the Highways Commissioner. How can he budget at the beginning of the year, when he is basing most of his Budget on a five-year plan, if he suddenly finds that he is touched for £600,000 during a period of six months? I offer the Minister my deepest sympathy in this matter. I have already issued a warning in this Council that we must watch that the funds that have been attached to specific portfolios by Statute (in this case, to the Highways Department) must, where possible, remain there. In this case a loan of honour had to be repaid, but do not let us pay it back in one fell swoop, because it may well be that on another occasion the Treasurer will look at the Highways Department, find there is no debt owing there and then seek means whereby he can tap that small Rothschild in some other way. I know that is the attitude of the Party opposite towards funds that it cannot attach. Honourable members here particularly should know the points I have been making from time to time with regard to the transfer of funds. I regret it was necessary to transfer this large amount so rapidly.

A point that has not been mentioned by any honourable member since this Parliament came into being is related to metropolitan stormwater drainage. I am not referring to the south-western suburbs scheme, which is progressing by stages and which is held up because of technical problems, such as the deepening of the Sturt Creek, and so on. I know why this point has not been mentioned (and I refer to both sides in both Houses): it is because we have not had the problem this season, but I warn the Government that, if we run into 3in. of rain over a weekend next year, it will get the blame for not speeding

up the formation of a metropolitan stormwaters committee, which needs to be set up by the various councils concerned. The arrangement at the time was that the Government of last year would not be prepared at any time to pay more than 50 per cent of the total cost of any scheme. One or two schemes were almost ready to commence: one was at Woodville, another at Henley. They have been proceeded with, but there are many other schemes which, with the continued growth of housing (I refer in particular to the development at Para Hills and Magill), have become urgently necessary. Without the slightest doubt, there will be trouble in St. Peters. I recall that only a year ago the present Attorney-General told me that he was virtually sick and tired of trying to get the council concerned to do something about it. He was prepared to assist it in contacting the Government.

I ask the Minister of Local Government: is he keeping an eye on the highly desirable planning that must be done? Otherwise, our city areas to the east, north-east, north, and possibly north-west will run into dire trouble if heavy rain falls over short periods during the coming year. Therefore, I have taken the opportunity to bring this matter to the Government's notice (for there is a lot to think about in a few short months) so that it is not overlooked. Whoever is responsible should be urged to take steps in the matter. It is not entirely the Government's fault: it is partly because certain Government and local government officers have not got together on this problem.

Finally, let me say a word about a poor unfortunate group of people in this State. I refer to the men and women generally known as punters. Last year they paid to the Government about £734,000. The tax on the winnings was £543,000, and the tax on the stakes was £191,000. I have worked this out as about 29 per cent. Although the figures may not be exact, they were corroborated this morning by the Betting Control Board.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If we have T.A.B. the betting tax will go by the board.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It may. I am pointing out what has happened in the past and it is a matter that honourable members in both places have regarded as unfair. About £40,000 was retained by the Treasury, being unclaimed dividends on the totalizer and unclaimed betting tickets. If honourable members opposite have a conscience regarding the considerable number of people who have

been taxed an amount of £734,000 in 12 months, have they considered to whom this £40,000 belongs?

It is the punters' money. Although the individual amounts cannot be returned, at least a gesture could be made to the punters, possibly in regard to the tax on the stake money. We have this additional £40,000 being retained by the Treasury, with no solace being given to the punters. I suggest that friendly consideration be given by the Government towards taking some action in the interests of punters.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We will give it the same consideration as you gave it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Having received the assurance that the matter will be considered, I support the second reading.

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

#### PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2038.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): In speaking to this Bill I think it is worthwhile to say that the area of land concerned was first brought under the notice of Parliament in 1946, when it consisted of an untidy area of swampland near the township of Port Pirie. It was commonly referred to as Jam Tin Park, which aptly described it. Much of the area was made available to the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club for improvement. I gave the following explanation of the Bill when I introduced it in 1946:

Under the Bill the racing club will obtain a fee simple title to the land, but will be bound by an obligation to use it for the objects for which the club is established, that is to say, horse racing and purposes connected therewith. If at any time the club does not use the land for its objects, its title to the land may be cancelled by the Minister of Lands after three months' notice to the club, and upon such cancellation the land will again become Crown land. That position has arisen. The area has been filled and considerable improvement has been made. A trotting and racing track, which is a considerable improvement on the racecourse that used to exist out from the town, has been provided. The area is drained and the club has to contribute to that, but otherwise no rates are involved. A portion of it was taken in 1960 for high school recreation grounds, and considerable development of recreation areas has

taken place. There is a high school oval and a basketball area. Much of the land has been occupied and considerably improved. However, some of the land is not required by the club, and the Education Department is prepared to take advantage of it to provide further recreation facilities for the high school.

I hope that the department will find money to fill and develop the area, and so make one more desirable improvement to that part of Port Pirie. In view of the use that is to be made of the land, and as the club favours the proposal (I have been in touch with the club), I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I, too, support the Bill. I attended school at Port Pirie and, as the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin has said, part of the area to be reclaimed was known as Jam Tin Park. It was just that, an eyesore and a blot on the town. With the advent of River Murray water to Port Pirie, the growth of community-mindedness and the assistance by Broken Hill Associated Smelters and municipal authorities, Port Pirie has been growing better each year.

The giving of this land to the high school by the Racing and Trotting Club will mean not only greater beautification but also provide another playing field for the children attending the school. In these days playing fields are becoming the accepted thing and Governments are prepared to help in every way possible. Much work will be required to fill and level the low-lying sections of the area, and I hope that the Education Department, which, I assume, will be financing the work to make this area suitable for a playing field, will be able to find the funds with a minimum of difficulty. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I thank honourable members for their attention to this Bill and for its speedy passage. I congratulate the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club for its gesture, as the playing areas at the Port Pirie High School are inadequate and the Education Department is anxious to secure the transfer of this land to establish additional playing areas. The speedy passage of the Bill will enable the transfer to be effected quickly, because it will enable the department to secure the title to the land. I assure honourable members that the department is anxious to go ahead quickly with this project.

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

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2039.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): This Bill has been introduced to effect certain improvements to and correct certain anomalies in the principal Act. Some of these have become necessary through the passage of time. The measure also brings certain fees and penalties into line with present money values. Clause 3 amends section 17 of the principal Act by substituting the word "Commonwealth" for "Empire". Although this is something that some of us may regret, it is nevertheless a fact that it is now the British Commonwealth instead of the British Empire. Paragraph (b) of this clause amends the principal Act by providing for a five-year course instead of a four-year course of training.

Clause 12 increases the penalties provided in sections 29, 30, 30a and 31 from £50 to £100. I think the increase is reasonable, as it brings the penalties into line with current money values. Clause 13 amends section 30a by making it an offence for holders of permits to advertise or hold themselves out as veterinary surgeons, and I believe this is a reasonable provision. It is fair that practitioners should not in any way be permitted to advertise as veterinary surgeons. The provision at present applies only if the person himself advertises; it does not extend to advertising by someone else on behalf of the practitioner. This is now overcome and I support this clause.

Clause 14 limits the scope of section 31a, which was inserted in 1938, to the extent that an unregistered person may not advertise himself as qualified to do certain operations such as castration, spaying or dehorning. I am not sure why this should be done. The principal Act provides:

Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, any person not registered under this Act may advertise or hold himself out as being qualified to perform the operation of castration, spaying or dehorning on any animal, or the operation necessary to relieve animals suffering from bloat or hoven, or the tailing of lambs.

This clause seeks to substitute for the words "castration, spaying, or dehorning on any animal" the words "castration or dehorning of any animal or spaying of any animal other than dogs or cats".

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What if the farmer does it himself?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is a point I should like cleared up. I am not happy about the restrictions to be imposed, and I should like the Minister to explain later. These restrictions would be imposed in areas where a qualified veterinary surgeon would not be readily available. It is already our policy not to use practitioners or unregistered persons in areas where veterinary surgeons are available.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If you relax it, it will allow anybody to operate on a dog or a cat.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It may do that, but I am seeking an explanation from the Minister.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Doesn't it do the reverse?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think that may be so. My personal view is that it does the reverse as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris suggests. I should like the Minister to clear up that point. Clause 15, in addition to making provision to curb any unprofessional conduct, increases the penalty for a breach in that regard from £10 to £100. This may seem a steep increase, but I understand that it has the support of the profession itself. I have discussed this measure with a member of the veterinary profession in my district, and I am informed that most of these amendments are, in fact, requested by the profession. Generally, because of that, I support the Bill.

As stockowners, I think we could say that we are pleased with the great improvements in veterinary services that have occurred in recent years. We are aware of the shortages in the profession that still exist and we are also appreciative of the fact that veterinary practitioners who are not qualified have rendered good service, in some instances where it has not been possible to get a fully qualified surgeon. One area in particular is Eyre Peninsula, a large area that has no regular veterinary surgeon. Some veterinary practitioners have had some training at Roseworthy Agricultural College where they have studied veterinary anatomy and physiology, and I believe that, possibly because of the depression, many of them were unable to complete the course at a university. Nevertheless, they have a natural aptitude and have given good service in lieu of veterinary surgeons and have become quite experienced. Others have served in the military forces under a certified veterinary surgeon where they have picked up considerable knowledge.

While it is not the desire of anyone to continue with the use of veterinary practitioners for longer than necessary, we have to realize the



valuable contributions that they have made. Something like this is being done in regard to dental nurses. I was speaking to a dentist in Nuriootpa recently and he said that he was in favour of the proposed arrangements for dental nurses. He said dental nurses could do much good work and relieve the stress and strain on dentists. It may be that for some time we shall have to make considerable use of veterinary practitioners, even under some supervision as assistants to veterinary surgeons, until we get enough fully qualified surgeons. I should be sorry to see any unnecessary restriction placed on veterinary practitioners who have proved themselves to be capable, where there are not veterinary surgeons in the area. With these comments, and with the qualifications which I have mentioned, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the Bill, but with similar qualifications to those mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, particularly with reference to clause 14. The problem of the shortage of veterinary surgeons in this State, particularly in the area that I have the honour to represent, is one that is not easy to solve and I am pleased to see that under this Bill an unqualified man, on registration, can still carry out a certain service to the agricultural community in particular by looking after stock. To my knowledge, there is no qualified veterinary surgeon in the whole of Eyre Peninsula; and although there is a qualified surgeon at Clare, there is not another in the North.

I notice that the Minister in his second reading explanation said that this was the only State that allowed unqualified men to be registered. It is an excellent thing to see that this still applies, but it is rather ironical that so often we say we should do certain things because other States do them, and it is good to see that sometimes we are doing things that other States are not doing. One major problem for the farming community in relation to veterinary surgeons is supplying vaccines for distemper in dogs. For many years vaccines for the control of distemper could be supplied only with the approval of a qualified veterinarian. This creates some hardships, particularly when it is remembered that Eyre Peninsula and the area north of Clare extending to the station country is periodically affected by this disease. It is similar to the diseases of man, such as poliomyelitis, encephalitis and others that seem to come in cycles. So it is with distemper in dogs, and the man who makes full use of his dog

finds it a valuable creature. This restriction on the sale and issue of vaccines for distemper is one that still needs to be examined and I hope that in due course the authorities can relax the control of this vaccine to make it easier for people generally to get it. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2039.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): The Bill seeks to amend an Act that was first introduced in 1915 after continual requests from the South-East Stockowners Protection Association for legislation to protect them from the practice of sheep stealing. It was common practice in those days for dishonest persons after obtaining unlawful possession of stock to skin them, dispose of the carcasses in the scrub and sell the skins, which they were able to do when there was no Act controlling the sale of hides and skins. One would imagine that in these days the reverse would obtain, that the carcasses would in many cases be more valuable than the skins. In the Lower South-East areas, the Tantanoola tiger was often credited with the disappearance of stock.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We have one here!

The Hon. L. R. HART: But, when the stock continued to disappear after the tiger myth had been exploded, it was decided to introduce this legislation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The tiger is still there.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The tiger is not still there. His monument is there: it is on top of the Tantanoola Hotel. Hide, skin and wool dealers (commonly known as skin dealers), together with other itinerant traders, serve a useful purpose in primary producing areas. Skins and hides are a depreciating commodity, particularly when improperly kept for long periods and when it takes a considerable time to accumulate sufficient skins to make it worth while consigning them to a broker. The skin dealers assist the farmers to market the skins before they become over-dried and are attacked by weevil. There is the additional attraction, of course, that the farmer gets

cash on the property. Generally, the skin dealers, although keen businessmen, are reputable traders, with the exception of that minority which, unfortunately, one finds in many walks of business. It is to control that minority that this amending Bill is introduced.

Possibly, one reason why these amendments are necessary is that licences are issued too freely. The Chief Inspector of Stock, who is the person responsible for issuing licences, is of high repute. I have no wish to criticize him, but I feel that more regard should be paid to the need for better character references from people applying for licences under this Act. People are getting licences who resort not only to taking wool, skins and hides from people's properties without permission but also to theft. I appreciate that they can be dealt with under the criminal code.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You have to catch them first.

The Hon. L. R. HART: To emphasize my point, let me instance the case of a friend of mine who recently had two bales of wool stolen from his property, one of which was eventually traced to a person who held a hide, skin and wool dealer's licence. It is quite true to say that licences are being issued to people of ill repute. Not only do they take skins but there is some doubt whether some of them are not involved even in other thefts occurring on properties.

It often happens that, when the skin dealer visits a property, the owner is away and, in many cases, acting in good faith, he takes the hides and skins that appear to be the ones that the owner would normally be selling to him. This Bill sets out to legalize that type of action. New section 12b states:

An owner or his agent may confer upon a licensee a general or special authority in writing to buy or receive into his custody or possession hides, skins or wool belonging to the owner. In other words, the owner may give to the licensee a written authority to buy or receive particular hides, skins or wool. When a licensee has such written authority, he will be obliged to record the particulars of any transaction made under this authority in a record book but will not be required to obtain the signature of the owner to such an entry. This is to safeguard the position of itinerant dealers with whom the stockowner has a standing arrangement to collect his skins, hides or wool.

Possibly, that is good up to a point but, if we study the Act, we find that all persons who buy or collect hides, skins or wool must be in possession of a licence. They may be working

for a principal but they themselves must be in possession of a licence. There may be cases where an owner issues a written authority to an employee of a particular principal firm and, by the time the next regular visit of this firm to the property comes around, that person has left the employ of that firm and another person has taken his place. I take it that in this case this other person who would be then employed would not be permitted to take the skins, as had been the custom.

There is one interesting respect in which this Bill differs from a number of other Bills that we have considered in this Chamber: it does not seek to increase the licence fee of a dealer. In fact, if one looks at the regulations gazetted under this Act, we find that in 1936 the fee was three guineas. However, in a recent regulation gazetted on June 17, 1965, we find that the fee has been reduced to £3. It is rather unusual for the present Government to be reducing fees.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We help where necessary.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I appreciate that and hope that that will be kept in mind when we are dealing with licences issued to other types of dealer.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Are you sure it is not a typist's error?

The Hon. L. R. HART: No: they are trying to bring licence fees into line so that they are readily convertible into decimal currency; but an interesting point is that the fee goes down instead of going up. Clause 3 sets out to insert after section 12 a new section to be known as 12a, which reads:

Subject to subsection (2) of section 12b of this Act every licensee shall forthwith upon any hides, skins or wool being bought by him or received into his custody or possession enter in the prescribed manner in a record book to be kept by him on his premises the prescribed particulars of the transaction and shall cause such entry to be signed by the owner (or his agent) of such hides, skins or wool at the time the transaction is made.

This is a normal procedure with present reputable dealers, and this Act does not really do anything other than require certain persons to do something that is already being done. It does not and could not prevent the theft of wool. I wonder why the Bill has been introduced. The Minister said in his second reading explanation that the Police Department had been consulted, and it may be that the legislation will help that department in its investigations into the theft of wool. Clause 3 of the Bill inserts new section 12a(2), which provides:

Any person who neglects or fails to obtain the signature of the person from whom he bought or received the hides, skins or wool in his record book, or who wilfully makes, or causes to be made, or signs, any false entry in a record book required by this Act to be kept by the licensee, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

We find that the penalties are provided in three sections of the Act. Section 15 says:

(1) Any contravention of or failure to observe any provision of this Act, whether by act or omission, shall be an offence against this Act.

(2) Every person guilty of an offence against this Act shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, or to be imprisoned, with or without hard labour, for any period not exceeding twelve months.

Section 18 provides:

In all proceedings against a licensee for an offence against this Act, the licensee shall produce his licence to the special magistrate or justices hearing the case.

We go further and find that section 19 says:

The special magistrate or justices before whom a licensee is convicted of an offence against this Act may, in addition to any penalty imposed, cancel the licence by endorsing thereon a memorandum of such conviction: and in such case the licence shall be surrendered to the clerk of the court, who shall forward or deliver it to the Chief Inspector.

That section provides that a special magistrate "may" cancel a licence. We have heard a lot in this council recently about the words "may" and "shall". Here we have a case where a person can be prosecuted for an infringement of the Act but he "may" lose his licence. I consider that in this case he should lose his licence. I understand that some people who at present hold licences under this Act have had proceedings taken against them but, through having had good representation in the court, they have been able to escape a penalty and are still trading as dealers. In my opinion, there should be some tightening up in issuing licences. There is no need to issue a licence to a person who is not of good character. However, I am prepared to support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the Bill and, generally speaking, support the comments of my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Hart. I know some of these dealers and it would be true to say that most of them are honest. Frequently, many of them have to go on to properties when the owners are away in order to take the skins and hides. They do this because they have verbal understandings with their clients. However, I think that new section 12 (a), part of which the Hon. Mr.

Hart has read, and which obliges the dealer to keep a book showing the purchase of any hides, skins or wool and the signature of the person from whom it is received, is a good one. It will tighten the provisions to some extent and will mean that the dishonest minority of dealers will find it more difficult to get away with their dishonest practices.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It will provide a closer check.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It will provide a closer check, as the Minister said. I consider that the Hon. Mr. Hart has a point when he says, with reference to the cancellation of a licence, that the word "may" could well be altered to "shall" and I shall be interested to know whether the Minister will further consider the matter. The insertion of new section 12a(1) may cause hardship to honest dealers and owners who have regular arrangements, because owners are often away at the market or on other business when the dealers call.

However, I consider that new section 12b, which gives an owner power to give written authority to the licensee to collect hides, skins or wool, will overcome this problem to a certain extent. I am never keen on having additional regulations or controls where they are not necessary. Nevertheless, I consider that in this case something of this nature may be necessary. I hope that the Minister will consider the points mentioned by my colleague and myself. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I thank honourable members for their comments on this Bill. Both the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins have referred to the need for a closer check when issuing licences to dealers in the first instance and they suggested that where it is thought that a person is not sufficiently reputable to hold a licence, one should not be granted to him. I consider that the authorities do this already and that licences are not issued where it is considered it would be wrong to issue them.

The other point made was in relation to penalties. Section 12 lays down a general penalty for a breach of the Hide, Skin, and Wool Dealers Act. That penalty is not to exceed £50, or an offender may be imprisoned. I suggest that the fine would depend on the seriousness of the case. Another section embodies additional penalties and uses the term "may", to which the Hon. Mr. Hart has taken objection. He says that the word "shall" should be used. However, I think

honourable members will agree that a magistrate hearing a case against one of these dealers for a breach of the Act should have some discretion. One person might commit a more serious offence than another. Under the Act the magistrate has a discretionary power and if he considers that the offence is such as to warrant cancellation I have no doubt that he will immediately cancel the licence. On the other hand, if he considers that the offence is such as to justify a fine or imprisonment without cancellation, surely he should have some discretionary power. If we strike out "may" and insert "shall", it will become mandatory for the magistrate, irrespective of the offence with which the person is charged, to cancel his licence. If "shall" is inserted, the magistrate will have no alternative but to cancel even on a minor breach that warrants a fine of, say, £2. I do not think the Hon. Mr. Hart intends that to happen, but that will be the effect of what he suggests. I thank honourable members for their comments on this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Book to be kept showing purchases of any hide, skin or wool and signature of person from whom received."

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Although I have read the report of the debate in another place, in which the Minister said he had conferred with the Police Department, I should like to know who asked for this Bill. Nobody can deny that this will involve another set of books being kept and signatures being obtained from people who do not want to be bothered. It is another form of unnecessary bureaucratic control. For all I know, the Minister may not be concerned about the matter. Have so many breaches come before the court that cannot be dealt with under the Police Offences Act that the measure is necessary? It is amazing that in another place only one member saw fit to comment briefly.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): This matter was considered by the previous Government, but apparently it did not go any further. I think the honourable member knows who requested the Bill.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: I do not; it was not my department.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Representations for these amendments were made by the Chief Inspector of Stock on October 27, 1964, to the Minister. Investigations were made, and the Police Commissioner was consulted about

allegations of people stealing hides. After the discussions with the previous Minister, the matter went to the Attorney-General for a Bill to be drafted. A draft Bill was produced, but it was not proceeded with. One or two other anomalies were found, and the opportunity was taken to deal with them.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I thank the Minister for his explanation. I recall some mention of this matter but, as it was not my department, I was not aware what stage the matter had reached.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2008.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): This Bill should not delay honourable members too long, as the explanation given by the Chief Secretary and the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Rowe covered most points connected with it. This brief Bill first deals with the administration of estates and property of people in prison. It changes the name "convicts" to "prisoners", and I think we can agree with the Minister that this word is more in keeping with modern practice. Indeed, I do not remember the word "convict" being used in general parlance either in the courts or by members of the legal profession in recent years. I think it is much better to use the word "prisoner", but in doing so we are not just effecting a change of name but are widening considerably the class of persons whose properties may be administered by a curator, because, whereas the word previously used dealt with only those people who were in prison as a result of convictions for felonies, now it is proposed that all persons sent to prison, whether by the Supreme Court (as in the past) or by any other court, may take advantage of the provisions of this Bill, which will enable a curator to be appointed to deal with property owned by a prisoner while he is in gaol. Of course, we realize that once a man goes to gaol he is shut away from the world and contact with business affairs and property matters. Occasions sometimes arise when it is necessary for somebody to act on his behalf and attend to his business matters. It is interesting to note that there is no compulsion upon the Public Trustee, the person who usually has

been appointed curator, to be so appointed. It is open to the prisoner to nominate somebody else as his curator. Although this is not done often, it is good that this freedom should exist for the prisoner. The Public Trustee has been the person so nominated in the past as the curator of prisoners' estates but, as far as I know, he has never so acted, unless requested to do so by the prisoner concerned. Sometimes the Public Trustee has been reluctant to enter into a curatorship, because a prisoner's affairs are usually in a mess and it is time-consuming for the department. The small section of the Public Trustee's Department that has dealt with estates of prisoners in the past has conscientiously carried out the necessary duties. I have no doubt that provisions in this Bill that will relieve it of the need to deal with matters up to £500 will be welcomed. Obviously the Comptroller of Prisons is the appropriate person to deal with estates of up to £500. Again, this will not be automatic: it will be done only if the prisoner requests it. The reserving of the right of a prisoner to nominate his own curator is a necessary provision. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading. The Bill will be a valuable alteration to the administrative machinery that now exists.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2014.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I found much of interest in this Bill, and, generally speaking, the Government is to be commended for introducing it. At this time, with the road toll becoming more and more serious, it is important that everything possible be done to safeguard motorists and pedestrians.

Clause 6, which amends section 31, does two things. First, it extends the number of devices that may be controlled by the board to other than those radiating light. I can find nothing wrong with that, but, secondly, it gives the board an authority to override other parts of this Act, or "any other Act or law". One cannot easily realize what other Acts or laws may be nullified by such sweeping phraseology. It seems that the alteration I mentioned first is sufficient for the purpose. We have been given no proper reason or, indeed, no example of the necessity for the overriding rights specified in the phrase: "Notwithstanding the provision of this Act or any other

Act or law". It means, as I interpret it, that the board may make directions or demands in respect of not only private citizens and councils but also other Government authorities, such as the Harbors Board or Railways Department, in connection with devices or signs that they may use and consider necessary.

I object to the wording of clause 8, because it takes away the right of control from Parliament. The tendency of boards and committees to desire to be autonomous and free of any control is a well-understood characteristic of human nature. With respect to the explanation given as to the need for temporary speed limits, the many cases where this applies must be limited and, in any case, I see no reason why a regulation could not be so worded as to apply at specific times only.

I emphasize that Parliament must always be considered a reasonable body and capable of viewing regulations in their proper perspective in the matter of necessity. Further, it is one of Parliament's primary duties to protect citizens from undesirable or unnecessary controls. I shall always strongly support the right of Parliament to ensure that regulations and other subordinate legislation shall be referable to and controlled by it. Clause 13 amends section 53, and I support it. However, if this clause is to be effective the law must be policed. It deals with the speed of heavy vehicles. I live near a main road leading to one of our biggest quarries. Extremely heavy, fully-loaded, large trucks carrying stone consistently travel on this road in busy traffic and through intersections at excessive speeds. To refresh the memory of honourable members, I refer to the appropriate part of the Act, section 53(2), which is as follows:

A person shall not drive on a road within a municipality town or township a commercial motor vehicle (whether drawing a trailer or not) at a speed in excess of those hereinafter prescribed:

- (a) If the aggregate weight of the vehicle and every trailer drawn thereby exceeds three but does not exceed seven tons—thirty miles an hour.
- (b) If the aggregate weight of the vehicle and every trailer drawn thereby exceeds seven tons but does not exceed thirteen tons—twenty-five miles an hour.
- (c) If the aggregate weight of the vehicle and every trailer drawn thereby exceeds thirteen tons—twenty miles an hour.

I normally travel in my car at about 34 miles an hour, except where I cannot do this, and lorries pass me frequently every day. It seems

to be an unwritten law that they shall not be apprehended if they are travelling up to 10 m.p.h. over the permitted speed. In fact, it would be interesting to have an inquiry into whether Parliament's intention in respect of this legislation had been deliberately ignored.

Coming to clause 15, I agree with other speakers about signalling devices. I find that the offence of leaving one's turning lights on when the turn has not been sufficient for an automatic switch-off is trivial compared with the penalty proposed. I know, of course, that £50 is the maximum penalty. However, annoying as this mistake is, from a psychological point of view if one is driving behind a car that has its turning light still operating it does not mean that one will have an accident. It is much more likely that a person will take infinite care almost automatically if the turning light is still operating. I cannot see that it is a very important clause, annoying as the matter can be.

I commend the Government for introducing clause 21, which deals with pedestrians walking on the right of the road. Pedestrian discipline in Adelaide is the worst of any city in Australia. In Melbourne and Sydney pedestrians would not dare walk on roads as they do here. In Brisbane the police are assiduous in their duty of keeping roadways clear for vehicular traffic. Adelaide's traffic congestion is brought about largely by slow-moving traffic, hindered by ambling pedestrians. Therefore, this clause

will go a long way towards alleviating that situation.

The last clause I mention is clause 25. I know, before I start on this, that I shall have a hard job convincing anybody, but I suggest that the Minister look at the drafting of the clause. It seems that "between half an hour before sunrise and half an hour after sunset" could easily include midnight. If someone looks at a clock and says to himself "between the hours of this and that", there are two ways of looking at it. It does not matter whether sunrise comes first and sunset comes second if we use the words "between half an hour before sunrise and half an hour after sunset", because it can be the other way round. That period could include the hours of darkness instead of the hours of daylight, and it would be difficult to get a conviction for a contravention of the provision. The only way to be sure about this is to add a phrase such as "in any one day" or "during daylight hours". This may be a suggestion from someone who is being rather pedantic, but it could be a legal point. The Bill has much merit and I support it.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.21 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 14, at 2.15 p.m.