

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, December 1, 1965.

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

PETITION: ALDINGA SCRUB.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP presented a petition signed by 117 electors and residents of the area of the District Council of Willunga in the district of Alexandra in the Southern District of the Legislative Council respectfully praying that legislation be enacted to protect the vegetation and wild life in the Aldinga Scrub against clearing and destruction.

Received and read.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that the notice of motion given yesterday for leave to introduce a Bill to give effect to the prayer contained in the petition has been the subject of discussion with the President, who has pointed out that Joint Standing Order No. 1 relating to private Bills will prevent me from proceeding with the Bill in the manner I proposed.

PETITION: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 1,628 electors residing in the Mount Gambier, Millicent and Victoria Districts in the Southern District of the Legislative Council. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the Legislative Council.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on November 23 about the future appointment of justices of the peace?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member asked a question about a survey, and I have received a report from the Attorney-General stating that the survey has almost been completed and an announcement will be made before the end of the year.

NATIVE FLORA.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads obtained a reply from the Minister of Lands to my recent questions about native flora on roadsides?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Lands, advises that the action

envisaged by the honourable member is not practicable, as on many occasions the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves and the Fauna and Flora Advisory Committee would not be aware of all the clearing activities undertaken by district councils. However, the honourable member is assured that it is the practice, when it is known that a particular species exists, to bring the circumstances to the notice of the district council concerned. Through the activities of the Fauna and Flora Advisory Committee, it is expected that action will be taken to bring to the notice of the district councils the need to conserve roadside vegetation and to encourage them to seek advice on these matters.

DECIMAL CURRENCY BILL.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: We have on our Notice Paper a Bill called the Decimal Currency Bill, which is before us in its Committee stages. It has been held in Committee pending the passing of similar legislation by the Commonwealth Parliament. I understand that that legislation has made some progress recently and may have been passed by now. Will the Chief Secretary make available a copy of the Commonwealth Act before this Council goes into Committee on this Bill, as several of its clauses refer to the Commonwealth Act and, if a copy of the Commonwealth Act is not available to honourable members, will the Chief Secretary have a copy of the sections referred to in the Bill made available to us?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I should like to say a simple "Yes" to those questions, but I have not seen a copy of the Act referred to. I understand from the Parliamentary Draftsman that a Bill dealing with decimal currency has passed through the Commonwealth Parliament. He asked me not to proceed in Committee with our Bill for the time being as he had some explanatory notes to draw up. If a copy of the Commonwealth Act is available, I will make it available to honourable members. When I contact the Parliamentary Draftsman I will find out the exact position and then may be able to give the honourable member a definite answer to his question. I will do my best to comply with the wishes of the honourable member.

ROADSIDE TREES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked on November 25 about an area of native pine south of Taillem Bend?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have an interim answer. The question has been asked previously in this Chamber and has been answered. The honourable member followed it with another question, stating that when frequently using the road he noticed that no signs had been erected in this reserve. I have received advice that action is at present being taken to dedicate the reserve to the Woods and Forests Department and that it is the intention of the department to erect adequate sign posts in order to prevent the unlawful removal of trees.

MEMBERS' ACCOMMODATION.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on November 24 about accommodation for private members at Parliament House?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The position is that I understand that the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, and the Clerks of both Houses, are giving consideration to the provision of accommodation for the additional Cabinet Minister and are also discussing the matter of improved accommodation for all members. My colleague, the Minister of Works, has arranged for the Director, Public Buildings Department, to be available to assist in any way required.

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Hon. Mr. Octoman.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In April of this year, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I visited Eyre Peninsula and as a member of the committee heard evidence at Port Lincoln regarding a proposal to close the Yeelanna to Mt. Hope railway line. Whilst there, that matter created considerable interest and a number of people living in the area attended and gave evidence. The committee was asked by witnesses that the railway line in question be not closed, in spite of the fact that it was not a paying line by any means. Some people implied that they realized they had erred in not using the railway more than they had done in the past.

Members interjecting: Question!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Members interjecting: Question!

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the honourable member to put his question. The privilege of this Council is that any member

may call for the question and immediately the question is called for the honourable member must ask his question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I apologize, Sir. I was not aware of that. I thought that if I had been granted leave to make a brief explanation I would be allowed to finish that explanation, but I bow to your ruling, Sir, knowing that you would not err. My question to the Hon. Mr. Octoman relates to a report in the press that the honourable member attended a meeting at Port Lincoln recently. Is he in a position to inform this Chamber, first, how many of the people who attended that recent meeting at Port Lincoln regarding the Road and Railway Transport Act also attended the earlier meeting held at Port Lincoln in connection with the inquiry of the Public Works Committee into the proposed closing of the Yeelanna to Mount Hope railway line? Secondly, how many of that number also attended the meeting held last year by the Transport Control Board to take similar evidence, when, I understand, there was unanimous opposition to the closing of this line and, thirdly, did the honourable member attend the meetings of the Public Works Committee and the Transport Control Board, and, if so, did he oppose the closing of all or part of this line?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: This appears to be rather a long question and I request that the honourable member place it on notice.

CAR THEFT PREVENTION.

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

The Hon. L. R. HART: In November last year the Australian Automobile Association held a meeting at Surfers Paradise in Queensland and one of the resolutions discussed at that meeting referred to the illegal use of motor cars. The association expressed concern at the increasing incidence of the illegal use of motor vehicles and was aware that this matter was a world-wide social problem. It urged that the underlying causes of such behaviour should continue to be investigated as a special topic for the social sciences. The association commended the Australian State police authorities for their efforts in recovering the vast majority of vehicles used illegally and for the action they are taking to apprehend and prosecute offenders. Nevertheless, the association urged that State Governments introduce legislation requiring manufacturers to install anti-theft locking devices on all new vehicles and that impressed serial numbers

be located on the main parts of vehicles in a manner difficult to alter. It further stressed the need—

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Question!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister of Roads say whether any request has been made to the State Governments that the decisions reached at this conference be given effect to, and also whether the State Governments have been asked to resolve the legal difficulties arising from the illegal use of motor vehicles not being considered to be theft?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the honourable member's question to Cabinet and give him an answer next year.

SAFETY RAILS.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question regarding the provision of guard rails on Greenhill Road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have been informed that it would be desirable that the whole of the Greenhill Road and the other hills roads be covered by safety fencing to prevent the probability of an out-of-control car leaving the road. However, the economics of doing this for a probability is questionable, in view of the fact that moneys could be expended to better advantage at locations known to have a large accident history, that is, on the same road within the city area, at Portrush Road, Eastwood Terrace, and Goodwood Road intersections. Locations where accidents have occurred or that tend to present a hazard have generally been covered by safety fencing and it is considered, that whilst safety fencing might be desirable, there is no case accident-wise for an accelerated programme.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The PRESIDENT: There has been some cross firing in regard to the proceedings this afternoon and I would point out to honourable members that almost invariably Ministers do ask that questions be put on notice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: COUNCIL BUSINESS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Northern): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: A few moments ago my attention was drawn to a report in the local press of this morning regarding a question I asked of the Chief

Secretary yesterday in which I quoted a paragraph of a letter that had been circulated under the signature of the Hon. the Premier. The letter referred to the Labor Party being hampered and frustrated by Liberal and Country League members of the Legislative Council. There seems to have been a misunderstanding here because the Minister replied that it was not members here against whom the point was taken but members in another place. However, I asked a succeeding question to clarify the position when I read the whole section of that letter.

I may have omitted the words "Legislative Council" in the first instance, although some members said that I did complete the reading of the section whilst others were not quite sure. I accept that position, but the matter I want to clarify is that the question I asked was in regard to the letter in question and whether the Chief Secretary supported the statement that had been made in that letter, to which he gave a denial that this Chamber had in any way delayed the legislation brought before the Council. I just want to clarify the point as it seems there has been some misunderstanding in reading this report that the statement was made, and it has been denied by the Chief Secretary in his reply that the statement was incorrect in regard to this Council.

TOWN PLANNING REGULATIONS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the regulations under the Town Planning Act, 1929-1963, in respect of the control of land subdivisions, made on September 30, 1965, and laid on the table of this Council on October 5, 1965, be disallowed. I suppose there is no topic of greater interest to the people of South Australia, particularly those in the metropolitan area and its environs, than town planning. South Australia has many people who have travelled considerably and have had the opportunity of seeing what happens when there is not advanced thinking or planning to enable the city to cope not only with the aesthetic requirements but also with transport requirements within the city itself. It is a subject of much interest. Representations have been made to me regarding these regulations.

However, I think it is necessary that, before I discuss the proposed regulations, I indicate three points that establish my attitude to town planning and anybody associated with it. The first thing I desire to do is pay a tribute to the Town Planner, Mr. Hart, who

is not personally well known to me but whose work I know of. Anything that is done regarding these regulations in no way reflects upon the Town Planner, on his capacity, sagacity, integrity, impartiality or competence in any shape or form. Representations from both sides have included nothing but complimentary remarks regarding the Town Planner, and I wish to make it clear that anything said regarding these regulations is not in any way anything of a personal nature as regards the Town Planner.

The second thing I have hinted at in my opening remarks is that there is no suggestion that I am not in sympathy with town planning. I think it is essential and I think it would be a tragedy if, after the city had been well planned by its founder with many wide streets, the good work were not followed up by planning ahead. A good start was certainly made with our city, which is only a little over a century old. My third point is that the disallowance of these regulations will not prevent the Town Planner from carrying out his functions. The first regulation I refer to says:

The Town Planning regulations, 1963, made under the Town Planning Act, 1929-1957, on May 30, 1963, and published in the *Government Gazette* dated May 30, 1963, page 1434 thereof, are hereby revoked.

The disallowance of these regulations would still leave operative the regulations referred to in that *Government Gazette*. I have tried to the best of my ability to see what essential features will cause any difficulty to the Town Planner, and I find that in the main the only additions that have been made relate to withholding approval of a plan. These are extended into more paragraphs than the regulations that have been in existence since 1963. I have made a patient and diligent examination, although it has perhaps not been as full as the examination that the Subordinate Legislation Committee has been able to make. On making a comparison, I have found it very difficult to discover many things that were not covered. They are written into more paragraphs, but some of the paragraphs in the original regulations seem to overlap, so I cannot say precisely what difference there is between the two. I know that if these regulations are disallowed the Town Planner can initiate a new set of regulations immediately if he so desires. In the meantime, he is covered by the regulations already in existence.

There is some doubt or misunderstanding outside Parliament about the way in which Parliament functions regarding regulations

and their disallowance. Regulations are laid on the table of both Houses from time to time and are examined by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. This is a very busy committee, but I am astounded to find that it has not been called together for the last fortnight, as some regulations are perilously close to the expiration of the period in which Parliament can consider them. I do not know why the committee has not been called together in that time. The members of this Chamber who are members of the committee have been available for work, yet the committee has not been called together and it is an essential committee. We have had a particularly busy session and, as all members know, it takes time to consider matters raised from time to time in legislation (which is what regulations are in another form, as once they are passed they have the effect of Statutes). There is perhaps more than one approach to this matter, but the first I shall deal with is the report of the committee that was presented to this Chamber. It is an unusual report, as it commences with the following words:

The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has the honour to report that it is of opinion that no action should be taken to disallow the regulations made under the Town Planning Act, 1929-1963, laid on the table of this House on October 5, 1965.

Usually the reports that we have received for many years have stated that the committee has considered certain regulations and recommends disallowance, but on this occasion the report was made under another Standing Order that is rather difficult to follow, but apparently the committee has this let-out. I do not know if it was unable to reach agreement, but we have been provided with this report and nothing has been done about it. The report continues:

However, notwithstanding this recommendation, the committee, as a result of evidence laid before it and which is tabled herewith, desires to draw the attention of the House to the following matters.

That is exactly what Standing Orders say the committee can do—draw attention to certain things. When I read the things to which the committee drew attention, I could not find any better reason than they provide for moving for the disallowance of the regulation. The report continues:

(1) New regulations numbers 69 and 70 provide for appeal to the Town Planning Committee against a refusal of the Town Planner or a council to approve a proposed plan for subdivision or resubdivision. Under section 8 of the Town Planning Act it is provided that the Town Planner shall be the chairman of this

appeals committee. It is thought that this situation is not entirely desirable, and that consideration should be given to the appointment of an independent chairman.

It is because of this that I particularly want to make it clear that there is no reflection on the Town Planner, but the committee is drawing our attention to the fact that he is in rather an invidious position. This position is sometimes referred to as appealing from Caesar to Caesar. I think that draws our attention not so much to the effect of these regulations as to the need for the preparation of a Bill. I understand that a Town Planning Bill is being prepared and I think that in view of the size and magnitude of the regulations the sooner we have that Bill the better. We have not had a Town Planning Bill for some time, and those that have been introduced have been simple measures providing that certain things be done under the Town Planning Committee's report. I repeat what I said before about the practice of English law—that matters are prescribed in Acts of Parliament, and from the Acts of Parliament we get our authority to act. The sooner the Town Planning Act Amendment Bill is introduced the better. I understand that it is being prepared at present, and this matter should be dealt with there. The report continues:

(2) Under new regulations Nos. 7 and 22, if a council fails to approve a proposed plan of subdivision within eight weeks of date of receipt, a plan shall be deemed to be refused, and the only recourse of the subdivider is to lodge an appeal . . . these regulations are governed by the provisions of the Town Planning Act and it is thought that consideration should be given to placing the onus on a council to approve or disapprove a plan within a specified reasonable time.

In other words, the committee is suggesting that this regulation does not give proper consideration to people who are concerned, and it is one of the things that should be dealt with by Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: That also involves the Act.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: That is so. I have referred to Parliament, as this is something that Parliament should consider in the form of legislation. If Parliament considers the matter all people will know where they stand, but unfortunately regulations are laid on the table of both Houses, become law, and the man in the street knows very little about them, whereas he knows what to do in relation to an Act of Parliament. Then I come to paragraph (3), which states:

Under new Regulation No. 68 the Town Planner may withhold approval of any plan, *inter alia*, on the grounds that the proposed subdivision does not comply with recommendations contained in the report of the Town Planning Committee, submitted to Parliament under the Act. It is pointed out that this report has, at the present time, no statutory authority.

We are basing regulations on something with no statutory authority. Again, I point out the urgency of dealing with the Town Planning Act. Then:

(4) The Town Planning Act, at present, makes no provision for compensation to be paid from any source to the owner of land proposed to be subdivided, if such subdivision is refused on the grounds—

- (a) that the site was one of exceptional natural beauty or of architectural, scientific or historical interest; or
- (b) that a reserve of at least 100ft. width fronting the sea coast, lakesides, banks of rivers or major creeks, plus a road is required.

This is included in the regulations but there is no provision in the Act. Then:

(5) The Town Planning Act does not make provision in cases of resubdivision, for payment of compensation from any source to the owner, where land is required for road widening purposes, as a condition for such resubdivision, whereas such compensation is payable to adjacent landowners who are not resubdividing.

Again, there are regulations that have not been discussed by Parliament or been authorized. Then:

(6) New Regulation No. 67 enables the Town Planner to withhold approval of any plan if the proposed mode of subdivision or resubdivision would destroy any site of exceptional natural beauty or any site or building of architectural, scientific or historical interest on the land. Without legislative backing for this regulation the same could be self-defeating in its object in that land owners desiring to subdivide or resubdivide might be tempted to destroy such features prior to submitting a plan for approval.

(7) New regulation No. 31 which provides for reserves along the sea coast, lakesides, rivers and major creeks, and that the rear of allotments shall not abut such reserves, also allows the Town Planner to dispense with "this requirement". It is considered that the words "this requirement" do not make it clear what portion of the regulation the Town Planner in his discretion may dispense with.

(8) In new regulations 30 and 31 providing for reserves fronting major creeks and major drainage reserves, it is pointed out that these two expressions are not defined.

So we have eight paragraphs that have been submitted criticizing the regulations. As the Subordinate Legislation Committee has no power to amend, we have no option but to

either accept or defeat the regulations that are made. The committee has no amending powers. Alterations are sometimes made by arrangement with councils that volunteer to redraw local government by-laws and submit new ones. A similar arrangement would work effectively here, because I do not desire to interfere with the functions of the Town Planner in any way. Perhaps the councils concerned and the Subordinate Legislation Committee could come to some satisfactory agreement on these matters. I have no doubt that the Town Planner was given ample opportunity to express his views and opinions to the Subordinate Legislation Committee; so surely some agreement could be reached on the provisions needing revision, to make them acceptable to all concerned? I desire that course to be followed. On the one hand, we are urged to do something and then, on the other hand, somebody is powerful enough to say that if the regulations are thrown out there is nothing to enable the Town Planning Act to be administered. There is no suggestion in this motion that that position need result. The Town Planner could submit regulations to carry him over a certain period and shortly we can perhaps have a complete Town Planning Act before Parliament that will tidy up these matters considerably.

It is difficult for me to analyse and compare the old regulations with these. There seems to be more misunderstanding outside than I could get out of these regulations after a few days' study of them. Therefore, I move this motion with the suggestion that the Town Planner quickly revise the regulations, if there are deficiencies between the 1963 regulations and these, and meet any problems that may not be covered by the old regulations.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support this motion for disallowance. I do not wish to speak at length, because the details of these regulations and the reason for moving for their disallowance have been given comprehensively. There are two main points. The first is the effect of these regulations on the general public; and the other is the efficiency of administration of our Town Planning Department under the Town Planner (Mr. Hart). It is true that there is no criticism of Mr. Hart, who is a most conscientious officer doing much for town planning in this State but, when we look at regulations like these, we have to look farther than the present Town Planner, because these regulations, if they become law, will apply to any person who may succeed the present Town Planner.

When these regulations were laid before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the committee examined them at length. It was probably one of the most difficult decisions to be made by that committee during the present session. Some members of that committee thought the question was so important that it should be debated in Parliament, so a report was made listing the different clauses where some objection was found. I do not intend to explain the clauses in detail, because they have already been debated, but there could be injustice to some people in these clauses, and that was the whole object of the move for disallowance here today. It is not the desire of any honourable member here in any way to restrict the administration of our Town Planning Act. This is true because, apart from the regulations that are laid on the table of this Council, we have the existing regulations that these will replace.

Should the new regulations be disallowed, the old ones will fill the position in the interim period, which should be a short one, until new regulations can be drafted and gazetted. This will take only a short time and the similarity of the two sets of regulations will ensure that the administration of the Town Planning Department will not receive undue interference during that interim period. Also, it would not endanger areas of beauty or subdivisions, so that no great harm would be done. On the other hand, as the Subordinate Legislation Committee or this Parliament has no power to amend the regulations, the only way out is to disallow them in Parliament so that a new set can be drawn immediately having in mind the objections that have been raised.

As far as the administration and working of the Act is concerned, the disallowance of the regulations should present no difficulty at all. I consider it is the duty of all members of Parliament to examine both sides of a question and if there should be any possibility of an injustice being done every effort should be made to ensure that it is rectified. I repeat that it is not the desire in moving the disallowance to hamper in any way the proper development of town planning. The regulations should be withdrawn and redrafted in order to obviate the possibility of any injustice occurring. I support the disallowance.

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

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION
BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It gives effect to the report of the committee of inquiry into the citrus industry which was presented to the Government last month. In brief, the findings of the committee were that:

1. The citrus industry in this State lacks effective organization and co-ordination.
2. Seventy per cent of fresh citrus fruit sold in the State is marketed in a most unordered manner with no contribution to the welfare of the industry.
3. Legislation should be passed as a matter of some urgency to provide for an orderly system of marketing in the industry.

The Government hopes that the other States will follow our lead with this legislation because statutory organization of the citrus industry on an Australia-wide basis would mean the greatest benefit to the industry as a whole.

As the long title indicates, the Bill provides for organization in the citrus industry and for an orderly system of marketing by the establishment of a committee to be called "The Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia", and which will have plenary powers to control and regulate citrus marketing in this State. Turning to the provisions of the Bill in detail, clause 1 contains the short title and clause 2 provides for the Bill to become law on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This will enable necessary regulations and appointments to the committee to be made. Clause 3 deals with the arrangement of the provisions of the Bill and clause 4 provides for the repeal of the Citrus Marketing Act, 1931, which was not voted into operation. Clause 5 contains definition of terms used in the Bill. Two important definitions are those of "grower" and "marketing". A grower is defined, for the purposes of elections and polls, as a person who grows at least 50 trees for the production and sale of citrus fruit and, for the other purposes of the Bill, as a person who carries on the business of producing citrus fruit for sale (without regard to the number of his trees). By virtue of the definition of the term "marketing", the scope for the Bill will be limited to sales by wholesale and, except for fixation of prices, retail selling will not be controlled.

Clause 6 excludes the harvesting by a grower of his own citrus fruit from the application of the Bill so that other provisions of the Bill, which I shall explain later, will not require

him to be licensed for this purpose. Clause 7 is an interpretative clause providing that if, by reason of the Commonwealth Constitution, a provision of the Bill or an order or notice thereunder cannot validly apply to all citrus fruit according to its tenor, it will be construed as applying only to citrus fruit to which it can validly apply. Clause 8 provides for the establishment of "The Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia" as a body corporate. Under clause 9 the committee will consist of seven members to be appointed by the Governor. They will be four elected grower members (referred to in the Bill as "representative members") two other persons who, in the opinion of the Governor, have extensive knowledge of and experience in industry and commerce and an independent chairman, the last three members being appointed after consultation by the Minister administering the Act with the four grower members. Subclauses (3), (4) and (5) are normal machinery provisions. By virtue of clause 10 the first four grower members of the committee will not be elected but will be selected by the Minister from nominations supported by twenty or more growers. In view of the grower support for this Bill, the Government considers it unnecessary that the grower members of the first committee should be elected and that the committee may proceed to a more speedy despatch of its business if the Minister may, in the first instance, select the four grower members thereof.

Clause 11 deals with the election of grower members of the committee. They will be elected by growers: each being nominated by 20 growers. Elections will be conducted by the Assistant Returning Officer and will be necessary whenever a grower member retires from office or whenever there is a casual vacancy in his office. Clause 12 provides that in the case of a grower which is a company, the company may nominate a person who may vote on its behalf at any election or poll which may be held and who may himself be elected to the committee. Clause 13 provides for a register of growers to be kept for the purposes of elections and polls provided for by the Bill. Clause 14 provides that each member of the committee will hold office for two years with the following exceptions. In the case of the chairman, the Governor may, in the instrument of his appointment, specify some other period as his term of office, and in the case of two of the first four grower members, to be determined by lot, they will hold office for one year. Thus there will be two grower members who retire from office each year.

Clauses 15, 16 and 17 make the usual provision for casual vacancies, that members of the committee, as such, will not be deemed to be public servants, and usual provisions dealing with meetings of the committee. Clause 18 provides for remuneration and expenses of members of the committee and clause 19 provides that the committee will not be an instrumentality of the Crown. Clause 20 is one of the principal provisions of the Bill enabling the committee to control all aspects of citrus marketing. The clause empowers the committee to issue licences to any person proposing to act in any way in the marketing of citrus fruit, the licences being granted according to the respective functions which the applicant desires to carry on, but no licence will be necessary for the harvesting by a grower of his own crop of citrus fruit. If the applicant furnishes the relevant information and complies with requirements prescribed by regulations, he will be entitled to a licence and the only ground on which the committee may refuse a licence is that the committee considers it undesirable in the interests of the citrus industry the licence should be granted. Upon a refusal to issue a licence there will be a right of appeal to the Supreme Court.

The licence may contain terms and conditions relating to the marketing of citrus fruit and will remain in force for a period of 12 months but may be renewed. Subclause (4) is a normal provision enabling the committee to cancel or suspend a licence if the licensee fails to comply with the provisions of the Bill or of any condition to which the licence is subject. Subclause (7) provides for a penalty of £200 if a licensee contravenes a condition to which the licence is subject.

In clause 21 the general powers of the committee are set out. The most important of these are that the committee may itself undertake or arrange for the marketing of citrus fruit and citrus products, it may regulate and control the marketing of citrus fruit, raise moneys by imposing charges as provided by clause 23, employ officers, inspectors, agents and servants for the purposes of the Bill and may regulate and control the use of brands and trade-marks in the marketing of citrus fruit. In addition, the committee may exempt from the operation of the Bill growers of small quantities of citrus fruit and may also delegate certain powers, but these do not include the powers to issue licences and marketing orders, to impose charges and to employ its staff. The power to delegate is considered necessary for

the more efficient performance of day-to-day functions of marketing.

Clause 22 is another most important provision of the Bill which enables the committee to issue marketing orders. These orders may fix quantities or the proportion of a crop of citrus fruit which may be delivered or sold to such person or persons as are nominated by the committee. This clause also confers a right to sell citrus fruit to the committee as well as its nominees, but this is solely for reasons of constitutional law and it is not anticipated that this right will be exercised or that the committee will itself enter into any marketing transactions. By virtue of marketing orders issued under this clause, the committee will have complete power to regulate and control in such manner as it deems fit the entire marketing of citrus fruit until sold by wholesale. Under paragraph (d) of subclause (1), the committee may fix wholesale and retail prices and the rate of commission at which citrus fruit may be sold.

Subclause (2) of this clause provides that marketing orders may extend to products of citrus fruit and may make different provision for citrus fruit of a particular type, variety, count, grade, quality or quantity and may contain terms and conditions relating to presentation for sale, inspection of citrus fruit, advertising and promotion of sales, and practices which in the opinion of the committee are detrimental to the citrus industry. Subclause (3) is a machinery provision and subclause (4) provides for a maximum penalty of £200 if any person fails to comply with any direction in an order which is applicable to him.

By virtue of clause 23 the committee may impose a charge, not exceeding two shillings a bushel, for the purpose of meeting the cost of administration and may impose an additional charge, not exceeding two shillings a bushel, to create an equalization fund for growers suffering loss on the export market. This clause is modelled on a corresponding provision of the 1931 Act. Under clause 24 the committee may require returns from growers and licensees either generally or from particular growers or licensees. The returns may require particulars of citrus fruit of a certain type, variety, count, grade, quality and quantity, which is delivered to a licensee, and in the case of a grower may require details of the number of trees which he is growing for the production of citrus fruit, and an estimate of his crop. Subclause (3) provides for a maximum penalty of £100 if any person refuses

to comply with any requirement under this clause.

Clause 25 provides that the committee in exercising its powers under the Act must act to the best advantage of the citrus industry. Clause 26 deals with the duty of a licensee to accept delivery of any citrus fruit which is delivered to him pursuant to the Bill and provides that he may refuse to accept delivery only if the citrus fruit fails to comply with any prescribed requirements. If he so refuses to accept delivery, he must issue a certificate of refusal. Clause 27 confers on inspectors power to enter lands on which citrus trees are grown and to enter buildings in which citrus fruit is packed, stored or offered for sale. An inspector may inspect and take stock of the citrus trees, inspect accounts, books and documents and make copies of them or take extracts from them. Subclause (2) provides for a penalty of £50 if an occupier of any such land or building does not provide the inspector with all reasonable facilities and assistance. Subclause (3) provides for a penalty of £50 for a person who obstructs or interferes with an inspector in the exercise of his powers under this clause.

Clause 28 provides for a register of brands and trade-marks to be kept and that the committee will have a discretionary power to register brands and trade-marks for use in the marketing of citrus fruit. By virtue of subclause (4) a person must register a brand or trade-mark which he proposes to use in the marketing of citrus fruit or must obtain the approval of the committee if he proposes to use any brand or trade-mark under licence. If a person permits another person to use his brand or trade-mark for any such purpose, he will, unless the approval of the committee is first obtained, be guilty of an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of £100. Clause 29 provides that any arrangements or contracts the purpose or effect of which is to evade the operation of the Act will be void and of no effect.

Clause 30 contains two important provisions providing for offences in connection with the marketing of citrus fruit. If a person buys direct from a grower any citrus fruit which has not been sold and delivered as provided by the scheme of the Act and thereupon offered for sale he will be guilty of an offence, the maximum penalty for which is £100. Also, if a person does any other act, matter or thing included in the marketing of citrus fruit without being duly licensed as provided by the Bill he will be guilty of an offence, the maxi-

mum penalty for which is £200. Clause 31 provides for exoneration of members of the committee for any acts done in good faith. Clause 32 requires the committee to keep accounts and that the accounts will be audited by the Auditor-General. Clause 33 provides that proceedings for offences against the Act will be disposed of summarily and may be commenced at any time within 12 months after the commission of the offence. Clause 34 contains plenary powers for regulations to be made giving effect to the objects of the Bill.

Clause 35 contains a necessary financial provision enabling the Treasurer to advance such moneys as may be necessary for the establishment of the committee. Clause 36 provides that a poll may be held every two years on whether the Act should continue in operation.

In view of the grower support for this Bill, the Government considers it unnecessary that there should be a poll for bringing the legislation into operation but that it is desirable that growers should be able, every two years, to vote for the winding up of the committee if they desire to do so. Accordingly, the clause provides that every two years a petition signed by 100 growers may be presented to the Minister administering the Act on the question whether the Act should continue in operation. If 60 per cent of the growers voting at the poll, being not less than 30 per cent of the growers entitled to vote, vote against the continuance of the Act, the Governor will, by proclamation, appoint a liquidator to wind up the committee and fix a day or successive days on which the provisions of the Act will expire. Clauses 37, 38 and 39 contain machinery provisions relating to the winding up of the committee and the expiration of the Act.

I have taken the unprecedented step of supplying all members with a copy of the explanation of the Bill so that they will be able to make themselves conversant with the Bill and the explanation, and I hope I shall have their co-operation in securing the passage of this Bill through this Chamber before Parliament adjourns. I submit the measure for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading of this Bill which, as the Minister has said, has the support of the industry. When I say that, I mean it. It is not very often that one can say that a measure before Parliament is acceptable to the vast majority. I am aware that this will not suit and will be difficult for some growers. Certainly, they are a minority, but they will not be particularly happy about it.

However, the industry as a whole needs it and has asked for it, and it has been introduced promptly so that its provisions can be put into operation.

I am a close relative to this measure, and I think it can be said that its founding father is Mr. Quirke. War service land settlement settlers in the Upper Murray are particularly unhappy about the situation regarding the marketing of citrus, as they have made losses over the previous three years. A deputation from the Upper Murray Lands Settlers Association was introduced by me to the Minister in January of this year, and it came armed with a petition signed by well over 95 per cent of members of the association. The Minister immediately took action to set up a committee of inquiry, and I pay a sincere tribute to that committee for the work it has done. It was chaired by the Director of Lands (Mr. J. R. Dunsford), and its members were Mr. T. C. Miller (Chief Horticulturist), Mr. Eric Brown (a grower), Mr. M. T. A. Pettman (from Loxton), and Mr. H. J. Katekar, LL.B. (a grower from Renmark). Those honourable members who have studied the report will see the vast scope of the inquiry conducted by the committee before it prepared this report. I pay a tribute to the present Minister of Agriculture who, after receiving the report, proceeded with all haste to implement it and introduce a Bill so that the legislation could come into operation for the next year's orange harvest. It is essential that we have something organized as expeditiously as possible.

I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with individual clauses, although I shall raise one or two points in Committee. However, I should like to refer in broad terms to one or two aspects of the report. The first and most interesting thing about it is that it is most comprehensive and sets out information on the processing and marketing of South Australian-consumed, Australian-consumed and export citrus. The reasons for the inquiry are relevant; they are:

Increased citrus which was harvested in South Australia in the years 1962, 1963 and 1964 caused a serious decline in prices, and this allied to rising production costs caused growers' returns to recede far below economic levels. At the same time distribution became chaotic. The quantity of oranges was far greater than in the previous seasons and exceeded expectations.

Then follows one of the most important parts of the report:

Due to incorrect estimating much unexpected and unscheduled fruit came on to the market and included in the increased volume was a

substantial proportion of fruit of a quality lower than normal which increased the problems of marketing.

I think in that we have almost the crux of the problems in the citrus industry in South Australia today—the matter of estimating the crop potential and projecting into the future these increases so that when the committee is set up it will be able to look into the future and get about its business of selling fruit. The other industries with which I am associated have had the same problems in the past, but these have been met to a large degree because the industries have been able to look at the estimates and go ahead with selling schemes. The terms of reference of the committee were:

To inquire into all aspects of the citrus industry and to recommend steps which should be taken to improve the marketing of citrus fruits.

As honourable members know, the scope of the inquiry was very wide. The committee saw 126 witnesses, met on 36 days and saw all classes of people connected with the industry, as well as consumers.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They travelled around a bit, too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They certainly did. They took evidence in South Australia, Melbourne, Mildura and Sydney, and direct submissions were received from Queensland, New Zealand and South Africa. Information was obtained on oversea markets, including Hong Kong, Singapore, the United States of America, Canada and Europe. Physical examinations of markets in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide were made, and packing sheds, orchards and a citrus juice factory in the Murray citrus-growing areas were inspected. One can say that the scope of the inquiry was very wide, and that the Bill that has been introduced is on all fours with the report. The Bill does not contain anything that was not recommended by the committee after a full inquiry. The distribution of fruit, which is fairly important at this particular time, is done mainly through the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association. At present within South Australia 525,000 bushels of fruit are consumed, which makes 18 per cent of the total. Oversea export is 587,000 bushels, or 21 per cent of the total; factory citrus (South Australia and other States) accounts for 641,000 bushels, or 24 per cent of the pack. The Melbourne market takes 606,000 bushels, or 22 per cent; the Sydney market takes 338,000 bushels, or 12.5 per cent; other interstate markets take 125,000 bushels,

or 2.5 per cent, making a total of 2,822,000 bushels of citrus produced in this State, which is not at present being marketed to the best advantage. It is certainly not returning to the grower a payable price for the fruit.

The quality of fruit on the older trees is second to none; on the younger trees we expect the quality always to be a little rough and, with our present production, with the vast majority of young trees coming into bearing, it is natural that the quality of the fruit is not up to past standards. However, suggestions are made in this report about how this can be overcome. I draw attention to the committee's reference to the expansion of the Berri Fruit Juice Co-operative, an organization known as B.F.J. The committee in its report has recommended an expansion of this rather large co-operative. In order to expand, money is needed. I hope the Government is taking into account the fact that some of this money will have to be provided through the Loans to Producers Act, the normal manner in which co-operatives are financed. But this year we are already faced with heavy commitments in this field of borrowing. It is necessary for the State Bank to change its policy here, in that in the past the bank put up some 75 per cent of the money required for a project, and the matching money was provided by the co-operative concerned. The position operating as from this month will be that the bank will put up 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent and the co-operative will have to find 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent as matching money. This is not an easy thing to do in an expanding organization. So it may be necessary to review this policy by (1) making more money available under that Act to the State Bank, or (2) by providing some other form of finance, which no doubt the industry and the bank can come to terms upon.

I now turn to the present general price structure. Prices have been unpayable to the growers for three or four years. We have had higher production and lower prices. The report mentions the price of about 10s. net to the grower for each case. In the next year it was about 13s., and I know of plenty of growers who received as little as 4s. a case net, which is an absolute calamity price; at that price more and more would go bankrupt. This State is an exporter of citrus. We export about 60 per cent of the total Australian citrus exports, although we produce only about one quarter of the Australian total. There are two reasons for that—(1) quality and (2) the excellent work of the Agriculture Department in keeping fruit fly out of the State's producing areas.

Being free from fruit fly in our producing areas means that we have been able to take up all export markets, which is a great tribute to this State. The present production of citrus in South Australia is about 3,000,000 bushels annually, and it is expected that by 1970 this figure will reach 4,000,000, and that by 1975 it will reach the 5,000,000 mark. We can appreciate the task that this committee has to face up to right from the commencement of its operations, which will, I hope, be within weeks of the passing of this legislation.

At this stage I draw honourable members' attention to the conclusions that the committee came to on pages 41 and 42 of its report, because we should have some knowledge of what the committee really thought about those matters. I said that some growers would not be overhappy about this Bill. They are the growers of high quality fruit. The committee here recommends that the marketing should be done on a pool basis, with each grower's fruit being run separately. But many of the old established people in the industry have arranged with agents in Melbourne and other places over a period of 42 years a regular supply of fruit. They have high quality and their brands are well-known. Through their own industry they have worked up a high reputation. They are a little apprehensive about this legislation. It will be entirely up to the committee to protect these people. As there will be four grower nominees on the committee, they will be aware of this problem.

I do not think that these people ought to be unduly penalized for their industry, because they have pioneered new markets at times and have built up a reputation for quality and integrity. In a small shop not far from here the same fruit has been appearing year in and year out, as long as I have been in Parliament, from the same packer and grower. It is only because it is high grade fruit that this buyer continues to purchase supplies from the same grower each time.

I thank the Minister for making available to every member of this Chamber the information on this matter. It is something that I have suggested on other occasions, and I wish that it could happen with every Bill introduced in this place because then honourable members would not have to wait until the following day for the information. That happens sometimes, but not through any fault of either the *Hansard* staff, which is grossly overworked at present, or the Government Printer, who cannot cope with the volume of work crowding upon him. However, the action of the Minister

on this occasion would, if followed in connection with other Bills, assist in the despatch of business considerably.

Dealing with the Bill itself, the committee will comprise four grower members. In the first instance those members will be nominated in a panel of recommendations forwarded to the Minister who will choose four from that panel and appoint them to the committee. Two further members of the committee are to be nominated by the Governor and they will be persons skilled in commerce and industry. They will be appointed by the Minister after consultation with the four elected grower members on the committee. The seventh member of the committee will be Chairman and he also will be appointed by the Minister, who will in addition fix the term of office. The machinery for the election of the committee after the first period is set out in the Bill. A nominee must be a person who owns 50 or more trees and who is nominated by 20 growers. I think that this is a good provision because first of all it indicates that the man has sufficient backers to obtain his 20 nominators. If there is any weakness at all in this system it is that it is possible to have the whole of the committee elected from one area of the State. It is possible for the four members to come from a confined area. Other suggestions have been made but it appears that there are problems in each one of them.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I am sure you would have more than four nominations coming in from one area.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I admit that it is possible and it is conceivable that the committee could be appointed from the Upper Murray area with no representation from other areas. On the other hand, if it is set out to zone the area it is possible that the best offering is obtained for that area but not the best possible from the industry. Therefore, it is a two-way problem, and I consider that under this system the best representation will be obtained from those prepared to offer from the industry. Two members will retire every year and the normal term of office of each member will be two years. This will effect a policy of continuity.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Are they eligible for re-election?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. The other matter is that the committee has extremely wide powers. As many honourable members know, I have been a director of a co-operative for many years and the power vested in the committee of management of a co-operative is

extremely wide. In fact, at times I have wondered how the original constitution was ever passed by growers in the first place, because it gives almost the power of life and death to the co-operative over the grower. However, in all my experience in the co-operative movement I have never seen any powers abused by the various committees. That is because the members are close to the growers, and the moment they start to get out of line the growers have a quick remedy; they can get rid of at least four members at the next election if those members are not doing the right thing. Therefore, I am not worried about the wide powers vested in this committee and I have confidence in the type of people who will be elected to it. I believe that they will use their powers with discretion.

I do not think there is any need to labour this matter and I am in complete agreement with the scheme. I have a few questions I wish to ask in the Committee stages of the Bill, and one or two suggestions to make. However, on broad principles I commend the Bill to honourable members and congratulate the committee of inquiry on an excellent job in bringing down this report and getting the legislation so expeditiously before Parliament.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): It gives me pleasure to support this measure and I congratulate my colleague, the Hon. C. R. Story, on his contribution. All members know that he is second to none in his knowledge of the citrus industry and we are fortunate to have him in this Council because from time to time we need his specialized knowledge of the citrus and other industries in the Upper Murray areas in particular. It gives me pleasure to speak about the citrus industry because I have always been interested in the industry. I was brought up in the midst of a citrus plantation and members of my family have been actively engaged in the industry in the past. I still have relatives concerned with citrus, and within the district of Midland I have many constituents actively engaged in the industry.

Along with other honourable members I have been concerned over the last few years at conditions that have obtained in the citrus industry and in the marketing of the fruit. I have known for many years that these problems occur in cycles and that they have occurred in the past. I have been aware of the situation, particularly in the Upper Murray areas, where growers in years gone by, instead of getting a cheque with an account sales, have received a small bill for the costs of marketing their fruit because the fruit did not bring

enough money to pay marketing costs. Whilst this has happened in the past, the same thing could occur in the citrus industry again because at one period the market could be buoyant but later it could be completely chaotic. Therefore, I welcome this Bill. I compliment the former Minister of Lands, Mr. Quirke, who appointed this committee of inquiry in January of this year. I also echo the comments of my colleague who recently resumed his seat in complimenting the committee on the splendid report it has brought down. All honourable members have a copy of the report and it seems to me, from a limited study of it, to be a comprehensive report indeed.

I also commend the present Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Bywaters, for the assistance he has given to the committee and I commend him also for his anxiety to get the scheme in operation. We have all been made aware that the industry is right behind this move. The immediate hope of the industry is that the Bill will be passed without unnecessary delay so that the marketing scheme may be brought into operation for the 1966 marketing season. There is no doubt that, despite the extremely wide powers being vested in the board that were referred to by the Hon. Mr. Story, the industry as a whole fully supports the proposal. Of course, it may not suit everyone and we know that some growers have always marketed their fruit independently and that they have made some feature of their own particular type of fruit. They have been able to corner a particular part of the market as a result and those growers may be somewhat concerned about this legislation. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the industry as a whole will benefit from it, and it is the industry as a whole that we must consider.

I am also persuaded that those in the industry are in complete accord with the concept of legislation of this type being enacted on a Commonwealth basis. The Minister has assured us that the Bill is completely in line with the report, and I have every reason to accept that. This measure may well be the basis for at least a three-State scheme and may become Commonwealth-wide in due course. Marketing boards of this type have been set up in various industries and these boards are effective only when they operate on a Commonwealth basis. I hope that this will eventually happen in the case of the citrus industry.

We have noticed considerable expansion of the industry in the past in the Renmark, Berri and Barmera areas and, in more recent times,

expansion has taken place in Loxton and Waikerie particularly and in other areas. Much of this work has been done as a result of the war service land settlement scheme and also because of the initiative and drive of people expanding their activities on blocks already held. We have many valuable citizens engaged in this activity in our State and we have every reason for seeing that they are properly catered for and that they have an orderly and effective marketing scheme, in contrast to the chaos that has occurred from time to time in the past.

The Government has provided for four grower members of the board, two of whom are to be elected annually. Of course, because of the urgency of this legislation, those four members will be appointed initially by the Minister, and I personally have no quarrel with that. In view of the time factor, I consider that that is necessary and that it is supported by the growers themselves. I am also in accord with the provision that will obtain next year when the four grower members will be elected.

I heard it said the other day that, despite politics, good legislation is being brought in from time to time, and I compliment the Government on the legislation it has brought down in relation to the citrus industry this afternoon. I shall always endeavour to be fair and to give credit where it is due. The proposal was started by the former Minister of Lands, Mr. Quirke, and much credit is due to him, but this is a measure in relation to which we can forget politics and remember the greater good of the State as a whole. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I, too, express my thanks to the Minister for making the second reading explanation available to all honourable members. The Bill has been before us for only a short time and it is necessary that we know the full implications of it. We have been helped in this regard by having the explanation before us. I also express my appreciation to the committee for the tremendous amount of work it did in presenting a comprehensive report. It is generally recognized that the organization of a marketing scheme on a State basis has some weaknesses, but this scheme may, perhaps, be a model on which a more comprehensive Commonwealth marketing scheme can be built. We hope that that will eventuate, because the industry with which it deals is important. It has export value of considerable potential, provided we are able to obtain the right type of fruit for the export market.

In the past there has been a tendency to neglect our export market and that has been mainly because of fluctuations in the home market price. When the home market price has been low, growers have looked to overseas markets, but, when the home price has improved, export has been forgotten until home prices again reach a low level. In order to have a successful export market, we must have a continuity of supply of quality fruit. South Australian oranges measure up to the discriminating requirements of overseas markets and they enjoy a premium over fruit from most other countries, notwithstanding that we compete against the dumping of citrus fruits by some countries, South Africa in particular.

This industry has other problems besides marketing. One problem is disease, the foremost being red scale. I do not doubt that this committee will also, if possible, assist those people who are endeavouring to overcome the red scale problem.

It was my great privilege a week or so ago to go to Loxton and see the Minister of Agriculture open an insectary that had been built on the Loxton Experimental Farm. The purpose of this insectary is to breed sexually sterile but otherwise virile male insects. These will be released in large numbers and, from the high concentration of numbers of sterile males, it is hoped that eventually the insect that is the cause of red scale will be eliminated. An entomologist named Mr. Noel Richardson is in charge of this project. He is a young man who has had a considerable experience in this field, and he is doing an extremely good job.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think the population of Loxton may decrease a little as a result of this?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Because of the cure of red scale?

The Hon. C. R. Story: No, because of the remedy.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I understand that at this stage this remedy will be applied only to insects.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Many people at Loxton think the population will grow rapidly.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We were told that the building in which the insectary was housed cost only £1,000. The cost was so low because the dedicated men associated with this project set to work and built it themselves, and I believe this should not have had to happen. However, they had to build it or do without it. This project is very important in this industry, and I consider that more Government

money should be made available for it. I do not blame the present Government more than the previous Government, but a very necessary project associated with an important industry has not received sufficient consideration. I am sure that the insectary will be given the necessary funds to operate, however.

South Australia will no doubt have to face increased competition for export markets, because this very process of releasing sterile males means that we are looking to the day when fruit fly will also be exterminated. Once that happens, we shall be in competition with other States for export markets, particularly in New Zealand. Organized marketing needs a realistic and reliable pre-season estimate of the crop, as the Hon. Mr. Story has said, to provide for forward sales and for shipping space. This will be one of the most important aspects of the work of the new committee. This committee will enter upon its job with much goodwill from all people associated with the industry, and I am sure that from this embryo legislation, if I may call it that, we shall eventually get a Commonwealth-wide marketing scheme and that we shall have an industry based mainly on the Murray River areas that will play an important part in the economic future of this State. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): Although I hesitate to rise at this late stage to support this measure, I should like to make one or two comments about it. The basis of the Bill was the report of the committee appointed by the previous Government to inquire into the industry, and a copy of this report was provided to honourable members. For some three years there has been an increase in production in the Murray areas at a time when costs have been rising and prices have been falling. Consequently, the economics of the local industry got into a rather parlous condition. The inquiry committee was appointed to investigate the problems of the industry, and I think we should be very grateful to its members for the work they did in preparing a report in such a short time so as to give some definite lead on what legislation was necessary to do something for the industry and to improve upon what was provided in 1931, which has never been availed of.

The suggestions made by the committee have now been drafted into legislation. Honourable members have been willing to assist the Government to pass this measure so that its provisions can be put into effect for the coming

harvest, which is now showing on the trees and setting, and estimates of which are being made. The committee created by this legislation is given a fairly long list of duties, all of which are essential to solve the problems of the industry. The inquiry committee has realized the problems associated with the marketing of fruit, and it is expected that within a couple of years the new committee, from its experience and organization, will have achieved some results. The various places of marketing in this State and other States, and the export market, are matters that need investigating from a scientific point of view.

For too long our primary industries have suffered from the lack of marketing organization. When wheat was sold on a fair-average-quality basis and everything anyone could put into a bag was reaped, there were problems. That has been considerably altered through organized marketing and bulk handling. Consequently, a better standard of wheat is being produced, and it can be sold at a recognized grade. This type of thing has been adopted by other industries, and I cannot see why it should not apply equally successfully to the citrus industry.

Perhaps the most profitable market is the home market, and this could be developed more. I do not know how much the transferring of fruit from one area of the State to another will be affected. We know there are different places where, if the fruit is transported economically, plenty of people who are hungry and taste very little citrus juices from season to season will appreciate it. These will be matters for this committee to examine, as well as discovering how we can market fruit in other States economically. If this proves to be the basis for some future Commonwealth-wide organization, we shall have achieved a great deal. The Bill is supported by the majority of the growers, who have impressed on me the urgency of this measure.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): It has been said many times that necessity is the mother of invention, and I think that applies here. Throughout the Commonwealth there are many boards. It would be futile to enumerate them all. However, it appears that so far the only effective way of orderly marketing of a primary product is by means of a board; it seems that this is the only way in which a primary product can be marketed profitably for the grower. Most boards in this State are good, effective and efficient. Unfortunately, some lack the initiative to carry out the best methods of selling the various products for the betterment of an industry.

I sincerely hope that this citrus committee, to which we are now giving birth, will go forward with enthusiasm, initiative, and the drive necessary to make our citrus industry prosper as a result of orderly marketing. We hope that orderly marketing of citrus throughout the Commonwealth will be achieved.

The committee has wide powers. By the provisions of this Bill it will arrange for the export of citrus fruit from this State. Our disease-free fruit-producing areas command respect from everyone. That is a wonderful thing and all credit must be given to those who took the initiative in controlling the fruit fly when it was once said it could not be done. So we set off on the right foot. The committee will also have powers to advertise and take any steps it thinks fit to encourage the consumption of citrus fruit and create a greater demand therefor. The people of this State have not known whether the orange wrapped in the plastic bag by the roadside is of good quality, whether it is bitter or sour, whether it is too small for the price asked; people do not know whether they are being fleeced. I imagine that those fears will now disappear and that the quality of fruit on the market will be good and sound.

The committee will be able to make payments, if it thinks fit, to any licensee for the purpose of enabling him to carry on any business pursuant to his licence, which means that a person who is qualified in the marketing of citrus products will have a licence to work in conjunction or co-operation with the committee so that the fruit will be marketed and the surpluses will not be an embarrassment to the growers. This Bill looks to the future. It will do much for this industry and help the growers who are at present in the doldrums. This committee will not only be able to see to the quality of the fruit but it will also be able to look into the problems of the fruit juice market. Although many honourable members here drink a lot of fruit juice, the marketing is something that the committee should examine—why it is that so many people will not buy fruit juices in cans. They say it has a bitter taste. You and I, Mr. President, may not agree with that, but it is a fact. I have often wondered why research into the product cannot be intensified so as to make the demand for fruit juices greater. These juices can go to the farthest points of the State or the Commonwealth and be on the grocer's shelf for anyone to buy, either in or out of the citrus season. It is an excellent product. When people in the street are asked whether they like fruit juices from cans, it is

embarrassing how many will say, "Sorry; I don't like it." That is only one small point but one that this committee should investigate.

The Hon. Mr. Story referred to the growers who in the past have been able to establish and maintain a market. He also stated that he had seen the same brands on cases at the same shops in Adelaide year after year. These people are to be praised for their initiative in getting themselves out of the rut through the years by marketing their products, making sure that their products are of A1 quality and therefore commanding a premium price for them. Clause 28 of the Bill, in part, states:

A person who proposes to use any brand in the marketing of citrus fruit shall register such brand with the committee.

My first reaction when I read that was one of, "This is not good", because I consider that the use of one brand is the correct way to sell a product. Especially is that so in connection with organized selling, and therefore I was prepared to be critical of the clause. It has taken many years for the Wool Board to get around to sanity in this respect and now it has introduced throughout the world a common brand for pure wool. In addition, Americans have the word "Sunkist" for all fruit originating from a region in California; it is advertised as such, and it is a name that has caught on. Possibly it tends to make people want to buy the product. I recognize that those people who have established markets by the use of their brands must be commended and not criticized. I hope this committee can be effective in the marketing of citrus products and that in time there will be one brand for South Australian citrus fruits. Possibly they will go on to the market throughout the world and virtually be known by the one name. By having the one brand it will mean that the whole selling efficiency will be increased because of consumer demand. All honourable members know the word "Holden" and that it means a certain make of motor car; we do not have to think about its meaning. It means a motor car, and a good motor car; it is not necessary to explain what it is. In future years, I hope that it will not be necessary to explain the name "Riverland", or whatever name will be given, when our citrus comes on to the world market.

Another pleasing feature is that the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association is in full agreement with the scheme.

That is why I prefaced my remarks with the words, "Necessity is the mother of invention" because, regrettably, the marketing of citrus has slowed down; there has been over-production but there has not been an orderly organization to handle the whole crop. Therefore, the return to the grower has not been profitable; that is where necessity has entered the industry with this committee of inquiry being set up and this Bill eventually coming before the Council. I received a letter from the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative that stated:

That the view was expressed that the recommendations required only attention and intelligent implementation to ensure that, with statutory backing, the industry problems that have been beyond solution on a voluntary basis will be overcome and to that end the full support of the M.C.G.C.A. will be at the disposal of the Minister and all others responsible.

Those are good words and it means that the industry starts off with one voice. We all know the proverb, "United we stand, divided we fall." I know that there will be people who will wish to find fault, argue and criticize, but I hope they will hold their tongues sufficiently long for this committee to get on its feet, prove itself and become something of which we can all be proud. I hope that the children of the State can be encouraged to eat more citrus and that, as a result, their health will become something that we can be proud of. It is with pleasure that I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): My first desire is to congratulate the Chairman of the committee of inquiry, Mr. Dunsford, for whom we are all coming to have a high regard. His record of achievement in the Public Service probably stands higher than that of anybody for the last 20 years. I consider that to a large degree he must be given the credit for the Bill before us.

I have examined this Bill closely because it concerns me deeply, not only through the people I represent but also because it is likely to become a prototype for handling the large surpluses in other agricultural and horticultural lines. It looks as though it may well become Australia-wide in its application. In the past we have seen many of these boards set up, especially since the end of the Second World War, and some of them have proved completely hopeless in practice. They were impossible to operate as soon as the emergency that gave rise to their creation had passed.

I do not think there is any doubt that the huge surplus of fruit in the war years when

we lost our export market left us in a position somewhat similar to that obtaining at the present time in the citrus industry. Some honourable members may not be aware of what occurred with the Apple and Pear Board, but that was thrown out and lost its position of responsibility as soon as the growers were able to cope with the position. If this industry feels badly at this stage, that fate will inevitably be the result that will befall the committee set up under this Bill.

It must be appreciated (and I do not think many people do appreciate) what sacrifice will be involved in a scheme of this nature. This must be emphasized from the beginning because there are many people who, through their own hard work and business acumen, have been able to get rid of the bulk of their crop, even if not at completely profitable prices. They have rid themselves of their citrus crops, whereas others, who have relied on other channels, have been able to rid themselves of only a small proportion of their crop. Inevitably those people who have had the initiative and put in this hard work, and often have invested a large sum of money in setting up an organization to handle the crop, must be asked to make some sacrifices. I consider that the unanimity of opinion that has been expressed regarding the need for this measure indicates that most of these people realize what is involved.

One point of doubt about the Bill arises in relation to the constitution of the committee. The proposal regarding four grower members, and two expert members appointed by the Government, is all right, but difficulty arises in regard to the other competent person who shall be appointed by the Minister as chairman. It will be necessary for the Minister to try to find an independent person whose abilities are established and who can be trusted. Almost invariably, Ministers appoint public servants in these cases and many officers capable of doing a job of this nature are at present grossly overloaded with work on boards, committees and in other spheres.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is not necessary to have a public servant as chairman.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: No, but I think it would be better if the Government nominated three members and allowed the committee to appoint its own chairman. A body of this nature must work with the full confidence of the whole industry and we know that in all industries there are factions and cliques and that there are privileged groups who have been able to sell their product and also people who

consider that they have been left out on a limb. I have been informed that the number of people engaged in citrus growing in South Australia runs into thousands and this brings me to the point that, although the Minister may think a certain person has the confidence of the whole industry, that may not be so. We have seen that in relation to other boards.

Another point is that much capital will be called for if this committee is to operate successfully. Such establishments as packing sheds and juicing works will be required. In the next five years, about 2,500,000 more boxes of citrus will have to be handled. There is not sufficient investment in the citrus industry at present adequately to handle the crop and in the next five years a crop of double the size will have to be handled. This is not peanuts, to use a colloquialism. We must market our surplus fruit outside Australia and the requirements for export are gradually being pushed up.

At one time oranges could be sent to London merely by putting them in boxes with wraps, putting wires around the boxes, and dispatching them by ordinary truck to Port Adelaide for shipment. However, today all fruit for oversea destinations except New Zealand must be pre-cooled, and pre-cooling capacity of 30,000 boxes is needed to export about 100,000 boxes. In addition to that, packing shed machinery must be provided. I am sure that I am not making a wild estimate when I say that it will cost £2,000,000 in the next five years to handle the extra 2,500,000 boxes. The next point is the safe and equitable sharing of the fresh fruit sales within Australia. Sir Lyell McEwin implied that large parts of South Australia were not receiving sufficient oranges. There is some truth in that, but probably the most common subject men overhear women discussing is diet and keeping figures trim.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think that is only talk.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: No. The human stomach has a limit to what it can hold and the intake of more oranges must reduce considerably the quantity of apples, bananas and other foodstuffs that the 12,000,000 people in Australia can consume.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Almonds are rather indigestible, aren't they?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes, but they slip into the corners.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are not suggesting that we are over-producing, are you?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am not;—I am sure all we are up against is under-consumption. It is not possible to increase consumption on the home market greatly. I do not think we are over-producing, as I am sure there are more than sufficient world markets to take all the foodstuffs we can produce. However, we must find the means to get foodstuffs to those markets and to distribute them equitably. Other sources of distribution must be availed of. There is a wise provision to retain even the itinerant trader about whom the Hon. Mr. Geddes was, I think, a little unfair, and those selling oranges on the roadside. All these can be fitted into an organized marketing plan. If they cannot, there is something wrong with the Bill, but I do not think there is anything wrong with the Bill. A special tribute should be paid to the people who drafted it.

It would be easy to talk for a long time on this measure, as it is very important to me. However, I do not think it is necessary to do so. If the points I have made are kept in mind, I am sure that the Bill will be as successful as we hope it will be.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): Although I do not wish to delay the Bill, I should like to thank honourable members for their attention to it. Good progress has been made, and honourable members have undoubtedly done their homework. I appreciate the co-operation I have received from honourable members in this debate, which has been most interesting. Every member who has addressed himself to the Bill has had an intimate knowledge of this subject.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—“Application of this Act.”

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I understand that the grower will have full control of his fruit until it is snipped or plucked and placed into containers, but I am not sure whether it will be under the control of the committee while it is still on his property. Sometimes fruit has been left in the sun by careless people, and one of the things the new committee will want to do is look at this aspect of harvesting. Will the Minister say whether the fruit will be under the control of the committee after it has been picked but while it is still on the grower's property?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Once the fruit is harvested it will be within the jurisdiction of the committee even though it is still on the grower's property. Otherwise, the Bill

would fall down, because there would be back-door methods of selling. One of the activities of the committee will be to stop these things.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My second point is in relation to the grower who is licensed by the committee and packs his fruit for destinations in other States. I take it the fruit is under the control of the committee for the purpose of packing and everything connected with packing but, once that fruit is loaded on to a truck and reaches the South Australian border, it is outside the control of the grower. The real crux of this matter is that this committee will also have power to license a panel of agents, as is done at present. Is there anything in this Bill to stop the grower sending to an agent other than those recommended by the committee, when he has conformed to every other part of the Act up to that point?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Taking the case that the honourable member instanced earlier, a grower may have built up interstate business and goodwill. The committee would be anxious not only that the grower should retain that goodwill and trade but also that he should attempt to extend it. I do not think this committee would attempt to interfere in a case of that kind. In fact, every encouragement would be given for such a grower to continue his activities, in those circumstances.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Much fruit is sold on the tree, both legitimately and (one may say) illegitimately. The grower often picks it himself. Can he put his own fruit on to a truck, take it over the border and then claim immunity under section 92? Is there anything in the Bill to prevent him doing that? If the committee takes control of that fruit when it is mature and on the tree, this difficulty can be solved.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have been informed that in those circumstances the committee would have jurisdiction over that crop; otherwise, the work of the committee in orderly marketing on behalf of the growers would fall down. As regards section 92, the committee would attempt to exercise as much control as possible. Not being a Constitutional lawyer, I cannot answer the honourable member's question about section 92.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—“Grower companies.”

The Hon. L. R. HART: This clause relates to voting rights, because it provides for a company to nominate a person whose name shall be included as its nominee. For any

person to qualify, he must have 50 or more trees. In the case of a partnership of, say, three persons owning 50 trees, would each member of that partnership get a vote or would the requirement be that that partnership should own at least 150 trees before each member was entitled to a vote? Will the Minister clarify that point?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The clause deals with a body corporate and if that is so there will not be multiplicity. If it is a body corporate and two growers are involved they would come within the scope of the Bill. It may be one way or the other; the individual grower or a body corporate, but it is up to those concerned to nominate the manner in which they intend to operate. I do not think the committee would consider that there should be multiplicity of voting and attempting to utilize different clauses to do so. Clause 12 (2) states:

A person so nominated shall, by virtue of such nomination, be deemed to be a grower for the purposes of this division and section 36 of this Act.

The Hon. L. R. HART: When I asked a similar question with relation to the Egg Marketing Act recently the Minister obtained a ruling from the Crown Solicitor which, in effect, said that each member of the partnership was entitled to a vote. I would assume that the same conditions would apply here.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am aware of that, and I agree with the honourable member when he says that he assumes the same would apply as far as the interpretation of the Crown Solicitor is concerned; there is not much difference between the clause in this Bill and the other clause mentioned.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As far as partnerships are concerned, the vast majority of citrus growing is done in partnership; some being sleeping and others active partners. I believe that both members of such a partnership should have voting powers.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Subclause (4) covers the situation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, as long as both are actual growers and have 50 trees each. In many co-operatives, under somewhat similar conditions, the first person to nominate is the person who has the vote and in other cases the first-named person in the partnership is the one who exercises the power to vote. Under clause 12 (4) of the Bill each registered grower shall be entitled to vote at any election. If that is so, I am happy, provided that a sleeping partner is permitted to vote under the interpretation of

“grower”. The definition of “grower” in the Bill is covered in clause 5 and states:

(a) in Division I or Part II and in sections 34 and 36 of this Act, means any person who grows at least 50 trees for the production and sale of citrus fruit; and

(b) in the other provisions of this Act means any person who carries on the business of producing citrus for sale.

The partnership produces fruit for sale, and the partners are also owners of a certain number of trees.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: He must be a registered grower with 50 or more trees for the purpose of exercising his vote.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In the referendum to be held on wool marketing shortly the person who has 10 bales of wool has a vote. If he is in partnership, there must be 20 bales of wool in order for each partner to be entitled to a vote. Under this Bill I consider that, legitimately, two partners should control 100 trees.

The CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to do with wool and each industry is entitled to make its own rules.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In this clause our concern is the entitlement to vote. Under the Bill the person exercising a right to vote in accordance with the Act must be a grower of at least 50 trees. He will not be entitled to vote if he owns 49 trees, despite the fact that he sells his products and they come within the jurisdiction of the committee. If it is a partnership, a body corporate, and a grower of more than 50 trees, each member would be taken to be a grower.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I appreciate the point made and assume that in a multiple partnership with over 50 trees each partner is entitled to a vote.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That is the way I understand it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—“Powers to impose charges.”

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There has been confusion in some places on this matter. The first levy provided for is for the purpose of straight-out administration of the Act. However, some people have voiced some animosity towards the second levy, which is for the purpose of setting up the Export Compensation Fund. The maximum amount that can be levied is 2s. and I doubt whether the committee will use more than a fraction of that amount, perhaps 3d. or 6d., in the first instance. However, as the committee proceeds

and gets more matters under its jurisdiction, the levy may increase. By that time, the committee may have proved itself sufficiently useful for growers not to feel so badly about it.

However, I think it is necessary for the committee to have power to impose this second levy, because the canned fruit industry was in about as much chaos as the citrus industry is in until a fund was created to assist people who were prepared to pioneer new export markets. The clause will enable the committee to develop new markets and, if fruit sent into one of those markets does not realize the price, the grower can be compensated. This overcomes the problem that arises where a grower may be able to sell high quality fruit at a great advantage but the committee is not prepared to send that fruit into an export market. By equalizing, the grower of high quality fruit could not lose and the grower whose fruit was sent as a trial would be paid out.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member has put the position adequately. This matter is dealt with in the inquiry committee's report and the purport of the committee's remarks is in line with what the honourable member has said.

Clause passed.

Clauses 24 to 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Powers of inspectors to enter upon lands."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I draw attention to an error, in that after clause 27 (2) the words "Penalty: Fifty pounds" appear. That is in the wrong place. Also, the same words appearing at the end of clause 27 (4) should not be there. I suggest that the words "Penalty: Fifty pounds" be deleted from clause 27 (4).

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister want the words deleted from clause 27 (4) and inserted in clause 27 (3), not 27 (2)?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall make that alteration.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 28—"Registration of brands and trademarks."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Here again a penalty is mentioned and it is a pity that these penalties are not stated in both dollars and pounds.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not know that we can do anything about that until decimal currency is introduced. Amounts of £50 and £100 are convertible.

Clause passed.

Clause 29 passed.

Clause 30—"Offences in connection with the marketing of citrus fruit."

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Some people at Beetaloo Valley, near Port Pirie, grow oranges, and these are marketed by individual growers, who put the fruit into utilities and sell it in surrounding towns and farms. If any of these people have more than 50 trees they will have to be registered, but how will they get on under subclause (2), which provides that fruit shall not be sold unless it has first been delivered or sold to a licensee, the committee or a person nominated by it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If this causes any trouble, I am sure the committee will deal with it. All marketing must be under the control of the committee, or there will be no orderly marketing.

Clause passed.

Clauses 31 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Polls on continuation of this Act."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I believe that an amendment was made to this clause in another place and that it gets over the difficulty I saw in the original Bill. Will the Minister assure me that that is so?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This is a revised Bill that includes amendments made in another place.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Is there any provision for the making and tabling of an annual report?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: A report will certainly be presented to the Minister, but there is no provision making it mandatory that the report be tabled.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Is the Government prepared to provide somewhere that the committee must prepare an annual report and financial statement and that these must be submitted to the Minister? This legislation involves big money, and I remember another board that escaped this obligation. This matter is vital to the industry.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As I cannot give this assurance at this stage, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Remaining clauses (37 to 39) and title passed.

Clause 32 "Accounts and audit"—reconsidered.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move to insert the following new subclauses:

- (4) The committee shall, as soon as possible after the close of each financial year, prepare a report of its proceedings during that financial year, including a statement showing its receipts and expenditure during that year, and shall present the report and statement to the Minister.
- (5) The Minister shall, as soon as possible after receiving the report, cause it to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

I was earlier asked whether or not the Bill contained a clause that made it mandatory on the committee to be set up under the Bill to tender an annual report, to which I replied that no such clause in the Bill necessitated that action. It has been stated that not only an annual report covering the activities of the committee but also a financial statement should be made available annually and laid on the tables of both Houses for the benefit of honourable members. I was asked to give an assurance that the Government would do this, but was not able to give the assurance at that stage. I said that at no stage would I give such an assurance to the Chamber, unless I could back up that assurance at any time in the future. Therefore, I asked that progress be reported and that the Committee have leave to sit again, to enable me to examine the queries (and their ramifications) raised by honourable members. I have investigated this matter, and the Government agrees that the Bill should contain a provision not only that an annual report (including the balance sheet and statement of receipts and expenditure) be submitted to the Minister but also that it be tabled in Parliament, so that honourable members can have the opportunity of inspecting the work of the committee, and the sums of money involved.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thank the Minister for his action. If he had not moved the amendment, I would have done so. I know of one or two statutory boards to which such a provision does not relate and it has been extremely difficult to get information of a financial nature, although certain statistical information is made available. As wide powers are being given to the committee, we should have a true accounting and a report each year. I support the amendment.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I add my congratulations to the Minister regarding the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time:

I wish to express my appreciation to a young lady in the front office of Parliament House for the typing that she has done. Perhaps we could call this staff the backroom workers. Honourable members had distributed to them copies of the explanation of this Bill, as I thought this would be desirable in order to expedite its passage. All these copies were typed by this young lady unselfishly at short notice and without complaint. The work that she did facilitated considerably the passage of the Bill, and I greatly appreciate what she has done.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I associate myself with the Minister's remarks. We are extremely fortunate in the way we are served by the whole of the staff of Parliament House. I think every honourable member will confirm that any services required are given efficiently and with the best of good grace. I should like to include also an appreciation to the Minister himself for showing consideration to the Council in making a copy of the explanation available to all honourable members. We all agree that this is an urgent Bill and that it is necessary to pass it before the adjournment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I, too, should like to say how much I appreciate this. Not only is it a good idea but the explanation is extremely well typed. I want to follow up what I said this afternoon that, while I do not expect this young lady to do this all the time, this is what honourable members need when these difficult and complex Bills are before us.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Towards the end of the session at least.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: During the session, too. Anybody who is near-sighted, as I am, has difficulty in reading *Hansard*, because the print is so small. In addition, we have to carry pulls around with us. These pulls are also difficult to obtain on the morning after debate because of pressure of work, as I have explained earlier. I ask the Government to consider this matter, because such a facility as has been provided will expedite the work of the Council and we may even get on much better; perhaps tempers will not be half as frayed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes four amendments of substance to the principal Act. In the first place, it will provide for compensation for injuries arising out of or in the course of employment; secondly, it provides cover on journeys between residence and place of employment; thirdly, it provides for payment of compensation at current rates; and, fourthly, it increases the maximum amounts of compensation payable. I deal with these amendments in order.

The principal clause relating to the first two matters is clause 3, which will strike out the words "by accident" in section 4 (1) of the principal Act and will also strike out the word "and" and insert "or". Subclause (1) now provides a liability to pay compensation in respect of "personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment". As amended, this will read "personal injury arising out of or in the course of the employment". The necessary amendments in this respect are made by paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (i) and (j) of clause 3.

Provisions for cover on journeys between residence and place of employment are made by paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (h) and (k) of clause 3 and by clause 4. Section 4 (2) of the principal Act relates to journeys. Paragraph (a) provides for compensation while a workman in the course of a daily or other periodical journey between residence and place of employment (whether to or from work) is being conveyed by a means of transport provided by or by arrangement with the employer. This is amended by paragraphs (e) and (f) of clause 3 to provide for compensation while a workman is in the course of a daily or other periodical journey between residence and place of employment whether the journey is to or from work, but the limitation as to means of transport is removed by clause 3 (g). Paragraph (h) of that clause relates to section 4 (2) (e), which covers a workman while he is travelling between his residence or place of employment and any other place for the purposes of medical attention. The new provision will substitute for the words "while the workman is travelling" the words "on a journey taken by the workman". There could be some argument whether a man was actually travelling, for example, where an injury was sustained while he was not actually

in motion on a journey. Paragraph (k) of clause 3 will remove from section 4 (3) relating to apprentices on journeys between residence and trade school the requirement that they must be travelling in accordance with arrangements made with the employer.

Clause 4 provides that no compensation shall be payable for an injury occurring on a journey between residence and place of employment or trade school or a journey in connection with medical attention if it occurs during or after any unconnected substantial interruption or deviation or other break made during the journey. This provision is substantially in line with similar provisions in New South Wales and Victoria. Clauses 5, 6 (b) and 8 raise the maximum amount of compensation payable to £6,000 in the case of death and total incapacity, and to £4,500 for partial incapacity and table injuries. The existing maxima are £3,250 for death and £3,500 for incapacity and table injuries. Clause 7 provides for repairs and replacements of medical or surgical aids (for example, spectacles) that are damaged but where no personal injury has occurred.

Clause 9 provides for payment of compensation at rates currently in force at the time of death or incapacity, where the claim is made after the commencement of the Bill. There are cases where a workman suffers a recurrence of injury attributable to the same incident but, if the incident occurred before a change in rates, he obtains only the amounts that were current at the time of the first injury. This can operate somewhat harshly. The remaining amendments in the Bill, and in particular those effected by clause 10 and the schedule, are consequential and relate mainly to the removal of the word "accident" and the substitution of "or" for "and" in various parts of the principal Act.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

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

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT
BILL (SALARIES).

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

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It increases the remuneration of the judges of the Supreme Court by £600 a year as from

July 1, 1965. The last increase in their salaries was made in 1963, since when, as honourable members know, there have been adjustments in salaries of various Government officers, including those governed by Act of Parliament. Under this Bill, the salary of the Chief Justice will be £7,600 a year and that of each puisne judge £6,850 a year.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support this Bill, which increases the salaries of the Chief Justice and puisne judges of the Supreme Court by £600. This increase will mean that the salary of the Chief Justice will be £7,600 and that of the other judges £6,850. I do not want to talk at length on the Bill, but I think it is true that almost every judge of the Supreme Court has made a financial sacrifice to go on to the bench. The salary they receive is not such that one could say they were overpaid when it is taken in relation to the salaries earned by the top members of the profession.

The Supreme Court bench of this State has always been held in the highest affection and esteem, to which it is entitled, by the whole of the population of this State, and I am sure it will continue to do so. It is not generally realized, I think, that the whole of the salaries received by the Chief Justice and puisne judges are subject to taxation, as I think no provision is made for any expenses allowance in their salaries and there are very few emoluments attached to the office. This must be taken into consideration, as it affects the net amount that they receive.

Where comparatively young people are appointed to the bench, they must close down whatever practice they have had. Frequently they have young families and if they had stayed in private practice they would have kept their practices and been able to establish their families in them. I think the increases are justified, and I support the Bill.

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

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 to 14, but had disagreed to amendment No. 1.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be not insisted upon.

The Government at the elections promised that the new Department of Social Welfare would expand into the area of family and youth welfare work generally. It is proposed not to work in fields already covered by voluntary agencies but to co-ordinate their work with their voluntary co-operation and endeavour to fill in the gaps in existing services. Much work has already commenced in this field and a pilot youth project commenced in Kensington and Norwood on the basis of interim findings from a survey taken over the last three years. The committees concerned with this project have asked for the seconding of a suitable trained departmental officer to certain of the works or projects. The power contained in paragraph (c) removed by the Council's amendment provides for the Minister to use officers on such work. It is not proposed to do so on any large scale immediately. Until the answers in this field have been established by experiment and research, few officers will be used, but it is essential to have power so to use them or already announced projects must cease. The clause, the subject of the amendment, is therefore essential to the purposes of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I note that this is the only amendment that the Council placed in the Bill that has been disagreed to by another place. Honourable members will remember that when we were discussing this clause of the Bill certain new powers were included on which information was sought. I asked questions of the Minister, but he was unable to supply information at that time regarding the powers included in the Bill. In the absence of a reply at that time I intimated that I would move for the deletion of this clause, and that was done. An explanation has now been given, and I thank the Minister for distributing that information to this Chamber as it has clarified the position considerably.

It appears that the work being done by voluntary organizations will be continued. That work will be co-ordinated and therefore, as the mover of the motion to delete this particular clause, I am prepared to accept the explanation given because this provision may offer some opportunity not only for introducing new movements but assisting others. The information now supplied by the Chief Secretary is the clarification I was seeking in Committee previously. I am prepared to support the Chief Secretary's motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think I was the one who asked the Chief Secretary some

questions with regard to this clause in the Committee stage of the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A number of honourable members asked questions.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Like the Leader, I am indebted to the Chief Secretary for providing us with this more detailed information which, as he says, clarifies the position to a degree, and I therefore adopt the reasoning of Sir Lyell McEwin with regard to this matter. However, there are one or two matters on which I desire further information, and I would be grateful for the Chief Secretary's help in this respect. Portion of the statement just presented reads:

Much work has already commenced in this field and a pilot youth project commenced in Kensington and Norwood on the basis of interim findings from a survey taken over the last three years.

I should like to know what people conducted that survey and on what basis they did so. As far as I know, it was not done by a governmental authority or by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not have that information, but I understand that the pilot youth project has been in operation. It does not operate in my district, nor do I know anything about it. However, I will endeavour to ascertain the position and advise the honourable member.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I believe that all honourable members are interested in social welfare work and I do not wish to appear parsimonious in this matter. However, I think it is important for this Council to know that it is getting value for money that it spends. If we are able to help the children who are not being looked after by their parents and can keep them off the streets and give them some encouragement in life, I agree that the money will be well spent. At the same time, in the area of social welfare my experience has been that large numbers of people with all the goodwill in the world, but with no practical common sense, sometimes become engaged in this work. I think it is important that we ensure such a project is established on a sound footing, otherwise the good work being attempted by the Government and by the Minister will get off to a bad start. That is what I want to avoid and why I would like to know who was concerned with the survey. The Minister's statement contains the following comment:

The committees concerned with this project have asked for the seconding of a suitable

trained departmental officer to certain of the works or projects.

I think we should be informed of the projects likely to be considered and also of the qualities of the officer likely to be concerned together with his experience in the work. The statement continues:

It is not proposed to do so on any large scale immediately. Until the answers in this field have been established by experiment and research few officers will be used—

Such a project will involve the Treasury in the expenditure of a considerable sum of money, even if only a few officers are to be employed. In the field of social welfare we shall be battling to do the things we want to do because my experience is that school committees are not getting the grants to which they are entitled, and in various spheres cuts are being made in expenditure. Therefore, before launching a new project I think we are entitled to more information. As I said, I go along with Sir Lyell McEwin, and I think we agree that the clause taken out should be reinserted. However, I think it is reasonable that the Chief Secretary obtain further information on the matters that I have mentioned and I think that if such information had been supplied previously probably we would not have deleted the clause.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In view of the comments made I suggest that progress be reported and that the Committee have leave to sit again.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: When progress was reported, a series of questions had been asked. I shall try to satisfy the Hon. Mr. Rowe, although I do not know whether the report I have received will satisfy him. It states:

The 3-year survey referred to was as follows: the Kensington and Norwood Youth Survey was organized by the South Australian Council of Social Services in co-operation with the Government Child Guidance Clinic. It has been carried out under the supervision of members of the Department of Social Science at the University of Adelaide and some students for the Diploma of Social Science have done part of their practical work on the survey. In its present stages it has been overseen by Miss Marie Mune.

A meeting of all interested bodies in the area and all youth and social welfare agencies in Norwood was held, at which the Minister and persons associated with the survey outlined what had been done and recommended four projects for experiment to endeavour to fill the gaps in needed youth services in the area and to see what results socially occurred. The four projects were:

1. After-school recreation activities;
2. A hall to provide indoor recreation activities;
3. A teenage casual drop-in club;
4. A youth garden modelled on the Danish Tivoli Gardens.

I hope everyone has seen the Danish Tivoli Gardens! The report goes on:

Committees of those interested have been formed to examine and make detailed proposals on each of these projects. For the honourable member's information, these include prominent members of the Young Liberal Movement. It is not proposed to finance the projects from departmental funds. For instance, the indoor recreation hall will be provided as elsewhere by local subscription. The youth garden project is a long-term proposal designed to be a feature of the redevelopment plan for the area now in the course of preparation. However, it is desirable that a trained departmental officer be available for some time to the drop-in club, both to assist in staffing and to gauge the effectiveness of the project at close quarters.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I thank the Chief Secretary for that information, which I appreciate. In point of fact, I have heard many rumours as to what is going on and now I have a factual statement, not only for my own benefit but also to help me to explain the position to other people. If the Chief Secretary is of opinion that I doubted that he would supply the information to me when he had given me an undertaking that he would do so, there are no grounds at all for that misapprehension.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your actions did not point that way.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If the Chief Secretary thinks this, he has misinterpreted my actions.

Amendment not insisted upon.

COUNTRY FACTORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly with an amendment.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): If honourable members will turn to the Bill, which is No. 46 on their files, I shall explain the amendment that the other place wishes the Council to accept. The following words will be seen in clause 21 (3):

Penalty: Not less than fifty pounds and not exceeding two hundred and fifty pounds. The amendment is to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty". Subclause (3), if so amended, will read:

An occupier who fails or neglects to complete such repairs, alterations, or improvements within the period specified in that behalf in such notice shall, unless he satisfies the court that such factory or such part thereof or machinery therein was not defective in any of the matters set forth in the notice, be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Not less than twenty pounds and not exceeding two hundred and fifty pounds.

This is a reasonable amendment and I ask the Committee to agree to it.

Amendment agreed to.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RATES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 3235.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to speak on this Bill with much feeling, because I have never been fond of succession duties, which I have always considered to be one of those ghoul's taxes that we can well do without. However, as this is on the Statute Book, it is an extremely good reaper for any Government. Governments must make countries run, so once this type of legislation is on the Statute Book it is extremely difficult to get it off. I am not happy when talking about succession duties, and I am even less happy when I see the formula, which was difficult enough in the past, altered to make it tougher on people who have endeavoured to put away a little for their old age. I am opposed to this legislation as it stands, and I will do everything I can to see that it is trimmed a little.

This measure is a practical demonstration of Socialism at work. It is an object lesson in the art of trickery, because the second reading explanation does not in any way correspond with what the Bill sets out to do. To substantiate this statement (which I would not make loosely, because "trickery" is a nasty word) I point out that we have many practical illustrations of what the Government said it would do and what it actually did. In the policy speech given for and on behalf of the A.L.P. by Mr. Walsh and quoted in the telecast on the night it was given, the Premier (Mr. Walsh) said:

Our policy on succession duties provides an exemption of £6,000 for the estates inherited by widows and children. It also provides that a primary producer will be able to inherit a living area without the payment of any succession duties but a much greater rate of tax will be imposed on the very large estates. This will be more in keeping with what is in operation in other States.

Once again we come back to uniformity for uniformity's sake. There seems to be an obsession in recent times for "togetherness" in relation to tax collections in all sorts of legislation that has been brought before this Chamber.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It has been done a couple of times recently.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite. It is a good plan, all the same. I do not know whether this is not part of the overall scheme to get us all largely in the one mould, where we shall find it much easier to eliminate State Parliaments; all our Acts will be exactly the same throughout Australia. Why we must inflict upon ourselves these extra taxation measures I have no idea, because we managed for a long while to run our own State without resorting to the superior knowledge of other States—and we did it successfully.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The Government wants to keep up with the Joneses.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I know, but we have only to look at people who try to keep up with the Joneses to see what happens.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Especially when the Joneses are Socialists.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. The result is good if one has an income the same as the Joneses' but, if I had six yards of cloth and tried to cover myself, I would find it easier to cover the Hon. Mr. Banfield. Therefore, we have to cut the cloth to give everybody a decent covering. In the past we have seemed to manage very well in South Australia. Certainly, we did not have a lottery or other gimmicks, but we have had a fair margin of security for people in the lower income brackets. People's security is important. We can have all these other wonderful things but we get them at the expense of somebody else. On May 13, at page 4 of *Hansard*, the Government's policy is set out in the Governor's Speech. Paragraph 26 reads:

A Bill to amend the Succession Duties Act will be laid before you, principally to provide an exemption of £6,000 in estates passing to widows and children.

I emphasize the word "principally". First, I take exception to the Government's using the representative of Her Majesty the Queen, in the person of His Excellency the Governor, to put the seal of respectability on an election promise that it had no intention of keeping. When I say that, the only proof I have is that it was not in the Bill when it first came into Parliament. I stand by that, because I believe it was not the Government's intention

to do these things. In the first Bill that came before Parliament, there was no provision for £6,000 for a widow or £6,000 for the children. It had not made those exemptions; it had not exempted the primary producer who inherited a living area. The Government did not keep its promise, either, to confine its increase to the very large estates, which would be put on a much higher rate of tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What do you understand by "a very large estate"?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I understand by that an estate worth perhaps between £150,000 and £250,000. There are plenty of them about. In regard to this matter of very large estates, I quote briefly a few words from the Attorney-General, who is a knowledgeable man on matters of law and a very close associate of the financial adviser to the Australian Labor Party at present. Talking to 500 students at an orientation meeting of the A.L.P. at the University of Adelaide on Thursday, March 25 (which is a significant date, because it is very soon after the last State elections) he had much to say about the previous Government and its shortcomings and various other things; but it is important that he said this.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Was he being charitable to the previous Government?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; on the contrary, he was very rude to the previous Government and I thought for a young man who had had the opportunity of being well educated he showed a little lack of courtesy to an older man who had done a tremendous amount for the State of South Australia—the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford. Whether or not we are political opponents, nobody can take away from Sir Thomas the fact that he is a very great South Australian. The Attorney-General rubbished him completely there, in the presence of 500 callow youths.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He rubbished me last night, too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Mr. Dunstan?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: No—the other person you are talking about.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: You can get protection from Mr. Dunstan but I do not know about Sir Thomas: he fights out in the open. This is what this gentleman said:

Duties adjustment. Increased Government expenditure will be paid for in part by an increase in succession duties for those sad souls whose estates are over £100,000. Duties will be reduced on small estates. Tax avoidance practices will be caught. Question: Is the Labor Party going to cancel out the

university fee increase? Answer: Yes (Audience cheers) and we are going to raise student teacher allowances.

So terribly edifying! This is accompanied by a photograph of the gentleman with his shorts on. This is the promise made by the Premier today on television; it is the promise of the Premier in the Governor's Speech; it is the promise of the Attorney-General at the orientation meeting at the university on March 25—that the lower brackets of people would be helped, exceedingly well. Did the Government at any stage suggest that it would remove the existing benefits in the succession duties, that is, the benefits of exemption under this Act? Did it say that Form U of the Act would disappear where it was possible for normal little people to have their house in joint names, together with their motor car and other odd things that they owned? Did it say anywhere at all that it would remove those provisions and substitute in their place an aggregation of the whole? No, it did not say that at all. It imposed this damning burden on the thrifty and the prudent; that is the dreadful thing.

Did the Government at any stage say it would introduce legislation that would affect every family in this State that owned their own home in joint names to the extent of the whole valuation of the property? Did they tell people that joint banking accounts would in future be aggregated to form part of a deceased estate whereas under the present law only half of the joint account is taken into account? Was any mention made to warn the public of the Labor Party's policy with regard to life insurance? When the Labor Party brought down its Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill it struck at the very core of family security by deleting as an exemption a policy taken out, perhaps years previously, by a prudent person and made payable to the spouse in the event of death. That is a perfectly legitimate and normal practice, properly and legally transacted. Under the Government's provisions contained in this Bill this insurance policy would form part of the estate of the deceased. Unless those premiums have been actually paid by the beneficiary during the life-time of the deceased they will be lumped together to form part of the estate. It has been a tremendous advantage in the past, in my opinion, to have such insurance policies excluded, and I have had experience of it myself, in the event of death.

I think that most young men have done such a thing to ensure that their wives and children have a bit of ready cash on hand. I am in the same way as I believe the Hon. Mr. Banfield would be, because he is a fellow who looks after his affairs. I say that this Bill is nothing short of shocking in this regard because it strikes right at the heart of the careful individual, the person who takes out a £2,000, £3,000 or £4,000 policy of insurance. This means that if a husband, as head of the house and breadwinner, paid the premiums on the policy, although he made it payable to his wife, it would still have to be added to the estate for duty purposes. This is absolutely monstrous! There is no doubt about that.

In this case, either through ineptness (and I am trying to be charitable) or through bad advice from the financial advisers of the Labor Party, they have attempted to level people by bringing them right down on their knees. The Opposition has clearly demonstrated its feelings on this matter and it would not put up with this rapacious attempt to get at the wives and children of people in the small income bracket. They are the people we hear so much about from time to time whom the Government is going to protect; the small wage-earner, the white collar worker, the modest salaried person together with the small mixed farmer. We have heard this so often before. The Opposition has taken the appropriate action, I believe, in another place to put in order—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should not discuss what happens in another place.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not intending to criticize the other place nor am I in any way reflecting upon it. I am merely saying that the Opposition in another place has corrected the position, and I will leave it at that. The Opposition brought pressure to bear on the Government to show it the folly of its way and, after a great deal of debate on the subject, the determination with which the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Thomas Playford, and all Opposition members approached this legislation can only be described as courageous. They have not a majority in the other place, but as a result of their efforts the Government has been completely exposed in its slick trick—and I believe that is what it is. The Government has been forced to go for cover and accept some of the amendments proposed by the Opposition, but there are still many objectionable features in the Bill as it reaches this Chamber. Many of

these were pointed out yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Rowe and more will be pointed out by other speakers in this debate, but they are still in the Bill and some of them have been smoothed over as a bit of window dressing.

For instance, perhaps somebody on the Government side will explain to me how the modest businessman arranges his affairs so that his wife and family have sufficient means to live on to provide working capital to continue a business and at the same time find sufficient cash to satisfy the Succession Duties Department? How can this be done when the widow has been deprived of the proceeds of an insurance policy that she considered would come to her automatically and immediately? Now such a policy will be lumped in with the rest of the husband's estate. An amendment has been inserted that will allow her to receive up to 75 per cent of that amount after it has been approved and gone through the normal channels.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: No, the 75 per cent is payable immediately.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: "Immediately" does not mean that Dad is buried on one day and the following day Mum walks in and gets her 75 per cent. It does not work like that; I know, because I have been through this business.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It still has to be cleared.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, and there is a lot of formality. Under the old system when this was payable direct to the widow of the deceased it was settled in a matter of days.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about all the formalities that must be gone through?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There were no formalities; it was done by the insurance company. As I said, I have had experience of it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It would not be possible to get a copy of the death certificate immediately.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member address the Chair? We do not want three or four members speaking at the same time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member must have a poor sort of an undertaker to look after his affairs!

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I have not died yet, so I don't know.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I can assure the Minister that it does not take nearly as long to get the death certificate in the first place, and it has little to do with the matter I am raising. If somebody will tell me how a widow

can carry on and run a business and also get enough money to pay succession duties in the first 12 months after her husband dies I would be glad to hear it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The business is paying.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Government is obsessed with the idea that, if a man does not work with his hands, he is rich. The honourable member says by interjection that the business is paying. Many businesses pay only because people use some ingenuity and what is known as moral fibre. They take a risk and get on. They are private enterprise people.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: They pay the wages.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. If they do not pay the wages, people have to live on social services, and after that stage we get to a lower and lower bracket until another order takes over. We have seen that in other countries. Ceylon, one of the nicest little countries in South-East Asia, went down completely as a result of this sort of economy. It has gone down to the extent that it is now being run by the Marxists, because the standard of living got so low that the Marxists could offer the people a little more than they then had. If the old cow is milked until she goes dry in two quarters, there are only two quarters left to work on, and they soon dry up. I could give other illustrations of this hoodwinking.

In spite of all the extravagant promises that the Government has made, it has not the capacity to fulfil them and keep faith at the same time. So, it will increase all forms of taxation available to it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Can the honourable member see any reason why only 75 per cent of an insurance policy should be paid?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I cannot. Why is not 100 per cent paid out?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The other 25 per cent is wanted for duty.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It will be now. The Government does not even trust the poor widow sufficiently to let her get the cash.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What about the farmer's widow?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Each honourable member must look after his own argument. I am battling along with this one.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Battling is right!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Each honourable member will deal with his own facet and no doubt Sir Norman will have much to offer,

because I know that he has worked hard on this matter. This Bill is a part of the dream. I have seen it before and we shall see much more of it. I now desire to refer to this mythical thing called a living area. I do not know who advised the Government to put this in the policy speech, but perhaps if a man had a canary farm or something like that, he would probably be able to get sufficient land and buildings for £5,000 to enable him to run that type of farm. In the field of primary production, I cannot see how this exemption of £5,000 will enable sufficient people to be gainfully employed. It certainly could not be done in horticulture.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What would be the value of land required for a living area in horticulture?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A citrus property, on the basis of the present depressed prices for citrus, would sell at about £450 or £500 an acre. In the boom time, when reasonable prices were being obtained for citrus, the price was as high as £750 an acre. We must not forget that the capital improvement on that property would include about £150 for underground sprinklers. A man would require 20 acres for a living area at about £500 or £600 an acre. He could not make a living with less. In fact, I do not know how people scratch along on 20 acres, because 30 acres is an economic unit.

A fairly important committee, after having had experience of what happened in the Murray Mallee by having areas too small to be living areas and having to flog them to death with cereal growing in order to make a crust, came to terms with the land and the settlers. It aggregated the land and the areas are now from 2,500 to 3,000 acres. In the Mid North of the State a modest farm of 1,000 acres is worth a minimum of £40 an acre, and that is the value of the land alone. A house, equipment and stock are needed in addition. They are not all on the house. The cost is much more when these things are added. Is this a big estate? Was not the Government going to give an exemption on this sort of area? It has not. All that has happened is that these people have received an exemption of £5,000, which is not much. In addition, although nothing was said about the children when this Government submitted its policy speech, the moment the children reach 21 years of age, the figure is halved and they come down to £3,000.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: They share the £5,000.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. If there are three children, they share it. That is not good. If the living area is split up and an endeavour is made to put three people on it, we shall get back to the same position as we had in the Murray Mallee in the dust bowl days. It is not an economic unit. The Government is going to buy into trouble on this. Of course, this is the policy of the Government. It was also enunciated as the policy of the Opposition led by Mr. O'Halloran, who was a fairly realistic gentleman. However, he said the areas were too big and that if more people were put on them we would get more people in the country.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: He was a grazier.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Of course he was, but does the Minister think he ever bought less than an economic unit? He was too much of a realist to do that, and he knew how much land he needed to make a living. He did not carve his property down to 300 acres. If a property such as I have mentioned is regarded by the Labor Party as a living area, it would be reduced to only 200 acres in the circumstances I mentioned.

This Bill is ill-conceived. It is a nice way to filch money from the people, but the economy of the State and the security of the people have been completely overlooked. What is more, this will go on if this Council does not do anything about it because, once we put the seal on these extra amendments made to the Act by this Bill, they will be there for all time. I am old enough in the skull to know that when something like this is put into the Statute Book and is embodied into the State's economy the next Government cannot take it away.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It could not do so, especially if it followed this Government, which is giving away all sorts of benefits that the previous Government thought were a little too expensive. Can you, Mr. President, imagine a Government following this Government that could afford to reduce taxation? I believe the Government will get into a position in the next year or two in which it will have to tax people even more heavily to get itself out of trouble. It is in trouble now, and just when this will be necessary I do not know. I am convinced that while the husband is alive and can manage a primary-producing property his family gets along fairly well but, when he dies and leaves his wife and children, his wife is faced with the payment of succession duties and probate dues on a £40,000 property, and she probably has to

borrow money from the bank immediately to carry on. Would she have enough business training to run the farm herself, realizing that by the time her husband died she would probably be 50 and would have children under 21 who would not be able to take over the property? She may sell the property, but that sort of thing will dry up, and so will I. I absolutely oppose this legislation.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 3238.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I had not intended to speak to this Bill until last night, when I had a slight difference of opinion with the Chief Secretary, so I changed my mind.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: On stamp duties?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, on another matter, but I thought I would take this opportunity to ventilate one or two things. This measure is another tax-gathering lurk. Another thing I do not like about it is that the Government has some notion that everyone should send everyone else a present of a receipt with a duty stamp attached, whether people want receipts or not, or that people should keep sheafs of receipts. I do not favour this because, after all, the law protects people by making available the facilities of contracts. Legal contracts are sealed, and a receipt is a legal document, but if a person does not want a receipt I do not see why the Government should force him to have one, particularly as the Government has said it will not get any money out of this.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Just a slight increase!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is what the Minister said. If he sat down to work this out he would probably find out that the "small increase" would be a little like his idea of "large estates" in relation to the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill. His idea about what is small may not be the same as mine. I did not see any mandate in the policy speech for this measure.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Does your Party put everything it intends to do in the policy speech?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: We put in more.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We will have an opportunity to put our policy speech into operation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: When we get back, and I have already said that we will get back.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But you said your Government would have to raise the level of taxation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I said we would have to maintain this level of tax to get this State back on its feet, and I hope this is how it has been recorded in *Hansard*.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: *Hansard* is correct and takes it down well.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister has had a win at the moment, but I remember the time when he spoke of the mysterious treatment he was given by *Hansard*. I notice that several amendments are to be moved to this Bill. I am not happy about the provisions relating to receipts, and I shall give much consideration to the speeches made by honourable members on clauses 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, and particularly to the sliding scale of stamp duties. If this is not a taxation measure and the Government is not hoping to get more out of it, I cannot see why it is necessary to graduate these things, because a 2d. duty stamp is just as binding as a 1s. duty stamp, unless the law is altered. I cannot see that the little bit of extra ink required to write "1,000" as against "10" ought to demand a very much higher stamp duty.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There are two extra noughts.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but I cannot see that this is anything but a way of gathering in a few more shillings. I am not averse to that but, for heaven's sake, why doesn't the Government come out in the open and tell us that it is going to collect it? The second reading speeches do not match the actions. Does the Minister really check his second reading speech before it is thrust at him and he reads it? I do not think the gentleman is at all dishonest, but the second reading speeches do not match the actions. Here we are gathering in additional money right, left and centre, because these receipts have to be given for graduated amounts. Why not strike a figure somewhere in between 2c and 10c, if the Government wants to do this sort of thing, and charge that on the whole transaction, thus saving people from being messed around and frustrated? Instead of having to keep about five different lots of stamps, with an office girl specially set up as a permanent

stamp-licker (and, as long as she is not colour blind, she will know which stamp to pick up and put on the appropriate receipt), why not rationalize all this?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: How many different stamps now does she have to put on?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know. I suppose it depends on the amount of spit. It is the wherewithal that counts. Let us get somewhere in between and stop messing about with these controls, because there is enough misery in the world without inflicting more upon us, especially if the Government will not get much out of it. I support the second reading but I shall consider this matter further. I am open to conviction.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I do not intend to devote my energies to the whole Bill, because there are only two parts that interest me. It is unfortunate that the Government has found it necessary to raise the stamp duty on cheques. Nevertheless, that has been somewhat indicated by its revenue requirements. It has been pointed out on a number of occasions that an increase of 100 per cent is not a modest but a very considerable increase. However, I do not for the moment oppose that financial requirement of the Government; but I am going to make a strong point of objection about this fantastic putting back of the clock with regard to compulsory receipts. Here we are, with a tightening of finance all around the country, when only a short time ago there was a shortage of labour; labour was hard to get. All the schoolchildren had been taken into offices because of the wonderful development throughout the State over the years, which we sincerely hope will continue. Now we have this extra strategy of getting back to form-filling.

I could speak at length on the amazing efforts that this Government is apparently making to force people to maintain additional plant. I have been reading in the paper of a Bill that is running side by side with the Road Maintenance Tax Act. That Bill will virtually duplicate, if not treble (as any businessman knows), the amount of clerical work he will have to do in his own small business. Now, on top of that, we have something that is interesting the whole of the trade of South Australia—this fantastic business of going back to compulsory receipts. As far as I personally am concerned, my cheque butt has always been a satisfactory receipt and acknowledgment of my payments by the Commonwealth Taxation Commissioner, and to suggest, as this second reading speech does, that there

will be little gain, because of the many exemptions granted in these receipts, to the Treasury is absolutely asinine. Can we imagine anything more stupid than the suggestion that the Government will not gain any additional revenue, yet it will put many people of South Australia to the trouble of giving everybody a receipt? Any banker or businessman will tell us that we cannot process a receipt for under 1s. It is posted back, and there is a 5d. tax, to begin with, which does not go to the State Government. I have never seen such a puerile amendment to an Act, the bringing back of compulsory receipts.

I want to be firm about it. This provision will have my total opposition. If I wanted to support the Government and keep it in office, I would have a very big think about this amendment. If the Government carries it, it will be a deathknell, because it affects everyone in the community. Every person who goes into a store and spends £5 or £6 will have to get a receipt. Every little girl serving behind a counter, not perhaps this Christmas but the following Christmas, will have to prepare a receipt, write it out and stamp it. No arrangement is made by the Commissioner for some form of mechanical means in the till to be adopted in respect of receipts. That is barred in the Bill. We cannot move with the times and use computers and co-ordinated calculations: we have to go back to licking stamps and writing receipts for every transaction.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But no-one licks stamps today.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: You may just blow on them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have little hygienic pads now.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: But they have got to get the stamps. A highly reputable firm in this State has been spending for some years (because it deals with many customers) some £5,330 on stamp duty.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Per annum?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes. Its estimated new cost in that direction will be £11,500, an increase of £6,200. If that firm is to bear that increase of £6,200 and the second reading explanation states that no money will be made out of this Bill, what is the obvious and logical answer? The money will either go in the overhead, be wasted in collecting it, or else the Ministers of the Government have been grossly misinformed as to whether or not this Bill will result in any extra money coming in. I am prepared

to accept the figures given to me by an actuary.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Did the honourable member say an actuary?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I presume that an actuary gave the Government the figures—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. I think the honourable member stated that he took the figures of an actuary. I am wondering where an actuary is in Adelaide.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: There are dozens of them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Then the honourable member should inform us, because the Government cannot find one.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am informed that under this provision (and unfortunately I have not told the actuary about the difference in the value of the stamps to cover different amounts) it will be necessary to purchase 750,000 adhesive stamps, that is, approximately 2,500 stamps a day. He also pointed out that firms in many cases would not be mailing receipts to customers under this Bill, but would have to hold those receipts. This person is wondering about additional storage space, filing cabinets and so on that will be necessary to hold 2,000 receipts a day over a period of two years. That is what is involved in this fantastic amendment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't get too excited about it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am not getting excited. I now deal with the ordinary supermarket shopper. Purchases are made and the girl at the till sums up, at the end of which she must stop and get a receipt and thus hold up the rest of the queue waiting to pay. No provision is made in the Bill embracing receipts; none at all. Do not forget that for some extraordinary reason this will not result in any increased revenue to the Government, so we are told, but every cash purchaser who goes to these huge stores will have to obtain a receipt. It is not sufficient if the customer merely obtains a chit from the till; it must be a stamped receipt. If honourable members of this Chamber think that is progress, it is not the type of progress I can support. I have mentioned particularly the matter of cash sales, and I think the Government's proposal is fantastic because, despite one or two exemptions that seem sensible such as bank withdrawal and deposits, the answer still remains that the milkman, paper man and so on must issue receipts.

Can the Government sincerely say that there has been anything wrong with the existing system of the last five years with regard to receipts? If a person wants a receipt for record purposes it can be obtained and it must be properly stamped. The Government cannot say that the system has not worked, and all it can say in justification of this Bill is, "We want additional finance." As the Hon. Mr. Story said, let the Government come out in the open and say, "This will produce quite a reasonable amount of additional finance", but not try to cover it up and say, "It is not expected to receive other than a modest amount after allowing for exemptions." I do not intend to speak further on this matter except to express my extreme hostility to the measures in the Bill dealing with receipts.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I find myself in the same position as the Hon. Sir Norman Jude and that is that I find little in this Bill to commend it but much that will be a considerable hindrance and slow down business. The Government stated that little or no revenue would be gained from the Bill but I find it difficult to believe. In any case, whether the Government gains revenue from it or not it is certain that the general population of the State will lose money; not merely the money they will pay to the Government, but money that will be involved in time lost and the considerable loss in efficiency. In addition, there will be considerable increase in costs if this Bill becomes law. It is, unfortunately, just another example of the Government's policies that result in ever-increasing costs. Only nine months ago the Government was thumping around the country saying, "Live better with Labor." Once again (and we get this nearly every day) we have a good example of how to live dearer with Labor, and that is the situation at the present time.

Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Rowe said that something in excess of £5,000,000 is the amount the Government will take from the people of South Australia and that is another instance of the result of this Government's policy. Of course, Socialists want to take it from one person and give it to another, but in this case they will be taking it from their own supporters as much as from anybody else. I endorse the remarks of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude in opposing the considerable increase in stamp duty on cheques. I have stated before in this Chamber that we have become used to the inevitable rise in costs that has occurred in the past few years. It is realized that

many have been necessary, and some items have risen by 10, 15 or even 20 per cent. However, this Government is quite happy from time to time to increase costs by 100 per cent, and that is what will be done by some of the provisions of this Bill.

The other matter I wish to complain about is the compulsory issue of receipts. This will slow down the whole economy of the State. The stamp duty on cheques will hit a much greater proportion of the public than the Government realizes because a large number of people today use a cheque account for convenience and to save time. Many of those people would have been Government supporters last March, but most of them will shift their allegiance at the first opportunity.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are too optimistic.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No, it is the Minister who is too optimistic and he should get his other ear working as well as the one that hears people saying the Government is doing well. I could not in any circumstances support the increase in stamp duty on cheques. Possibly, a smaller increase may have been necessary, but the increase proposed is unnecessarily large. Perhaps the honourable gentleman who sits in front of me may say that it is not large, but the important point is what it costs in the whole field of cheque writing throughout the State.

I am opposed to clause 13, which makes it compulsory to give receipts. As some honourable members have said, this puts the clock back and slows down the wheels of industry. It is the sort of socialistic thinking that puts sand in the cogs and retards the progress of the State. Many businesses that could not be considered to be big businesses will have to employ additional girls to do the necessary work. There will be fewer transactions handled each day in many businesses because of the necessity to give a receipt in every instance. Therefore, in my view, this Bill has an impact on the economy of the State much more severe than the apparent financial implications. It will slow down activity in almost all branches of industry, and that is the most serious aspect.

I propose, in the Committee stage, to move an amendment that will benefit non-profit-making hospitals. As I have indicated in private conversation, there are no politics in this proposal and I know that the Chief Secretary, who actively supports all hospitals, will sympathetically consider the amendment. It will be in clause 15, which includes in the last exemption of the principal Act that

cheques drawn by any registered friendly society will be exempt. I shall move to add to that exemption cheques drawn by or on behalf of any non-profit-making hospital.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What do you call a non-profit-making hospital?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am talking about any hospital not set up by a private individual for profit, any hospital that ploughs back its profits into the provision of further facilities for the care of the sick.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Subsidized or community hospitals?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In my opinion, community hospitals would qualify. I suggest that the Chief Secretary look at this matter. At this stage, I support the second reading, having due regard to the objections I have raised to the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): A friend of mine has a shop at Whyalla, in which he sells merchandise, a few groceries and the normal run-of-the-mill items that average people in an average town want. He is not a big businessman: he is recognized as a man with a small shop. He keeps fairly accurate records of his business transactions and I asked him if he would give me figures for two weeks, not consecutive, of this year of his receipts for amounts over £5 and I also asked him what he estimated would be the additional cost if these new stamp duty provisions became law. In the weeks ended September 10 and October 8 this year, this man issued receipts for 312 separate payments of money, each amount being in excess of £5. If we work this sum out, we shall see that the percentage increase on stamp duty alone will be 25 per cent. These figures are not fictitious; I can give the name of the person concerned if the Minister wishes.

This is the case of a small man who is trying to give service to the housewife. This is not an example of the big financial firm, such as Sir Norman Jude has mentioned. I am not being critical of the figures he has given and do not doubt their authenticity, but additional stamp duty alone will cost an additional 25 per cent in the case of the man I have mentioned. There is then the cost of the wages of people who will be employed to handle the extra work and also the cost of postage if the receipts are posted. It is said that the rolling stone gathers no moss. The rolling stone that is important in this world is progress, which does not want to gather moss. I venture to say that we do not want to load every walk of life with this imposition in

relation to all business transactions involving amounts in excess of £5, or \$10. What will it cost the Electricity Trust, which supplies power to a large area of the State and which normally does not send out receipts? That authority must receive many payments of amounts in excess of £5 and, therefore, will have to pay stamp duty at the increased rate. What will it cost the A.M.P. Society, which adopts a similar procedure of not sending out receipts unless requested to do so? That company must receive many amounts in excess of £5. If we multiply the 25 per cent that applies to the little man right up the line, we are doing nothing but building up a fictitious price structure that is not necessary or warranted. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I did not intend to speak on the Bill until I heard some of the remarks made by the champions of business houses in this Chamber in relation to the issue of receipts. The clause to which most members object is that which provides that the issue of receipts will be compulsory. We all know that it is not obligatory to issue receipts now, but if people demand them they must be issued. This Bill provides that it will be compulsory to issue receipts, to which duty stamps must be affixed when they are for more than a certain sum. Not long ago the Commonwealth Government decided to increase the cost of postage to 5d. and to raise telephone charges—and it was not a Labor Government that increased those charges. When this happened, department stores said that as it would cost another 1d. to post out receipts to customers they would no longer send them out.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Most of the stores send receipts every month.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If the customer asks for them.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: No.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: They do it if a person has an account, but not everybody has an account at these stores. If a person demands a receipt he gets one, but otherwise he does not. Not long ago the Commonwealth Taxation Department more or less made it compulsory for receipts to be issued, as it was keeping a check on business people in relation to taxable income. The compulsory issue of receipts, which in this legislation is said to be so grave, follows the practice adopted by stores for many years, although it is not followed now. We know perfectly well that department stores can save considerable sums of money by

not issuing receipts. It was pointed out tonight in support of the contention that this clause should be taken out of the Bill that it would cost department stores a large sum, but nothing was said about the considerable sum they saved when they stopped issuing receipts—and this was not passed on to the consumer.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: How do you know? You have nothing to prove that.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member knows that it was not passed on. Honourable members say that if this Bill is passed in its entirety it will interfere with our economy, but I do not think it will. Additional staff will have to be put on to do the necessary work, and that will create employment. This in turn will put more money into circulation and, instead of the economy being retarded, it will get a little shot in the arm.

It has been said that a cheque butt is a sufficient receipt. I appreciate that that is so and that it is recognized as such, as a cheque can be traced so that if there is any dispute about a payment it can be used in court as proof. However, what happens when an account is paid in cash?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Stick to the discussion on cheques.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will give an instance of what happened a fortnight ago. Although I use a cheque book, I paid an account in cash and put the money into an envelope with the invoice and posted it to the firm, but a fortnight later I received a notice saying that I had not paid the account. I have no proof that I have paid, because the payment was in cash.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Didn't you send it by registered post? Don't you know it is an offence to send money through the post?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Will the honourable member institute proceedings against me?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: One can demand a receipt under the present Act.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not suggest that one cannot.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Why didn't you demand one?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: There is an automatic giving of a receipt.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is not automatic. If a person demands one it is issued, but otherwise it is not. The Leader knows that as well as I do. The workers employed by the Government have for many years had to pay for duty stamps on receipts for their wages. That was introduced by the previous

Government, and according to that Government it was in order.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Only if the employee was paid by cheque.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The previous Government thought that was in order, but it now thinks that it is wrong for department stores to pay for duty stamps.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You are suggesting that you will not tax wages but you will tax these people.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I make no apologies for believing that workers should not have to pay duty stamps on receipts for wages. That was one of the greatest impositions that was ever placed on employees.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: But the man who sells potatoes in the market should give a receipt?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I agree with what the honourable member is suggesting, and I will support the elimination of this sort of thing if he will play ball with me. However, I do not think he will, so I think I am fairly safe. These things went on for a long time, but now it is said that we are going back to the dark ages. Because of certain practices that are now going on the Commonwealth Government authorities may make it compulsory to issue receipts so that a check can be kept on people. Believe me, if the Commonwealth Government did that, there would be many revelations about these things. Do not let us fool ourselves that that cannot be done. Of course, if it was done by the Commonwealth Government it would be all right for honourable members opposite, but, if it is done by a Labor Government, they scream to high heaven. Honourable members have said that the poor departmental stores will close down tomorrow because they will have to employ extra staff to issue receipts to their customers.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They will just put their prices up, that's all.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: All right. Then why scream about this clause? Honourable members know that the extra cost will be passed on to the customer, so their arguments are not worth a cracker. What the honourable member has just interjected is a fact: it will make no difference whatever to the stores. We are really playing politics here. This had been going on for years, but was discontinued because of the increase in postage stamp rates made by the Commonwealth Government. Now there is a suggestion that the stores may have to issue receipts if this clause is accepted (and I know perfectly well that it will not

be). It has now been revealed by interjection that this will make no difference to the departmental stores: they will merely pass it on to the customer. The position is that, because the Government is demanding this, honourable members will oppose it anyhow. That is their attitude.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I rise with pleasure to support the second reading of this Bill, which seeks to raise stamp duties on cheques. It also provides for the compulsory issuing of receipts and other matters concerning the changeover to decimal currency. One reason why I support the second reading is that the Bill repeals existing sections of the Act covering amusements duty. This will mean a great saving to our State because, year after year, we have been presented with a Bill continuing the exemption on amusements duty, and the repeal of that section will obviate the need for the introduction of a new Bill each year. I congratulate the Government on effecting that saving for the State. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude in a vigorous speech asked what would be the cost to the State of the compulsory issuing of receipts. I know of one firm in South Australia (mentioned also by Sir Norman) that estimates an additional cost of £1,000 a month—not only for duty stamps but also for the cost of processing the receipts. The Minister of Local Government said that the members in this Chamber representing business houses were making a noise about all this. I do not represent any business house but am concerned about this legislation, because it does not achieve anything.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It does as far as we are concerned.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am wondering what it achieves from the Government's point of view. The Chief Secretary in his second reading explanation said:

It is expected that the extended list of receipts exempt from duty will almost cancel out the increase in duty, leaving possibly a small net increase overall.

If the extra cost of this to one business in this State will be £1,000 a month, what will the cost be to commerce as a whole in South Australia? I am not over-interested whether or not the costs are passed on. That does not concern me at all, but I am concerned about what the Minister said, that it will increase employment. It reminds me of the old story of everyone taking in everyone else's washing: it may maintain employment but no-one gets very fat doing it. The Minister also said that

this was a good thing because it had been the practice for a considerable number of years. I hope that we have made some progress in this State. The Minister also said that, when these matters were dropped some years ago, there was no drop in price. That has no bearing on this argument. The whole point is that we shall raise the cost to commerce in this State and it matters not whether the costs are passed on or whether the price is reduced when this is taken off: we are going to engage a number of people on a completely non-productive form of employment. The Hon. Mr. Potter called it "in sterile employment". Our standard of living depends upon the productivity of this State, how much each man can produce. If we are to have legislation that adds nothing to our productive capacity, I for one cannot see what benefits this legislation will confer. This whole matter of issuing compulsory receipts is Socialist stupidity.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is quite right.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot think of better words to describe it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I can, but I cannot express them to you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member may be able to inform me outside the Chamber. But this is typical of the attitude we see adopted in so much of the legislation now coming before us—this attitude of controls, forcing people to do things that add nothing to the productive capacity of this State or our standard of living. I am sorry to see that duty on cheques is being raised from 3d. to 5c. This will raise approximately £500,000 a year in revenue. While I am sorry to see this happen, I approve of this form of taxation because at least it achieves revenue for the Treasury without unduly employing any non-productive labour and placing obstructions in the way of commerce and industry. I will oppose the clauses dealing with the matter of compulsory receipts.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I wish to refer to the astonishing statement of a Minister of the Crown that was made in a rather sneering way that certain people here are champions of the business houses and that those people have spoken on their behalf. I would have thought a responsible Minister would know that his destiny, together with the destiny of all people of the State, is wrapped up with the business houses because if unnecessary additional expense is put on those houses then unnecessary additional expense will also be placed on the whole of the

economy of the State. The points I have had in mind ever since I read this Bill have already been made by other honourable members, but I propose to reiterate them in my own way because I consider (and I am speaking purely on the question of compulsory receipts) that in including this clause in the Bill the Government has had no regard at all to the interests of business, which ought to be its own interests, nor has it taken any account whatever of the cost to business, quite apart from the stamp duty involved. Stamp duty is one thing, and I have expressed myself during this session on my attitude on Governmental financial measures. There would be no worthwhile point in my repeating those views, but when, in trying to raise extra revenue, the Government puts itself out to add unnecessary additional costs, and unproductive costs, to business, then this is the time I consider I should speak out.

I have had some experience in the business world of the costs involved nowadays in processing such things as cheques and receipts, and I have made a random estimate that the ordinary sort of business would not be able to process a receipt under the sum of 1s. and I consider that a conservative estimate, not taking into account the stamp duty, stationery and any postage, because postage is not necessarily involved. Therefore, the cost of issuing a receipt where a receipt would not normally be issued would add every time to the business a cost of about 1s. This cost must ultimately find its way into the prices of the goods or services of the business involved and finally into the cost of living of this State. If this is a good thing I would like it explained why it is, because we have been told many times that we should get rid of nonproductive labour; that production is the thing that gives us the standard of living so important to all of us, and we who are engaged in business are all the time trying to cut out nonproductive labour. If, however, there is a better example of the enforcement of nonproductive labour on business in general (and it applies to both big and small businesses) then this it is. I have no alternative but to vote against this clause of issuing compulsory receipts.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is the amount of 1s. mentioned by the honourable member inclusive of a percentage for profit on expenditure?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It is a random estimate. It is what is referred to as a "guesstimate", but I think it would be somewhat near the mark and I also think, if anything, it would be low. I cannot say how

much is involved, for I am merely drawing on my general experience of costing. I am not opposing the aspect of revenue in this clause. What I am opposing is the additional cost to business that is completely non-productive, and I cannot see any answer that can be given in favour of that. I suggest to the Government that alternatives exist for this clause if it cares to look for them, or if it cares to ask somebody else for an opinion as to how it can obtain this additional revenue without all this waste of money. That is what it would be—a waste of money in this processing of receipts that are not required or desired, because the clause talks about filing receipts not asked for for two years. The Government knows perfectly well that many people do not want receipts at all; indeed, as the Minister of Local Government himself pointed out, many business houses do not issue receipts these days unless they are asked for them. Under section 84 of the Stamp Duties Act, which this clause sets out to amend, it is compulsory to issue a receipt if one is requested. The section states:

If any person—

- (a) gives a receipt liable to duty and not duly stamped; or
- (b) in any case where a receipt would be liable to duty, refuses to give a receipt duly stamped; or
- (c) upon payment to an amount the receipt for which is liable to duty gives a receipt for a less amount, or separates or divides the amount paid, with intent to evade the whole or any part of the duty,

he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds.

This amending clause sets out to add only one thing, that it shall be compulsory to give a receipt whether it is asked for or not, and if the person does not want it, it can either be posted to him (which would involve additional expense) or it can be filed away for two years, and this also would involve additional expense, both in the filing and in the storage space.

As I have said, there are other ways of raising this revenue if the Government wishes to examine the position without involving the whole of the business of the State in this tremendous additional expense that is entirely unproductive. I suggest to the Government that instead of people like myself having to vote against this clause it should withdraw it from the Bill voluntarily and re-think this matter, because it is clear that the Government has not given it thought from the angle I am putting. I could suggest two or three alternatives that would produce

the same sort of revenue without involving all this additional expense that will merely be added to prices and thus eventually add to the cost of living. I propose to support the second reading of the Bill, but I could not possibly support the clause requiring compulsory receipts.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—“Provisions as to duty upon receipts.”

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Without reiterating the arguments expressed by honourable members during the second reading debate earlier today, I merely remind honourable members that this clause relates to compulsory receipts. I move:

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): Without indicating my intention in respect of the motion, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES BILL.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 3240.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I must confess that I am deeply biased in relation to this Bill because I spent much of my working life under its provisions. Because of that, I am profoundly disappointed with the Bill. Much was said about the improvements that would be made to superannuation provisions available to public servants, but the provisions in the Bill are niggardly indeed. South Australian superannuation provisions have been economical, and there has been a good reason for that.

South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent in the world, and the only reason we enjoy the degree of prosperity that we do enjoy is the economy with which the country has been run for so long. Because of the need for economy, some injustices have necessarily occurred. I have always been concerned personally about the superannuation provisions for our Public Service. Grand promises were made that the injustices suffered by the Public Service would be remedied, so there must be some very disappointed people when they realize what actually has been given them. The person really in strife is the retired public servant already drawing his pension: he is given precisely nothing by this Bill. At least, a small provision is made; a very small amount of money is put to his credit, which he can draw but, if anything happens to him, his wife does not benefit.

After all those grand promises were made, if we add up the total extra provisions granted, they will cost the Government £40,000 in an annual total of about £1,500,000. The accumulated funds, to which public servants have contributed a large amount over the years, now amount to about £17,000,000. I sincerely hope that my ex trade union, the Public Service Association, is looking closely at this great generosity. Many things should be said about this Bill but at this time of night I have not the time to deal with them all. If anything happens to a Public Service pensioner, his wife gets nothing.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not exactly right: there is an increase in the percentage now.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: They do not get the credit.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They do not get the credit but they get an increase in pension. I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but it is fully explained.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I know, but the Chief Secretary must admit that it is a very "generous" provision indeed. Another thing that needs looking at closely by the Public Service Association is where these increases are going. Does the association realize that the only people benefiting from this "generosity" are those on the very lowest salary ranges? Anybody in the Public Service who has got anywhere in his career earns more than £1,700 a year. The only people to benefit under this Bill are those earning less than £1,700 a year. Actually, decreased benefits operate from that salary upwards.

We have seen much legislation coming into this Chamber aimed at levelling down things, but I did not think the present Government would ever take the opportunity of levelling down the Public Service in this way—for that is what it is doing. One thing that is really iniquitous (I say this from my experience) is the provision that the Superannuation Act makes for children. It is wrong; it always has been wrong and unjust. When a pensioner receiving superannuation payments dies, his widow gets about a two-thirds pension. The widow who has to support children gets, in addition to that, £1 a week. She is supposed to support her children on that. If the widow dies too and those children are left completely orphaned, they are supposed to carry on their existence at present on £1 a week and, henceforth, it will be increased to £2 a week.

Just think of the circumstances in which children are going to be left under this provision. I do not think this question has been very seriously looked at or even ever looked at; or perhaps the Government thinks that public servants do not have children. How it has not come up and been ventilated years before now I really do not know. A man may have been contributing for the maximum of his entitlement under the Superannuation Act, and for some reason or another he dies unexpectedly before he has made any other provision; no matter what style his children have been used to living in, all they will have for their future is £2 a week in today's scale of living. I think this is completely wrong.

I have dealt with what I consider are the bad things, and I think all three of those—four of them, really—are very bad indeed. I think there are some things that are good and, in fact, some things that might be a little over-generous. The fact that a widow can marry, and that when her husband dies and she becomes a widow again she will then retain her entitlement to the original pension provision is, I think, very generous indeed. It must be quite a comfort to the women that are likely to be in this circumstance.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are not saying we have done something right at last?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am extremely surprised and shocked to see that the Government has done it in this connection.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Without any nudging from the other side.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think this is about as fair as any provision that has ever been made in this sort of legislation or in

this sort of provisioning in any superannuation legislation. However, I think it is quite wise. I do not see that it is a necessity, but I do not think this generosity should be allowed to obscure some of the injustices involved. I must refer back to a matter that was the subject of interjection a little while ago. I refer to this very "generous" increase in pension to a widow. I said that she did not get any increase, but I was not correct there: she does get an increase of 1s. in the pound.

This is a "tremendous" increase in today's world prices and costs, and I think it shows up even more the tremendously poor provision that has been made for dependent children, not forgetting, of course, that these dependent children are entitled to relief only while they are actually dependent. There is no question of 21 years of age, or any recognition of the fact that their parents have been saving people; they just have nothing except this £1 (now to be £2) a week.

There is another matter that must be mentioned. The accumulated fund that is being administered under the Superannuation Act stands now at about £17,000,000. The annual contribution by the Government, we are told, is £1,500,000, and in addition about £500,000 is contributed by the public servants themselves, which means that about £2,000,000 is going into this fund each year. To administer funds of this nature is small beer when it comes to the overall administration of public funds in this State, in which many more times this amount goes through the

coffers every year. However, this fund is completely different in that it is essentially a provident and superannuation fund.

This fund, which does not belong to the Government but is partly contributed to by the Government, is being administered on other people's behalf by unskilled people, and this should cause concern. Administering and preserving the working of the Superannuation Fund is a specialized business, so specialized that a special skill is necessary and this is possessed by an actuary. The fact that it is necessary to have actuaries indicates the degree of specialization required. To administer a fund of this nature, skilled people should be employed.

The provision that it is no longer necessary to have an actuary on the board, whether or not he is available, is wrong. If an actuary is available (the fact that there is not one available indicates the importance and scarcity of these people) the amount of £17,000,000 in the fund warrants his employment, and this provision should be voted out. As these matters concern members of the Public Service, I would be surprised if there were not expressions of opinion coming forward quickly from that body to confirm what I have suggested tonight.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.23 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, December 2, at 2.15 p.m.