

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 13, 1966.

The Council assembled at 2.15 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

The Clerk announced that, owing to the unavoidable absence of the President, it would be necessary to appoint a Deputy President.

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

That the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill be appointed to the position of Deputy President.

I am sure that I speak on behalf of all honourable members when I say how sorry we are to learn that the President is not in the best of health today. We ask the Clerk to convey, on behalf of all members, our best wishes for a speedy recovery.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I, in seconding the motion, endorse the remarks of the Chief Secretary regarding our wish that the President will be quickly restored to health and able to resume his position.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair and read prayers.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

NORTH ROAD.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of October 4 regarding the Main North Road between Auburn and Clare?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The reply is as follows:

The Auburn-Clare section of the Main North Road has been included in the five-year advance programme for reconstruction, but this work is not due to commence until 1968-69. The alignment of this road, which was constructed about 1930, is substandard by present-day standards. However, until the reconstruction commences little can be done except to maintain it in a trafficable condition on its present alignment.

GAS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Minister of Mines say whether a natural gas pipeline can be tapped for local distribution similarly to the way in which a water pipeline can be tapped and whether, if the Gidgealpa-Adelaide

natural gas route is to be via Peterborough and Clare, the piping of gas to the industrial complex of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie will be more costly than if the pipeline were to be routed from Gidgealpa via Port Augusta to Adelaide?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I take it that the honourable member, in his question about tapping the pipeline, has in mind taking branch lines from the main line to a particular district. This is possible and feasible, and I have no doubt that it will be done. The proposed route is the direct route from the Gidgealpa and Moomba fields *via* Peterborough to Adelaide. This direct route is considerably cheaper than the suggested route *via* Port Augusta, Port Pirie and other places. On that suggested route, the distance would be greater by 50 miles, and I point out that the pipeline will cost about \$90,000 a mile to construct. Apart from this, whereas the present proposed route will involve the construction of one compressor station, the suggested route would involve the construction of two more compressor stations at a cost of \$90,000 each.

Also, we must take into consideration that, depending on the supply of and demand for natural gas, perhaps in 10 years it will be necessary for this line to be looped. If the suggested longer route were taken, extra cost would be involved when the line was looped. In addition to that, we would be bringing an 18in. pipeline into areas where there is no demand for gas and no likelihood of demand in the future. If there should be a future demand for it, it would be far more economical to put in a branch line of such a diameter as to meet the then requirements. It might be a pipeline 5in. in diameter. That would be preferable to laying an 18in. pipeline now in the initial stages and wasting money by doing something that was not justified. These things can be attended to if and when a demand arises for gas in those places mentioned by the honourable member.

However, at the moment, there is no demand for gas in that area, other than the suggestion that the power station at Port Augusta could turn over to the use of natural gas, which would mean the partial closing of the Leigh Creek coalfield. The use of natural gas would not at the moment be economical compared with the use of Leigh Creek coal; it would not be competitive. Also, the cost of converting the boilers at the Port Augusta power station for the burning of natural gas would be far greater than the cost of building

a new power station altogether. These matters have been fully investigated and discussed and their economics have been considered by the Government in deciding upon the route.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Local Government elaborate on the answer he gave me yesterday to my question about the Local Government Accounting Committee, and particularly in regard to when its findings might be available?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. Following the honourable member's question yesterday, the first thing this morning I contacted the Chairman and a member of the Local Government Accounting Committee and asked whether they could supply me with further information. This is to be taken not as a final but as an advance report from that committee. It is in these terms:

The Chairman of the Local Government Accounting Committee, Mr. E. W. Venning, A.A.S.A., of the Audit Department, advised me that since his committee, comprising also Mr. K. T. Hockridge, A.A.S.A., of my department, and Mr. W. W. Brokate, A.A.S.A., District Clerk of Mount Pleasant, commenced its inquiry in 1964 it has inspected council records in various parts of South Australia and in other States. The committee has been unable to devote anywhere near full time to the inquiry because of other duties of each member. The committee is convinced that some form of uniform accounting directions in South Australian councils is a necessity to assist council staff in recording its accounting transactions in a proper manner and to make adequate and appropriate reports to their councils and rate-payers. The committee has seen quite a number of existing systems which are quite inadequate, resulting in insufficient reporting and in senior administrative officers engaged on purely routine accounting work whereas they should be engaged on more important matters. Each State in Australia has some form of accounting directions and the committee finds that councils in these States accept this as a definite aid in administration and accounting.

Earlier this year the committee met council officers and members throughout South Australia and explained to them its proposed draft form of final accounts. Many suggestions and objections were submitted, many of which have been accepted by the committee. The metropolitan town clerks at a meeting in May expressed strong opposition to the committee's proposal to base its system of reporting of financial affairs on a cash basis instead of on an income and expenditure basis. The committee promised to reconsider this and following investigation in another State came to the conclusion that where councils integrate costing systems into their accounting records the receipts and payments method is not appropriate. Accordingly, the committee has decided to accede to the town clerks on this aspect.

The committee has also looked closely at activities of councils in connection with budgeting. It has seen many councils who do not budget, or budget but then do not use the budget. The committee is convinced that councils must budget correctly and continue to use that budget. Unless this is done councils cannot support any rate they may declare and cannot adequately manage their financial affairs. The committee therefore proposes to include in its report recommendations concerning budgeting.

Before submitting its final report, the committee will again consult with council members and staff to ascertain their opinions. The committee desires that its report be accompanied by suggested accounting directions in the form of regulations. This, however, will depend on whether Parliament accepts the clause in the Bill at present before the House to empower regulations to be made. The report will be submitted to me as Minister of Local Government and would be taken to Cabinet for consideration as to its release and further action.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question asking over what period the additional grant will be available for the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The question should have been directed to me as representing the Minister of Education in another place. I have a reply, and it is as follows:

The newspaper report announcing the increased capital grant to the University of Adelaide stated quite clearly that the sum of \$790,000 had been approved for university buildings in the University of Adelaide programme for the 1967-69 triennium. "The people concerned" mentioned by the honourable member, who presumably are the University of Adelaide authorities, have been advised of this increase in the ordinary course of administration and will be well aware of how much money there is to spend.

STATE LOTTERY.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Some concern has been expressed to me upon the introduction of a Bill for a State lottery that it may affect charitable organizations that from time to time run forms of raffles or clubs that run sweepstakes without gain to the promoters. Is it the intention of the Government to direct any specific action with regard to sweepstakes, raffles and similar matters, run without gain to the promoters, for charitable purposes (such as clubs or religious bodies) following the introduction of a State lottery, should the Bill be passed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question is one of policy, although I do not want it to be placed on notice. However, I cannot give an answer at present because I am not in possession of sufficient details but I will raise the matter in Cabinet and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill be extended to Tuesday, November 1, 1966.

Motion carried.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to remove weaknesses from the surcharging provisions of the Audit Act. Section 27 of the Act requires the Auditor-General, when satisfied that irregularities have occurred, to surcharge the deficiency and forward to the Treasurer a statement of unsatisfied surcharges to be enforced against the person responsible. The section does not state upon whom the surcharge is to be issued. Section 28 requires that, when such a statement is forwarded to the Treasurer, the Treasurer is to ascertain the person responsible and send him a notice in writing of the surcharge. How the Treasurer is to perform this duty is not specified. It is the Auditor-General who is given all the powers of investigation and only he can examine persons on oath in the exercise of his duties and powers under the Act. The Treasurer has no statutory powers of enquiry and thus the Act is defective.

The principal amendment, which is made by clause 4 (f), will enable the Auditor-General, after his investigation is complete, to require the accounting officer, or other person concerned, to show cause why he should not be surcharged; if he does not show cause to the Auditor-General's satisfaction he can then be surcharged directly by the Auditor-General with the deficiency. The amendment eliminates any doubts as to whether the Treasurer is to be surcharged in the first instance and then required to ascertain the person responsible. A consequential amendment is made by clause 4 (g), which removes present provisions dealing with unsatisfied surcharges and substitutes

a simple provision that all surcharges are to be reported to the Treasurer.

The other amendments made to section 27 are of a minor order. Paragraph (a) of clause 4 removes the last eight lines of subsection (1), as it is not possible to give a discharge to the Treasurer and the provision has not been complied with for some years. Paragraph (b) inserts into subsection (2) certain words designed to enable a surcharge to be made upon a person who has, at the time of an audit, ceased to be an accounting officer. Paragraphs (c) and (d) are drafting amendments designed to enable surcharges to be made in respect of any returns, statements, accounts and receipts and not only certain limited types of documents. Paragraph (e) inserts the words "or any regulations" in the paragraph dealing with non-compliance with statutory provisions. Paragraph (h) inserts a new subsection (5) to ensure that action for recovery of losses can be taken even though approval has been given to write them off.

Clause 5 amends section 28 of the principal Act consequentially upon the principal amendment to section 27. I have explained the reason for empowering the Auditor-General to surcharge an officer concerned directly instead of reporting to the Treasurer and leaving it to the Treasurer to ascertain the responsible person. Section 28 as amended will merely empower the Treasurer to recover the amount of the surcharge.

Clause 6 makes amendments to section 29 consequential upon the amendments to section 27. Clause 7 adds two schedules to the principal Act embodying the necessary forms in connection with surcharges. Clauses 3 and 8 are formal amendments to the principal Act relating to decimal currency.

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

BRANDING OF PIGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the principal Act in two substantive respects. Clause 3 amends the definition of "brand" in the principal Act by providing that a brand means a mark of a kind to be prescribed by regulation. The Act provides that a brand must consist of a letter, numeral, sign or character, or any combination thereof. It is intended that brands for pigs should consist of three letters, but the Government has

been advised that, as the Act now stands, there is no power to limit the form of brands in the desired manner. Accordingly, clause 3 provides that the form of pig brands will be as is prescribed.

The second amendment will enable pigs under six weeks old to be sold unbranded. It is not practicable to brand pigs of this age. Clause 5 (b) accordingly enables the sale of unbranded suckling pigs with the sow. This is a necessary practical measure. The amendments made by clauses 4 and 5 (a) are formal, being designed to achieve consistency throughout the Act where, in all but two places, the word "brand" and not "pig brand" (which is not defined) is used. Clause 6 makes the usual amendment to convert references to money to decimal currency equivalents.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2204.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I preface my remarks by saying that the financial structure of the State has been going through a long, hard and cold winter. The Consolidated Revenue Account shows a deficit of \$5,612,000 and there is a deficit in the Loan Account of \$2,465,000, making a combined deficit of \$8,077,000, which is proof of the worry that not only the Government but also the Parliament and the people of the State must have.

There are about 5,826 factories in South Australia, which employ 110,813 men and women who each year produce manufactured goods valued at about \$430,000,000. The population of this and the other States supports these industries, industries that make most of Australia's motor cars and trucks and a healthy slice of the nation's refrigerators and washing machines. They also contribute a major part of the labour force for the nation's space and missile research at Elizabeth and Woomera.

In order that industries could be brought to South Australia in the first place, the leaders of industrial companies had to be persuaded to decentralize their manufacturing plants from the Eastern States. This was not an easy exercise, because the big centres of population were around Sydney and Melbourne. In those days, it was fairly logical for secondary industry to stay near the labour force as well as near the major centres of the spending power

of the public. Industry could not see any reason to spend capital on buildings and equipment in South Australia.

I shall deal with the contributing factors to the establishment of secondary industry in South Australia as we have it today. In the past, there was a stable wage structure. This was a low cost of living State.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Did you say low cost, or low standard?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I said it was a low cost of living State. It had, and still has, a realistic and co-operative labour force. It has and has had stable Government. In addition, it was a low tax State. These were the assets the State had to offer. This was not merely window dressing: it was substantial fact that enabled industry to see the merit of coming to this State, staffing the factories and spending capital. It also allowed the migrant intake to be absorbed within the State. The Labor Government, when it came into power, honoured its promises to give service pay to its daily paid workers, agreed to increase teachers' salaries, allocated more moneys to social service needs, and indulged in other extravagances to the tune of about \$4,000,000. To offset this increase in spending it was logical that it had to increase water rates, land tax, wharfage dues, rail freights, stamp duties, and almost every avenue open to it to tax. In doing these things and honouring its promises, the Government has unfortunately helped to destroy some of those precious assets of the State that were used to generate more and more secondary industries. The principal of these assets were the relatively low wage structure, the low cost of living and low taxation.

This State cannot afford to live in isolation within Australia. It must have full employment and the ability to sell its products in other States at a price that is competitive in those States. Industry must get its fair share of profits without having to absorb additional costs in its cost structure, and employees must be allowed a fair share of the wage rise adjustment. The long hard financial winter will continue until initiative at Government level can realize what is needed. Because of the geographical situation of this State and the fact that it was once a mendicant State, it must be obvious that our work force, industrial might and agricultural population must be observed and considered separately.

It must be obvious, too, that there is a very fine balance between success and failure—success not only for the State but for the Labor Government, or failure and loss of all the

assets the Government inherited. The Government must see that the climate is right for the financial capital of Australia, which is commonly regarded as being Melbourne, to see the need and have a desire still to send capital for investment to South Australia. South Australia was once considered to be the best State in the Commonwealth for capital investment, but I understand that Western Australia is now regarded in this way. Whether this is so or not, our geographical situation is such that industry can export to the east or the west. In order to keep the wheels of industry turning, the capital flow to this State must be encouraged. If we are to survive, new industries must still come here, and they must be industries other than the motor car and domestic electrical trade industries, which can suffer violent trade reactions such as we have witnessed in relation to the motor car industry recently. Sales reactions in that industry have affected all sections of the community.

This is no reflection on the Government: it is a reflection on the problems of Australia. However, we must encourage to come here industries of a more stable nature than the industries we now have. If these industries cannot be encouraged to come, how will we absorb the annual work force caused by children leaving school at the end of each year? If new industries do not come here, the Government must realize the needs of industries already here. As much as it may loathe the profits made by individual companies, the Government must strive to create the climate necessary to encourage and give confidence to industries to expand further and, by expanding, to increase their labour intake.

So far this session the Government has introduced a mass of social legislation—for totalizer agency board betting, lotteries, dog racing and so on. Laudable as some of these social reforms may be to many people, what have they done to maintain the stability of the cost of living? How many boys and girls leaving school at the end of this year at a Leaving or Matriculation age will gain employment from this type of legislation?

In the 1930's many people left South Australia and went to other States because there was not sufficient work for them here. Do we want to turn back the clock? Do we want to subscribe to the suggestion made recently by a spokesman for the building trade that the migrant intake should be stopped to provide stability within the industry? It is easy to blame the Commonwealth Government for all our current problems but, although some of

these problems surely lie at the door of Canberra, do not let us be like the ostrich and bury our heads in the sand, as many of the problems lie right here at the door of this Government. Confidence is engendered by a feeling of understanding with industry and with the work force, and by the Government with its legislation. Social legislation does not fill the stomach or ensure work for tomorrow. As a humble member of the Opposition, it is not easy for me to give the recipe for future success. However, I think success can be achieved if we consider realistically the needs of industry, the work force, primary industry and the individual, remembering always that one section cannot work without the other. Success can still be the boast of this Government if there is a stability of taxation and a steadying down of social legislation.

I shall now deal with hospitals. Recently, I read a report in which it was claimed that the average Australian born in a hospital returned to it 50 times—eight times for treatment and 42 times as an outpatient. The average patient expects and demands the best possible treatment both for himself and for his next of kin. In July of this year Stewart Cockburn had published in the *Advertiser* an article headed "A Call for Higher Nursing Skills". In this article, among other things, he criticized the Legislative Council for not allowing the regulation requesting that the Leaving Certificate be the minimum recruiting standard for nurses in this State. In his article he said:

Too much legislation in South Australia seems to have been by the farmer for the farmer.

I agree that there is a great need for higher nursing skills, but let us look at some of the problems our trainee nurses are facing in Adelaide at the moment. I refer to some of the maintenance problems at Austral House, an annexe to the Royal Adelaide Hospital where trainee nurses live when in residence. The first floor shower drips onto the morning tea room downstairs. There is no hot water in any hand basins, yet the instruction book on the etiquette of nursing states that personal cleanliness is essential and that a nurse should wash her hair twice a week. To do this the girls have to use buckets previously used for scrubbing the floors in order to get hot water to the hand basins for them to wash their hair.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Where is this?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Austral House. There are five toilets in the building, each one

in a bathroom. Having toilets in the bathrooms creates problems when a girl comes off duty and wants to take a bath or a shower while another girl going on duty may want to use the toilet. The problems are there and they create embarrassment and difficulty. There is only one telephone for 80 nurses to use to make outgoing calls. I realize that these are little pin-pricks in the realms of Government but, if we are to strive for higher nursing skills and we want the best nurses, we should be prepared to provide the best of equipment and living standards for them.

Mueli has been said about the problem of the computer for the Legislative Council roll. The Hon. Mr. Hill when speaking drew an interjection from the Chief Secretary, who said that if Labor gained control this Council would be abolished.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We want to cut down expenses.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is just the point I was trying to make—thank you, Mr. Banfield! To cut down expenses is just what we want to do. If we eliminate this money for the computer, we shall go some little way towards solving this problem.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: One House in Queensland costs more than two Houses here.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But there is a Liberal Government in Queensland, isn't there?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: When referring to the Local Government Bill, the Minister made the point that the thinking advanced by honourable members at that stage was constructive; it was the way that Bills should be looked at. I think that is an honest statement by the Minister. It is what this Council has always tried to do. It is a good thing that there should be this freedom of thinking, that one House of Parliament should have time to study and examine legislation dealt with by the other House of Parliament. We all appreciate the role of the Legislative Council. There are many people who are not on the roll of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is to be corrected.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: This is an interesting exercise. We have now had an interjection to the effect that we should save money and then the same honourable member interjects, "We will have this fixed."

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Don't you think the interjection implies some form of compulsion?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In spite of the interjection by the Chief Secretary (I quote his words—"I understand the enrolment forms will be done by post, not by personal canvass"), as honourable as the Honourable the Chief Secretary is and as much as he would abide by his words, it is not the authority of Government, and the fact that the second reading speech does not mention the \$84,000 to be spent on this line leaves an element of doubt whether the Minister may not be overruled by other authorities within his Party.

The programmes outlined for the various Aboriginal reserves in the State are extremely good. I have looked at many of these reserves within the Northern District and I confess I have the greatest admiration not only for this Government but also for the administration that is looking after these reserves, regardless of who is initiating it. However, one thing that worries me and the Aborigines in these reserves is the problem of wages. Unfortunately, the Aborigines do not get paid the basic wage for work they do on the reserves. The reason I know not and have not been able to discover. To be fair to the problem of Aborigines within the State, I think it is time we looked at this small but pertinent point. As we all know, money in the pocket is one of the basic needs of man today: if he has a few dollars in his pocket, he has the chance of a square meal when he needs it. If the Aborigines in the reserves are to be paid a little less than their counterparts get outside, it is leading to a problem within themselves that it may be difficult for us to solve in years to come. This is a social problem that needs to be looked at realistically. I trust that, as time goes on, the progressive thinking going on in the reserves will enable the wage structure to be looked at analytically and a fair wage to be paid to these men and women who work on the reserves for the benefit of the reserves and, virtually, of the Government. We do not want to label the Government an employer of cheap labour—that is not the intention at all.

We find the Libraries Department in a rather sorry plight. It operates under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act. We see that for the purchase of books last year (1965-66) \$70,010 was voted; this year only \$69,211 is proposed, a decrease of \$799. In spite of our technological advances in television, radio, high-speed trains, high-speed communications, aeroplanes and everything else, the chances of getting a decent book to read at a country library in this State are slender. When I say "decent"—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What do you mean by "decent"?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I was just going to deal with that. I should like to see in the preamble of the Libraries (Subsidies) Act a definition of a "decent" book—something that is not blood and guts, something that is not purple passion.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I thought you were implying that they were nearly all indecent books.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Some of them are. Most of them are not of a high standard. This is because of the way in which the libraries work. They get a subsidy from the Government (in this case \$69,211) which goes to cover, to a point, the purchase of books. Then the various libraries within the State, and particularly in the country, have to subsidize this amount again in order to get a box of books, containing some 30 to 40 volumes, which is sent out on a quarterly basis. Because of the high cost of publishing and purchasing books the better quality books are denied to institutes. Therefore they buy a cheaper brand of book, and when that is done the inside product is also cheaper. I spoke on this problem in the Appropriation Bill debate last year and an interjector said that the previous Government had not done anything about the matter, and why should this Government have to do it? I cannot answer that question. However, this year the Government has decreased the grant by \$799.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At least it will stop some of those indecent books going to institutes!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I agree that it stops books going out and this leaves people with little of good quality to read. It is the little things of this world that mean so much and do so much for a community; to read a decent book improves the mind and widens horizons. Without books people will lose an important part of their existence and as long as the library subsidy is treated as being of minor importance, perhaps as something not quite necessary, with an attitude of "We will give them a few dollars here and there", the standard will deteriorate even further and will not be for the betterment of the Government or the people.

Another matter that disappoints me concerns agricultural and horticultural shows held in country areas in September and October. Such shows are conducted almost every Saturday during that period in some part of the Northern District. Their role is to enable local inhabi-

tants to exhibit the results of their breeding, agricultural finesse and so on to their neighbours. It enables the manufacturers of agricultural machinery to maintain employment by exhibiting their goods; it enables everybody to have a day out; it enables those with a desire to learn to take advantage of an opportunity to learn. A cut of 5 per cent has been made in the grant by the Government covering prize money for the various country show societies.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It could be said that the Minister of Agriculture is a butcher.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The problem of the Government is to balance its Budget and maintain employment as well as encourage all activities in the State. I admit that, but I consider that pruning prize money to shows by 5 per cent, even though it is a relatively small cut, will have a distinct effect on those shows and will create another burden for the societies on top of other costs that they have to meet.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Most of them have not received their subsidies.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I have been most impressed with some of the magnificent Dodge Phoenix motor vehicles used by the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It was a legacy: we inherited those!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We got them second-hand.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Not too many of them; six of them, I think.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I thank the Hon. Mr. Kneebone for saying it was a legacy, an inheritance, with or without succession duties. Might I suggest that when it is necessary to replace those magnificent big cars consideration be given to purchasing Valiants or Holdens, which are nearly as big in seating capacity as some of these great Black Marias.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is the honourable member insinuating that this Government is going to be here for a long time?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is a well-known fact.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I do not insinuate anything; I have been told it was a legacy and my suggestion is that the Government replace these large vehicles with a smaller and more economical product.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I ask the honourable member why he did not broach this subject before.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The previous Government could afford those vehicles, couldn't it!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: While they kept others poor!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is not true to say that the previous Government bought them all. I think there must have been new ones purchased when this Government came into power. However, that is a small point. I turn now to the matter of a water supply for the West Coast, particularly in the region surrounding a township called Kimba.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: When was that project approved by the Public Works Standing Committee?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is not for me to answer interjections concerning the Public Works Standing Committee, because I do not know.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was long before Giles Point!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The point is, it was promised by the previous Government and agreed to by this Government and still they have not a decent water supply.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Nobody denies that part.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: All members are aware of the geography of the State, and the old saying of its being the driest State of the driest continent on earth. An agricultural revolution is taking place on the upper part of Eyre Peninsula; in fact, on many areas on Eyre Peninsula, but particularly in the area adjacent to and including Kimba.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Hence the Crown Lands Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Exactly; that interjection is well-founded. It is obvious to the Department of Lands that there is expansion taking place in country that was previously scrub and had relatively no productivity at all. Such country is poorly watered, with agricultural and township supplies dependent entirely on water from catchment. If there is no stability of water supply, productivity is stifled as well as the growth of township areas. These areas are getting most things: they have electricity and well sealed roads, while even the townships have kerbing-to-kerbing sealed streets as good as can be seen anywhere. However, they do not have a permanent water supply, and nothing is more frustrating than having all advantages but not a drop to drink. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I want to say at this stage that the Opposition had me frightened yesterday because I thought perhaps I might not be given permission to speak.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member does not have to get permission to speak.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I spent last night examining Standing Orders to see whether any reason existed why a President or a Deputy President might stop me from speaking but I discovered that as long as I kept my remarks in order I was entitled to speak. Unlike the members of the Opposition, who apparently are instructed to speak, the only person I need to consult about speaking is myself, and once I get that permission I am in business. I am able to speak without being instructed. As usual, Opposition members have been putting the cart before the horse.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Are we in the horse and buggy days?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We have difficulty getting out of them because of the regime of the previous Government. However, Roseworthy Agricultural College shows an improvement from the horse and buggy stage it was in when we took office. Last year this Council denied the Government much revenue by rejecting certain Bills and making amendments to others. Because of that, our deficit is larger than it otherwise would have been. The Opposition members, having done their utmost to ensure that our deficit was as high as they could possibly get it, now offer us concern, regret and sympathy because it has been necessary for us to budget for a deficit.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: I don't say there is much sympathy attached.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Hill mentioned sympathy, and I know he was sincere when he said it. Other honourable members have offered concern while others have offered their regret. I suggest that, if they had felt concern and sympathy for the welfare of the State last year by allowing the Government to raise the finance required, they would not have been offering concern and regret this year.

Every Opposition member who has spoken has been concerned about our spending \$70,000 in order to bring the Legislative Council roll into some semblance of what it should be. I do not know whether they are concerned about the \$70,000 or about what the computer will tell us. I understand the Opposition's concern about the computer because of its action in sending to a computer the result of a poll taken in August about what the Liberal and Country League might adopt as policy. I understand that the answer was, "You have missed your

opportunity; Labor is so far in front. Give it away." In view of that, it is no wonder that Opposition members are perturbed about what the computer might do to the Legislative Council roll.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That proves how crook these computers can be.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Opposition is still not anxious to give to people who are not enrolled the same consideration that has been given to those on the roll for many years. If a person purchases a block of land, the electoral office advises that person by letter that he is qualified for Legislative Council enrolment. However, I do not know why that advice is not sent out in other instances.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Are you sure it is not?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am positive it is not. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris went to much trouble to show that this system had operated since 1925. He could not go back beyond that time and did not tell us why he had to start there. My research does not show when the system commenced, but, even if it commenced only in 1925, the previous Government had plenty of time in 40 years in office to correct anything that was wrong. We intend giving everybody the same opportunity to be on the roll. We do not favour one side more than the other: everyone is entitled to a fair deal.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is the point we are not sure about.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course honourable members are not sure, because they do not know what a step towards democracy is. They have never taken it. However, we are taking that step.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is a wonder you have not put it into practice in your own organization if you are so democratic.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I point out that the State is our concern. It belongs to everybody and we are attempting to put our policy into operation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about getting it into the Labor Party organization?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We say the expenditure of \$70,000 is a step towards achieving democracy in this State. Whatever the cost of democracy, it is cheaper than dictatorship at half the price. I am suggesting that, because we had a dictatorship for so many years, the Opposition does not know anything about democracy. While there is a restricted franchise for the Legislative Council, Opposition

members want to restrict it further. Last year the Opposition had the opportunity to avoid the expenditure of that \$70,000, but the Bill that we brought in did not reach the Committee stage. We provided for one roll for the two Houses and, if that Bill had been agreed to, an expenditure of \$70,000 would not be required now. However, the Opposition now complains about expenditure that it could have saved.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It wasn't in the interests of democracy to do it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It depends on the interpretation of democracy. There is a discrepancy between the views on the two sides of the Council. The people know that we on this side are closer to democracy than members opposite are. The Labor Party is equally as democratic as the Liberal and Country League. Not only has there been much talk about Labor Party pre-selection: an elderly Senator who dared to speak in opposition to the Government in regard to Vietnam no longer wishes to stand for pre-selection.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He hasn't been kicked out, like Captain Benson was.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, because honourable members opposite say, "He is not a bad old fellow, anyway. He has been loyal to the Party up to now." They say to him, "Don't re-nominate when nominations are invited."

The Hon. C. R. Story: Wasn't Captain Benson always loyal to his Party?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The fact is that these things happen in both political Parties. However, when they happen in the Party of members opposite, they are hushed up, and the newspapers support the Liberal Party in keeping them hushed up. There is a small paragraph in today's newspaper, back on about page 10, about a rift between the Liberal Party and the C.P. in Victoria.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: By "C.P." you don't mean the Communist Party, do you?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not know. They go hand in hand. If we have had a slight rift in Victoria at any stage, at least it has not been hidden at the back of the paper: it has been shown so that everyone can see it. We are not ashamed to air it and let people know, because we have nothing to hide. However, much is hidden in the back pages of the local press.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that the proposed scheme to bring the Legislative Council roll to what it should be would not be in keeping with the present spirit of voting and enrolment.

He claimed that enrolment and voting should not be compulsory, but he did not go on, of course, to say that voluntary enrolment and voting should be open to all adults. He wants voluntary voting, but apparently he wants it restricted, whether it is voluntary or compulsory.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I cannot follow that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member said that the spirit of this Chamber should be voluntary voting and enrolment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The spirit of the Constitution.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He did not say "Constitution"; he said that the spirit of election to this Council was voluntary enrolment and voluntary voting. He did not say, "If we can get voluntary enrolment and voting we are prepared to open it to all and sundry" so I presume he still wants the qualifications to apply, irrespective of whether people are prepared to volunteer. It would not enter his mind that perhaps it should be extended to people without qualifications. He wants it to be that way, and to be on a limited franchise.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not follow you.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member does not want to follow. Why?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I just cannot follow your argument.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member said there should be voluntary enrolment. Does he deny that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I said "the spirit of the Act".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Unfortunately, it is not recorded.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member spoke about voluntary enrolment and voluntary voting. Does he agree that he said that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I said that the spirit of the Act was for voluntary enrolment and voting.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Does the honourable member agree that the spirit should be for voluntary voting?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Why should it not be voluntary for all concerned?

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Because we want responsible people.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Tell the people in Northern District that the rest of

them who are not on the roll are not responsible, and you will see how responsible they are! That is a responsible statement—to say that others are not responsible persons!

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: I said, "We want responsible people." You say you want irresponsible ones.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what you say—that those not on the roll are not responsible.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: No, that is what you say. I said, "We want responsible people."

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Kemp says they should not be on the roll because they are not responsible people.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: I have repeated the words I have said, and no other words, Mr. Deputy President, three times. My words were, "We want responsible people."

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And you are implying that the others are irresponsible.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You are saying that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what you are saying, in effect.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: We want responsible people.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I still say that every member who has spoken against the expenditure in relation to the Electoral Department had an opportunity last year to save that expense by giving all people the opportunity to vote. Much has already been said about unemployment in this State, and I, like every other member of this Council, do not like to see any unemployment, whether the numbers be large or small. I consider that the Government is to be congratulated because in its endeavours to keep as many people employed as possible it has not stopped any projects that were started, with the result that there was a deficit at the end of the financial year. Surely that position is more desirable than having a great number of unemployed, but has the Government been shown any appreciation for that? Of course, all the blame for unemployment cannot be placed at the door of this Government. It is no secret that the Commonwealth Government is partly to blame for the chaotic conditions in the motor industry today. As many people in this State depend on the motor industry to obtain a living, the Commonwealth Government must accept its share of the blame for the present conditions.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The State Government must accept some blame, surely!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The blame for the chaotic conditions in the motor industry cannot be placed at the door of this Government. It is significant that the motor car firms did not blame this Government. They blamed the Commonwealth Government to such an extent that they threatened to withdraw their financial support of the present Commonwealth Government Party at the next elections unless it bowed to their wishes. They were not laying the blame at the door of the State Government; they saw fit to go to the Commonwealth Government, which is where the blame is to be laid. It is fortunate that they made that threat, because it appears that the Commonwealth Government has been smartly brought into line and is going to do what the firms are asking.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It did not want to lose their financial support.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it did not.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: What about the Australian Workers Union?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At least the A.W.U. did not say that it would support the Opposition, whereas the car firms made a threat and the Government jumped to it. It is significant that when the first report of that matter came out in the newspaper it was placed on the front page—"Car firms threaten the Government". By the time the "red spot" edition came out, it was back in the paper on about page 9 or page 10. By that time the *News* was in a hot spot! This news item did not even reach the *Advertiser*, because by the time the next publication came out the Government had jumped to the wishes of the motor firms, which blamed the Commonwealth Government for the chaotic conditions in their industry.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Of course, the claim was so ridiculous that it lost its news value.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It had no more news value because it had been fixed up. This is similar to what happened in another direction in relation to the Liberal and Country League Federal Council, which is now saying that the States will get extra finance. Previously it said that we were the ones to blame and that this State was the only State without money, but the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria were the two people responsible for a censure motion on the Commonwealth Government for not supplying the States with sufficient money. There is a small footnote: "The masters have spoken and the Government will jump." We expect next year to get added

finance as a result of this firm action taken by this outside body—the Liberal and Country League Federal Council.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: When this Opposition complains, will this Government jump, too?

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about the building industry?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Members opposite cannot upset me. Coachbuilders have gone out of existence, but that is not the fault of the Government: a different type of material is used. Progress has affected the building industry, and not so many bricks are being laid. The fact that bricklayers are out of work does not mean that any fewer houses are being built, however. It means there are different types of material being used and that people other than bricklayers are building those houses. As a result of the motor car industry pulling the Government into line, we feel that in the near future the industry will start to brighten up. Much has been said about the deficits in this State, but of course deficits and possible deficits are not new in this State or in any of the other States, or indeed in the Commonwealth itself.

According to the Auditor-General's report for 1964-65, there were 11 deficits in the last 19 years. There were deficits of \$120,918 in 1946-47; \$625,060 in 1947-48; \$368,846 in 1948-49; \$379,334 in 1949-50. For the year ended June 30, 1955, the deficit was \$4,467,856; for the year ended June 30, 1956, it was \$2,859,710; in 1956-57 there was only a small deficit of \$97,232; for 1957-58 the deficit was \$798,814; for 1958-59 the deficit was \$2,053,432; and for the year ended June 30, 1960, the deficit was \$622,208. So it can be seen that deficits are not the sole prerogative of this Government.

The Hon. C. R. Story: But we were not financing the State's activities out of Loan funds.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You were not financing them at all; you were running into debt. You were financing with other people's money, or you would not have been in debt; you would not have shown a deficit.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Have you ever had an overdraft?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My credit is not quite so good as that of the honourable member opposite. If these were only overdrafts in those years, then why decry a deficit on last year's operations? Let us look at the question I raised about the possible deficit. We find that in April, 1960, it was necessary for an honourable member in this Council, by

the name of Mr. Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles, in moving the Address-in-Reply to say that he feared there would be a possible deficit of £2,000,000, and at that stage he congratulated the Government on the fact that it would be only £2,000,000; but, of course, as in many other cases, he was a long way off beam, because the Government finished up by balancing its Budget.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Does the honourable member think that there will be a surplus after this Government has been in office for three years?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This Government will not be finished after three years.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: But will there be a surplus in two years' time?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The present Opposition never at any stage budgeted for these deficits previously. It could not even tell nine or 12 months ahead, when bringing down the Budget, what the financial position would be like at the end of June, so how can I tell honourable members now what the position will be at the end of three years? An honourable member suggested that it was not quite the right thing for State Governments to go running to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You can always make up the deficit by additional taxation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You insinuate that there is something crooked in it, that we do not believe in accuracy in financial matters.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We at least are budgeting for a deficit. In years past the Party opposite did not budget for a deficit, but it certainly finished up with one. It has been suggested that it is not quite the right thing for the State Governments to go running to the Commonwealth when finding themselves in difficulties. The previous Government was not too proud to accept a special grant from the Commonwealth Government to the extent of \$6,286,718 to offset most of the deficits, as just mentioned. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Hart, when I asked him about the position in other States, said that of course New South Wales was in the mire because it had had a Labor Government for many years. We know that during these years of deficit, South Australia was a claimant State and the only way it was able to get special grants from the Commonwealth Government was on the budgeting of other States. If they finished up with a balanced Budget, the Commonwealth Government made special grants to ensure that this State had a balanced Budget. New South

Wales under a Labor Government was one of the States that assisted this State to receive special grants. That cannot be denied.

Members have referred to certain projects that have been reported upon and recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee but that have not been proceeded with. In particular, they are very worried about the fact that the oft-mentioned deep sea port which the previous Government finally decided it would put at Giles Point has been deferred for the time being by this Government. Many honourable members have referred to that in this Council. Why should that one project be their only worry when the following projects that were favourably reported upon by the Public Works Committee, and in good time for the previous Government to carry out, were not proceeded with? I shall refer to some of them. What about the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, which was recommended in 1962, when the previous Government was in office?

The Hon. C. R. Story: It was well on the way.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is well on the way all right, possibly in the same way as the Victor Harbour sewerage scheme, which was recommended in 1957 but was never proceeded with. It was favourably recommended, as was the Giles Point project. What about the Port Pirie sewerage scheme, recommended also in 1957? What about the Port Augusta sewerage scheme, which was recommended in 1957? Not one of those projects was proceeded with under the previous Government; yet, because this Government has deferred one of the projects previously recommended, it has done a very bad thing in the eyes of some people. The Mallala Area School was reported upon in June, 1960; the Automotive Trades School in Frome Road was reported on in July, 1959, but not a thing was done about it. The Millicent Primary School was reported on in June, 1959, but not a thing was done about that. The Port Augusta gaol was favourably reported on in July, 1961, but not a thing was done about it by the previous Government; and so I could go on and on, mentioning projects favourably reported on by the Public Works Committee during the previous Government's term.

It appears that the backbenchers in the previous Government were deluded into believing that all the new industries and projects announced by the previous Government were realities: for instance, the electrification of railways was to be a big project undertaken by the previous Government. The paper mill

in the South-East had reached the stage where the Premier of the day went to America to finalize the negotiations. We have not heard the report of his trip to America in that regard and, what is more, we have not the paper mill in the South-East promised by the previous Government.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You have missed out the deep sea port.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have not. I have said that that had been deferred along with some of these other projects. The deep sea port nearly finished up in the Hon. Mrs. Cooper's area in Burnside, and that was where it was rumoured earlier it was to be placed. Eventually, however, they settled for a swimming pool and a very good one it is, too. Anything to get votes in a district resulted in promises being given by the previous Government. Take Kadina, for instance; in 1957 it was announced that an abattoir would be established near that town.

Then, of course, came the really big project, the atomic power station at Lake Leake. What has happened to that? What has happened to other promises made by the previous Government which it had plenty of time to carry out before the public woke up to it? Not only did the people of this State wake up to the broken promises of the previous Government and give it its just deserts, but the backbenchers, as soon as they were given their opportunity when the time came to elect a new Leader, went right outside the people who they had previously claimed had given such good service and elected a man of unknown quantity and quality to lead them. They were not prepared to trust one previous Cabinet Minister to lead them. So much for the pay-out as it affected not only the people of the State but also the people within their own Party, who rejected them out of hand.

With regard to natural gas, many members have attempted to jump on the band waggon and say that that project was under consideration by the previous Government. In fact, how anxious were they to get a gas pipeline in this State? When it was recommended that members of the previous Government go overseas to investigate the possibility of natural gas they were not interested enough to do so. Other items have not been quite so palatable, and the Opposition did not want to be associated with them, as apparently they were not in progress during the term of the previous Government. The present Govern-

ment can take full credit for its efforts to expedite the development and use of natural gas in this State and that is one matter where the Opposition cannot logically jump on the band waggon. The Opposition went further and attempted to draw a red herring across the trail when the Premier was in Canberra attempting to negotiate a loan for the establishment of the gas pipeline. The Opposition attempted to obtain a vote of no confidence in the Government: quite a morale booster for anybody trying to improve conditions in this State!

The Government is to be congratulated also on its stand in making sure that it will retain control of the distribution of the gas. It has been suggested that if the Government did not obtain a favourable reply from the Commonwealth Government, and if money was available from sources other than that Government, it should attempt to obtain it from those sources. However, it would not be available at the same rate as that provided by the Commonwealth and even if money was available at perhaps only 1 per cent higher than that available from the Commonwealth it would cost at least \$300,000 extra in interest alone. In spite of the many words spoken by Opposition members they have not, with one exception (and again I refer to the matter of the electoral roll), indicated what item of expenditure they would be prepared to cut. Nor has the Opposition indicated how, if it were in Government, it would raise additional revenue; therefore, it can be safely assumed that the Government has again brought forward a Budget acceptable to the people of this State. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the Bill, at least in part. Some matters in the Budget I think are necessary while others I consider to be unnecessary. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches made by various honourable members, and I cannot agree with the Hon. Mr. Banfield when he says that those speeches have not been constructive. I think that they have been, in many cases at least. After all, the role of Her Majesty's Opposition is to examine, criticize and endeavour to improve on the Government's proposals if it considers that such proposals warrant it. If it is not prepared to do that, then the Opposition is not worthy of its name. It seems strange to me that honourable members supporting the Government should be worried by what Opposition members have said, for they have a wonderful harvest in the document before the Council, of which they have

taken advantage. The members of the Government seem a little thin skinned.

The Public Works Committee is this evening leaving for the Upper Murray to investigate the desirability of a bridge over the Murray River in the vicinity of Kingston. I have no doubt that in due course the committee will report on this project and that (having had the assurance of the Hon. Mr. Banfield that all Government promises are carried out) in no time there will be a bridge over the Murray at Kingston.

I was intrigued by the references the Hon. Mr. Banfield made to projects that were not carried out by the previous Government. He referred particularly to the matter of sewerage. I think he mentioned Victor Harbour, Port Pirie and Port Augusta. Sewerage is a tricky item, as any member who has represented a district for any length of time will know. Under the Sewerage Act certain priorities are fixed by the department and a reference is sent to the Public Works Committee. One problem is in suddenly finding, in an expanding State like South Australia, many new houses that are built near a water shed. As a result that area becomes a fouled area as far as water catchment is concerned. Therefore, established priorities for sewerage have to be frequently altered. My home town was reported upon in 1936, and it is still awaiting sewerage. It is impossible to install it at the rate of development of this State and therefore I would cancel out anything that the honourable member said on that subject.

Although many other points were raised, I will not deal with them at this stage. However, I take issue on the same point as has been taken by other honourable members and that is the expenditure of \$70,000 for enrolling qualified electors on the Legislative Council roll. I am not an expert on computers, nor are many other people in this State, but I have had some experience with electronic data processing machines and I realize it is a complicated and difficult subject. We have several computers in this State, and it would be interesting for this Council and the general public to know much more about this project and how it will be programmed. No information has been given and nobody except this Government would have the hide to include an item of \$70,000 on the Estimates without giving an explanation. I do not think anyone else would have the cheek to do that without introducing a Bill in order to enable honourable members to do some research.

The franchise for the Legislative Council is based on a voluntary vote and voluntary enrolment. Any departure from that is a departure from the Act and from the Constitution. After all, the Constitution is much older than the Labor Party. Therefore, we are breaking new ground without being given information about who will programme this exercise or about the material to be fed into the computer.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Enrolment will still be voluntary.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It will be voluntary perhaps. I have grave doubts about how voluntary it will be. Technically, I believe the Minister is telling the truth.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I am telling the truth more than technically.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know that I can go all the way with my honourable friend and I do not know that I am going to go all the way about the truth, because it sometimes gets people put out of Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I want to know what the technical truth is.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister believes that he is telling the truth but, when he says that the vote will be voluntary, I presume that a person will have to send back a card.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He won't have to. It will be voluntary.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have not heard sufficient about this and I hope the Chief Secretary will give us more information, because the Government will have realized by now that this is a live issue. If this Government were really flush with money, it could afford to have a few trimmings. The use of computers can be of much benefit to various forms of development and we would be getting some return for our money if the \$70,000 were to be used to increase the productivity of agricultural industry.

In New South Wales at present, a computer is being used in certain analyses to enable farmers who feed in statistics to be able to tell how much fertilizer and what type of fertilizer they should apply at a given time in order to bring forth the best productivity from their lands. This has increased productivity considerably in portions of the wheat belt in that State and reports have been written on the matter by Dr. Calwell (who is no relation to another person named Calwell). We should look at this item carefully. I am so unhappy about it that I have spent much time deciding how to vote on the Bill. This item is a complete abrogation of all the things I believe

in regarding the Legislative Council and its franchise.

The Hon. Mr. Hill has mentioned an increase in Ministers' salaries and, although I have taken out figures from last year's document and have worked hard on other figures that seem to tally, I cannot find the reason for this monstrous increase of 197 per cent. I want to know the reason for it, because the salaries of members have increased by only 7 per cent.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You have taken into consideration that there is an additional Minister, have you?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, I included that in my figures.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: And there is still an increase of 197 per cent?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have a full report on that. I gave a guarantee that I would give that, and I have obtained it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The report will have to be very full to satisfy me.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is a simple explanation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Municipal Tramways Trust has been mentioned and, in the past, that organization has been heavily subsidized by the Government. In some years it has been subsidized by as much as \$300,000. Those subsidies were given in order to assist in the changeover to buses. I am concerned about unemployment, because it affects mainly places in my district, such as Elizabeth, Salisbury and Salisbury North. The industries in Elizabeth are specialist industries, including General Motors-Holden's, and some of the ancillaries to that company, electrical works, and so on.

Many people living in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area are gainfully employed in those industries. However, members of their families are not all suited for such employment and Adelaide is their place of employment. I am not blaming this Government but am pointing out the inadequacy of transport into Elizabeth as a contributing factor to the unemployment of those people. I have led deputations to Ministers on this matter. The people who live on the eastern side of the road have a very long way to go to the railway. They must take a bus there and, as the railway operates only to a fixed pattern, if their places of employment are not along the railway line they must have transport at the other end. This is not only costly but also time-consuming.

I consider that the activities of the Municipal Tramways Trust ought to be extended along the Main North Road to the Elizabeth and Salis-

bury area to give the people there an alternative means of transport. I know this is a fairly tall order but, if these people are to be brought to their employment, I believe it must be done. Whether we are to use M.T.T. "blunderbuses" (which I think are far too heavy for our metropolitan roads) or whether there should be some lighter form of bus transport is a matter for experts to decide. However, in the interests of the people of Elizabeth and of the State, people must be taken to their employment at reasonable cost even if it means that for a period the Government will have to subsidize the M.T.T. or a private operator.

I think the establishment of Elizabeth has been of very great benefit, as it has decentralized a great number of people from the city area and has put them in a rural atmosphere. It is desirable that this be so rather than that people should be cluttered up among the smoke. If all types of industry cannot be located at this point, facilities must be made available for people to commute, and we may have to subsidize their transport. I suggest that the Government consider this, because for some time lack of transport has been a thorn in the side of people at Elizabeth, whom it has made very unhappy. Many wives there want to work, and some need to do so if they are new to the country, because it is difficult for them to establish homes on the husband's income alone.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Can you tell me what the fare is likely to be?

The Hon. R. C. STORY: I shall certainly get it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It would be a fair amount.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It would be. I shall get the figure for the Chief Secretary. We have not heard much lately about decentralization in general. I have always said that we can decentralize only to places where there are materials, services and facilities. It is completely uneconomic to do otherwise. However, we have not had any great moves towards decentralization in the last 18 months, and I thought from what I heard from the Government Party when it was in Opposition that we would have seen some progress towards decentralization, because I thought that Party had the answers. I do not profess to know much about this. I served for a period as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee and I know these problems are difficult, but we have not heard of any real plan, which we were promised we

would hear if there was a change of Government. I am wondering whether we are going to get anything on this matter. This is a complex problem. I have studied the position in Victoria closely. In that State a committee seems to roam the country constantly trying to do something about decentralization.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Unfortunately, some of the industries have not proved successful in Victoria.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: What the Chief Secretary is saying is what I was preaching all the time my Party was in office, but I was then on the defensive.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I was just commenting that some had not been successful.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I can recite chapter and verse those that have failed. Some of them were industries that looked as though they should have been "goers", as they were in towns with populations of between 35,000 and 40,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am thinking of an industry at Bendigo.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That town could not sustain a stocking factory, although one would have thought there were enough legs there to sustain it. The Hon. Mr. Bánfield was interested in the trade of shoemaking: a boot factory was established at Mildura, which has a big population, but it failed because not all the people there wanted shoes from that factory. I look forward with interest to what the Government's public relations officers will do to get industry here, because we are paying these people and the Premier's Department has been expanded to deal with the matter. The department was extended almost from the word "go" and the Secretary to the Premier was upgraded to the position of head of the Premier's Department. We want to see results. Money is being paid for the services of public relations officers, who are there to attract industry and not to write speeches and prepare articles for the newspapers.

Subsidies for hospitals are important. I know the Chief Secretary has had some difficulties in relation to the subsidies on a \$2 for \$1 basis and that he has given some assurances to various hospitals that the money will be paid soon.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: As soon as this Bill is through Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. However, the subsidies should have been paid out of the last Budget.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, this is the normal procedure.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: But it is not normal to have to wait.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is, every year.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Normally, a subsidy is asked for and granted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Since 1951 subsidies have not been paid until the Appropriation Bill has been passed. I have been on the board of a hospital all that time and I know that this procedure applies every year.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Normally we had our money every 12 months.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: What is happening now, I think, is that after this appropriation we shall get the money that we should have got after the last appropriation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; don't give me that! In a few cases it might have been.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I only want a few cases.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That practice has gone on for the last 15 to 20 years, too; that is normal procedure.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have never had to wait, over that period.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Oh, don't be foolish!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have been paid.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will reply to that in full; I have nothing to hide. The procedure is the same as was followed with the previous Government, with the same officers and in the same way.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Chief Secretary seems to be defending himself fairly vigorously.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Well, don't come at my department when I know what I'm doing, because this is the same procedure.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The cutting back of some of the subsidies occurred, I understood, because funds were not available at that time to pay them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This was the usual practice when your Party was in office—"You cannot have it this year but, if you like to make the payment yourself, you can have it next year." It has been going on for 20 years.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is very interesting.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your hospital has been lucky.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; it seems so. I do not know why I have not heard honourable members complaining in this Chamber before.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Because it is accepted practice; it is the accepted thing.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is not accepted by the hospitals involved.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You name them! I have not had a complaint from any hospital.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We did not have any complaints from the racing clubs, either, about T.A.B.; we did not have any complaints about one or two other things. I do not know whether it is that the Chief Secretary has such a winning way with him or whether the people have gone soft and do not complain.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not know what you are barking about; you have got very fair and generous treatment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Is that so?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am wondering whether we got very fair treatment or not. Out of what was available perhaps we got our share. If that is fair treatment, I am happy to accept that, but my feeling is that we have had to wait longer than usual.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Hon. Mr. Potter asked me today about somebody waiting. The only reason why people are waiting is the time that this Bill is taking to go through Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There is nothing extraordinary in what is happening in this debate. It is our business to look at these things. This appropriation is going through at about the same time as it normally does. We usually have about nine or 10 sitting days on this measure. By now we have reached about the seventh sitting day and, if the Chief Secretary does not get us all stirred up—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't tell me I am doing something different; it will be early next week.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I hope so. I merely mentioned the fact that subsidies did not come along as quickly as they usually do.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have come along as usual and, let me add, more gently and more kindly. I have visited about 30 hospitals. If I am thinking of the hospital you have in mind, I can say that you have had very fair treatment. I am doubtful whether that hospital should have got anything. Don't push that one too far!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable member should be allowed to proceed with his speech.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Thank you, Mr. Acting President. The Chief Secretary should give me a reply on this.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have had it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I cannot have had it, surely?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes, you have.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Anyway, if we got very fair treatment in one of the hospitals in my electoral district, it only made up for other things.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A borderline case went your way; in other cases, it could have gone the other way.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I have allowed the honourable member some licence. The Hon. Mr. Story must be allowed to proceed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Thank you! I do not wish to delay this measure. After what the Chief Secretary has told me about this money being paid as soon as we get the appropriation through, I will not proceed further with this business; but I want to say, before I sit down, that what the Hon. Mr. Banfield said when he spoke about so many of these things was absolute hogwash: it is not borne out by the facts. When we start to talk about such things as the franchise for the Legislative Council and the rejection of the impossible legislation that was put before this Chamber, legislation to abolish itself in the interests of democracy—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What clause of the Bill talks about the abolition?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was in the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I didn't see it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: You did not see it because it was cunningly concealed, but it was there; and it was there for the purpose of abolishing this Legislative Council, which, in my opinion, is a democratic organization.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But its members are not exactly democratic.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is part of a bicameral system established by the Constitution of this State. Anybody who introduces a Bill to abolish part of this democratic set-up and expects legislation under the Constitution that will do something to deprive—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If this place went out of existence, it could be done democratically by its voting itself out of existence. Wouldn't that be democratic?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It would not be democratic at all. So many people talk about democracy. I have been to Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conferences attended by 20 or 30 delegates from different countries, from those embracing the Socialistic wing of Communism through to the most conservative

people. I spent from seven o'clock one night until half-past two the next morning trying with many other people to work out a democratic system.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You could not do it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Indians explained what they understood by "democracy". The delegates from Singapore tried to describe what they thought of as "democracy", and so it went on. Russia had democracies. In Russia there is one Party and there is a choice of several people to vote for. That is their idea of democracy. It is a matter of definition, so we do not need to get too steamed up about democracy.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You introduced the subject. You said that this Chamber was democratic.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; I was answering the Hon. Mr. Banfield.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You said it was democratic.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I was in the process of answering the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who made certain claims.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you think it is democratic?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Constitution is something you have to work by.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Who drew it up?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: You have a constitution in the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And that was drawn up by people in the Party.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was not drawn up on a one vote one value basis, either.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It certainly was not. At least the people affected by it have a right to vote; that is more than the people had a right to do when the Constitution of this State was drawn up.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The point I am making is that it is necessary for a person to put his own house in order and get back to the very grass roots. The Hon. Mr. Banfield referred to the abattoirs at Kadina, and that intrigued me. I have represented that area for about 12 years and have been on many deputations on this matter. The previous Government went as far as to say that it would assist that project in every way possible. History shows that it was turned down by the farmers in the vicinity of Kadina for the good reason that they could see they would not get sufficient support when it came down to brass tacks and the money had to be put up.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is my point: the previous Premier announced this project, that it was to be established, but it did not go on with it, irrespective of whether there was any merit in it or not. That is my argument.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Premier of the day was perfectly right in this matter in doing what he did. For the honourable member to say that there had been any breach of faith on the part of the previous Government in this matter—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I did not say that there was a breach of faith; I said these were projects announced by the previous Government and not proceeded with.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As I have said, the previous Government did its part.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, it—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It inquired into it, and the committee reported favourably upon it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I don't think—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will cease interjecting.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The position was as I know quite well, and I say that the honourable member should get his facts straight before speaking because if he is bowled out on one matter it casts doubts on the authenticity of other statements that he has made. In conclusion, having examined the whole of the financial matters presented, I hope that the prediction made by way of interjection by the Chief Secretary that everything will be all right in two years' time and that we shall have a balanced Budget will prove correct.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is no doubt that the honourable member is the only member of the Opposition who has expressed that view, and I say, "Thank you".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is of no pleasure to me to see anybody hard up. My greatest pleasure is to see prosperity everywhere. It is good for all of us.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Many of the Opposition will be praying the other way during the next 18 months.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not think that is a reasonable thing to say.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will say it again next Tuesday when I reply to the debate on this Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Because people criticize (and they have plenty to criticize)

it can be seen that the Government has budgeted for more than its income will allow. It is not possible to spend money before getting it. For instance, in the matter of service pay, instead of saying "Yes, we shall grant you this service pay when we see how the money rolls in" the Government paid it immediately. I put such action down to inexperience, but I shall be the happiest man in the world if the Chief Secretary's prediction that the Budget will be balanced at the end of the second year comes to pass. We must not forget what the Hon. Mr. Banfield said when he took a 19-year period and picked out the years in which we had a deficit.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I didn't think that the previous Government had any deficit!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It has had them, but the wonderful thing is that when it went out of office after 27 years the Budget was completely balanced.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We are confident that our Budget will be balanced at the end of that time.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It will not take us 27 years, either!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Honourable members should not forget that in those 27 years remarkable expansion took place in this State, and the Government provided all services that were required.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not factual; it did not provide all services because we are so far behind now. Perhaps it provided some of the services.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Government provided all services required up to that time.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is why Kimba still has no water!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Government provided services that were much better and more adequate than those in any other State in the Commonwealth. I am referring to electricity, water and roads—the essential things. The Government did not set up its Ministers in air-conditioned offices and, although it may have been penny pinching in that respect, it certainly spent what money it had in planning for the benefit and development of this State. I believe with a little more experience this Government will realize that that is the proper way to do things, and I hope that at the end of its term it will have returned to a balanced Budget. At this point I support the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2207.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): The measure is an interesting one and its main provision concerns certain parts of the State (broadly speaking, around the periphery of Goyder's line of rainfall and within a newly defined area of hundreds set out in the Eleventh Schedule of the Bill). They consist, roughly speaking, of hundreds ranging from the Western Australian border to the vicinity of Kimba, thence along Spencer Gulf, up to about 100 miles north of Port Augusta, and back in a south-easterly direction to the vicinity of Hawker. The fact is that the land above Goyder's line of rainfall, under better methods of farming, has improved. The land between Goyder's line and the new demarcation in the Eleventh Schedule has become much more productive and valuable.

Some of it is selling at up to \$46 and \$48 an acre, although the unimproved value of the land would be low. The object is to enable further development of this area and to bring the unimproved value more into reality. Various types of tenure apply to the land. The majority of it is perpetual leasehold, though other types of leases are held, and there is some freehold land. The Bill imposes certain limitations regarding the amount of land that can be held, and a higher total value of land that can be held is fixed.

The limit of \$10,000 in section 31 is being increased to \$15,000. In addition, the words "outside Goyder's line of rainfall", are being struck out and the words "situated outside of hundreds or situated in any of the hundreds set out in the Eleventh Schedule to this Act" are being inserted. Section 220 is also being amended. That section deals with the conditions of surrender, and the limit of \$24,000 is being increased to \$36,000. This increase will be of real benefit to people holding perpetual leases in the outer areas. People in the more highly developed areas will be restricted to holding land under any tenure of a maximum value of \$36,000.

The provision in clause 6 that the total area of land that any one person may hold is 4,000 acres seems generous in relation to land in a good area of the State. However, it is a pity that we have to restrict the area of land that may be held. Provided a person is capable of working his land properly and is getting the full return from that land, perhaps we should allow him to have more land. If a

person holds 4,000 acres in some of the better parts of the State, it is likely that the value of \$36,000 will restrict him.

What is important is that any land held outside the new demarcation in the Eleventh Schedule will not necessarily be restricted to 4,000 acres. Discretion is given, I think in section 225 (5), to enable the Land Board to permit a person to hold more than that acreage. A man may hold land on the inside comprising nearly 4,000 acres and he can be allowed by the board to have other land, such as pastoral or miscellaneous leases, outside the line of demarcation. I am interested in clause 3, which provides:

Section 5 of the principal Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

(g) by proclamation amend the Eleventh Schedule to this Act. Upon the making of any such proclamation the Eleventh Schedule shall be deemed to be amended to the extent specified.

I want that provision amended so that the action can be taken by regulation. I can see by the gleam in the Minister's eye that I am going to get away with this.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are not going to get away with anything.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think I am, because the Minister has the same sort of gleam in his eye now as he had yesterday when he agreed to an amendment to another Bill. Furthermore, I think he will move the amendment himself to save me the inconvenience of having to get it drafted.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I am always generous.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I can see that the Minister is still in a good mood. I think it is wise to have this done by regulation, because Parliament then knows what is happening if any of the hundreds referred to in the Eleventh Schedule are taken out because of some extraordinary breakthrough in the development of land or new land methods. Some of these hundreds may be taken out, and others may be added.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I take it that you are supporting the Bill provided that this is done by regulation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. If a matter has merit, it will always have my support. However, we have differences from time to time about the merit of matters brought forward.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They all have merit, although some have more than others.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This Bill is about as bare as one can get when it is decided to have control. If there

are controls, someone will always get hurt but, if there is no control, probably many people will be hurt in the long run. I think this Bill will give more people an opportunity to own land. I have one query for the Minister to answer, however. If a person owns 4,000 acres and wishes to transfer it to his family, will the Land Board view with favour the transfer of that 4,000 acres to other members of the family who may hold up to 2,000 acres in the area themselves?

We do not want to get too hidebound in this matter. I imagine that no action will be taken (although I would like an assurance on this) to take land away from people who at present have land and that no action will be taken to cancel leases. I take it that perpetual leases will still have the sanctity they have always had and that no action will be taken to force people to sell land hurriedly, but that this legislation will start to operate at the time of transfer to other people. I think the purpose of the Bill is mainly to deal with new lands that will cause South Australia to have very much more cereal-growing country. I am particularly interested in the development of areas in the vicinity of Peebinga. This will enable farmers' sons to get more land, but they must be screened: not every donkey who wants some land should be allowed to go out into that country. I recognize that the board has a right to see that people who go out into this country are satisfactory and to watch the transferring of this type of land. If the Land Board can find suitable applicants within this State, I imagine that they will get a priority and that only as a last resort will people have to be brought in to develop it. I think that will be the board's policy, as it has always been.

I think it was the Hon. Mr. DeGaris who asked yesterday what effect this measure would have on land tax. Probably, as most of this land is now under perpetual lease, the position will remain as it is. However, I should like the Minister to tell us the effect on the State land tax of any change made by the deletion of the words "Goyder's line of rainfall". I know that miscellaneous leases and pastoral leases do not incur land tax, but will the Minister say whether any change will be made in the land tax position as a result of this measure?

I support the Bill, and I am pleased that the Minister is going to accept the suggestion that "regulation" be used instead of "proclamation". With this change, I shall be happy to support the measure, which I hope in some

way will assist in the development of country, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, where new techniques have increased the value of land out of sight in the last few years. Although some people had very large tracts in the early days, this land has become too valuable to be semi-developed or undeveloped, which it is in some areas. If it is broken up into small parcels, I am sure we shall get a greater productivity, with which comes greater prosperity.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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 has three main objects with which I shall deal in order. The first is to amend the principal Act to provide that as from a date to be proclaimed there shall be a stamp duty of 2c on every receipt issued for \$10 or over but less than \$50. Issue of such receipts will be compulsory only if demanded by the person making the payment but, once issued, the requisite stamp duty on the receipt will be compulsory. On the other hand, issue of receipts for amounts of \$50 and over will remain compulsory whether demanded by the person making payment or not, and will continue to be subject to the present duty of 5c. The purpose of the enactment is to protect the Government revenues, which have suffered considerably since the minimum amount of receipt subject to duty was raised from £2 to \$50. It is estimated that the loss of revenues suffered is about \$100,000 per annum and that this amendment will restore the revenues to approximately the level that earlier obtained.

The immediate provision for the new duty is made by clause 8 (e) of the Bill, which adds the new rate of duty to the schedule. Clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7 make necessary consequential amendments. Clause 4 amends section 82 of the principal Act, which defines "receipts". Formerly at £2, this definition was altered last year to read \$50 when receipts for under \$50 became not taxable. As it is proposed to tax receipts for \$10 and over, the definition is now being changed to include receipts for amounts of \$10 or upwards. Clause 5 (a) amends section 84 of the principal Act by retaining the ordinary provision requiring receipts to be given on request and making separate provision for the compulsory giving of receipts for \$50 or over. Clause 5 ((b) and

(c)) makes consequential amendments to subsections (2) and (4) of section 84 of the principal Act.

Clause 6 amends section 84b of the principal Act, which was inserted last year to provide for a person to compound for the duty. As amended this section will now provide that a person may compound for the duty on all receipts or put duty stamps thereon: in other words, he may either put duty stamps on every receipt, whether given voluntarily or compulsorily, or pay the whole of the duty direct to the Commissioner in respect of all receipts.

Clause 7 makes a consequential amendment to section 84c, dealing with penalties. The other amendments relating to duty on receipts, which are made by the Bill, relate to exemptions. The first, made by clause 8 (f), includes an exemption from duty on receipts given for bets on totalizators operated by any person authorized to operate totalizators. At present the exemption is limited to receipts on bets on totalizators operated by racing clubs. Should a totalizator agency board be authorized in due course, the amendment will make the necessary provision in regard to receipts.

Clause 8 (g) will exempt from stamp duty receipts to the Social Welfare Department for maintenance or relief payments or moneys paid out of any trust fund of the department. Such payments include relief paid in cash, maintenance payments to deserted wives and families, payments from various trust fund accounts, refunds of amounts overpaid and payment of maintenance subsidies for children placed out with foster-parents. It is considered that such receipts, which are in effect receipts for social service payments, should not require stamping.

The second set of amendments is made by clause 8, paragraphs (a) and (d). Those paragraphs deal with stamp duties on money-lenders' contracts and hire-purchase agreements, raising the present rates. At present the general rate of duty on these instruments is \$2 for every \$200 (with lower amounts where the consideration ranges from \$20 to \$150) and in future the general rate will be \$1.50 per \$100. The proposed rates have been applicable in Western Australia since 1963 and are in fact lower than those operating in Victoria and Tasmania, where the rate has been 2 per cent since 1958 and 1960, respectively. Only in New South Wales and Queensland is a lower rate equal to \$1 per \$100 still applicable. Recent press reports suggest that the rates in Victoria may be reduced to \$1.50 per \$100, but that the duty will be extended

to apply to a wider range of credit instruments. It is also reported by the press that the rates will now be increased to 1½ per cent in New South Wales.

The third set of amendments made by paragraphs (b) and (c) of clause 8 raises the rates of duty on conveyances. At present the rate of duty on conveyances on sale is \$1 up to a consideration of \$100 and thereafter \$2 per \$200. The new rate will be \$1.25 per \$100 (or part) where the consideration does not exceed \$12,000; where the consideration exceeds \$12,000 but does not exceed \$15,000, \$1.25 on the first \$12,000 and \$2.50 per \$100 of the excess; where the consideration exceeds \$15,000 the rate will be \$1.50 per \$100. The effect of the new rates will be a duty of 1¼ per cent up to \$12,000, rising gradually to a rate of 1½ per cent between \$12,000 and \$15,000 and thereafter remaining constant at 1½ per cent. The figure of \$12,000 for the lowest rate has been chosen so that conveyances of modest house properties in South Australia will be stamped at the lower rate.

The present rate of duty on conveyances operating as voluntary dispositions, namely \$2 per \$200, will be raised to the same rates as will apply to conveyances on sale, which I have already mentioned. The rates on conveyances have remained unchanged in South Australia since 1927. In all the other States there is a basic rate of \$1.25 per \$100 and in all other States except Queensland a higher rate of \$1.50 per \$100 is applied when the consideration exceeds various stated figures. The increases in the duties on conveyances, hire-purchase agreements and money-lenders contracts are expected to give additional revenue of \$880,000 this year and \$1,320,000 in a full year. Clause 9 makes a drafting amendment to last year's amending Act, section 15 (d) of which contained an inappropriate reference to a heading in the Second Schedule to the principal Act.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROWLAND FLAT WAR MEMORIAL HALL INCORPORATED BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had given leave to the Hon. B. H. Teusner to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Rowland Flat War Memorial Hall Incorporated Bill if he thinks fit.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966. Since the passing of this Act in March of this year an election under section 11 of this Act has been conducted. The experience gained from the conducting of this election clearly shows that section 12 and section 14 of this Act do not make satisfactory provision for the election of the eight members to council by the Senate of the University of Adelaide or for the election of members by Convocation after Convocation is constituted in 1971. The Government accordingly accepts the representations made by the Council of the Flinders University that the Act should be amended to give this aspect of the Act a more workable and more widely acceptable basis. The amendments proposed by this Bill would have the effect of ensuring that the Senate of the University of Adelaide would be relieved of the burden of conducting any further elections of members of the council as provided for in section 11 of the principal Act and further of clarifying and simplifying the procedure whereby Convocation itself elects members of the council after 1971. Under the existing section 12 of the Act two members of the council elected by the Senate of the University of Adelaide shall retire after one year's service, a further two after two years' service and two more after three years' service and so on. This means that apart from the election conducted on July 1, 1966, further elections will have to be conducted in 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970. In addition, an election would be necessary under subsection (2) of section 12 to fill a casual vacancy.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide has brought to the notice of the Council of the Flinders University the impracticability of and considerable financial costs in giving effect to section 12 of the Act. He has pointed out that there are more than 10,000 members of the Senate of the University of Adelaide and strictly all those members of the senate should be notified of an election for members of the Council of the Flinders University. Under the standing orders of the senate only those members of the senate resident in the State of South Australia and such other members as may request it need be notified of meetings of the senate. These at

present number about 5,000 and this number will increase annually by 700 to 800. Of the 5,000 members of the senate not at present on the mailing list, the Senate of the University of Adelaide does not know more than half of their addresses and many of these would prove to be out of date. From this it will be seen that it is completely impracticable for the University of Adelaide to notify substantially all members of the senate of an election for members of the Council of the Flinders University. It will also be appreciated that conducting an election of this magnitude does entail a tremendous amount of work and very considerable expenses, which would have to be borne by the Council of the Flinders University. The Council of the Flinders University is seriously concerned with this state of affairs.

Apart from the foregoing, the council has come to the conclusion that it is generally undesirable that some of its members should continue to be elected by the Senate of the University of Adelaide since this is a body quite separate from and not concerned with the Flinders University. It is proposed, therefore, that the Act should be amended to provide, in effect, that after the first election (which has already been conducted) the Senate of the University of Adelaide shall no longer have the burden and responsibility of conducting elections of members to the Council of the Flinders University. Clause 4, which repeals and re-enacts section 12 of the principal Act, accordingly provides that the eight members elected to the council by the Senate of the University of Adelaide on July 1, 1966, shall continue and remain in office until an election is conducted by Convocation in accordance with section 13 of the Act. All casual vacancies occurring in the interim period will be filled by appointments made by the Council of the Flinders University.

The person appointed to fill a casual vacancy would be in the same classification as the person whose place he filled, that is, he would either be a member of the academic staff of the university or a person not employed by the university. This provision generally has, it is felt, considerable merit since not only does it give some degree of permanence to the eight

elected members on the council thus enabling them to take a full and effective part in all the preparatory and planning work connected with the establishment of a new university, but also, and perhaps more importantly, it would avoid any feeling on the part of the council that the affairs of the Flinders University were to some extent being controlled through the ballot box, as it were, by an outside body whose interests might not always be in accord with the interests of the Flinders University.

Clause 5 which repeals section 14 of the principal Act covers the same ground as the existing section 12 except that it provides for a new procedure for the conducting of elections of members to Convocation after Convocation is constituted. The new proposals envisage that from the time Convocation first meets there would be four of the elected members retiring every other year, though they would be available for re-election. This would ensure some degree of continuity and also ensure the experience that some of the members had gained might be utilized for a longer period of time. Subclauses (1), (2) and (3) accordingly replace subsection (1) of section 12 but subclauses (4) and (5) reproduce subsections (2) and (3) of section 12 with one important qualification. The words "of all members" occurring at the end of subsection (2) have been deleted. The reason for this is that the existence of these words in this subsection might well impose a burdensome requirement upon Convocation to trace all its members in various States of Australia and throughout the world. The election will, however, still be by postal ballot and the council will in due course make a statute or regulation under section 20 (1) dealing with the procedure etc. to be followed in an election. I commend this Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 18, at 2.15 p.m.