

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 18, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

STATE LOTTERY.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of Thursday last in relation to lotteries?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There has been no amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act in respect of these matters, and no policy direction has been given affecting the enforcement of the Act by the police.

PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD.

The Hon. L. R. HART: On October 6 I asked the Minister of Roads a question about the Port Wakefield Road at Virginia. Has he a reply?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. Alternative proposals for road arrangements in the vicinity of Virginia were referred by the Highways Department to the Town Planner in March of this year for his comments prior to entering into discussions on this matter with the District Council of Munno Para. In his reply to the department, the Town Planner raised the question of the future long-range development of this area as a living area and suggested a conference of interested parties to discuss the location of a future major centre before road proposals were finalized. The department is agreeable to a participation in such discussions. However, it has been necessary to delay further work on this project while the staff of the department's planning section has been engaged on other urgent work. It is now expected that a conference, as suggested by the Town Planner, that will include representation from the District Council of Munno Para will be arranged in the near future.

AMPHOMETERS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of October 6 about amphotometers?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The approval for the purchase of the portable electronic traffic analyser, manufactured by Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Co. Ltd., for use by the Police Department in detecting speeding motorists followed inquiries in the other States and overseas. It was because the department considered it advisable to continue using the

one type of accepted device that a further two analysers were purchased for the use of members of the Traffic Division. The department is aware of the amphotometer and the use made of it in Victoria, and a copy of the article "Death and the Amphotometer" in the issue of the *Bulletin* dated August 20, 1966, has been made for consideration in the event of funds permitting the purchase of additional speed-detecting devices in the future.

STRATA TITLES.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to my question about strata titles?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I promised the honourable member I would look at this matter to see where we were. The position is as follows. The Bill has been drafted and is currently being examined by the Building Act Advisory Committee and the Town Planner. It is expected that the measure can be introduced this session.

SEED CROPS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It has come to my notice that seed producers in the South-East have been told that on or about October 24 all seed crops will be inspected for certification. The inspection for certification usually decides the strain of the crop and the presence of any noxious or objectionable weeds. I am also informed that this year only one inspection will be made. It is impossible to completely rid seed crops of the objectionable or noxious weeds in the South-East at a time towards the end of October, as many of these weeds that must be removed do not show up until later in the year. Usually, two inspections are made—one at this time and one close to the Christmas period. I appreciate that round about Christmas time the objectionable weeds that do show up can be easily removed, but it is impossible at this stage to remove them. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture bring this matter to the attention of his colleague as it is of some urgency, and will he see whether a more reasonable approach can be made to the certification of seed crops in the Lower South-East?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall be only too happy to take up this matter with my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, as requested, and bring down a reply.

GREENHILL ROAD.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I have previously drawn attention to the dangerous Greenhill Road and the lack of guard fencing. In the last few days the meagre fence that was present in one of the most dangerous sections has been completely removed and replaced with only white-painted guide posts so that this extremely dangerous section is now, in effect, unguarded. Will the Minister of Roads say whether it is intended to leave the road in this condition or is this work preparatory to more effective guarding?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member refers to a particular section of road. He does not tell me what it is. It would be much simpler for me if he would let me know what particular section of road he was referring to so that I could have the matter investigated and a reply brought back for him.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The Minister is seeking further elaboration. I did not think this work could go on without his knowledge. The section I refer to is about three-quarters of a mile above the present guard fencing and in the overhanging part above the old quarry in the gully next to Slape's Gully. In this section, the road bitumen paving is so close that a vehicle cannot leave the paving for more than 4ft. or 5ft. without falling over a slope several hundred feet deep and as near vertical as possible in the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall obtain a report on the question raised and give a reply to the honourable member as soon as possible.

CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question is the result of a letter that I have received in connection with the building of the Chowilla dam, a matter in which we are all interested because of its importance to Australia's water supply. The letter is from a skipper who operated a boat on the Murray River, and it reads:

No Australian would be worthwhile if he stood by and watched a harm being done

because he sensed that his adverse comment would be unpopular. Development in South Australia runs parallel with a possible water shortage, as indeed it does in some of the other States. To exploit a main river resource for even a doubtful temporary supply would be a dangerous experiment. My lifetime on the river, together with study and observation, makes me believe that the dam would be a costly failure. Water may be stored in the mountainous regions. The salt content of the Murray River has been a sharp surprise to many, brought about by the short existence of the locks and weirs, together with extensive irrigation in a process of extending. To build a stoppage dam where the land fall is 3in. to the mile extending the flow of the river 140 miles—70 land miles—would, I feel, develop a huge area of stagnation.

I presume that these matters have been considered by experts but, in view of the contents of that letter, is the Minister able to give this Council more information on the subject?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, I will convey the matter to my colleague, the Minister of Works, and bring back a report to the honourable member as soon as possible.

GERMANTOWN HILL.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Recently the nearside of Germantown Hill going south has been refenced by the landholder. Prior to that, for many years the landholder's fence leant against the Highways Department posts, while the Highways Department fence, in return, leant against that of the landholder. This resulted in one of the most untidy regions of fencing in the metropolitan area. In view of the approaching tourist season, will the Minister take up the matter with the Highways Department with a view to resuscitating this fence immediately now that the other fence has been erected by the landholder?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, I shall be happy to take the matter up with the department.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES
REGISTRATION BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to the registration of births, deaths and marriages, and to the legitimation of children. Read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2271.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I wish to take advantage of the traditional privilege by which we may in this debate raise matters that affect our districts. The matter with which I wish to deal in some detail is agricultural education, which by mischance has been allowed to drift into a most unsatisfactory condition. After all, agriculture is by far the largest industry in South Australia and, so far as we can see into the future, it will always remain so. This huge industry and the many people engaged in it are poorly served by technical training, which becomes more and more exacting each year.

Agriculture today calls for more scientific knowledge, applied knowledge and trade skill than have ever been required before. In addition to facing the problems of finding export markets, we also face the rising costs that inevitably arise from Australia's high standard of living. The business problems of farming today are much more complex and difficult than those of any other industry. However, we have one agricultural college, which has a maximum out-turn of about 30 or 35 students a year, to serve this huge industry. The only other tertiary education available is that provided by the university in the degree course for Bachelor of Agricultural Science.

Over the years, the university has progressively become more specialized in its purpose of turning out very highly-trained specialist agricultural researchers, and today it is materially of no use whatsoever in serving as a basis of training in tertiary education for a man who wishes to enter the field of agriculture broadly. I think this has very wisely been done by the university. It has been faced with the impossibility of giving a broad general education in agriculture in the short space of four years. So, it has narrowed the field so that the graduates it now produces are very narrow in their speciality.

They have become plant pathologists, soil chemists, etc, and in the speciality they are very highly trained and fit at the end of their training to take their place in the research institutions of Australia, such as the university and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. However, in the whole of the period of training at the university they have no contact with practical agriculture.

Even the fleeting contact that is arranged for them in visits and in working during their holidays is reduced or specialized to their own training, so that a man who finishes the agricultural course at the university trained as a plant pathologist has not a clue about the problems that face a farmer running a flock of sheep, let alone the problems of a dairy farmer. Often he has practically no knowledge even of the practice of cereal growing, though some of the speciality may be attached to it.

I do not think we can grumble about this; it has arisen from necessity. It is impossible to give complete training in the broad field of agriculture in the narrow limits of the four-year agricultural science course. It is sufficient to say that we are now beginning to feel very seriously indeed the result of this specialized training, because a graduate from the university who enters the Agriculture Department as an agronomist or a plant pathologist will, in view of his high qualification, be given a fairly senior position.

He enters that position well trained in his own speciality but completely unfitted to take any responsibility except in his speciality. In a few years, with promotion, he becomes very senior in the department and naturally a candidate for the administration of his branch or section, so that we end up with the senior officers, although highly specialized, unfitted to take a really intelligent interest in the broad sphere of agriculture except by chance education or the expenditure of their own time.

At the next step of training—the Roseworthy Agricultural College—the total possible out-turn is between 30 and 35 a year. The figure, with natural wastage, is actually even lower. This was originally a broadly based practical course aimed at training farmers' sons. It has not got the possibility of training the number of farm managers required in agriculture each year. It has been estimated that we need between 700 and 800 people entering agriculture each year (but I believe the figure is nearer 1,000) to be trained in the work required of owners or managers of farms. Roseworthy cannot possibly look after them, as it has also to train men for the Agriculture Department in extension services and also men who will be teaching agriculture in schools.

There is also the new departure in agriculture (the farm management adviser), and the training in this field is done at Roseworthy. This means that the great majority of young people entering agriculture must get

their training in the course of their normal education, and here we come up against another decision, which I think has been made wisely, in that the Education Department has clearly taken the responsibility of giving children going through its schools a good general education on broad lines and will permit such specialization as is possible in agriculture in high schools, where there is provision for it, and in the area schools.

However, because of the short time the children are attending these schools and because they have to pick a broad general education as well as a speciality, they can do only a very elementary study in agriculture. They must leave school with very large gaps in their knowledge. Their training is not anywhere near sufficient to meet the demands that have to be met from day to day by farmers.

The Urrbrae Agricultural High School was left to the Education Department by Mr. Peter Waite in the knowledge that this position was rapidly arising. That school has gone to some trouble to give a more specialized training in agriculture, but again with the prime responsibility of giving a good general education so that, even in this specialized institution, although it goes further than is possible in the normal high school with an agriculture course attached, there is still a very limited education in agriculture possible compared with the real requirement.

It is impossible for me to do any more than point out the grave need for improvement. I understand that the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science has made an analysis of the subject and has presented it to the Minister of Agriculture for consideration. In the Eastern States a valuable analysis has been made by Dr. Farquhar, and this is available to the Minister. Both these analyses have been made by people who have studied this subject from the background of the trained agricultural scientist, who is, as I have said, essentially specialized and who has no clue as to the real needs of the practical farmer as he stands in this world of 1966.

If this position is allowed to remain as it is, I have no doubt that there will be improvement in the training of agricultural research officers and extension officers, but I doubt whether the practical training that we must have for future farm managers will be given. This is a very difficult subject. I make no bones about that. The attitude of farmers and children themselves is one of the grave difficulties that must be overcome. We often have

entering agriculture boys who do not like school work. They want to finish their secondary education as early as possible and go into agriculture to get away from books. They do not realize the specialized need they will have for training during their lives.

We have the attitude of farmers themselves, who often say, "I prefer to give my own son my training rather than have him mucked around by these theoretical farmers in the city and at the university." These attitudes have to be overcome. In agriculture we must have every highly trained man we can get. The only solution is for the industry itself as well as the university and education authorities to appreciate the need and to come together in some form of committee set up to sort out the whole problem.

At present, through the separate authorities working piecemeal, we are getting nowhere. We are finding that the highly trained man who will become senior in administration in agriculture is becoming more and more specialized. Not only is he uncertain as soon as he gets into broad agriculture: he is very uncertain when it comes to teaching agriculture. It is necessary not only to teach agriculture to those entering agriculture but to teach the people who will teach those who will be entering agriculture; so it is something like the lesser flea on the back of the flea that is biting the dog.

This problem is big. Its solution will be costly and it must be practical. Undoubtedly, what was envisaged by the late Peter Waite, who gave the land upon which the Urrbrae Agriculture High School is now situated, is probably what we shall need in the future. We must have this training not only in the city area but also in the districts that these people will be serving.

It is impossible to teach a fruitgrower who will be farming a block at Renmark how to grow currants, citrus and other specialized forms of production with which he will be concerned by putting him down on the Fullarton Road in the Urrbrae High School. The tendency should be towards a series of these agricultural high schools associated with practical farming in the regions that they will serve, each in the widely different districts of the State.

It is impossible to think of creating a series of Roseworthy Colleges to serve all these separate industries: it would be far too costly. Roseworthy College is costly. That cost is warranted, and the record of Roseworthy College over the years has been very good.

We need to train not only the man who will become the farm manager: there is also the man who will be working with him. When a man goes on the land today, he rarely goes out with a grubber or an axe, as his counterpart did 30 years ago. Usually he has at least \$6,000 worth of tractor with him and he has up to \$20,000 worth of machinery. We are using men who have had no training whatsoever to undertake this responsibility.

What I hope will never occur is that this problem will become a political football. It is not raised this afternoon in that spirit at all. It is raised for the purpose of drawing attention as widely as possible to this great problem that we must solve if we are to keep our agriculture efficient. But sufficient of that: I now turn to another topic.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I think you have made an impression on the Minister.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Unfortunately, he does not seem to be listening.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: His representative here is.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The next question I wish to raise is this terrible one of the road accident toll. Again, I do not wish to raise it as a political matter, because this is a problem that must be solved. There is no need to labour the terrible statistics showing that our great losses in life and material are far greater than were our losses during the wars in which Australia has fought. This problem is receiving only piecemeal treatment, little by little. There seems to be serious hesitation by every Government at getting to grips with this problem.

I noticed recently that the Premier, laudably, has been looking at the result of probationary driving licences in New South Wales, and has said that these will be introduced in South Australia. This is another piecemeal attempt at solving this problem. It is not good enough. I do not think it is satisfying anybody who thinks responsibly about this matter. Let us look at the probationary licence being attached to a licence granted for the first time.

It has been proved again and again that the safest driver on our roads is the young person who has just been given his licence for the first time. He remains a safe driver for one year or two years thereafter. The most dangerous driver on the road, from the figures quoted in the press in the last week or two, is the man or woman who has had a licence for a year or two, has gained confidence and a vehicle and is driving it from 18 years of age to about 26 years of age. Road fatalities are highest in this group.

The probationary licence is a good thing because it undoubtedly induces a sense of responsibility into the licensee, who has the responsibility of looking after a vehicle, the most dangerous thing we have in our community at present. However, nothing is done about the 18 to 24-year-old, and nothing about the repeat-accident driver, and this appears to have been overlooked entirely under present legislation. These types of driver will not bring to driving the same sense of responsibility that he normally brings to all other actions as a member of the community.

There seems to be trauma in the attitude of people when it comes to driving. We will not adopt an adult attitude in anything connected with it. Take, for example, a person who takes a car without permission. The purchase of a car represents probably the largest single item of expenditure of a family, other than the purchase of a house.

This person takes a car and goes joyriding; all too frequently he ends up by completely or partially destroying the vehicle but, when convicted, his action is regarded merely as a misdemeanour. The driver given little more than a caution and told not to do it again. In contrast, take the case of a person who steals an article worth 55c from a store; this is treated as a criminal case, quite distinct from a person stealing a car (a valuable object) together with the petrol in it, and the driver is, as I have said, treated as a nice person and merely told not to do it again.

Such an attitude must be changed; I believe everybody wants to see this happen. If a probationary licence system is introduced after responsible thought has been given to the matter, such a licence should apply not only to the holder of a new licence, but also to the holder of any licence who may have a defect, a defect of being accident-prone, as well as the person who repeatedly drives under the influence of alcohol or another person who is too old and therefore becoming too slow in reflexes. I do not think anybody should drive today without having visited Police Headquarters and heard the lecture that is given at least once a week throughout the year. I took a member of my family to hear the lecture before that person sat for a licence and the lecture impressed me.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: When is a person able to attend?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Any day he likes; if the Minister has not attended, I strongly advise him to go as it will be a most valuable

experience. Mr. President, the theme of the lecture is that the people causing this damage, this terrible carnage, on our roads, are not criminal types but nice people such as you and I. The point is made again and again that the driver really "on the ball" is not liable to accident: the driver who is aware of what he is doing is a defensive driver. This may be seen every day in the low rates of accident of taxi drivers and ambulance drivers, and others who are more or less professional drivers.

There is no doubt that the fault that has given rise to this horrible loss of life and tremendous toll of injury is nothing else than lack of education and appreciation of personal responsibility. Action must be taken to drive this point home. I believe that if the provisional system of licensing is introduced it should apply not only to the person newly licensed but to all drivers involved in accidents, even if involved only by chance. It can do nothing but good.

I understand from recent press reports that about 1,000 licences a year are cancelled in South Australia. This means that everything possible is being done already by those responsible. It has not had the effect of cutting down very much the loss of life and injury sustained in road accidents. With a provisional licence extended as far as it can be so that everybody knows if he is not a defensive driver at his next error he will have his licence suspended for three months (and at the end of that time he tested again before being granted a licence) there will be a more responsible attitude to driving at speed or with recklessness than exists today.

This subject cannot be left as it is at present: that is, just being pecked at occasionally when it affects the conscience of people. It must be tackled as the greatest social ill that we have in this State. Undoubtedly the world has sufficient knowledge to assist us to cut our losses to a tenth if that knowledge is conscientiously applied. I think this can be clearly seen from experience not only in Australia as a whole but in Victoria with the introduction of breathalyser tests and in New South Wales with its probationary system of licensing.

Tremendously reduced losses are recorded in other parts of the world, particularly in the Scandinavian countries and in some parts of the United States of America. A tremendous amount of study has been carried out on this subject, but we are not applying it here because whenever the subject is brought up most of

us take the attitude that some other person is responsible; it is that other person who must be disciplined. Our individual rights must not be affected when it comes to driving a dangerous projectile through the community at an excessive speed.

A short time ago I asked the Minister a question and it is expected that we will get a reply, but I would like to elaborate on that question. It referred to the Greenhill Road as it exists today; it is nothing more or less than a death-trap. As I have pointed out, if the front wheel of a car leaves the road by no more than 4ft. or 5ft. the car will inevitably fall several hundred feet down a steep slope. That road is being used by buses that are crowded with schoolchildren in the mornings and afternoons and that at other times of the day carry many adult passengers. These buses serve the most thickly populated agricultural areas in the hills, such as Uraidla, Summertown and Carey Gully.

The reply given to a previous question was that the further extension of safety fences was not warranted, because there had been no accidents. If this is taken as the excuse for leaving a deadly hazard completely unguarded: nobody has demonstrated the hazard by committing suicide. If this road is left in its present condition, with the wire fence in poor repair for most of its length and now completely removed from one of the most dangerous sections, a terrible tragedy will occur.

There is no possibility of passengers surviving if a bus goes down one of those slopes. I give this warning to the Minister because I do not think the matter can be treated in the light-hearted spirit with which it has been treated every time the question has been raised. Along the new Gorge Road safety fences have been provided on parking areas where cars may damage their bumper bars on protruding rocks. Responsibility will rest with the Minister if he allows this dangerous state of affairs to continue.

I shall now deal with some matters in the Estimates that require attention. The department with which I am most concerned is the Agriculture Department. I find that the provisions for payments to dependents and officers retiring or resigning and for long service and recreation leave payments are consistently down. In the case of the group of departments with which I am dealing, it is \$23,954 down, and a reduction occurs in practically all departments. I ask why this is so. As a result of long service leave legislation passed

earlier in this session, there should be more expenditure on this item, instead of less. Undoubtedly, the provision for salaries is increased. I ask the Chief Secretary for an explanation of this matter.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What long service leave legislation was passed in this session?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In the last session, then.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think you mean the amendment to the Superannuation Act.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Why is the provision this year less? The provision should be at least the same as last year. It must be appreciated, particularly by the farming community, that the out-turn of the departments that serve the community must be considerably down this year. The same number of men will serve them in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, plant industry, and so on, but the amount of money that has been provided for the work of those officers has been seriously cut down.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are you sure that is right?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes. In the case of extension there has been a cut down, even in relation to the purchase of books for the library. The provision for research centres is down by \$37,548. That is a huge amount, because it goes to buy the seed, superphosphate, petrol and oil. It is of no use having many men employed if they have not the money with which to operate. I agree that it is probably not necessary to hold about \$200,000 in reserve for fruit fly prevention in case there is an outbreak. However, I hope the Government will be able to find the money required if this pest does occur this year. If fruit fly is allowed to get out of hand, our fruit industries will be in a perilous condition.

I do not think the present Government has a clue about how seriously the community will be affected if fruit fly is allowed to get out of hand. The maintenance of many of our markets depends on our ability to send with the product a certification that the areas from which the product is taken are free from this pest. The provision of \$105,240 will be sufficient to maintain the quarantine safeguards at Renmark, Bordertown and elsewhere, but we must have provision, at least in reserve if not directly in the lines, so that the fruit fly can be eradicated if it breaks out. Otherwise, we jeopardize industries that are worth millions of dollars to this State annually.

The reduction of \$2,758 in regard to extension does not sound much, but it means the expenditure of \$1,000 less on research information. Bush fire research is down about \$8,000. Plant industry has been able to keep its vote fairly sound. The provision for soil conservation is down \$2,708. Horticulture generally (and some research is involved in this) is \$12,000 down. I appreciate the desire of the Government to save money, because it has to do that if it is to have a hope of balancing its books. However, does the community appreciate that this is being done at the cost of keeping these men less effectively employed or idle because of lack of the means with which to work?

We find this trend elsewhere. Out of curiosity, I turned over to the Aboriginal Affairs Department, where I found there was a huge increase in the salaries for the head office but that tremendous savings had been made in expenditure for the reserves, which is the expenditure that affects the Aboriginal directly: the reduction is \$88,803. Apart from the Gerard Reserve, for which there is an increase of \$3,800, the expenditure on all other reserves has been decreased as follows—Point Pearce, \$5,680; Point McLeay, \$12,974; North-West, \$25,232; Coober Pedy, \$3,365; Koonibba, \$26,455; and Davenport, \$15,097. This means that, despite all the promises made, the money directly expended in improving the welfare of the Aboriginal will be cut to a dribble.

I do not want to carry on in this mood of criticism, but I have commented on facts relating to an industry with which I am concerned very deeply. I endorse with the whole of my heart the remarks made by previous speakers.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): This has been an interesting debate. Nearly all previous speakers referred to the rather melancholy fact that there was a credit of \$1,200,000 in the Revenue Account at June 30, 1965, and that at June 30, 1966, there was a deficit in that account of \$5,600,000. If we take into account also the deficit on Loan Account, the total deficit was \$8,000,000. If one looks at the causes of this situation, to do which one must refer to the financial statement of the Treasurer, one can see that this has happened in two ways: first, there has been a short-fall in revenue (that is, it fell below the estimate), and, secondly, there has been some increase in the expenditure budgeted for.

I shall not belabour the Government for not having been able to budget correctly and

for having suffered this short-fall because, after all, certain factors cannot be taken into account by even the most competent person engaged in preparing a Budget. However, one would think that the Government should have been a little more realistic in its estimation of some revenues it expected to receive, particularly in relation to some of the revenue-raising measures placed before Parliament last session.

If one looks at the other side of the matter (the fact that costs are ever increasing) one is immediately impressed by the outstanding fact that one of the greatest single increases in costs that the Government had to face was an increase brought about by an additional award for teachers that came into force as a result of a determination of the Teachers Salaries Board. That and the additional research grants required for the University of Adelaide were the two important factors that affected the expenditure of the Government. One would therefore think that some lesson would have been learned and that some provision would have been made in the Appropriation Bill or the Estimates of Expenditure that would have made it possible for expected increases in awards that came into force during the year to be provided for, seeing that such increases proved so important a factor last year. Perhaps the Government may say to such a statement, "Well, it has never been done before." I can almost hear the Chief Secretary saying that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have learned a lot in the last three weeks I did not know before!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: In the past we have not had deficits accumulated to this extent. In a situation where one is budgeting for a surplus, or even where one is budgeting for a balanced budget, it seems to me that one can take a certain amount of risk in the possibility that during the financial year there may be some award increases of the magnitude of the increases awarded to teachers. With a bit of luck the increases could be met. However, we are carrying our accumulated deficit and not paying it back or reducing it, and in addition we are providing for expenditures which, even after applying all the taxation increases mentioned in the statement, will mean that we are still going to finish up with a further net deficit of \$2,300,000. This is in addition to carrying the deficit left over from last year. One feels that in the circumstances the failure to provide for possible increases in

awards of one kind and another is the height of folly. For instance, this Budget is already \$500,000 out, because recently increases have been awarded to clerical officers in the South Australian Railways. A statement in the press last week indicated that this would cost this Government nearly \$500,000, so that, even before we have passed this Bill, the Budget is out to this extent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not exactly right, because the good Lord has looked after us with some rain that will bring about a saving of about \$300,000. You must put it in the pot and mix it together. I know you are looking only for the black things to damn the Government, so I hate to throw this in! You would not know how to be fair.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am merely pointing out that this \$500,000 does not appear on the Estimates of Expenditure.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: On the other side we have thousands of dollars for pumping water which we shall not want.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: That is right. There are some things that may go to the credit side, but I point out—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You just point out!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: —that that particular matter arose from the very point I am making. It arose out of a so-called unexpected increase in an award rate. That is the very thing not provided for in these Estimates. It may be thought by the Government, "Oh well, we run into this sort of difficulty. If we have increases in awards and margins, we can make it up in some way or another." It may be true that we can make it up by an increase in revenue, although that again has been taken into account in some respects in this Budget; or it may be thought by this Government that the Commonwealth Government will have to get it out of a hole and that it will have, somehow or other, to find additional moneys to meet these further expenditures. This may be only partly true.

I say it is certainly not true that we can look to the Commonwealth as a source of revenue to help us if the rises in award rates that may be given during the year result from the implementation of policies that this Government claims so glibly have been endorsed by the electors of South Australia. I refer to such policies as the implementation of service pay and equal pay for female employees. If the Government wants to pioneer in these fields (and it says it will be a pioneer in these respects) it must be prepared to suffer the financial privations that may result from

being such a pioneer—and from being a pioneer left in the wilderness. Let me read from page 4 from the Treasurer's Financial Statement:

In compiling the proposed expenditures for 1966-67, the Government has, of course, taken into account the recent basic wage increase and all other awards already made. It has not made any forecast of prospective awards. It has continued to provide for service pay to Government employees at a present cost to Revenue Account of about \$1,600,000 a year, as promised at election time and endorsed by the electors. It is providing this year, in accordance with policy endorsed by the electors, the first instalment of the five-year programme of equal pay to female Government employees for equal work, and this will cost \$340,000 this year.

The Government has also provided for the free book scheme, endorsed by the electors, costing \$560,000. My point is that it has made no forecasts of any prospective awards.

I said a moment ago that already, before we pass the Bill, we have an award to railway employees that will cost nearly \$500,000. There are at present before the Public Service Arbitrator two applications—one for increases for professional officers in the South Australian Public Service and the other for increases for female clerks in the Public Service. This has nothing to do with equal pay: it is just a normal application for an increase in rates of pay. I venture to suggest that substantial rises will accrue as a result of these applications. It may be suggested, "Why do you assume that? You are not the Arbitrator. You do not know what he will or will not do." That is certainly true, but I think I know a little about the arbitration system, and I have said on other occasions in this Council that our present arbitration system is chaotic.

It is a little like a model of one of those atomic structures of little round balls all connected to each other by rods. If one interferes with one of those little balls, it alters the whole structure. Perhaps if one liked to use some sort of analogy, it might be more appropriate to describe our present arbitration system as a mass of cells. Some of them are little, some are large, and they are all tenuously attached each to the other. It is apparent to anybody who knows anything about our arbitration system, whether in the Commonwealth or in the State sphere, that it works within those cellular structures.

I have said previously that wage rises are taking place all within little watertight compartments. If any honourable members have any doubts about that, they have only to look at their Parliamentary papers and read the

report of the members of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal and the reasons given for the increases that were granted. That tribunal, following the same line that all tribunals take, looked around the circle and compared the salaries of members of Parliament of this State with those of other States. When these two applications I have mentioned come before the Public Service Arbitrator for final decision, I guess there will be a looking around by the Arbitrator within the appropriate little cell or circle.

Let me briefly refer to the female officers in the Public Service. By and large, it can be said that most of them are engaged on clerical duties: only a handful do professional work. Those doing clerical duties can be divided, roughly, into four groups. The first group comprises girls with no real academic qualifications. The second group comprises generally women who have obtained their Intermediate certificate in shorthand and typing, although also included in this group are some women who have gone as far as the Leaving certificate in those subjects. The third group comprises women who can do 100 words a minute in shorthand and have a much superior typing ability to those in the second group. The fourth group, the top of the lot, are those women who can write shorthand at 120 words a minute and have superior typing qualifications. That would be a short classification of most of the women employed in the Public Service.

The second group that I mentioned, the girl with her Intermediate certificate in shorthand and typing, is, incredible as this may seem to honourable members, already on a salary margin above that of a tradesman employed by the Government under an award. If the usual arbitration method of approach is used in the current application for female employees before the Public Service Arbitrator, he will look around the little circle, compare the rates that such a female worker receives in South Australia with those being paid in other parts of Australia (as was done in the Parliamentary salary claim) and, if this is done, those females will receive an increase. The tradesman, a man with a tertiary education and one who has served a full apprenticeship, will drop further behind in his salary rate as a result.

I want to take this matter one important step further because it touches on the Government's avowed policy of providing equal pay for women for equal work. This policy has been implemented without reference by the Government to any tribunal for investigation.

I put this matter to the Minister of Labour and Industry last year and he said, "No, that will not be done. This is a matter of Government policy." Therefore, it has become promulgated because apparently it is Labor Party policy. However, I suggest that because of the background of what I have just said it will produce some real headaches for Budget experts in a short term. It is true that the matter of equal pay is one for the Public Service Board to implement and to determine who shall receive such equal pay and who shall not. Teachers already have equal pay and they received it without argument because the Government said they should get it and told the Teachers Salaries Board that they were to get it; the first one-fifth instalment is provided for in this Budget.

So far, if one reads the *Public Service Review*, which is published every month, it will be seen that the Public Service Board has dealt with a handful of women, mainly professional or sub-professional employees, and has granted them equal pay. The point I wish to make is this: do not think that that is going to be the end of the matter, and that the question of equal pay will be limited to those groups because already there is building up a considerable pressure group in the Public Service Association. Already that group is very vocal and I would like to offer an example that I consider is typical of what will happen. Take the woman mentioned in group 4—the woman at the top of the scale, who can write shorthand at 120 words a minute and is a superior typiste. Some people in this group already hold the office of court reporters in our local courts and courts of summary jurisdiction. I have heard it mentioned that it is only a matter of time before they will be sitting up in the *Hansard* gallery recording our debates because there are not sufficient men available to do this work.

I make the point that before long those girls, as court reporters, will have a case for pay equal to their male colleagues sitting alongside them doing exactly the same work, and consequently the girls will receive \$3,700 a year. If that happens, it will mean that all the stenographers in other departments will be hundreds of dollars behind them. The Public Service Association (and it is interesting to note this) has already openly said that all women's salaries will have to go up because some of the women are going to receive equal pay. The process of keeping within that little circle will continue, and that is the kind of problem the Government will have to face.

Is what I am saying fantastic? I suggest it is not; it may well be that the Labor Party or the Government will say, "Well, in implementing our policy for equal pay we are only following the principles of the International Labour Organization recommendations." As a matter of interest, at the 1951 convention of the International Labour Organization the following statement was made:

The convention required its member States or forces consistent with their existing methods for determining rates of remuneration to ensure the application to all workers of the principle of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value.

It did not go on to say or explain in that convention what it meant by "work of equal value", but in one of its explanations issued later it said that it meant that if it made no difference to an employer whether he employed a man or a woman on the particular job, then he should pay equal money. In other words, if the only differential was a sex one, then there should be equal pay. Perhaps one need not quarrel with that at all, but when the New South Wales Industrial Commission had to approach the problem of equal pay it said, in effect, "It is all very well to talk in those terms, that if there is only a sex differential, there should be equal pay. We have to approach it differently because of the setting in which we are required to apply the so-called principle of equal pay. In determining whether equal pay is to be given, we have to consider whether the work is similar." Therefore, if this is to be the test, it is beyond doubt that a woman court reporter or a woman *Hansard* reporter must be given the same pay as a man receives.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: At about \$75 a week, that would be.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I could expound the principle and the difficulties involved at some length. It seems to me that the Government has embarked on this policy without reference to anybody. It has applied the policy because it is gospel, according to the Labor Party, on this issue. The principle favours women in employment. As I have said, certain categories already are getting higher margins than married men who have had a tertiary education. If the Government's policy is going to favour women employed in the Public Service (as it is) to the comparative detriment of men, what is the Government doing for the women who look after the children and do the cooking and cleaning at home? Further, what is it doing for their husbands?

We were all told that we in South Australia were going to live better with Labor, but what has this Government done for Mr. and Mrs. John Citizen up to now? It seems to me that the average citizen and his wife have had to meet higher taxes than they have had to meet before. There have been increases all around. Judgment summonses in the local courts are running at an all-time high. If Mr. John Citizen is working under an award, he is working harder than ever and has to see certain sections of women receiving higher margins than he is receiving.

The Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, in its recent basic wage judgment, said that it was concerned about the average working man. I am concerned about him, too, because it seems that the only benefit this Government is handing to him (although he has not yet got it) is the loan of a few measly primary school textbooks if he happens to have children at a primary school. I do not want to be unfair about the matter—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't make me laugh!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It seems that this is all this Government has done for that type of citizen. Some people may be living better with Labor. I think members on the Government benches are doing that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A lot of members now on the Opposition side came down a bit, didn't they?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Ministers, with 197 per cent increases, are doing better.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will be sorry you have said that.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The Government is not concerned with its weekly-paid employees. Here is another gloomy thought. If what I say occurs and there are considerable increases in women's salaries in the Public Service, and if the Government cannot afford to pay those rates, who will get the axe? It will be not the women, but the weekly-paid men in the Government's employ.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why is that?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Because they are more vulnerable. I asked the Chief Secretary a question recently, but I did not get the answer to the question.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You didn't get the answer you wanted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: In effect, I asked the Chief Secretary whether he would give a guarantee that no men would be dismissed when effect was being given to the policy of equal pay for women. He only said that no

man would be shifted in his job to make way for a woman.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: One member of the Liberal and Country League said that he would sack all his female employees.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I know that. The most vulnerable people are those employed by the Government on weekly rates and they will be the first to get the axe if any tight period for the Government occurs as a result of this policy. There is no provision in this Budget for any possible award increases. In other words, I suggest that there is in this Budget a hidden time bomb ticking away, for which no provision has been made, and that if it explodes it will wreck the Budget.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Such as the Metal Trades Award for Railways Department workers.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Such as the award of \$500,000 that has already been made. If in addition increases are granted in matters already before the Arbitrator, goodness knows what they will cost! If the Government implements its policy of equal pay, that will cost an enormous amount of money for which there is no provision in this Budget. These things could occur, and evidence of that is already apparent in what was announced last week. With those warnings, I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): Before I reply to matters that have been raised in the debate, I wish to say how much I appreciated the attitude taken by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin and all other honourable members when I had to leave the Chamber because of illness after introducing this Bill a fortnight ago. I read Sir Lyell's speech and found it to be typical of him: it contained nothing that would hurt me.

The debate has reminded me of an old family choir around the organ on Sunday night or of a group of people around a fire in the country, taking turns to sing songs and everybody coming back to the same verse.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: That is better than a juke box in the city.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It may be, too. The voice was tenor at the beginning, then there was a bass, and later there was a sweet soprano! However, they all sang the one chorus, which in the main contained nothing other than complete condemnation and damnation of the Government. No matter how factual or otherwise or how logical or illogical it was, and irrespective of whether it was in the interests of the State, the song was to the effect that this Government was no good and that it must be kicked to death.

I shall try to answer some of the points raised and prove how unfactual and unfair were some of the comments. I would have to go a long way back to find an occasion when I was treated so unfairly as I was treated in this Chamber last Thursday. People who live in glasshouses should not throw stones, but many stones were thrown at this Government, particularly in relation to unemployment. If the people who threw them had examined the position they would not have said what they did. Let me be realistic on this—and people who know me best know that I do not run away from facts. I say candidly that there has been an increase in unemployment in the last 12 months, but there has been a reason for it: the economic position has not been as good as it could have been, and seasonal conditions not only in this State but also in other States have not been good. Unfortunately, unemployment increased as a result. However, we must remember that it was not many years ago that we went through a similar situation, the reason for which was the same. I will compare conditions in 1961 with present conditions. I cannot remember any great publicity in the newspapers or over television or radio in 1961 such as we had two or three weeks ago. This was no credit to the people concerned, and it grossly exaggerated the position. When we pointed out what the Government was doing and what could be done, there was a terrible silence: there had been a different approach to the matter. It is a tragedy that one or two of the things mentioned happened, but these things will happen when new people come to a country and try to settle down and meet a period of unemployment. However, the position this year is not as bad as it was in 1961.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We were not the worst off in Australia then.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know whether we were not, but in terms of people unemployed we were worse off then than we are now.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We want to deal in percentages.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Dear, dear! The honourable member is new in this Chamber. Let me tell him that I do not believe in percentages, because they do not give a fair picture of the position. I will talk in terms of bodies—mouths and souls, and men and women.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are all that count.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They are. I thought honourable members would have walked

away from unemployment unless they knew the story properly. I have put in my life in making a study of this. We do not want to go back: let us look ahead. I shall compare the recession in 1961 with that today, and my authority is the *Quarterly Abstract of South Australian Statistics*.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What are the future prospects?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall come back to that. They are not as dim as the honourable member would like them to be. I have not picked out one particular month of the year to suit any particular purpose. I have taken the figures for April, May, June, July and August. Also, I was fortunate enough to get the September figures yesterday. In April, 1961, 4,711 males and 3,387 females were registered as unemployed (a total of 8,098) and in April, 1966, despite the growth in population, 3,337 males and 2,690 females (a total of 6,027). This is 2,053 less than in 1961. In May, 1961, there were 4,948 males and 3,585 females registered as unemployed (a total of 8,533) and in May of this year 3,901 males and 2,813 females (a total of 6,714). This figure is almost 2,000 less than in 1961. In June, 1961, there were 5,710 males and 3,325 females registered as unemployed (a total of 9,035), and in June of this year 4,414 males and 2,943 females (a total of 7,357). In round figures, 1,500 more were unemployed in June, 1961, than were unemployed in June of this year. In July, 1961, there were 6,581 males and 3,472 females unemployed (a total of 10,053) and in July, 1966, there were 4,473 males and 2,755 females (a total of 7,228): about 2,750 more were unemployed in 1961 than in 1966.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And we have more population in this State now.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and if one works out the percentages one finds it was even worse than it is today.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: What about figures in other States? You have not given them for 1961.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have given the State's figures, and that is all members opposite used.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: We were not the worst State in 1961.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am speaking about what has happened here. We are here to look after this State, not after Victoria, and members opposite have said that this State is worse than it has ever been. I am proving—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are proving only to yourself!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have given the Commonwealth figures, and they cannot be argued against. The unemployment figures in terms of numbers and percentages are not as bad now as they were in 1961. Nobody can deny that.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: We have gone from the position of being the best in the Commonwealth to the worst. See how you can get out of it!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will come back to that one; you can't get out of that one. It may be on percentages in the Commonwealth, but there were more bodies unemployed in 1961 than there are today.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: With a smaller population then.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, there has been a growth in population in the past five years. Is that true or not? I know that my remarks will not get the publicity that the remarks of others got.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I think you will get a lot.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In August, 1961, the figures were: 6,405 males and 3,238 females, totalling 9,643 unemployed. In August, 1966, the position was: 4,765 males and 2,582 females, totalling 7,347. In round figures, that is 2,300 fewer than in 1961.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That was under a Liberal Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. In September, 1961, there were 9,045 males and 3,103 females registered for employment, totalling 12,148. Unfortunately I have not the break-up to the end of September this year. At the end of the month there was a total of only 7,078 persons registered for employment. In round figures, that is about 5,000 fewer than in 1961. People who hang their hats on the unemployment position have not a great deal to do.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is a big difference, comparing the populations.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Are you taking the unemployment position seriously?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is tragic if there is any unemployment at all. For three weeks now nearly every speaker in this Council has said that the figures are worse today than they have been in the State's history. I have not gone back to the depression days but to the last recession. When honourable members condemn this Government for the

unemployment position, they have short memories. Do not misunderstand me. I have been through the mill and know what unemployment means—not through being unemployed myself. I know what it is to go for a period of months without a weekly income. Don't think I have no sympathy on that score, but I do not like to see unemployment exaggerated for the benefit of a political Party. If we are going to talk unemployment, let us have something worthwhile and near the mark.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did the Commonwealth Government get the blame for the 1961 position?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I know somebody who was out of a job and with no money for three years, so you are not the only one to know about these things.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I know that; I can appreciate all that. This worries me just as much as the 1961 position did. I advise all honourable members to do what I did then, and they will get a real appreciation of the position. I went along to the Department of Labour and National Service, in Currie Street, and saw either the Assistant Director or the Director, a Mr. Sharp. He is prepared to show people the type of person who goes there. Not all the people who are registered for employment are unemployed. There is a big percentage of the first 1 per cent that is unemployable, and there is another percentage of them who are people already in jobs who desire to change them. I do not know the present position but, if honourable members want to talk about unemployment and the effect of the figures and they wish to appreciate their real value, let them go out of their way to go to Currie Street to ascertain the present position.

They will find that .7 per cent or .8 per cent of the first 1 per cent are either unemployable or desire to change their jobs. If we deduct that from the 7,000-odd at the end of September, we find that the real unemployment position is not nearly as bad as the press, television and radio would have us believe.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You think the position is good?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, it is not good. When there are 1,000 people out of work who want work, the position is never good. It is only good when everybody wanting to work is working. I have not taken the trouble to look up in *Hansard* what I said in 1961 but it is there for honourable members to read. I appealed to the Government of the day to try to do something to alleviate the position. I

talked to many local government people and suggested at that time that something should be done to remedy the position; but the local bodies were spread over such an area that it was not practicable.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The State Government did do something in 1961, didn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, not to my knowledge.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It made money available.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No—the Commonwealth Government did. I hope the Commonwealth Government does make money available this time.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: This is what we want to hear.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Two things about the 1961 recession and this recession come to my mind. State Governments cannot do very much about it. With the general tightening up of the economy, if there is a bad season we can do what we like but it is not a great deal. From the two recessions and the experiences in between them I have learnt an obvious lesson: it is abundantly clear to me how dependent our State (and in particular Adelaide) is upon the motor car industry. People are not buying motor cars and they have not the money to spend; when that happens, the motor car industry cannot function at normal capacity. The result then is that the men are put off and nobody else wants them.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: They cannot pay taxes and have money left as well.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is so; I try to be factual and fair. I want to conclude my speech with some remarks about the future and then I will reply to the Hon. Mr. Hart. I wish to speak on hospitals and their charges. If ever I was hurt it was last Thursday; I regret having to mention this, and I would have preferred to do so in the presence of the honourable member concerned. The Hon. Mr. Story was completely non-factual last week when speaking about subsidies to hospitals. I state categorically that no hospital, community or subsidized, has been promised money for 1966-67 and has not received it or will not receive it. The position of the hospital mentioned by Mr. Story was one on which I had to make a big decision. It is a big decision when it becomes necessary to alter a decision made by a previous Minister, and that is what faced me in this instance.

When I took office the previous Government had agreed that certain alterations should take

place at this hospital and that the nurses' quarters should be built. It had been agreed that the old nurses' quarters should be turned into a maternity wing. I am not critical of this decision of the previous Government because it was a doubtful proposition; it was decided that because the other place involved structural alterations it could be termed maintenance work on the old nurses' quarters. The member for the district in another place thought that the Government was a bit hard and asked me to look at it and possibly review the position. I visited the hospital and the member accompanied me. I looked at the position and I thought, "This looks all right." I had thought previously that the previous Minister might have been a little severe on the hospital concerned; the total amount that was brought forward as an extra was \$1,022, the Government's extra share over and above what had been previously decided amounting to \$680. We agreed to do that, and that amount was paid last year.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: That was before the Minister had had much experience.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; I think I would do it again and I am not being critical. The honourable member looks at it in one way and I look at it in another.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I left a good heritage.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have not complained about it.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Tell us about the recent circular.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member cannot get me off this track. A remark was passed that if a certain thing was done it would create a favourable impression and improve the approach to the hospital. Then we decided that they should have permission to do this, and eventually it was done and the hospital advised. The application was received in my office (and the letter is here, but I do not wish to mention the name of the hospital) on June 6, while the letter was dated June 2, 1966. I think the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin will say to me, "Pretty late to get on the Estimates 1966-67", and the hospital board knew this. My officers and I examined the proposition and they were inclined to shake their heads over it. I said, "I would like to do this because it is a nice hospital; we have done the nurses' quarters, and the renovations were quite good; this is to improve the approaches and assist the beautification of the place." The estimated cost of this work was \$3,242 while the Government's share, on a two for one basis,

amounted to \$2,161. As everybody would know (or certainly the previous Minister would know) when it comes to June for the following year's Estimates nothing else has a chance of being included. The honourable member concerned was aware of this.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Those applications are looked after in advance.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They cannot get in this year. The honourable member is at cross purposes with me.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It is usual to get in early and anticipate such things.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I know that. This was a doubtful one, whether it qualified for a subsidy or not. At first thought, no possible hope existed for including it in the 1966-67 Estimates but, if it was agreed to, it could have been earmarked for 1967-68. As I have said, the letter was dated June 2, and I have explained what we did, yet Mr. Story had the audacity to get up in this Council and accuse me and my Government of not paying a subsidy as usual.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: As I have said, it is next year's.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member accused me of not paying it this year when it had no hope of being on the Estimates.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Why not?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member should know why not and he does know. The Estimates are usually made up in April or May.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: If I were making a domestic speech such as the Minister is making I could give many examples of items being included in the Estimates up to August.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: But the honourable member did not have a member of another Party get up and accuse him of what I was accused of last Thursday. I consider it most unfair and I want to leave it at that.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Will you have enough money for a new switchboard and transformer at a certain hospital?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I don't know; I have not caught up with that one. I am not afraid to go to any hospital, and there is only one hospital out of step; I know Sir Lyell and I would agree on this one because its wants are altogether too luxurious. It is in the South-East. We have spoken of hospitals at various times, and in speaking to another Bill I said what would happen with regard to hospital fees when the Budgets of other States were published. I want it to go on record concerning one State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Financed by lotteries?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not entirely, anyway. The report reads:

The Royal Perth Hospital is overcrowded and hospital facilities in Western Australia are below needs and the new medical centre to be built to meet metropolitan demands is, as yet, only a Bill before the State Parliament. But, on November 1, the daily hospital charges for public hospitals are to be increased from \$7 to \$10 in the public wards, from \$9 to \$13.50 in the intermediate wards and from a minimum of \$11.50 to a minimum of \$18 for private rooms. The point has now been raised that the new charges may be beyond the means of some patients badly needing hospital treatment and, if that is so, what will be the result. At the Royal Perth Hospital, a full investigation is to be made into the probable effect of the new fees. The sad part about the situation is that the increasing number of road accident victims is one of the main reasons for the overcrowding. I have a schedule of daily rates charged to patients in major public hospitals in Australia and ask leave to have the schedule incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It seems that hospitalization in Queensland is free. The Hon. Sir Lyell may tell me what he knows about the Queensland system one day when he is in a good mood. I just do not know the position there. We cannot get any satisfaction in relation to the position between the Commonwealth Government and the Queensland Government. Anyway, the public wards there are free.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Such as they are!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We are accused of increasing our charges in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: We used to be criticized for charging at all.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I know that. One cannot pull up his socks if he has no socks on. Our charges for hospitalization are the lowest in Australia, with the exception of Queensland, and nobody knows what that State is doing. I wish to deal briefly with the computer in connection with electoral enrolment. I said, by way of interjection, what we intended to do in connection with the provision of \$70,000 on the Estimates. I make no apology for my attitude. I told the Hon. Mr. Hill that the Government intended to bring the rolls up to date and to have as many people enrolled as possible. That is our intention. I think the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that, when I retired, I would not believe in the abolition of this Council. However, I shall never change my opinion. I sincerely and genuinely believe that,

DAILY RATES CHARGED TO PATIENTS IN MAJOR PUBLIC HOSPITALS IN AUSTRALIA
Current and Previous Rate and Date Operative

State	From	Type of Accommodation					
		Public		Intermediate		Private	
		General	Maternity	General	Maternity	General	Maternity
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
South Australia	1/5/65	6.50	7.00	8.00	8.50	10.00	10.50
	1/4/66	7.50	8.00	9.00	9.50	11.50	12.00
New South Wales	1/5/63	6.00	6.00	8.80	8.80	11.60	11.60
	-/10/66	8.20	8.20	+0.30 11.70	+0.30 11.70	+0.30 14.90	+0.30 14.90
Victoria	1/1/66	8.00	8.00	10.50	10.50	15.00	15.00
	1/9/66	10.00	10.00	13.50	13.50	18.00	18.00
Queensland	1/10/60	Free	Free	6.20	6.20	7.00	7.00
		(No Means Test)		(To be increased from November, 1966)			
Western Australia	-/6/65	7.00	7.00	9.00	9.00	11.50	11.50
	1/11/66	10.00	10.00	13.50	13.50	18.00	18.00
Tasmania	1/8/65	8.00	9.00	—	10.00 } 10.50 }	—	11.00 } 13.00 }

within a State, there is no need for an Upper House. That is one plank of our Party's platform in which I believe 100 per cent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Which ones don't you agree with?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Do you want me to ask you whether you still knock your wife about? I shall not fall for that. If an Upper House is wanted within a State, let us have one roll for both Houses. That may remove some of my objections to an Upper House.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I thought you might have reached the same position as the Hon. C. C. Kingston, whom we looked on as a statesman.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We are not supposed to live in the dark ages, are we?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have given my opinion of many members of Parliament who chop and change from Party to Party and I do not have to be told that my opinion is un-Parliamentary. I know it is. I hope to reach retirement as a firm and good member of the Australian Labor Party, and I believe I shall do that.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: This Council has saved you from many sins for which you otherwise would have been responsible.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In reverse, I think this Council has restricted us and has prohibited us from doing many things we wanted to do. I do not mind any honourable member raising a matter legitimately if there is a query about it. However, my colleagues and I shall not be parties to any misappropriation or mishandling of money. I think the Hon. Mr. Hill overdid it when he spoke about Ministers' salaries, because he must have known there would be a reason for the increase. I hope the answer I shall give will satisfy him.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How do you think he overdid it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Because he played politics about the matter. There is an old saying that, if one throws enough mud, some of it will stick.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: This wasn't mud. It is in the document.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have given my opinion and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris can stick to his. Regarding the Hon. Mr. Hill's question, the amount voted for Ministers' salaries in 1965-66 was \$35,700. This was as provided by section 65 of the Constitution Act, except that the increase of \$4,200 provided by the

1963 amendment to the Act for a ninth Minister was not included as the ninth Minister had not been appointed. Actual payments were \$38,387. Basic Parliamentary salary to the extent of \$53,566 payable to Ministers last year was voted and paid on the line for Members of Parliament in accordance with the Statutes in force at the time. Actual payments of Ministers' salaries last year therefore totalled \$91,953. I shall now give the true comparisons for Ministers' salaries and for salaries of other members of Parliament between 1965-66 actual payments and 1966-67 proposals. For Ministers, the actual payments of \$91,953 in 1965-66 are expected to be increased by \$22,047 to \$114,000 in 1966-67. For other members, the actual payments of \$338,589 in 1965-66 are expected to be increased by \$82,061 to \$420,650 in 1966-67.

The different presentation this year is due to the fact that all payments are grouped under the authority of one Act—the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act. Last year it was necessary to show two Acts as the authority—the Payment of Members of Parliament Act for all basic salaries and the Constitution Act for additional Ministerial salaries. Expenses to be covered by the separate provision of \$5,000 for Ministers' travelling expenses were previously met from the "Office Expenses" lines of the various Ministerial departments. I hope that satisfies honourable members. If any further information is required, I shall be glad to obtain it.

Another matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill was in connection with the line "Premier and Treasurer—Miscellaneous: Contribution to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for subsidies for country areas". The following explanation is given: The Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act, 1962, provided for the payment of \$1,200,000 to be used to reduce electricity tariffs in country areas. Of this, \$600,000 was set apart by the Act to enable the Electricity Trust to reduce its own tariffs to country consumers to within 10 per cent of metropolitan tariffs, and the remainder was available for subsidies to undertakings apart from the trust. The subsidies to the latter were given in the form of discounts on accounts rendered to consumers. Late in 1964 the trust advised that as a result of increased economies it was able not only to assume full financial responsibility without further subsidies for the reduction in tariffs effected in 1962 but that it was also able to provide single meter tariffs at metropolitan rates for all its consumers in country areas.

As no further subsidies were required by the trust, the balance of moneys was available to effect further reductions in the accounts of consumers supplied by private country electricity undertakings. Accordingly, the previously applied discounts were doubled from early in 1965. An amendment to the Act in 1955 gave the necessary authority for the moneys provided in the Act to be applied for this purpose. The original Act appropriated a fixed sum for these purposes. The amending Act provided also that any further moneys required to continue the scheme were to be provided by Parliament for the purpose. The amount estimated to be required in 1966-67 for payment of subsidies to private country undertakings to enable them to reduce their tariffs to within 10 per cent of the trust's metropolitan tariffs is \$265,000. The amount held for these purposes in the Electricity Trust of South Australia trust account at June 30, 1966, was \$217,000. Accordingly, a further \$50,000 has been included in the Estimates for these purposes.

This brings me to my conclusion. The Hon. Mr. Kemp mentioned various lines and, when I said that I thought the Agriculture Department had more money provided this year than last year, he said that it was substantially reduced. Perhaps we are at cross purposes. He said certain lines were reduced, whereas in my second reading explanation I said:

Agriculture Department, \$2,103,000.—This year's provision is \$118,000 more than last year's payments. As there has been no major outbreak of fruit fly for three years, no provision to deal with a fresh outbreak has been considered necessary this year.

Despite this, it was said this afternoon that, because the lines were not provided as previously, the sum spent in the Agriculture Department was less. That is not factual; but it is the same old story.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The honourable member did not say that: he said that the amount provided for activities was down but that the amount for salaries was up.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I said that the amount provided for the Agriculture Department this year was greater than last year's payment, and he said it was not. He said the lines were down. There was an insinuation that we were not spending as much as we did last year. That theme has gone right through this debate. I will say that publicly as well as here.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What about his comparison in relation to the Aboriginal Affairs Department?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I did not pick that up, but I heard the comments about the Agriculture Department. I do not sit home, either! We are going all right, and I hope members opposite have a few dollars to spare at election time. This has been the theme right through the debate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But you must agree that the provision for research has decreased.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I said the provision for this year was greater than the payment last year.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The honourable member then quoted lines relating to research.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They are down, but the total is greater.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Only on salaries.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Never mind what the increase is for. The theme throughout the debate has been that we are not spending as much as we did last year, yet expenditure is between 13 per cent and 15 per cent higher.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: We agree with that. We are not suggesting that you are not spending it: we are suggesting that you are wasting it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member should analyse some of the things said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I said that the expenditure for the Agriculture Department had increased by 9.2 per cent whereas total expenditure had increased by 16 per cent and that therefore the growth in agriculture had not matched the total growth of the Estimates.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is so, but it is greater than last year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It would have to be.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: But your colleague did not agree with that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think it has been misinterpreted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Never mind that. It is in *Hansard*, and it goes out and is quoted against us. Sometimes I do not think it is accidental. My honourable friend asked about unemployment. I believe we have seen the bottom of unemployment in this recession. I think the position will gradually improve and that we will pull out of it the same as we did in 1961. I base my reasons on the fact that not only this State has had a reasonable rainfall and that the prospects are good but that the centre of Australia is in a similar position

and that New South Wales, I believe, is expecting a record crop. Queensland is not as bad as it was. When the economy starts to move in the early part of next year, at the latest, and people start to buy motor cars and machinery again, I think things will go all right.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you think we can maintain our migrant intake?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We have to, provided there is employment for them. I have always been an advocate of migrants coming to this State, but I make two provisos, which I think are sound: first, provided they have somewhere reasonable to live; secondly, provided they have jobs. In those circumstances, let's have them by the thousand. The financial position of the State is improving and I think will go on improving. I am not a pessimist. We shall continue to improve. In case any honourable member did not read it, I want to have recorded in *Hansard* a statement of the State's financial position to the end of September, which was released by the Premier. It is as follows:

The Premier (Mr. Frank Walsh) in releasing the State financial figures for September, 1966, said that a clear improvement was evident in them. The surplus in Revenue Account for the month was \$2,221,000 as compared with \$2,070,000 in the previous year. The month of September ordinarily shows a surplus because of the relatively low interest commitments. This is in contrast to the month of August, when high interest commitments and an additional pay day for teachers means a heavy deficit.

The aggregate deficit for the quarter to the end of September was \$5,385,000, which is above the figure of \$1,642,000 at the same time last year. The major reason for this difference is the alteration in timing of water and sewer accounts. These have brought in \$2,034,000 less than in the first quarter of last year, although in the full year an increase of over \$2,000,000 is expected. This lag in water and sewer revenues is purely temporary. On Loan Account, expenditures for the quarter were \$18,942,000 or 24½ per cent of the Estimate for the full year. This compares with \$17,923,000 for the first quarter of last financial year.

In conclusion, I should like to thank honourable members for their interest in the debate. They have put much effort into it. Whether or not I agree with what was said, I appreciate that they put forward their points of view as they believe them. However, I think their views are representative of their districts possibly more from their Party's point of view than from that of the State.

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

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2273.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not desire to speak at length on this Bill. The Minister has indicated that he is anxious to have it dealt with as soon as possible. The general purpose for which it was introduced is one that we could all support and for which we were seeking legislation: to make adjustments because of recent assessments that have considerably affected the value of land and, in consequence, the monetary limitations in the Crown Lands Act that would affect leases held.

On first reading the Bill I was somewhat perturbed to find that, while that part of the legislation was satisfactory, there were two innovations, one relating to the limitation of acreage and the other spelling out in a different manner the old original line drawn on the map by Goyder. Of course, I had at the back of my mind what had occurred in land settlement in this State in the past (and not in the very distant past, either) because of limitation on holdings. In the late 1920's and the early 1930's there was settlement of the Chandada Estate on Eyre Peninsula, with dire results, because the land was purchased at a high price and soon afterwards there appeared root disease and other things; but, whatever it was, the real trouble was not that: it was that the land had been knocked about in an effort to produce a crop. That country was settled on 640-acre farms and at that time the economic situation of the industry was not good. It was during the period when we were going through the change from horse farming to mechanical farming; those people could not feed their horses, and certainly could not afford to buy a tractor, with the result that the settlement was a failure.

During my period as a member of Parliament I can also remember seeing what happened in the settlement of the returned soldiers from the First World War in the Blinman area of the Flinders Ranges, where holdings were insufficient to keep enough sheep to feed a man's family. There again, adjustment had to be made, and if members travel through the North where land was broken up into square mile farms, all that can be seen are derelict old buildings, but there has been an aggregation of those farms. Fortunately, it became stable even though it was done the hard way because it was a case of the survival of the

fittest. The people who hung on longer than the rest were able to obtain a neighbour's farm and, by the effluxion of time, things were adjusted and a fairly stable community established around that area. Then, of course, it was in the 1940's that the marginal lands legislation came before us. That was a measure to enlarge holdings on Eyre Peninsula, and again seasonal conditions aggravated matters during the period of settlement. The country had been blown to pieces with drift and again aggregation was necessary to stabilize both the country and the people living on it.

Perhaps it is only natural that I should be a little conservative when I see a limitation on acreage included in the map relating to this Bill. Because of that, I began to look for the reason why this was being introduced now, and the answer was not too difficult to find after I had made inquiries from the proper source. It was just what we had been thinking earlier about land tax assessments which, in many cases, are completely unrealistic and not associated with the value of the property or what that property can produce. There exists a system of establishing values on the basis of what somebody is prepared to pay for the land. We can obtain all kinds of examples from people who do not know any better and who pay more than the land is worth.

Again, take the case of a man living alongside a certain area (I am speaking in this instance of freehold land, because leasehold has not come into the picture) who desires an extra block of land, or a paddock from a farm to be sold nearby. Perhaps two or three people in the vicinity want a paddock in order to establish a holding—they may not have a family holding or perhaps they have a son growing up—and because they have a property of their own and have had it for some time, they make sure that they get the land they want and are prepared to pay perhaps anything from \$20 to \$40 an acre extra for that land. The land is purchased and the price paid becomes the valuation of surrounding properties; this is completely unrealistic.

I can imagine the problem the Land Board would have faced with the new assessment which, in some areas, has increased considerably. We all know of extreme cases where it has increased by up to 100 per cent, while in others it has risen 60 to 70 per cent, and in others again no comparable change has occurred. Everybody has a desire to avoid aggregation at the expense of people who

are desiring to hold land and work it at the present time. I think the provision in the Bill makes it possible for the Land Board to adjust any anomalies that may occur. I do not care where the line is drawn, whether on Goyder's line of rainfall or any other line on the map; there must always be fringe decisions that will make it necessary to make some adjustments regarding the area that is established which, in this case, is 4,000 acres.

Having spoken to the Chairman of the Land Board, and also to the Director, regarding this matter, I do not think I can criticize the area that has been fixed; in the main, I think that would not be considered extravagant, but in some cases it may be. Of course, there is no way of drawing up a Bill that can make an exact limit of the size of a holding. It is better, I think, to err on the side of too much rather than too little. Where too little is allowed, it appears that power will be given to the Land Board to give special consideration in such a case. That is under section 225 (5) of the principal Act, which reads:

Notwithstanding anything in this section the board may recommend and the Commissioner may consent to the transfer or subletting of any land if owing to special circumstances it is in the opinion of the board and the Commissioner just and reasonable that the transfer or subletting should be permitted.

Therefore, after giving it due consideration, I support this innovation because I think it is necessary in view of what has happened: the disparity of values in one part of the State as against another part. I have confidence in the Land Board that it will give proper and practical consideration to the problems with which it is confronted.

The other innovation is the alteration to Goyder's line of rainfall in the schedule. Whilst I have not had time to study the exact picture on the map, I am satisfied that, under the provisions that have been made, the board will be practical in its approach. I know that agricultural pursuits are being carried on successfully beyond Goyder's line, and therefore it is necessary to make some adjustment somewhere. I think this has been an attempt by the Land Board to present a better definition between agricultural and pastoral country. I am prepared to accept it as a practical effort to make the administration of the Act fair and reasonable and to obtain the maximum settlement on the land without involving the dangers of over-settlement

and having to repeat what has been done in the past, when disintegration has had to be followed by aggregation.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2274.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): In the time available to me I gave more attention to the previous Bill than I have given to this measure. The first matter that strikes me in the Minister's explanation is the re-introduction of stamp duty on amounts between \$10 and \$50. For many years, a 2d. duty stamp was required on all receipts over £2. When we considered legislation in the last session, a progressive rate of tax was applied. I think the rates were 2c, 5c and 10c. The Council was opposed to various charges, because they would have required the keeping of a variety of duty stamps. Such a variety of stamps could result in people who made mistakes innocently being charged with criminal offences.

This Council sought a single rate of duty for all transactions, and this request was agreed to. Conference discussion of the matter was hurried and the minimum amount attracting duty was fixed at \$50. I thought at the time that that might affect Government revenue. However, no blame can be placed on the Council for what happened: the Government itself was in agreement with what was done. I mention that matter today only because the Chief Secretary has said that the Council interfered with the amount of revenue to be collected by the Government. I point out that the concession granted in relation to stamp duty was voluntarily provided by the Government.

We are going back to the stage where we have two rates of stamp duty. Where receipts for amounts up to \$50 are demanded, duty stamps will have to be attached. It is expected that this will bring in revenue of \$100,000 and the Government is entitled to revenue from that source. Although I do not favour having two different rates of duty, I do not offer any opposition to the proposal. The other provision agreed to last year related to the compounding of duty, and that is being altered slightly. I do not know the reason for the alteration.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was mentioned in the explanation.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes, but I want to know the reason for this provision. Payment of stamp duty is compulsory in relation to amounts of more than \$50. Therefore, duty would have to be paid by one means or the other. Another amendment deals with stamp duty on hire-purchase agreements, for which the rate has been increased. This looks all right on the surface. However, it puts a tax on people who, unfortunately, have to borrow from money-lenders and hire-purchase companies. I understand that the finance company takes the cost of the stamp duty, and I merely assumed that this amount is passed on. We know that all charges of transfers and other dealings with finance companies or solicitors are charges against the person doing the business.

However, I understand that finance companies have to pay a charge in certain cases, particularly when a debt is paid off before the due date, when a refund of interest and charges is involved. The finance companies cannot recover from the borrowers. Surely people should be encouraged to pay off their borrowings. The finance companies have to take charges on the assumption that the transaction will run for the whole period and, although money borrowed may be repaid in, say, two months, the full period of the loan may be 12 months upon which full duty has been paid.

The obvious answer is that the companies will have to be more careful. Otherwise, they will be at a disadvantage. The Government does not want to do the companies an injustice. It is not the millionaires who have to deal with finance companies and hire-purchase companies but people of modest means. I do not think we should do anything that will make things difficult for them.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They refund only a portion.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: But they pay duty on the whole amount for the whole period. I ask the Government to look at the position, because I think it may cause an injustice to people who are not able to stand it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are the two points I have heard the two you wish to raise?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes. Of course, the usual comparisons have been made; it has been said that we are not up to the top of the Australian States. The Government will not be satisfied until we are.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I was in the reverse position today, as I quoted one case where we were at the bottom.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: There are two points of view on that, and I think the Government is at the top in that matter, too. I have not made a long study of this measure, and perhaps there will be other points in relation to increased commissions. This does not amount to a big percentage, but in total there is a big increase, which will mean that someone will have to find \$1,500,000. However, the Government will need this money for its revenue purposes, so I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will reply to the two points raised.

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

STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2216.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): This Bill, in effect, arises from the vote at the referendum of the people of South Australia held, I think, in November last, in which quite an overwhelming majority was in favour of lotteries. In round figures, 345,000 South Australians voted that they wanted lotteries and 142,000 said they did not. This means that for every one person who did not want lotteries nearly 2½ people said they did. In the circumstances of this vote on a matter of this nature, I think it behoves us to consider only the detail of the Bill. I do not want at this stage to go into the complete detail of the measure: I merely want to draw attention to clause 19 (8) (d). I think the Chief Secretary will agree with what I have to say, because we often agree on various things.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are very lucky.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, I am very reasonable.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: We agreed, for instance, on the Bill dealing with totalizator agency betting that neither of us wanted to see a reversion to the old betting shops of the early 1930's.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is right.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think the Chief Secretary will agree that we do not want the streets of Adelaide, in relation to lotteries, to become like the streets of Brisbane. I do not know whether the Chief Secretary has been to Brisbane in the last few years and seen how tickets are hawked.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have been to Perth and Melbourne, and I do not like what I have seen.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I was sure the Chief Secretary would agree with me, because we see eye to eye, on this matter at least.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have that point covered in the Bill—or at least we think we have it covered.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Chief Secretary is so reasonable and is obviously in such a reasonable state of mind this afternoon that I am sure he will listen to what I have to say. I want to analyse the precise point on which he interjected, because this is the only point about which I am worried. The Chief Secretary said that the Government had this covered.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I corrected that and said that I thought we had.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is so. Clause 19 deals with various offences, and subclause (7) provides that a person shall not distribute, display or publish or cause to be distributed, displayed or published, by any means, any notice or advertisement, etc. This is a fairly wide clause: it provides that a person shall not display any advertisements that state certain things or from which certain things may reasonably be inferred, and paragraph (c) provides that he shall not invite any person to purchase from him a ticket in a lottery. Up to that point, I agree that the matter is covered, but the clause then makes certain exceptions, as it provides that it shall not be an offence under subclause (7) for an agent of the commission or any person authorized by the commission to sell tickets to display within or outside premises a notice bearing the words "Lottery Tickets Sold Here" without the addition of any other words.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The intention is to limit the notice to "Lottery Tickets Sold Here".

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is so, and so far so good. I agree entirely. Subclause (8) (b) provides that it shall not be an offence for the commission to display a list of the names and addresses of prize winners or agents of the commission, and I agree that this is perfectly reasonable. Subclause (8) (c) provides that it shall not be an offence for an agent of the commission to distribute or display any list referred to in paragraph (b). In other words, the agent can display a list of prize winners, and there is nothing wrong with that. Indeed, these things make a lottery a success, and they have to be. However, the sting (and this is the clause I should like the Chief Secretary and the Government to

consider) comes in the tail of subclause (8) (d), which I have paraphrased by underlining certain words. It provides:

It shall not be an offence . . . (d) for any person, who is requested or authorized by the Commission to do so, to print, exhibit or publish . . . any—

I emphasize "any"—

notice, placard, handbill, card, writing, sign or advertisement of any lottery . . .

In other words, if any person has the consent of the commission, then he is entitled to publish any handbill or any advertisement whatsoever. This is the paragraph I draw attention to. I am not at all happy about it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you think that that might undo all our good intentions?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will look at that.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This is the dragnet clause that we so often find in Acts of Parliament. As I have said many times, it is the clause put in to permit anything to be done that may or may not be thought of, and there is generally some protective provision in, such as "with the consent of the Minister". In this case it is "with the authority of the commission". It states clearly that with the authority of the commission any person can exhibit or publish any placard, handbill, sign or advertisement of any lottery. This, in effect, hands to the commission the authority of Parliament to restrict these matters. As I felt sure it had been, the Government has been at pains to provide in this way, and that is why I addressed my remarks as I did to the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I can ease your mind on that. The Government is determined that that shall not happen.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It is clear that great care has been taken to provide in the Bill that the minimum requirements shall, in effect, be the maximum (that the minimum display of advertisements shall be used) but then this total clause really throws the whole thing again into the melting-pot or puts completely into the hands of the commission what may be done.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will have this matter thoroughly examined.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am glad to have the Chief Secretary's assurance on that (I felt I would get it), because the commission will be appointed to make this lottery a success. That will be its job. No doubt, it would be a great temptation in certain circumstances, if the lottery was lag-

ging or the whole thing was not being as popular as anticipated, to open it out and proffer tickets in the sort of way that the Chief Secretary has said he has seen in Western Australia and as I have seen in Queensland, which I consider is totally undesirable in a city of the character of Adelaide.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Again, we agree.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am glad that the Chief Secretary agrees. On that note I propose to resume my seat. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the measure in general terms. Obviously, many people want a lottery and I am happy to vote in favour of one. However, like the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, I am concerned with the safeguards that must be included in the Bill. It is obvious that the Government has endeavoured to write in safeguards. A close scrutiny of this measure is required as regards safeguards that are obviously necessary to maintain high standards.

I deal first with signs. Under clause 19 (8) (a) authority is given for a notice or notices to be erected either inside or outside premises and to include certain words. I have not so far had time to investigate fully the point I had in mind, but I am concerned that these signs should and will have to conform to signs by-laws, which of course are prepared by councils. They come under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1923-1932, and the Building Act. I am not sure on this point.

Perhaps the Chief Secretary will tell me whether or not the regulations that can be made under clause 20 of this Bill can override the by-laws concerning signs that apply in any particular area. If the lottery was not successful and the commission appealed to the Minister on the point that further promotion and further publicity were needed for the lottery to succeed, would the commission have the power to override councils in regard to the sizes, positions, etc., of signs in connection with their by-laws? That is my first point. It needs close scrutiny.

My second point was mentioned by the last speaker—that in Brisbane lottery tickets are sold in the street, not from within premises but by people walking the streets. They have trays and placards and they must have some licence to sell lottery tickets in that way. Councils can give licences to hawkers or they can grant tradespeople a licence to sell upon the street, under the Local Government Act, section 669 (13) (II). We see in this city that some people are allowed to have fruit barrows from

which to sell fruit and flowers; and a separate licence is needed for news boys, etc. These licences are given, and local government has the power to give them.

We have to be careful that a position could not arise where a local government body, whether in the city of Adelaide or in a country town, gave an agent for the commission the right to sell in other than his business premises. So far, I have been unable to find in this Bill whether an agent is specifically forced to sell lottery tickets or to conduct his business only on registered premises. There is some reference to the position in some way but I think that in the clause dealing with the powers and functions of the commission there should be a provision to the effect that "an agent appointed under this clause shall conduct his business only on particular premises". That is my second point.

My third point relates again to the main issue raised by Sir Arthur Rymill, in connection with subclause (11), which gives the commission the right to override all the good intentions expressed in the previous parts of this long clause 19. Again, we must face the possibility that the lottery may not be as successful as people have hoped, and some further publicity may be needed. That is where some control should exist.

I think the commission, as well as going to the Minister as it has to do under the Act seeking the right to widen the scope of publicity, should have some guide as to what Parliament intends. Perhaps we could write into the Bill that special cases requiring further publicity could be approved by the commission. However, as I read it, there is no guide at all for the commission.

If a lottery were not successful, the commission would go to the Minister and the responsibility on his shoulders would be great when considering the extent to which he could agree that further publicity should be given. It could possibly get into the realm of being deemed objectionable, and of course that is not the intention of the measure.

I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that clause after clause has been inserted to maintain a standard to limit garish publicity and promotions that we do not want to see and which have occurred in other States; yet in clause 19 there seems to be a let-out. Like previous speakers, I treat this clause with great concern. I trust that in his reply the Chief Secretary will touch on some of the points that I have mentioned. Also, in the Committee stage

of the Bill it is possible that certain amendments will be moved in an endeavour to make a special effort to ensure that these standards will be maintained for all time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I do not want to become political over this matter; I consider it to be above politics. Everybody is well aware that in his policy speech the Premier promised the people an opportunity to indicate their desire regarding a lottery to be run by the State. As everybody knows, the referendum was carried overwhelmingly by about 70 per cent of the people voting in favour of a lottery. This was in spite of dismal forecasts that the action being taken was like putting poison in the hands of a child. Consequently, this Bill is a follow-on from the result of that referendum, and the Government is to be congratulated on the speed with which it has acted in carrying out its promise to the people.

It appears that lotteries are big business in other States, and we hope that the same will apply in this State. We notice that in Victoria subscriptions to consultations rose from \$19,270,000 in 1960 to \$21,340,000 in 1964. Duty paid to consolidated revenue in Victoria in 1960 amounted to \$5,932,000. Under the Victorian Tattersalls Consultation Act revenue from the consultations was paid into consolidated revenue and each year an equivalent amount has been paid out of consolidated revenue in such proportions as the Treasurer determines into the Hospitals and Charities Fund and the Mental Hospitals Fund. In 1960 the Hospitals and Charities Fund received \$5,078,000 while the Mental Hospitals Fund received \$854,000. In 1964 the duty paid to consolidated revenue was \$6,609,000 of which the Hospitals and Charities Fund received \$6,309,000 and the Mental Hospitals Fund \$300,000.

In 1962, in New South Wales, subscriptions to the consultations amounted to \$39,195,000 while cash prizes totalled \$24,494,500. I do not know the amount of the distribution to hospitals, but at least it indicates that the lottery operates in a big way. If the 70 per cent of people who voted in favour of having a lottery in this State actually support such a lottery, it will not be long before it becomes big business in South Australia, bringing with it some assistance to our public hospitals. I do not think that the establishment of a lottery means this will be the end of financial worries as far as hospitals are concerned, but at least it means

that money being used to assist hospitals in other States will no doubt be diverted to assist our hospitals.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: A good, factual statement!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Under clause 17 of the Bill the commission shall offer as prizes in any lottery conducted under this Act not less than 60 per cent of the value of the tickets offered for sale in that lottery. This compares favourably with allocations in other States.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It is 64 per cent in other States.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not 64 per cent in other States. As I have said, this compares favourably with what is the average in other States, and 60 per cent is about the average distribution there. I think the limitation imposed regarding advertising the sale of lottery tickets is a good one because I have seen some footpaths cluttered up in other States. It has been stated that we do not want that in Adelaide, and I agree. With regard to the question of penalties as proposed in clause 19, while I do not like penalties in some Acts, I think the maximum penalties proposed in this Bill will act as a deterrent to people who think they may be able to commit offences and get away with them. The penalties will make such persons think twice before committing offences. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

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

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 11. Page 2152.)

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines): It was brought to the notice of this Committee that on occasions concentrates were handled on the wharves at Port Pirie by cranes, and I accepted an amendment to include wharf 7. Wharves 5 and 6 were mentioned. Honourable members asked whose responsibility they were, and I said they were the responsibility of the Harbors Board. The graph on the notice board shows that these cranes do not and cannot operate on wharves 5 and 6, as there are no rails for them. The cranes we are concerned with are the responsibility of the Mines Department, and they cannot operate on these

two wharves, where mobile cranes are used. There is no way in which an inspector of the Mines Department can be responsible for inspecting mobile cranes, as they are owned or hired by the local stevedoring company. Ships' gear is also used for loading directly on to ships. I do not think it was ever intended that an inspector of the Mines Department should be responsible for inspecting mobile cranes, and in the circumstances I do not think wharves 5 and 6 can be covered. A proclamation was made last Thursday that contained various definitions, including definitions of "machinery" and "wharf". The purpose of these regulations is to bring every piece of machinery at Port Adelaide under the jurisdiction of the Harbors Board. If necessary, the regulations could be extended to these wharves at Port Pirie.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not want to seem unduly persistent, because if wharves 5 and 6 were omitted there would not be much left. However, last week I mentioned the mechanical loader that belongs to the mining authorities.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It has never been used, and it will be dismantled and taken away.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: It was erected to load products mechanically, and it is still there. It was the subject of an industrial dispute on a demarcation issue. The loader has not been used, but if agreement can be reached it may be used in future, in which case I should like to know what regulations cover its use.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This is another matter raised for a specific purpose. If honourable members want to throw this Bill out, let them do so. This machinery has not been and will not be operated. If it were to be operated in future, however, the regulations would cover the position, but I have been told it will not be used.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think the value of the Minister's reply is that the Harbors Board now has a regulation, so the position is covered.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.58 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 19, at 2.15 p.m.