

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 19, 1967.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

RACING DIVIDENDS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: During the last session legislation was passed enabling the Government to take the necessary action to prevent the exploitation of the minimum dividend guaranteed on totalizer investments. The method that has been adopted by the Government is that other dividends are shaved to make the minimum dividend 50c in the case where a horse pays less than 50c. The shaving of dividends was also the method used to prevent this exploitation in Victoria, but the method there is to be dropped, and new regulations have been drafted in relation thereto. The shaving of dividends procedure, while preventing the manipulation of the totalizer on the minimum dividend of 50c, means that the backers of other placed horses are called on to meet the deficiency. Is the Chief Secretary aware of the proposed changes in Victoria; if not, will he make inquiries to see if the proposed regulations in Victoria could be applicable in South Australia?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer to the first part of the question is, "No, I am not aware of this", but as promised in the last session of Parliament, regulations will come into force. As I have told honourable members, if a better suggestion were to be put forward, the Government would examine it. I shall take up this matter with the Totalizer Agency Board and have it examined. If it is a better proposal, and if it is accepted by both the T.A.B. and Treasury officials, the necessary amendments will be made. I shall be happy to have a thorough examination of the proposal made to see whether it would work better in the interests of all concerned.

LUCERNE.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question I asked on July 4 regarding lucerne wilt?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: A proclamation under the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection

Act is to be submitted to His Excellency the Governor shortly. The proclamation will prohibit the entry into South Australia from Victoria of any part of the lucerne plant, including the seed, produced in Victoria.

CHEMICALS.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question I asked on June 22 regarding the potential health hazards in agricultural chemicals?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has supplied the following report:

The issues raised, if the question were to be answered in detail, are very varied as there is an extremely wide range of chemicals used internally and externally on animals, on pastures and cereal crops, and in horticultural practice. They include pesticides, herbicides, antibiotics, anthelmintics and a host of other drugs. A summary is given of the various bodies concerned with this problem on State and Commonwealth levels. Before any stock medicine is registered under the Stock Medicines Act, its effect on the animal and also the humans eating the flesh or by-product of the treated animals is examined.

A stock feeds additives subcommittee appointed by standing committee has prepared a list of prohibited drugs and of drugs which may be added to stock feeds within prescribed limits. There are two representatives of the National Health and Medical Research Council on the subcommittee. The findings of the subcommittee were gazetted in regulations under the Stock Foods Act, South Australia, on June 8, 1967. There is a pesticides committee appointed by standing committee which reviews pesticide residues and usage and recommends to standing committee what steps should be taken to avoid residues in excess of permitted levels. There are also a number of inter-related committees under the National Health and Medical Research Council, including the Veterinary Public Health Committee, which give consideration to such matters and make any recommendations considered necessary to safeguard human health from drugs used on animals. The bodies referred to above have access to information prepared by the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations organization and to other sources of information dealing with this subject. The controls imposed through these committees are adequate to protect human and animal health from the effect of chemicals used in agriculture.

TRANSPORT COMMISSION.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think that one of the matters on which it would be in the interests of the State to have some clarification is transport policy. I know that the Royal Commission on State Transport Services has been looking into this matter, attending very diligently to its work and making a very thorough inquiry, and I do not want anything I say to suggest that we should hasten it in its work or lessen the effectiveness of what it is doing. However, I understood at one stage that it was possible that the Commission would submit an interim report. Can the Minister of Transport say, first, whether it is likely that an interim report will be made and, secondly, whether it is the Government's intention to wait until the final deliberations and decisions of this Commission are made known before it determines its transport policy?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No interim report has yet been received from the Commission, and there is no guarantee that one will be received; in fact, I have not asked for one. The Government intends to wait for the final report from the Commission, and Cabinet will consider that report before determining future transport policy.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: A short time ago the Minister of Labour and Industry, giving a report from his colleague, the Minister of Works, said that following the advice of a committee that had been appointed, water cartage to Kimba for stock would be undertaken. However, the position has deteriorated considerably since I received that reply. Is the Minister fully aware of the gravity of the situation, and can he say when water cartage will commence?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I myself cannot answer the question but I will discuss the problem with my colleague the Minister of Works and bring back a reply for the honourable member as soon as it is available.

NOOGOORA BURR.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture, an answer to my question of June 27 about noogoora burr?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague the Minister of Agriculture has furnished me with the following report:

Two regulations under the terms of the Weeds Act, 1956-1963, give weed control inspectors in the Agriculture Department powers to control the movement of stock carrying noogoora burr into South Australia and within South Australia. One regulation makes it an offence to move stock carrying the burr within South Australia and inspectors can quarantine the stock until they are cleaned. This usually means shearing in the case of sheep. The other regulation requires the submission of a declaration by the owner or agent that the stock have been inspected by them and that they are free of burr. These declarations must travel with the stock and a copy must reach the department before the stock enter the State. During the last seven years regular inspections have been made at sale yards in South Australia where sheep coming from other States are likely to be offered. In addition, an officer has attended sales at Yelta in Victoria for the express purpose of preventing burry sheep entering the State.

These measures, together with occasional inspections on private properties by the two noogoora burr inspectors, have kept the position in hand. Since 1960 when regular inspections for noogoora burr control commenced nearly 4,000,000 sheep have been inspected. During this period about 100,000 sheep have been quarantined because they have carried the burr. Last year about 4,000 very lightly infested sheep were shorn to remove the burr compared with more than 60,000 heavily infested sheep in the first year of operation of the regulations. It is evident that only a very few owners or agents are failing to comply with the requirements and excellent co-operation is being received from other States. From time to time the co-operation of local landholders in reporting suspected breaches of the Act has been valuable. If inspections were made by inspectors operating in other States, it is doubtful whether this number of infested sheep would be reduced. However, it is agreed that it would ease the work load of our own inspectors. Means of having stock inspected in other States before entry into South Australia are therefore under consideration.

NEW HORIZONS.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to a political pamphlet distributed in the electoral district of Edwardstown, which forms part of Central District No. 2. It is called *New Horizons* and is authorized by G. T. Virgo, Morialta Street, Adelaide. The Premier is featured in a portrait on the front page. On the third page in large print are the words "Your Local

Member", and then in smaller print "Geoff Virgo, 2 Narkunda Street, Glandore". Then some telephone numbers are printed, too. Can the Chief Secretary tell me what is meant by the words "Your Local Member"; also, if the reference is to a member of Parliament, is not the Hon. Frank Walsh the particular member?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not having seen the document, I am unable to give any explanation whatsoever.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government obtained from the Minister of Lands an answer to the question I asked last week about weights and measures?

The Hon. S. O. BEVAN: The Minister of Lands states that, due to the many technological changes that have taken place in weighing and measuring instruments, it has been found necessary to set up schools of instruction in order that weights and measures inspectors may be acquainted with the procedures necessary for testing, and at the same time opportunity is being taken to explain the revised Weights and Measures Act and regulations. All inspectors will be required to demonstrate their proficiency by a theoretical and practical examination that will cover the Act and regulations and their ability to test the instruments with which they will come in contact.

For the purposes of the examination, an inspector will be permitted to have access to his copy of the Act and regulations. It is not expected that an inspector would have a complete knowledge of these matters, but he should be sufficiently familiar with them to be able by reference to ascertain the requirements. Should any inspector not pass the examination, an extension of time will be granted to enable him to do so within a reasonable time.

The department is setting itself out to assist both district councils and their inspectors in every way and, in addition to the schools it is intended to conduct, an officer will visit each council inspector individually in his own district to offer any help and advice which the inspector may require, to ensure that each one is able to perform his duties efficiently.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Chief Secretary inform me what percentage of the Government's own insurance is carried by the Government itself and what percentage is carried by private insurance companies, in the

categories of fire, workmen's compensation and compulsory third party insurance?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to obtain the information.

SWINGING BASIN.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Swinging Basin, No. 3 Dock, Port Adelaide.

LAND EXCHANGE; GLEN ROY AND HYNAM.

Consideration of the following resolution received from the House of Assembly:

That the proposed exchange of portions of freehold section 216, hundred of Glen Roy, and section 406, hundred of Hynam, as shown on the plan and in the statement laid before Parliament in terms of section 238 of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1967, on June 20, 1967, be approved.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I have studied the Minister's explanation of this resolution. An exchange of land is proposed near Morambro Creek, north of Naracoorte, in the South-East. The land is wanted for road-widening purposes and for the stock-piling of road metal in this area, as it is difficult to find suitable places near the road and near the sources of supply of the metal. The Land Board has investigated this matter and has decided that the transaction is reasonable. The other party concerned, the present landholder, is also agreeable. Consequently, I see no objection to the resolution and I suggest that honourable members agree to it forthwith.

Resolution agreed to.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 600.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I can support this Bill only with some reservations. It sets out to extend the provisions of the Cattle Compensation Act to make finance available from the Cattle Compensation Fund to assist in the eradication of bovine tuberculosis in the cattle herds of South Australia. When discussing stock diseases one tends to think of some of the exotic diseases that could come to this country if quarantine regulations were relaxed in any way. Cattlemen, however, are deeply conscious of the threats to cattle herds in this State that arise from bovine tuberculosis,

a disease that has existed in this country for many years.

A concerted effort has been made in recent years to eradicate this disease from cattle herds of this State, and great credit must go to the officers of the Agriculture Department, led by Mr. Marshall Irving, Chief of the Division of Animal Industry, and Mr. W. S. Smith, Chief Inspector of Stock, for their untiring efforts, often against considerable opposition, to rid this country of dangerous and infectious stock diseases.

Because of the stringent health and hygiene requirements of countries importing our meat and dairy products, it has become imperative that efforts be made to extend areas that can be certified as free from bovine tuberculosis. The Metropolitan Milk Board regulations require that every licensed producer shall submit his herd to be tested for bovine tuberculosis, and such tests are conducted every three years. Testing is carried out in most instances under contracts with private veterinarians who contract with the Agriculture Department to carry out this work. The regulation applies only to the producer who supplies whole milk to the metropolitan area. In addition, I understand that the whole of the South-East dairy herds are tested for tuberculosis. That testing, of course, does not come under the Metropolitan Milk Board regulations but is done by arrangement with the Agriculture Department. Dairy products which are used for manufacture and which are produced outside the stated areas are covered by regulations under the Dairy Industry Act, and testing is not required under this Act. In dealing with herd testing, the Minister in his second reading speech said:

At present the major portion of the programme is undertaken by private veterinary surgeons paid out of general revenue. The expenses of the programme are continuing ones as testing must be carried out at regular intervals. The availability of funds has in consequence determined the degree of expansion of the programme. The primary purpose of this Bill is to authorize the Minister to meet the costs of this programme out of the Cattle Compensation Fund.

The Cattle Compensation Fund will no longer be a compensation fund if it is going to be used for other purposes. It would appear that the fund could be used, on authorization by the Minister, to carry out the testing required by regulations under the Metropolitan Milk Act. The costs of the testing carried out under this Act at present are met from general revenue. If this Bill is

passed, general revenue will no longer supply the funds required for the testing; the money will come from the income and, perhaps, from the fund itself. I realize the importance of having areas certified free from tuberculosis, because South Australia is the only State that can meet the necessary hygiene requirements of Japan, which is an expanding importer of cheese from this country. I understand that Japan is at present our best market for cheese; therefore, this market must be protected. South Australia is in a unique position, as it is the only State that is certified as free from bovine tuberculosis.

This problem is not only an industry problem but is one of national concern. If the problem grows, it could well bring greater demands on the Cattle Compensation Fund. It is important that any demands, other than for compensation, should not have the effect of depleting the fund. The fund at present stands at \$272,182. During the year ended June 30, 1966, receipts into the fund from stamp duty amounted to \$36,494. Payments from the fund for compensation purposes totalled \$16,532, so the net increase over that period was about \$20,000. In the previous year the net increase was about \$15,000. I have been given to understand that it is expected that the expenses incurred under the scheme envisaged in the Bill will be met largely from the interest of the fund and from future payments into the fund from stamp duty.

It should be realized that the fund did not previously bear interest. Honourable members will recall that I have asked on several occasions why this fund was among those trust funds that do not bear interest, whereas the Swine Compensation Fund is now among the trust funds that do bear interest. However, I presume as a result of representations being made, the Cattle Compensation Fund is included among the trust funds that bear interest; that is, if it is still there.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is there: you needn't worry about that.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister has said that this scheme has been hampered by the lack of funds. It is appreciated that the scheme should be expanded; that there should be a survey of cattle stations where the disease probably exists; and that provision should be made for the testing of cattle at such stations. There will need to be some form of priority as to which stations will be tested. There are several problems associated with the testing of cattle on the properties, and it is necessary that the cattle be tested on the properties. First,

it is necessary to know how many cattle are on the station. The owners of some of the bigger stations may not be able to gauge the number of cattle on their stations to within a thousand or two, particularly after good seasonal conditions, when the cattle would roam over a very wide area. There is always the problem that a full muster can never be obtained. If a cattle station owner can get a muster of 80 per cent or 85 per cent of the cattle on the property, he considers he is doing well.

The cost of the scheme for the future can only be estimated at present. If I were to ask the Minister what expansion was envisaged and what the likely cost would be, I think he would reply to this effect: "Although I believe substantially more will be spent in the future than is being spent at present, I doubt whether anybody could forecast the end result." The effect of the Bill will be that not only will there be an expansion of the scheme but that the whole cost of the scheme will be borne by the Cattle Compensation Fund. I consider that it is the duty of the Council, in the interests of the cattle industry of this country, to see that the fund is protected. If the income from the fund is to be used for testing purposes, then any demands on the fund will have the effect of reducing it. In other words, if the income of the fund is going to be eaten up by the testing scheme, any demand on the fund for compensation purposes will deplete it. It is incumbent on the Council to ensure that this does not happen.

There would probably not be any complaint if the interest from the fund were used for the expansion of the scheme: in previous years the fund did not bear interest, whereas in future it will. There would not be any complaint if the balance of the stamp duty (the levy applied to the cattle producer) in excess of the claims on the fund were used to expand the testing scheme. On that basis the fund would remain intact but, if the whole of the income is to be used for the expansion of the scheme, any future demands on the fund will deplete it. Therefore, we should pay heed to the ultimate effect the Bill will have on the Cattle Compensation Fund.

I consider it is the duty of honourable members to protect the fund, while in no way hampering the expansion of the tuberculosis testing scheme. The scheme should be expanded, but whether the Cattle Compensation Fund should be used for the purpose should be closely watched. Disease in this country is a matter of national importance. That fact has been recognized in the past, as the cost of

the scheme has been borne by the Treasury, whereas if this Bill is passed the scheme will be financed by the cattle producers, and we do not know what far-reaching effects it will have. They are satisfied to contribute to the scheme, provided that the fund that has been built up over the years is not depleted. I think the Bill goes a little too far too quickly, in that the previous arrangements, under which the Treasury financed the scheme, are being removed in one fell blow. If the Treasury is going to pull out of this scheme, I believe it should do so gradually, and we should perhaps have a look to see whether it is possible to get some subsidized scheme whereby the cattle producer provides some of the finance required for the expansion of the scheme and some of it is provided by the Treasury.

However, I hope to have a closer look at this Bill in the Committee stage, and I foreshadow an amendment along the lines I have indicated whereby the fund will be protected against demands for the expansion of this scheme. In the meantime, I am prepared to support the Bill in its present form, but with those reservations.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): Since this Act was passed in 1939 there have been various amendments. Today we are being asked to change what was a compensation Act into one which includes compensation and a means of financing another scheme. The primary producer today is faced with many problems, which are multiplied by the hazards of weather, and to have to pay out of this fund, which is provided by him, for services that in the past have been provided by a Government department is going to throw another very heavy burden on him.

I am fully aware that the purpose of this Bill is to make possible wider tuberculosis survey and testing. There are two main types of tuberculosis: human and bovine. The latter type hits hardest at children, causing glandular and bone types of tuberculosis. Not so many years ago it was a very common condition in Scotland. Testing of herds was introduced, but there was not a great deal of difference in the incidence of the disease until the testing became nationwide. I maintain that until this testing in South Australia becomes State-wide we are not going to get a really valuable and effective control of bovine tuberculosis.

I understand that some 43,000 to 45,000 cattle are under test, including all the Milk Board suppliers and some beef cattle, and

that in round figures there are 659,000 cattle in this State. In other words, some 6 per cent of the herds are under test at present. If by 1973, or thereabouts, in the interests of our exports, all cattle have to be tested, there will be a tremendous drain upon the fund, not only because of cost but because new pockets of tuberculosis infection could well be found. Consequently, large sums probably will have to be paid in compensation. In other words, if this sum of money is drawn upon in increasing quantities during the coming years, there could soon come a time when there would be no compensation fund left at all and the Government would have to provide money from other sources. However, bearing in mind the importance of the control of bovine tuberculosis, both as a health measure at home and because of the importance of our export trade, I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I have listened with interest to previous speakers and I have examined this Bill, and in its present form I cannot support it. The design of this Act in 1939 was purely for compensation purposes, and over the years it has served its purpose and the fund has accumulated to a total of \$275,000. Various rates have been struck to assist with compensation for the cattle industry, and because of the buoyancy of this fund the rates have been reduced, so that at present the rate is 5c for a beast that fetches up to \$70 and 10c for beasts bringing more than \$70. The maximum compensation at present is \$120.

It is true that we need to make a concerted effort to eradicate bovine tuberculosis. By the same token, we must not overlook the fact that there are other diseases which could attract very considerable compensations. One such disease is brucellosis, which is at present being investigated. We are always under the threat of exotic diseases coming into the country. I believe that the cattle men, to whom the fund really belongs, would do their utmost to assist in an eradication plan. If the Minister, in consultation with his department, could announce some definite programme, the methods to be used and the amount of money to be expended even in one financial year, I believe that an approach could be made to the cattle men and that some conciliation could take place. However, at present the Bill stipulates that its primary purpose is to authorize the Minister to meet the costs of this eradication out of the Cattle Compensation Fund. Perhaps this could be done from the interest accumulating on the principle, for this amount is being held in trust and therefore

should be bearing interest. I believe that this could be the basis of an approach, or perhaps it could even be on a dollar for dollar basis with the Government.

As has been pointed out, the problem is not just state-wide: it applies to the nation. The need for eradication has been accentuated by the attitude of the cattle men of the United States of America, who do their utmost at all times to discourage the sale of Australian meat in that country. They realize perfectly well that it would be quite impossible for herds in Australia to be guaranteed free of tuberculosis.

I believe that great progress is being made with the testing of dairy herds. In fact, this is quite evident from the figures the Minister gave when he explained this Bill yesterday. However, the greater portion of this fund has accumulated not in respect of dairy cattle but in respect of cattle sold for slaughter. I believe, as I stated before, that some approach should be made to these people, and indeed to all cattle owners, who have a body called the Cattlemen's Association. If the details of a plan were laid before them, I am sure they would be prepared to co-operate. I am just as certain that they would not be prepared for their representatives in this Chamber to sanction the Bill in its present form. At this juncture I oppose it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 602.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I appreciate the Minister's four-page second reading speech, which I can only suggest was a magnificent apologia finishing with a one-paragraph summary putting the crux of the whole matter before honourable members. I notice that on the first page he states:

The situation . . . was explained by my predecessor . . .

Who that person is I do not quite understand. I was under the impression that I was his predecessor—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And you did a good job.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The fact is that I never had the problem of explaining a juggling act of this magnitude! To recapitulate, the policy previously supported by both Parties in this Parliament was to ensure that the State qualified for the full matching grants

offered by the Commonwealth in its two consecutive five-year plans, and to this end grants were made from Loan funds by the Liberal Government to facilitate this; but to cover the position fully (which was due to an anticipated surplus at that time) in 1964 provision was made by inserting section 31a in the Highways Act in order to obtain repayment at some later date, which naturally was not expected to be in the early years, as the projects were of a mature and capital nature. In 1964-65 and 1965-66, as I reminded honourable members only last week, the Government therefore made the Highways Department repay \$600,000 and \$640,000 respectively to the Treasury. This was not unreasonable and was accepted, albeit it was done so rapidly as to cause an immediate reduction of the works programme of the Highways Department in various directions. I again remind honourable members that a further \$1,000,000 was extracted from the funds of the department during the financial year just ended.

All this was accompanied by a statement by the ex-Premier (Hon. Mr. Walsh) when he spoke on the Loan Estimates last year. Unfortunately, I suggest to honourable members that not quite enough attention and publicity were given to it at the time. To refresh the memories of honourable members, I quote from his speech:

As in the past two years, no special loan allocation is proposed for road purposes this year, apart from those provisions required by special legislation for the Morphet Street bridge project. During recent years, the funds available to the Highways Department from State sources have been more than adequate to qualify for the maximum Commonwealth matching grants and such as to ensure that the department can progressively plan and undertake programmes. In point of fact the department in 1964-65 after repaying \$600,000 of earlier advances still retained \$700,000 of funds from State sources more than required to secure the maximum Commonwealth subsidy. In 1965-66 after repaying \$640,000 of earlier advances, the department retained—

I love this expression "retained"; I shall enlarge on it later—

for road purposes \$1,140,000 of funds from State sources more than required to secure the Commonwealth subsidy. In the current year, the Highways Department seems likely to be in an even more advantageous position. (Actually it requested a further \$1,000,000 from Highways funds).

The Treasurer at a later stage in one of his financial addresses went on to say that he anticipated collecting a further \$1,000,000 from the Highways Department. That statement was made at the beginning of the financial

year. Both Houses accepted and passed the Loan Estimates, which included various amounts, some being associated with the Highways Department, but they did not include the \$1,000,000 expected to be taken from the department during the year, and obviously it had to revise its road programme (drawn up, possibly, slightly before then) in order to meet the necessary demands of the Treasurer. I could repeat that statement but will not. However, it occurs almost verbatim in the Minister's second reading speech, and I think that it may be desirable to repeat some of it because the wording is slightly altered. I quote what the Minister said yesterday:

A current review of the whole situation shows that, while all the State funds available to the Highways Department could be used to good effect for road purposes, the demand for many other works and services is much more urgent in relation to the funds available for them.

I note that the Minister takes that broad attitude towards his own funds. He continued:

Therefore, it is proposed to require a further contribution of \$240,000 from the Highways Fund to Revenue Account in 1967-1968 in accordance with section 31a of the Highways Act.

There is nothing to do with the Morphet Street bridge for the moment. He continued:

This will complete the recoveries of earlier advances which may be made to Loan and Revenue Accounts pursuant to that section.

As I indicated last week, there is considerable legal doubt whether in fact the verbiage of section 31a does not duplicate the demands that can be made by the Treasurer, and the Minister is well aware of that problem in the minds of the legal officers of not only this Government but the former Liberal Government. The Minister went on to say:

After allowing for this proposed recovery and for heavy expenditures this year on the Walkerville office building it is clear that the amounts available for road purposes will still be well in excess of the amount necessary to attract the full Commonwealth matching grants.

What are the conclusions that should have been drawn then that are now shown up in the light of these glaring deficits in the Treasury? The most important one should be obvious to honourable members. I have quoted from the Minister's second reading explanation. What both the Treasurer's speech and the Minister's speech imply definitely is that, when the Highways Fund revenue from the State in any year has reached an amount to qualify for the full Commonwealth road assistance (I emphasize the word "assistance"—that is all it is) because

the Commonwealth realizes the States' responsibility for roads is a heavy one, it has agreed to assist them by way of returning to them part of the petrol tax collected through excise.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You ought to have been paid the lot, without doubt.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I beg to differ; it was not levied prior to the Commonwealth Roads Aid Act under which most of Australia's petrol was imported and the tax was levied as an excise and import duty. The Commonwealth allocates this money to South Australia in order to assist it, but the Commonwealth puts a proviso on its assistance with respect to any State that is not prepared to assist itself: it puts a tag on it and that portion of it is known as a matching grant. What right has any Government to suggest that funds that are diverted by Statute to the Highways Fund when they really accrue through natural increase (that is, through the increase in the number of motor vehicles) and through the road maintenance tax should return to the Treasurer? The Government's implication is plain: when it has enough in the local funds to match the Commonwealth grant, then it can see whether it can lend to other departments the balance of the motor registration fees.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Then we have no right of allocating funds for road works?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I remind the Minister that I was talking about revenue funds; motor registration and licence fees are not Loan funds, but are fees paid by the motorists of this State every year in the form of registration and licence fees. I remind honourable members that it is only a short and simple step for these financial wizards to embark on a further act of repudiation by repealing the Statute that diverts the motor registration and driving licence fees to the Highways Department and by making a new set of rules. And why not? This is their way of going about things. Don't let us be fooled; the only safeguard the motorist now has is this Legislative Council. However, if this Council rejected such a repudiation, it would be told that it was taking the business out of the hands of the Government and denying it funds for revenue purposes.

The sooner the people of South Australia are told about this the better. Would it not be better to tell them now that their registration and driving licence fees are being diverted from road purposes to other purposes, which are quite possibly estimable purposes? They should be told now that revenue they are

providing is being cut back by millions, and that there may be worse to come in the future.

Stripped of its trimmings and duplicity of phrase, this Bill is virtually a repudiation of an arrangement for a loan to the Adelaide City Council which was unanimously recommended by a Select Committee of the House of Assembly, not 20 years ago but in 1964—only a few months before the Walsh Government came to office. The arrangement was unanimously supported by the House; I do not recall even the member for Adelaide in that House raising a dissentient voice.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He was on the Select Committee, wasn't he?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I think he was, and it was a unanimous report. The Adelaide City Council is to be highly commended for its handling of its road and traffic problems over many years. I remind honourable members that, because of the lack of funds in the Highways Department in the past, no contributions were made to the council beyond a fixed annual amount (I think it is \$40,000 or \$50,000 now) as a contribution to the cost of the roads passing through the park lands, which attract no rates because there are no adjacent ratepayers' properties. No contribution was ever made to the city bridge; in fact, the Government does not even pay for parking privileges on North Terrace. Because the Morphett Street bridge and ancillary constructions represented a big burden for the Adelaide City Council to carry, the Government with the full approval of Parliament decided that the Highways Fund should pay half of the total cost of the project up to \$3,000,000. In other words, \$1,500,000 was to come from the Highways Fund, and the other \$1,500,000 was to be provided by means of a loan from the Treasurer to the council. I again emphasize to honourable members that this measure was approved by Parliament and incorporated in the Statute Book.

It has been provided that motor vehicle registration fees should go direct to the Highways Fund, but what does this Bill do? What of other Loan purposes—drainage works and loans to councils throughout the State? I understand that a deputation is to meet the Minister this week to complain bitterly about the great reduction in grants. If the Minister knew this State as well as I do, he would know that this movement of deputations and complaints will snowball much more rapidly than the rain this year has snowballed.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You seem to be the only one that knows of this deputation. I do not know of it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The Minister will probably know soon. Some members may suggest that I am warning the Government far too soon of the fate that will overtake it when councils, not to mention motorists, wake up. When they wake up and the 200,000 members of the Royal Automobile Association realize what is really going on in connection with fees paid by motorists, they will express great indignation—and possibly in a quite practical manner. It may be suggested that I am warning the Government too soon, but at least I suggest to honourable members that I have shown the grounds upon which I entirely oppose this Bill. I shall oppose it not only here but among the electors of this State. I remember Mr. Lang and Langism. The title of this Bill should be amended; it could well be entitled “A Bill for the repudiation of an agreement entered into between the Treasurer and the Adelaide City Council and for purposes incidental to the taking over of such obligation by the road users of this State”. In the last week or two we have seen, heard and read some startling fiction which, I believe, was entitled “How we balance the Budget”. I have been nauseated *ad nauseam*.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member gets terribly upset over that; it really upsets him when the Government balances the Budget!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Briefly, if the removal of some \$2,400,000 and now another \$3,400,000 from the highways fund over a period of a very few years (totalling over \$5,000,000) and the obvious deduction in the highways programme by nearly \$4,000,000 of that amount is a proper way to balance a Revenue Budget, when those funds have already been marked for a specific purpose by Statute, then I and many others will need a far more lucid explanation and some more practical and less fantastic alternative. Even in this morning's press, the Premier again emphasizes that he is balancing the Budget by a method similar to that of some other states. Let me state the facts simply. This Premier is not balancing the Budget by transferring Loan funds to revenue: he is balancing or assisting to balance the Budget by transferring portion of last and this year's motor registration fees to the Loan Fund and then to revenue. Can any honourable member, particularly the Minister, deny that?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Yes.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I trust that interjection will be noted. I leave honourable members to consider how that would be described in business circles or by the Auditor-General's Department, when those funds are not only already committed by Statute but they have been included in the departmental budgets. This Bill can stifle that official criticism, but it will not stifle public opinion. Last week I referred kindly to the problems besetting the Minister of Roads. Today I almost feel that I should send him a wreath. I do not intend to support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 603.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): The purpose of the Bill is to continue prices legislation until December, 1968, and it is similar in character to former measures which for several years extended price control for annual periods. This policy generally has been pursued by both this and the former Government.

I believe that the present Government has a definite mandate to introduce this measure, and because of that belief I do not propose to vote against the Bill. However, I think that the time must come when this form of legislation must be viewed seriously, irrespective of what Government is in office.

When considering the actual price of goods I think all members would agree that, compared with the number of goods produced and sold, the number of articles under price control would not be great.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But they are very important in the cost of living structure.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I know a few of the items under control are important, but I do not think the percentage would be great. I think that is a point to be borne in mind when considering the advisability or otherwise of dispensing with price control.

Then there is the matter of taking practices in other States as a guide. The present Government has been keen to establish uniformity with many practices in other States, and I believe that, apart from New South Wales, where price control is exercised in a limited manner, this is the only State that has retained such legislation. Surely that is some indication that the time is either here or rapidly approaching when a serious review of this matter is needed?

It was necessary in other States, with different economies or different climates in their economies, but as the years have passed times have changed and the Governments in those States have seen fit to dispense with price control legislation. I think that is a reason why this matter should be seriously reviewed in the near future. Surely there comes a time in a healthy economy when normal supply and demand of goods and services reaches a point when there should not be a need for price control?

It may well be that the Government and other people fear the consequences of abolishing such legislation. Such a fear would be human: many people fear changes of this kind, but many times such fears have proved unfounded. That might well apply in this instance if price control were abolished.

When introducing this measure the Minister referred to building costs as follows:

Statistics continue to show that home building costs in this State are the lowest in the Commonwealth. Price control over a number of essential building materials and services has been an important factor in maintaining this advantage for the State.

The Minister claims that low building costs are an advantage to South Australia, and I agree entirely. In the last day or two press reports have mentioned one of the measures that the Premier proposes to introduce to combat the lull in the building trade in this State. This was featured on the front page of the *Advertiser* yesterday and indicated that the Prices Commissioner was to be given the task of investigating the activities of South Australian Housing Trust builders as well as their relationships with subcontractors over the past three years.

If there is or has been any form of malpractice, as indicated in the *Advertiser*, then I agree that some form of investigation is necessary, but I issue a warning that if any vendetta is carried out against builders for the Housing Trust, and if as a result builders decide not to tender for trust work, building costs in this State will assuredly rise, because the prices at which the builders are building for the trust are exceedingly low. That is the very anchor in this State to our building costs.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The bone of contention is that the remuneration of the contractors has increased but they have decreased their allowances to the subcontractors.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The trust, as principal, should be given the job of making an investigation; that job should not go to

the Prices Commissioner. At least the trust should be given that opportunity.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We want someone outside to inquire into it and tell us whether it is factual or otherwise.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The fact remains that there is a strong possibility that as a result of this investigation the costs of these builders will rise. Certainly, the builders who build for the trust are building houses very cheaply. If they did not the next group of builders to put in their tenders would put in higher ones. If the tenders were higher, the whole range of building costs in the State would increase.

Private enterprise builders find the trust a very strong competitor, so they have to keep their building costs and tender prices down. Because the trust acts as an anchor and sets this level of low building costs, so throughout the whole of the building industry of the State there is a very low cost level, which is an advantage to the State.

If we start interfering with the trust builders to a degree and they do not continue to build for the trust, the costs of the trust and building costs generally in this State will rise. Consequently, that advantage will be lost.

My third point deals with trade practices. The Minister mentioned unfair trading practices and misleading advertising when he gave the reasons why the operations of the Act should continue until the end of December, 1968. He said that one of the reasons was the supervision of the unfair trade practices provisions of the Act, including misleading advertising.

I am in favour of unfair trading practices being investigated, and the question of misleading advertising is very important. Advertisements dealing with "king-size", "jumbo-size" and so forth can be very misleading to the public. Advertising and publicity go hand in hand, but misleading advertising and misleading publicity must be looked at closely.

Earlier today, in a question, I dealt with what I considered to be misleading advertising. I was dealing with a pamphlet of a political nature that had been handed to me. There are words in the pamphlet which, in my view, are very misleading. I have the pamphlet with me. The Minister said that he had not seen it, and I was very sorry that he had not.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. Will the honourable member table this interesting document, pursuant to Standing Orders?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is no need to. He can show it to me later.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall be pleased to table it.

The PRESIDENT: Bring it up.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On the general question of misleading advertising and misleading publicity, there is some need for investigation. In dealing with the general approach I am making of questioning the need for this legislation, I refer to paragraph 26 of His Excellency's Speech, which states:

A Bill to deal with a wide variety of unfair trade practices within the State will be laid before you.

Here, it would seem, there is some duplication. Because of the duplication, I again say that the time is rapidly approaching when very serious consideration must be given to the need for prices legislation. If unfair trade practices are to be dealt with in a separate Bill, that is very strong evidence that there should not be any need in the future for prices legislation.

Surely all our efforts should be directed toward the common aim of achieving a prosperous and buoyant economy in South Australia, with keen competition and with reasonable but not unreasonable profit for private enterprise. During the last few years the wage structure of the State has changed and, particularly in the last two years, the cost structure has changed. Under these changed conditions, and with the need for private enterprise to regain confidence in the State, I do not see how this Bill will achieve its aim.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the Bill, and I wish to make one or two comments on it. In his second reading speech the Minister said that its purpose was to do about five different things. First, it was to control the prices of a fairly extensive range of goods and services that are of vital importance to the everyday man in the community. Secondly, he said, the object of the Prices Department was to watch fairly carefully price movements of items that are not controlled, so as to ascertain whether they should be brought under control. Thirdly, the purpose of the Bill is to enable complaints made to the Prices Department by people who consider they have been overcharged for particular goods or services to be investigated. Its fourth purpose is to enable a specialized investigation to be made of doubtful practices carried on by various people in the community. Fifthly, it is to supervise unfair trade practices and misleading advertising. I am very interested

to see that the document referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hill is now on the table, so that the Prices Commissioner has a matter for his immediate attention. I hope we will hear from the Minister the result of the investigation into this document.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Normally when these matters are raised, the first thing the Minister says is, "Give me a specific instance and I will have it investigated." This time it has been produced. We will wait to see the result, because I am interested to know whether the Prices Department investigates all or only some of the complaints that it receives. What happens to this document from now on is of concern not only to me but to the whole of the administration of the Prices Department.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't be funny! You're getting too foolish for words!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: There will be another opportunity to discuss this matter. I am sorry that something unpleasant has been unearthed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is not unpleasant. You are making a fool of yourself carrying on as you are.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: There are others besides the Chief Secretary who can judge that. It has been said that, because of the operation of the Prices Act, although an application for a 0.7c increase in the price of petrol was made the increase finally agreed on was 0.4c a gallon, and that bread was 2c a loaf cheaper here than in other States. It was also said that there were lower prices here for children's clothing, footwear, various kinds of soap, and pies and pasties, and that the primary producer had been saved about \$500,000 a year because the price of superphosphate was fixed. This is important, because the only reason this State has expanded over the past 25 years is that it has had a cost advantage compared with other States of the Commonwealth. We are not naturally endowed with the wealth of the other States, and we have to make every post a winning post. Consequently, this difference has kept us in the limelight of progress.

My complaint is that I cannot see evidence of the careful control of costs by the Government itself that it apparently expects of other people through the operations of the Prices Department. If other people are to be tied down in respect of their rate of profit, and if all their activities are to be watched in detail and to be subject to the control of an

outside judge, then I think the people responsible for this legislation should see that they treat themselves as being in the same category.

I have said that in this Chamber before and I repeat it now, because I believe that there are evidences of lack of attention by this Government to the matter of controlling costs. When it is confronted with the charge that it has imposed increases, it says that there have been some increases but that they are only marginal, which is a very nice high-sounding word. However, I have evidence from a good many sources that the private sector of the community is finding it exceedingly difficult, and increasingly difficult, to compete with its competitors from other States. That evidence is gradually percolating through and becoming obvious to everyone in the community. Industries are closing down, while some are moving to other States. I should like to see statistics produced of the operations of interstate furniture removal contractors, for I believe they would show that there has been a very large exodus of people from South Australia to the other States.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You would also need to see the statistics regarding the people that move to this State.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: What I am saying is that there is a preponderance of people (and they are qualified people) leaving this State, and I cannot see that the determining factor in that is anything but costs. I support the Bill, but I do it with this emphasis: that I believe that if we as a Parliament are saying to other people that they must control costs and so on, then we have some obligation to try to do something about these things ourselves. When people are getting their accounts for water rates and land tax, when they have to meet municipal rates and charges, when they go to the Registrar of Companies and see the cost of filing documents in that office, when they look at the increases that have occurred in stamp duty, and when they look at excess water rates (which are turning up now more frequently than they used to) they think that this is a rather one-sided bargain. If we are to keep the confidence of these people and be able to look them in the face and say that we have done our part, I think we must be more careful with regard to increases in costs. Unfortunately, the movement away from the State starts before we in official quarters realize it. Therefore, I sincerely hope the Government will have regard to costs and give

closer attention to the management of its affairs than it has done in the past. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): Mr. Acting President, the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Rowe have referred to a document tabled this afternoon as one that might come under the heading of unfair trade practices. If honourable members care to look at page 133 of *Hansard* they will see that in my Address in Reply speech I referred to a pamphlet known as *The Voice of South Australia*, which was issued by the Liberal and Country League. They will also see that I was able to show that that document was completely misleading in its claim. Not one member opposite attempted to answer the charge I made concerning that pamphlet, so I can only assume that they completely agreed with what I said concerning it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: We don't take notice of everything you say.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I know the honourable member does not. I support the second reading of this Bill. My only regret is that it does not hand over the powers of this State in this matter to the Commonwealth, for if it did so price control would become much more effective and be much more beneficial to the people of Australia as a whole. If honourable members opposite do not want to do things that are in the best interests of the people of Australia, they are only following in the footsteps of the Liberal Government that was in power in this State for many years. In that respect they would be following the example that was set in the early stage.

I do not think anyone would disagree that the people of Australia were far better off when prices as well as wages were controlled. Unfortunately for the majority, the Commonwealth does not now control prices, although it exercises a fairly strong control of wages. As a result, prices in many items have gone well ahead of wages, so much so that if wages were still adjusted quarterly the basic wage would be \$6 higher than it is at present. Even if that amount had been granted, wages would only have kept pace with increased costs. However, the continuation of the Prices Act in this State has helped considerably to make the money that is available to individuals go much further than it otherwise would.

A report in this morning's *Advertiser* was most interesting, and no doubt the Government was very pleased when it had the opportunity to supply figures to a gentleman who, it was stated in the newspaper, was a "noted

opponent" of price control. As a result of these figures, no doubt he will see for himself that price control is fully justified, because the figures show (and they are claimed to be very conservative) that the following amounts have been saved over the last 12 months: \$758,000 a year on bread alone as a result of the price of a 2 lb. loaf being 1c to 2c lower than in Sydney and Melbourne; over \$3,600,000 a year on petroleum products; \$1,200,000 a year on clothing; \$800,000 a year on footwear; \$436,000 a year on haircuts; and \$240,000 a year on pies and pasties. The latter items at one time were de-controlled, but as a result of the control being lifted the manufacturers decided to increase the price excessively, with the result that pies and pasties were again brought back under price control.

It has also been calculated that \$550,000 was saved on superphosphate. Members opposite claim to look after the man on the land, so surely they must favour the saving of \$550,000 a year on superphosphate. The figures given show the savings to consumers in this State.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What is happening to the people from whom the money is being saved?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Consumers are able to buy other goods, and this in turn creates more employment in the State. People can now buy 18 pies for the same price they would have had to pay for 12 pies if this commodity had not been under price control. This creates more work for the manufacturer who had attempted to increase the price. Of course, this applies to all other commodities. Money saved is money earned, and in this instance the Prices Department has earned for the consumers of this State an amount of \$7,500,000 during the last 12 months by the saving it has made for the people. Surely the hardened objectors to price control must see the advantage of having such control; they must also agree that there would be much greater advantage if price control was effective throughout the Commonwealth.

In addition to the savings referred to, many firms have been wary about increasing their prices because they know there is a possibility that, if they are not discreet about it, they will find that they, too, will be brought under price control. That has caused a considerable saving. In addition to these savings, the Prices Department does effective work within its limited scope in other regards. For many years there have been bitter arguments between the grapegrowers and the winemakers of this State. Nothing was done about it

until the Labor Government came into power. In 1966 it asked the Prices Department to investigate prices and, as a result of the intervention of the department, last year a minimum price was fixed for grapes. Although neither side, for different reasons, was completely satisfied with the price fixed by the Prices Department, at least it brought some stability into the industry. The results achieved under the Act clearly justify its continuation. I give the Bill my full support.

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

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 603.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to support this short Bill, which extends until December, 1969, the life of the Land Settlement Committee. Also, it extends, correspondingly, the time within which the Commissioner of Lands may acquire land in the western division of the South-East. The Land Settlement Committee is an important committee of this Parliament. It could and should be having much more work given it than it has at present. Every honourable member will agree that land settlement is important to the further progress of South Australia. Although we probably have only slightly more land left to develop for agricultural purposes in total acreage than Western Australia is able to develop every year, the development of that land is, nevertheless, of great importance to the State. It is necessary that the Land Settlement Committee look thoroughly into these matters of further development and that the Government pursue a positive policy in this regard.

I do not believe the cessation of freeholding was a positive policy in any way, because it has slowed down land development in South Australia. The substandard lands that we have left to develop appear, at first glance, to be hopeless propositions, but we all know just what trace elements have done in recent years to very poor soil in this State and other States. The land that we have left to develop needs trace elements; it also needs (at least, in some cases) some things more elementary or fundamental than trace elements—such as stock water.

The slowing up or the virtual stopping of the construction of the Keith water main must reduce and retard the availability of stock water in areas where further development is

necessary. In the large area bounded approximately by Keith, Bordertown and Pinnaroo, my information is that the underground water is most unsatisfactory, even for stock in many instances. If we are to get further development, we must get facilities, and one of the first facilities we need is an adequate water supply. Further, water supplies are needed to develop southern Yorke Peninsula, another portion of South Australia in which a fairly large area of land remains undeveloped. The Government and the Land Settlement Committee must direct their attention to that area. However, it may be that underground water will solve the problem, at least partly, there. The councils on southern Yorke Peninsula are constantly seeking departmental usage of the Carribie basin. I am aware that the supplies of water in that basin are limited but, if large storage tanks were constructed and pumping went on during the winter months in normal years, a valuable addition to the water supply system could be secured in that part of the State.

In my view, it is regrettable, having regard to further land settlement, that the Government has seen fit, in accordance with its socialistic policy, to do away with the freeholding of land, as I have mentioned earlier. If the Land Settlement Committee or the Government approves the settlement of the kind of land to which I have been referring, it is approving something which, at the outset, is nearly valueless. If, by much hard work a man can over many years make this sort of land into a worthwhile asset, surely he is entitled to keep it as freehold land to hand on to his sons and not merely hold it on leasehold. There are many disadvantages, and even in some cases hazards to health, associated with the sort of work that has to be done for many years to develop poor soil into a worthwhile property, with a good cover of clover or other pasture, or into land that can be cropped with barley and other grains. If this is to be held only on leasehold, I do not believe we shall get the initiative, the enterprise and the hard work needed to develop this marginal land into a worthwhile asset.

This marginal land is the only thing that is marginal in this case, because the costs, which have increased during the last two or three years, to country people are anything but marginal: they are largely taking the profit from the country people. The fact that one cannot freehold at present is one of the main causes of the continual slowing down of expan-

sion that has occurred over the last two and a half years.

The Land Settlement Committee is charged also with the examination and approval or otherwise of applications for assistance under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, introduced by the Playford Government in 1963 or 1964. There has been a marked reduction in the applications made under this Act—probably not dissociated from the reasons I have just given. I understand that applications in the last year of the Playford Government under this Act totalled 84, and at the end of the financial year just concluded there were only 26 applications.

Another very important function of the Land Settlement Committee is that it deals with drainage problems in the South-East which, unfortunately (in some respects at least), are not evident at present. Indeed, we were recently requested by some residents in the South-East to fill up all the drains in their area. However, this is evidence that some of them have short memories and, given a wet season or two (and they will surely come again), there will be agitation for more drains and more efficient drains—and this agitation will be quite justified in many cases. I shall not further elaborate on this matter but leave it to those members who have far more knowledge of this part of the State than I have. I believe that I have indicated to honourable members the need for this committee to continue, and I support the Bill.

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

FOREST RESERVE: MURTHO.

Consideration of the following resolution received from the House of Assembly:

That forest reserve No. 58, hundred of Murtho, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on June 27, 1967, be resumed in terms of section 81 (1) of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1967, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

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

That the resolution be agreed to.

This reserve comprises about 5,047 acres and was proclaimed for the purposes of forest reserves on July 4, 1901. A literal interpretation of the proclamation was taken and the area shown on the official plans is the area of the land concerned, together with the half-width of the Murray River adjoining the reserve, because the hundred boundary is the middle of the Murray River. A 150-link

reserve bordering the river appears to have been created in about 1909 without any action being taken regarding the 1901 proclamation.

Thus, two anomalies exist in regard to this forest reserve and this motion merely seeks to provide the means of eliminating the anomalies. Should Parliament resolve to permit resumption, the Crown lands thus created would be re-reserved to exclude from the forest reserve the half-width of the Murray River, and at the same time to cancel the 150-link reserve. The Conservator of Forests has signified his agreement with these proposals. In view of these circumstances, I ask honourable members to support the resolution.

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

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 604.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I support the Bill; it is almost identical with those that have preceded it in past years. As the Minister has stated, it merely permits payment of compensation for damage and for fruit removed in the course of the eradication of the fruit fly outbreak that occurred early this year. The main difference between this Bill and previous Bills of this type is in connection with compensation claims which, in the past, have had to be lodged near the end of the year (in November or a little later). However, under this Bill claims must be lodged by August 31, 1967, and this indicates a fairly profound change in the method by which this pest is being tackled today.

There is one point that I must emphasize: in the past, almost invariably a small outbreak of the kind that occurred early this year has been the precursor of the discovery of a much longer established outbreak beyond the one-mile radius within which eradication measures can be carried out.

It is necessary to understand a little about the technicalities of fruit fly eradication in this regard. If it had been possible to do so in the early days of fruit fly eradication, the Agriculture Department would have extended its eradication measures over a larger radius. The reason that the one-mile radius, which we have come to regard as standard, was adopted at that time was that it was the largest practicable area that could be handled without disruption to the community as a whole.

In the early stages of fruit fly eradication a large number of workers was needed, and it

was impossible in the relatively small community of Adelaide to employ the number of workers needed to strip the trees over a large area. The amount of fruit grown in the metropolitan area of Adelaide is very large: I have no idea exactly how much fruit was stripped from trees in the proclaimed area. However, because the outbreak was discovered late in the season and because it was not as serious as some earlier outbreaks, considerable modifications were made in the type of insecticides used and the method of using them.

I warn the Government that, whilst the very small outbreak this year only covered a limited area, this limited outbreak must be regarded as a warning that this is probably not a new introduction of fruit fly; almost surely this dangerous and persistent pest has been living somewhere not far away from where the outbreak was discovered this year, and we shall probably find the pest in larger quantities next year or, what would be more dangerous, in the following season.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Can the fruit fly live on things other than fruit?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The list of hosts suitable for the survival of the fruit fly is very long indeed. It is usually confined to fruits or, in some cases, seed capsules. It has even been found in boxthorns. I do not think there is any purpose in delaying this Bill, and I strongly recommend that honourable members support it.

Its essential purpose is that the Government should compensate people affected by the eradication measures; these people pay very heavily when produce is taken from their gardens in the cause of eradicating this pest in the national interest. The sacrifice of these people should not be regarded lightly. The amount of income that some hard-working families obtain through their use of the small amount of soil in their household gardens is amazing. Instances have occurred over the years where a great amount of produce has been taken—and it is really fresh produce. It is the best possible food that can be given to a household and I think it is only fair that the State should pay for it.

Referring to the second reading speech, I notice that the dates of proclamation this year are considerably later than normal. This also represents a risk and a possible danger because at least two or three generations of the fly could have hatched and scattered before detection of this outbreak. Whether they would

remain within the one-mile radius of operations is open to question.

If it were possible, it would be better to increase greatly the radius of operation, although I do not think our community would be able to afford this. However, technically it would be more satisfactory. I do not think there is any purpose in speaking further, but I strongly recommend that members support the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise briefly to support the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Kemp. I do not see any purpose in delaying this measure further; in fact, the sooner people who have suffered some loss are compensated the better it will be. It has always been the policy of the department and of Parliament to reward people for their honesty, and I believe the success of eradication measures in this State has been the result of the sympathetic attitude adopted by the department in the first place.

I commend officers of the department for the manner in which they have handled road blocks in various parts of the State. Hundreds of tons of fruit have been taken from people at the State borders. Of course, nobody is happy when he brings in a case of prize oranges from, say, Mildura and it is taken away at Yamba. My experience is that it does not matter who that person is, because each receives the same firm but courteous treatment at a roadblock. Each person is asked about fruit being carried, and the boot and glovebox of every vehicle is inspected. I understand that the airways also conduct inspections and I believe this is necessary.

I think more has been done in South Australia to contain fruit fly with periodical eradication than anywhere else in the world. The re-introduction of fruit fly into the metropolitan area from time to time shows that occasionally some fruit gets through the roadblocks, because each is a new outbreak and not a carryover from a previous outbreak.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The outbreak last year definitely pointed to fruit being brought in.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I agree. Sometimes it is Queensland fruit fly and sometimes Mediterranean fruit fly; they bob up in different places. There will always be some smart Aleck who tries to get around regulations. However, by and large the public of South Australia has co-operated magnificently, and I think the best way we can show our appreciation is to pass this Bill without delay.

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

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 604.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading of this Bill. It makes five distinct amendments to the principal Act; first, in relation to special rebates and exemptions for persons dying as a result of military service, and the proposed amendment extends those exemptions to any person serving in an area that may be proclaimed by the Governor. The rebates and exemptions were first introduced in 1940 and applied to the 1939-45 war. In 1951 an amendment was made to the principal Act extending the rebates and exemptions to those who served in the Korean and Malayan conflicts. This is now to be extended to cover other areas where Australian troops may be engaged on active service. The amendment is achieved in clause 3 by inserting new paragraph (e) in section 55aa.

This section deals with the provisions introduced in 1951 in relation to the Korean and Malayan conflicts. Paragraphs (a) and (b) are almost the same as the provisions included in proposed paragraph (e). Section 55aa, in part, reads:

- (a) Any person who has died from wounds inflicted, accident occurring or disease contracted while he was on active service in the Korean war as a member of a naval, military or air force of the Commonwealth or any other part of His Majesty's Dominions, or of any country associated with His Majesty in the Korean war:
- (b) Any person who has died from wounds inflicted, accident occurring or disease contracted while he was engaged in Korea in the work of providing ambulance services, medical attention, recreational facilities, entertainment, accommodation, or sustenance, for members of any naval, military, or air force of the Commonwealth or of any other part of His Majesty's Dominions while such members were on active service in the Korean war:

Those two provisions, which were inserted in 1951, are included in the amendments in this Bill. However, subsection (c) of the principal Act provides:

A master or member of the crew of any British ship who dies from wounds inflicted, accident occurring or disease contracted as

the result of any action against that ship during the Korean war by the enemies of the United Nations:

There may be a reason why this particular subsection is not included in the Bill to cover a person who may serve in the area as a master or a member of a crew of any British ship. Perhaps the Chief Secretary could examine the matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will do that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Clause 4 increases the remission of duty, in the case of a person dying on active service, from \$10,000 to \$20,000. The remission of \$10,000 was originally inserted in 1942. I am certain this provision will meet with the approval of all honourable members. In 1949, an amendment was made to the principal Act to allow duty on a property derived by illegitimate children to be at the same rate as if the children were legitimate. This is included in section 56a of the principal Act. The new provision allows the same rate if the mother or father of an illegitimate child derives property on the death of that child. I draw the Chief Secretary's attention to the marginal note in the Bill. The marginal note in section 56a of the principal Act is as follows:

Rate of duty on property derived by illegitimate children.

The Bill is somewhat the opposite, but the marginal note is exactly the same. I suggest that "by" should be altered to "from". This marginal note may refer to the whole section of the principal Act, but I consider it should be altered as I have suggested.

Section 56a (1) of the principal Act deals with the rate of duty on property derived by illegitimate children, and section 56a (1) (a) deals with the rate of duty on property derived from illegitimate children. Section 56a (2) deals with the rate of duty in relation to illegitimate children. This appears to be clumsy, as it deals with two matters, in between which a somewhat different matter is dealt with. I should like the Chief Secretary to examine that point.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will attend to all these matters.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Clause 6 deals with the rate of duty on property derived by children adopted *de facto*, which is a somewhat strange term. However, the principle here is that the Minister, at his discretion, may direct that the duty payable in respect of such property so derived shall be at the same rate as if such person were a legally

adopted child of the deceased person, and duty shall be assessed accordingly. I cannot see any other way to do this, but I am always somewhat concerned when there is, as in this case, a Ministerial discretion. The Minister must be satisfied, and he can then direct that the duty payable shall be the same as if the child had been legally adopted.

I see a number of problems that could arise with such legislation. I know of situations such as both parents being killed in a motor accident and a child three years of age, who inherits the property of his parents, is taken by a relative who has no children. Perhaps 10, 20 or 30 years later that child could once again inherit at the appropriate rate the property of his adopted parents. It is possible for a child to inherit in a direct blood line from two separate people. The Minister's discretion can vary in these matters. How will the Minister decide whether a person can establish that children have been adopted *de facto*? How long must they live with the people—and at what age should the child be taken by the people before it can be considered? There are doubts in my mind when the Minister has discretion to decide whether the lower rate will apply, or whether the person receiving the succession is not related as far as blood is concerned.

I cannot see any way around this, but I think it should be inquired into when there are no specific terms laid down in the legislation. Ministers vary and change.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have different natures, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree. I cannot find any solution, but I draw the attention of honourable members to this matter. Clause 7 inserts two new words in the Second Schedule to the principal Act. Paragraph 5 of the Second Schedule reads as follows:

Subject to paragraph 6 of this Schedule, upon any property devised, bequeathed, or passing under any non-testamentary disposition—

(a) for the purpose of the advancement of religion, science or education in the State;

Under the Bill, the Second Schedule will read:

(a) for the sole or predominant purpose of the advancement of religion, science or education in the State;

No explanation was given in the second reading speech as to what the words "Sole or predominant" would do to this paragraph. I assume that it would somehow limit its scope, but perhaps the Chief Secretary could

enlighten us further as to the scope of the two words.

Clause 7 includes bequests to the new Flinders University by striking out the words "University of Adelaide" and inserting "any university in the State". Clause 8 is a general amendment to the principal Act relating to decimal currency. I find the Bill unexceptionable, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which I do not think will raise any controversy. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has very carefully explained the meaning and purpose of each clause. I am pleased that the Government has in one respect taken up the amendment that I moved to the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill when it was before the Council last year. That amendment provided for the normal rate of duty on property derived by parents of an illegitimate child. This was one of the amendments that was accepted by another place in that Bill, and it was one that had been awaiting attention for a number of years.

The existing Act, of course, has been only a one-way traffic, and this amendment does cure the position. However, I agree with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that perhaps some of the drafting is a little clumsy and that it could be looked at.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There are some suggested amendments on the file dealing with that aspect.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I see. Under clause 6 the Minister will be granted a discretion in connection with the rate of duty to be applied where children are adopted *de facto*. I, too, consider that some guide lines should be laid down as an indication of what will be an accepted policy on this kind of thing over the forthcoming years. It is very important to recognize that children who have in fact been adopted and who have been members of a household for many years ought to be regarded, from the point of view of the payment of duty, as normal children of the parents. That this has not been so in the past has always seemed to me to be wrong. We must realize that before the coming into operation of the Adoption of Children Act in this State (I think in 1926) all people that were adopted were in fact adopted *de facto*. In other words, anyone who is now above the age of 41 and who was adopted as a child in South Australia would have been adopted *de facto*.

It may very well be that people of that age are the very class of people who in the

years to come (in the next 10 years, particularly) will be expecting to derive some inheritance from their adopted parents, and therefore it is very timely that this provision should now be enacted. It is true that the Minister must be satisfied that the children have in fact been adopted *de facto*. However, I do not think that would present any great difficulty to any Minister, because this could be satisfied by a declaration and corroborative evidence.

What does concern me is this: in what circumstances, once the Minister is satisfied that the *de facto* adoption has occurred, is the special rate of duty to apply? Will the criterion be that a person must have been adopted for 20 years, or 15, or five, or (and this is the thing that worries me) will the amount of duty involved be a consideration? After all, this is a concession from the revenue. In other words, if \$50 duty is involved, will the concession be given as a matter of course, whereas if \$5,000 is involved the concession will not be allowed? I think this is one of the problems we have to face.

As I have already said, I should like to see some guide lines laid down. I do not know how we can deal with this matter in any other way than to allow a discretion to the Minister of the Crown because, after all, every case is different, and we cannot put down in a Statute rules that will meet every case. However, I hope the amount of duty that might be saved to the Government in any individual case will not be a matter that will be given any weight at all, particularly in cases where children have been adopted *de facto* almost from birth. In many cases, of course, this does not arise, because since about 1926 most people who have been adopted have been adopted formally under order of the Court and they are then treated in all respects as the natural children.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are still many that are not, even now.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I think that is so. It is very difficult to know at any particular time what percentage of children would be in this category. Certainly, before 1926 there was nothing like legal adoption under Statute. I support the Bill, and I hope that the Minister will be able to give some indication of what the Government's policy will be in connection with these duty remissions.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMEND-
MENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 599.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill which, as the Minister said, makes five unconnected amendments of substance to the principal Act. I find on checking the purposes of these amendments and on checking through the relevant sections in the Act that it has been necessary to amend these sections on a number of occasions. It is obvious that these amendments before us now are the result of a very real need further to correct some of the anomalies that arise in the administration of this Act.

I have very little comment to make and very little criticism to offer. However, I should like to ask the Minister one or two questions. Clause 3 is quite straightforward. It amends section 9a of the principal Act, which is a provision introduced in 1961 to allow the then District Council of Salisbury to petition to become a municipality. In that respect, I just question the marginal note.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is the marginal note in the Act, isn't it?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, but it appears in the amendment. Also, what is the precise intention of new subsection (3)? After clause 3 amends section 9a of the principal Act to enable other district councils than Salisbury to be included by proclamation after a petition has been submitted, new subsection (3) provides:

The Governor may by proclamation declare that this section shall apply with respect to any district council named in the proclamation and upon the making of such proclamation such district council shall be a district council to which this section applies.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The answer to that is clear. Noarlunga or any other rapidly expanding area will be able to approach the Government, and the Governor will by proclamation be able to declare those areas municipalities. This new subsection obviates the necessity to amend the Act when a district council applies to be proclaimed a municipality.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I thank the Minister for his interjection. I should have thought that paragraphs (a) and (b) of this clause would cover this. It appears to me from new subsection (3) that a proclamation could be made without a petition being presented. As the clause is drafted, paragraphs (a) and (b), taken in conjunction with sec-

tion 9a of the principal Act, provide that a proclamation can be made after a petition is received from a council.

I believe the principle behind clause 4 is satisfactory, in that it enables a council to exempt a property from the minimum rate, in whole or in part, where that property is in two adjoining districts and where part of it may be so small as to make the proposed minimum rate rather high. What is the meaning of "minimum" here? If there is a minimum rate and the whole or part can be exempted, what then becomes the minimum? This clause amends section 228 of the principal Act by adding a new subsection. Subsection (1) of section 228 provides:

Any metropolitan municipal council may for any financial year by resolution fix a minimum amount which shall be payable by way of rates on ratable properties within the municipality; and if the total of the general and any other rates payable in respect of any one ratable property in any financial year is less than the minimum amount fixed as aforesaid for that year—

and this is the important part of the section—the said minimum amount shall nevertheless be payable in respect of the said ratable property. Yet we have the proposed new subsection (3), which provides that either of the adjoining councils may exempt a property from the payment of the minimum rate, in whole or in part. So one provision says it is payable while the other says it is not. I do not see the usual wording in a case like this—"Notwithstanding anything contained in subsection (1) . . .". I question that.

Clause 5 makes a similar provision for district councils. It amends section 233a of the principal Act and provides:

Section 233a of the principal Act is amended by inserting therein after subsection (2) thereof the following subsection . . .

Then follows new subsection (3). I point out to the Minister that there is already a subsection (3) in section 233a, which was inserted in the Act in 1966. I agree wholeheartedly with the proposed amendment in clause 6, which enables councils to spend greater amounts of money on projects other than those authorized in the Local Government Act. Section 288 of the principal Act is amended by clause 7, which extends the power of a council to insure the wife of the mayor or any person exercising the official functions of the wife of the mayor of the municipality against personal injury. On checking the definition of "mayor", I find it means the mayor or acting mayor of a municipality. This provision will cover situations likely to arise. It will cover the daughter

or a relative of the mayor acting on behalf of a mayor, or in similar circumstances a councillor's wife or relative deputed to act for the mayor. I think the definition of "mayor" covers that.

Clause 7 (b) increases the amount of money that the Adelaide City Council can spend on special public functions or public entertainment. This is worth while, because a council with the status of the Adelaide City Council requires some latitude in this field, as it is often asked to entertain people of international stature. Clause 8 extends similar provisions to those contained in clause 7 to the wife or relative of

a chairman of a district council. Paragraph (b) authorizes district councils to spend more money on special public functions or public entertainment. At present-day money values, this represents a far more realistic approach to the problem than we have at present. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 20, at 2.15 p.m.