LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

NAILSWORTH CROSSING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A couple of weeks ago I asked a question of the Minister of Roads about the pedestrian crossing opposite the Nailsworth school. From memory, I think the information given was that for the last six months there had been about half a dozen accidents at that crossing. My information is that many more accidents than these have occurred there. In the last few weeks a pole at the crossing has been struck by a vehicle passing through. On October 5 a letter appeared in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Danger to Children". I quote part of it:

On Friday afternoon our five-year-old daughter and a neighbour's daughter were close to being murdered by an idiot at the lights at Nailsworth Primary School, which, incidentally, do not have much warning on approaches.

I believe that this crossing is in some way dangerous to the public. Will the Minister again look at this matter with a view to improving the crossing and providing greater warning of it, if possible moving the crossing to another place or making a different kind of crossing at this point?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This crossing has received considerable attention. Its removal has been considered, but we must appreciate it is not a question of merely moving the crossing to suit somebody's convenience. The Nailsworth school is right there and the crossing is there for the protection of children entering and leaving the school, so that they may cross the Main North Road, which is not at present adequate to cope with the volume of traffic on it. The crossing was put there deliberately for the safety of those children. It has traffic lights (red, amber and green) visible for a considerable distance along the road, which is marked appropriately.

I have had reports of motorists driving through the crossing against the red light to the danger of children and other people using it. It is a matter of bad road behaviour. This does not happen if a police constable is there: then, everybody stops for the lights if they are red. However, it cannot be policed all the time to see that the signals are obeyed. I agree with the contention of the Road Traffic Board on safety measures for these children and we would not remove the crossing from the school entrance. It has been suggested that it could be further down the road, but school crossings are deliberately placed at school entrances for the safety of the children. These matters are under consideration at present. They are being investigated to see whether there is some means by which the crossing may be improved. I know the complaints have come from one individual, because he has been on my back for 2½ years concerning this matter.

BURRA COPPER

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: On August 16, 1966, the Minister, in replying to a question of the Hon. Mr. Geddes concerning a company exploring for copper in the Burra district, stated:

The company is exploring to ascertain whether copper in commercial quantities can be found. If it is not discovered under the terms of the lease the company will be finally treating the proven low-grade ore and extracting the copper from the mullock that will be left.

From further information supplied to me, I understand that at that time four drills were operating in the area. People interested in the Burra area are now concerned because this activity has considerably lessened. I understand that at present only one drill is operating and, in view of the prospects of copper finds in other parts of the State, concern is felt that the development of this area is slowing up. Can the Minister inform the Council of the present programme for the exploration and development of copper in the Burra area, and can he say what are the future plans regarding this matter?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is some little time since I last saw a report on this matter. Considerable difficulty was encountered in drilling in this country. The Mines Department attempted some drilling because it was felt there might be another lode in the area. Due to the porous nature of the ground it has been difficult to keep water on the drill; the drills run hot and the diamonds may be lost. The company has encountered the same difficulties. The last report was that direct drilling

is now taking place straight down and that mud is being used to keep the drillhead cool, thereby enabling drilling to continue. I have not had a report on this matter within the last couple of weeks, but I shall obtain one and let the honourable member have it.

SILVERTON TRAMWAY COMPANY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The annual meeting of the shareholders of Silverton Tramway Company Ltd. was told that the company was quite capable of standardizing the railway line from Broken Hill to Cockburn. Can the Minister say whether this line could be built at no cost to the State or Commonwealth Governments and, if it follows the present route used by the Silverton railway system, will this cause any inefficiency in the overall running programme of the new standardized railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: True, the Silverton Tramway Company could standardize this line without cost to the State or Commonwealth Governments. The railway line between Cockburn and Broken Hill is controlled under the New South Wales Act, and I believe that under that Act the New South Wales Government could request the Silverton Tramway Company to standardize its line without cost to the New South Wales Government; or that that Government could take over the Silverton Tramway Company's route.

Of course, the Commonwealth Government, which pays the major portion of the cost of the standardization of railways in Australia as a result of the standardization agreement, has its own views regarding what could be done between Broken Hill and Cockburn. This has been the problem in the negotiations between the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of New South Wales and South Australia for some time. I thought some weeks ago that finality was being reached, but I have not heard from the Commonwealth Government since regarding the matter. I believe the Commonwealth Government may consider that there could be some inefficiency as a result of the standardization of the company's line. I consider it is urgent that finality be reached, and I am pressing the Commonwealth Government all the time to this end. I hope that something will happen soon. The statement made by the Silverton Tramway Company that the company could be asked by the New South Wales Government to standardize this section of the line is technically correct. No doubt the New South Wales Government would not take any action unless it had full agreement with the Commonwealth Government. We do not come into the matter unless the Commonwealth Government or the New South Wales Government decides that the company's line should be vested in the South Australian Government. This is a matter that will have to be decided.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a supplementary question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The previous Railways Commissioner expressed the view that it was far better if this State's railway system did not enter into the ore handling traffic at Broken Hill, and that because of that it was desirable that there should be an alternative route so that the company itself could continue to handle the ore. He foresaw problems in this direction. Can the Minister say whether the present Commissioner holds those views and whether that is one of the problems holding up this all-important part of the project?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In my perusal of the docket I have not found that the previous Commissioner was opposed to the Silverton Tramway Company's keeping in existence because of this problem.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: No, he approved of its doing this work; he thought we should not do it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think what the previous Commissioner was worried about was being involved in the payment of the lead bonus in Broken Hill. This is still a problem as far as South Australia is concerned.

HAIRDRESSING

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry an answer to my question of September 26 regarding hairdressing?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Courses in hairdressing are conducted by several privately conducted colleges in Victoria, but the 15 months of training given by these colleges is not recognized in this State to be the equivalent of training by apprenticeship. Girls who have completed this course and who have returned to South Australia have experienced difficulty in finding employment, because South Australian hairdressers prefer to engage girls

who have qualified after serving an apprenticeship. It is almost impossible to say whether all master hairdressers are prepared to employ apprentices; this is governed by the amount of business available for each employer. Generally, there does not appear to be a shortage of master hairdressers, but there could be a shortage of qualified staff. No provision is made in the Victorian Hairdressers Registration Act for reciprocal rights with any other State. The Hairdressers Registration Board of South Australia will not register girls whose sole qualification is 15 months' training in a privately controlled school, as they lack practical experience and are not of the same standard as girls who have served an apprenticeship while training in the various States.

The School of Hairdressing of the Education Department in this State provides excellent training facilities (free of cost) for male and female apprentices employed in the metropolitan area for six hours each week (four during the day and two at night) during the first three years of the apprenticeship, and country apprentices are compulsorily required to do a correspondence course, also free of cost. Country employers are required to permit their apprentices to attend at the School of Hairdressing for a fortnight's intensive practical training each year during the first three years of their apprenticeship. This training is intended to be supplementary to the training provided by the master hairdresser in the salon for 36 hours each week. The number of young women who can be trained as apprentices is dependent on the number of master hairdressers who are prepared to indenture apprentices. The number of apprentices who can be employed must not exceed the ratio of apprentices to adults that is prescribed in the appropriate awards which apply in the hairdressing industry in the metropolitan area and country districts.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Northern Teachers College,
Christies Beach High School Additions.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE BILL

Read a third time and passed.

CONTROL OF WATERS ACT

Adjourned debate on the resolution of the House of Assembly.

(For wording of resolution, see page 2041.)

(Continued from October 5. Page 2461.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I appreciate the attention honourable members gave to the resolution. A number of points of view have been expressed, even though some honourable members tended to emphasize Party politics rather than proper consideration of the resolution. In some instances they seemed to support the resolution at the beginning of a speech but later indicated some opposition to it, criticizing the Government for introducing the matter for (as one honourable member said) Party political purposes for the benefit of a certain country member. I understand the difficulty experienced by honourable members in approaching this matter in starting by supporting the resolution and then speaking in a different manner later. I appreciate their difficulty because if they pleased people along the upper levels of the river then they could not please those situated near the lower end of that river. That is why I believe some honourable members spoke as they did.

I have with me replies to some of the questions asked. The Hon. Mr. Story mentioned several matters, and I will endeavour to reply to his queries. He referred to the Chowilla dam, and the report I have is in the following terms:

The function of the Chowilla dam has always been to enable the River Murray Commission to meet its commitments under the River Murray Waters Agreement as fully as can be done by development of existing water resources in the river. Restrictions have only twice been applied formally by the commission, but there have been a number of years wherein supply into South Australia has not been up to the full allocation figures. In these cases the development of demand had not reached a level at which the deficiency became serious to water users. For instance, in the year 1944-45 the total flow into South Australia was 760,000 acre feet as against the full allocation allowed in the agreement of 1,254,000 acre feet. This year, under restriction, the supply will be 949,000 acre feet.

The River Murray Commission accepts a figure of 564,000 acre feet as a base flow requirement in South Australia. This amount of water is fully used up by evaporation during the year but at the same time it does provide basic flow through the river and enables

the level of the lakes at the Murray mouth to be reasonably sustained. The applications for irrigation licences received have been steady for a number of years at about 2,500 acres per annum. Early in 1967 there was an alarming upsurge and in a period of three weeks applications covering 20,000 acres were lodged with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This was superimposed on a quite sharp increase in diversion of water from the river over the last two years. These happenings made it necessary immediately to apply strict control over the issue of licences and also to seek control of diversion downstream of Mannum. At the present time there is no firm information as to the area irrigated on the lower river and the authority to explore this situation does not exist. It cannot be assumed that unlimited development below Mannum can proceed with safety to the river system. Over-use on the lower river could lower levels to such an extent that all water users would be inconvenienced and ultimately deprived of water and this would immediately react over the whole of the South Australian section of the Murray River.

The issue of licences for irrigation is made by the Minister of Works. The investigation and machinery for dealing with applications is handled by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department on his account but there can be no support to the suggestion that the department and the Minister have operated independently in this matter. The authority of the Minister for the control of diversion of water by riparian and adjacent landholders extends equally to freehold and Crown leasehold land. The development of the use of the water resources of the Murray River is rapidly approaching the practical limits. Victoria is using water to the full availability of supply and South Australia, allowing for future commitments, has full development well in sight. The only present area of expansion of demand is in New South Wales and this is being achieved rapidly in that State. The situation is that chaotic conditions can develop in South Australia in the very near future if the water resources of the Murray River are not carefully planned and used. South Australia requires the best assurance available as to supply, and the Chowilla project offers the assurance of a full allocation in drought years. Had all irrigation diversion licences now being recommended been developed to the stage of full production together with the completion of the Murray Bridge to Adelaide main, the present restricted allocation to this State would not have been adequate. This would have meant that costly pipeline works would not be available at the time of need, and irrigators would have been required to reduce their demands throughout the summer significantly.

The Hon. C. R. Story: If the Chowilla dam had proceeded, of course, we would not have had this problem.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know that this is the complete answer to that. In reply to some points raised by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, the report continues:

The objective of the proposed proclamation to extend the Control of Waters Act is to ascertain and control the total amount of water being diverted from the Murray River in this State. A committee was formed to advise on the safe expansion of irrigation for a diversion of water up to a maximum of 360,000 acre feet per annum. This figure of 360,000 was a preliminary assessment of what is considered as the limiting amount to be diverted for irrigation purposes. The actual limit cannot be fixed until a full-scale investigation of the water resources of the State is undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This is currently being done and will take at least two years.

The committee investigating the water diversions on the Murray for irrigation found that it could not make clear recommendations owing to the fact that the amount of water diverted below Mannum is not known and can only be estimated at the present time. It is known that at least 25 per cent of irrigation in South Australia occurs below Mannum and as regards private diversions (that is, excluding Government areas) the figure is about 20 per cent. There are in excess of 10,000 acres of private irrigation below Mannum. If this portion of the State is allowed to expand in irrigation without check, it could within a short time jeopardize not only itself but also the existing irrigation elsewhere on the river and the stock and domestic supplies for the whole State. To allow an over-commitment on irrigation can be only at the expense of the storage capacity of the river system below Blanchetown and this over-commitment would cause the level in this section of the river to fall below that at which it is not practicable to irrigate at all. Whilst it is possible through manipulation of the locks and weirs to control the levels in that section of the river above Blanchetown, the level below is purely dependent on the water entering South Australia and the amount diverted therefrom.

The overall total diversions within the State are, therefore, very critical and must be not only known but also controlled. The question of water quality is receiving much attention by departmental officers and any proposals for corrective measures must depend on a knowledge of the total amount of water diverted; hence, the residual pondage in the system. The three-thirteenths share of the available water in the Murray River in 1967 is less than the normal entitlement of 1,254,000 acre feet and only helps to accentuate the necessity of knowing not only the exact diversion quantities but also the real danger of over-commitment for the limited total supply of water for State needs.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude had quite a bit to say but, in replying to the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Kemp, I think I have answered most of the points raised by Sir Norman. There are, however, one or two

specific points that may need comment. The report continues:

The regulation of the Murray River weirs and storages over the last 12 months has been normal and consistent with water availability and structure maintenance requirements. Since irrigation commenced in the Eastern States, it has been the practice in those States to allow the uncontrolled return of drainage water of comparatively low salinity to the river. Over the last 12 months or so, the error of this practice has been highlighted and active steps are now being taken to rectify the position. When the Act is extended to cover the lower portions of the river, field staff will visit all irrigators below Mannum and leave application forms for licences. The applications will require processing in a similar manner to those recently done for persons who had been given assurances of the availability of water from the Upper Murray in South Australia and the acreage of their licence fixed in the fairest possible way on the basis of the available water.

I do not think I need comment on what the Hon. Mr. Geddes said, because he supported wholeheartedly the resolution. I think I have answered what he said. I could say that what he said was a criticism of the Government—and the Opposition has a right to criticize the Government. I suggest, however, that all criticism should be constructive and not destructive.

Resolution agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2463.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): When I asked leave to continue my remarks I was giving some very important statistics showing how this State's unemployment position had changed markedly during the term of the Labor Government. I illustrated how the proportion of South Australians receiving unemployment benefits, compared with the Australian total, had risen from 5.9 per cent in 1964-65 to the staggering percentage of 18.5 per cent in August, 1967. The Chief Secretary, in effect, said I was not giving the whole picture because I had not given the figures and percentages for 1961. At that time I said that those figures were not markedly different from those for the 1963-65 period.

Since making that remark I have looked up the figures for 1961. In March, 1961, the relevant percentage was 8.06 per cent; in July, 1961, 8.05 per cent; in October, 1961, 7.47 per cent; and in December, 1961, 6.51 per cent. So, in fact, my suggestion was not far wrong; namely, that the figures for 1961 bore no resemblance to those for 1967. It is a good thing that I had the opportunity to look up these figures.

The Treasurer's Financial Statement reviews what has happened in the last 12 months, and thereby shows the fruit of the budgeting for the previous financial year. The Budget for this financial year shows the proposed financial structure for the coming year. This is virtually the bud on the tree for the future, but that bud contains the seeds of future events, and in this State we must not overlook the fact that it is a deficit Budget. It is using funds in providing for this deficit to the fullest extent that the Treasurer believes is warranted. He makes this point clear in his Financial Statement. He states that the deficit will be financed to some extent from the trust and deposit accounts. He wants to bring the proportion in respect of this method of financing up to about one-third. He says that about $9,500,000 from trust and deposit accounts will be absorbed for temporary deficit financing. He states:

In the present situation of adverse seasonal conditions and the obvious necessity to provide a stimulus to economic activity, the Government considers such a proportion fully justified.

He then refers to the fact that it was necessary to use trust funds in other States and, occasionally, in this State. It is obvious that the Treasurer is a little worried about the situation that has developed in the use of these trust funds, and it is implicit in his statement that any movement above the proportion of about one-third would have to be very carefully considered. A few days ago the Chief Secretary referred to the use of trust funds and said that it was absolutely legal and honest, and that he would not be associated with any Government that was not abiding by these principles. I am not here to challenge the fact that this may be absolutely legal. Leaving aside for a moment whether it is absolutely honest, I question whether it is prudent. This, after all, is the most important aspect of the whole matter. Using trust funds to finance a deficit is rather like using bank overdraft accommodation. There is a big difference between using temporary bank overdraft accommodation and permanently getting oneself into the position where one is short of liquid resources and where one cannot repay that accommodation.

I question the Government's policy on the grounds of prudence because, after all, those funds will have to be replaced at some stage, and there has been no indication in the debate or in the Financial Statement that the Government is prepared to repay these funds. The

policy is built on hopes, and I think we are entitled to ask, as a criticism of it, whether those hopes are realistic. Indeed, we may well ask ourselves whether the modest expectation of improved revenues from an improving economy is realistic. I question whether the "modest anticipation of improved revenues from an improving economy" (the words in the Treasurer's Financial Statement) provides a realistic assessment of this financial year.

During the debate on this Bill and on the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Bill many honourable members referred to the serious position this State is facing because of the lack of rain. This fact alone will drastically affect this State's revenue in many ways. It can, of course, directly affect the revenue of the Railways Department and the dues paid in respect of harbour facilities. I do not think anybody disputes that for a moment. Also, there will be indirect effects of a sustained and considerable loss of purchasing power by the primary producers of this State; these effects will result in indirect reductions in the Government's revenue. Indeed, if one looks at the Financial Statement one can see that the Government expects increased motor vehicle registrations for the current year, increased receipts from liquor taxes, increased Totalizator Agency Board revenue and increased lottery profits. In all these instances the revenue may be indirectly affected by a fall in the purchasing power of primary producers because of the drought. Just where would we have been without the revenue that is expected to come from lotteries this year? It would have dramatically changed the Budget regarding our hospital revenues. The point has already been made that nothing extra is being provided for hospital expenditure above the figure provided last year apart from the moneys that have come into the Hospitals Fund through the lottery, so where we would have been without that extra money I do not know.

I have already mentioned the "modest anticipation of improved revenues from an improving economy" referred to by the Treasurer, and I have questioned whether or not his hopes will be realized. On the expenditure side, the Budget provides for one week's extra leave for public servants. We have not had the new Public Service Act presented in this Chamber, but I would be surprised if that Act did not raise substantially the administrative costs of the Public Service and probably bring about additional long service leave.

Of course, there is also the question of equal pay, although I do not know that that will have such a tremendous effect on the State Budget as some equal pay is already provided to employees in the Public Service. However, on the expenditure side nothing is provided for any drought relief. Other speakers have already mentioned that fact. Consequently, I fail to see how we can be so terribly optimistic that this Budget will get us over our difficulties. As I have said, I think that it is just a "mark time" Budget and that there are chances that the revenues will not be realized and that the expenditures will be much higher than expected. Apart from that, I consider that this Budget has the seeds for the future in it. So far as I can see, it is only a forerunner of much higher State taxation in 1968-69.

I now want to refer to the line that provides for the expenditure of the University of Adelaide. In this respect I refer to the following very strange statement by the Treasurer:

> Approval is contemplated for the universities and the Institute of Technology to make some increase in fees operative in 1968.

One would have thought from that that this was something the universities were going to do of their own volition, that the Government would consider the matter and that it would undoubtedly approve. From the way this sentence is worded one could come to no other conclusion than that that was the impression the Treasurer wished to give to the public generally of the situation. Of course, we all know that this is not true, that long before this paper was prepared and delivered the universities, both Flinders and Adelaide, had been told by this Government that they had to put up their fees. In fact, we know that they have increased fees by 15 per cent. This is a strange change from the situation that I remember reading about in *On Dit* some months ago, when the present Treasurer said that not only was the Government against increasing university fees but that it would see that the fees were reduced.

On this matter of finance to the universities, it is true that for this 1967-70 triennium the Commonwealth and State Governments together thought that they were unable to adopt the recommendations of the Australian Universities Commission for expenditure. In fact, the capital grants required were reduced by about $4,500,000, and the revenue grants sought by the University of Adelaide were reduced by about $2,000,000. The immediate consequence was that the University of Adelaide had to set quotas and limit admissions.

In this respect, it may have been thought that the universities were being a little bit too greedy or that they had grandiose plans for expansion which had to be pruned back. It is interesting to note that in 1952 the total income of the universities throughout Australia was $11,000,000. In 1958, six years later, the total income of universities had risen to $28,500,000, and in 1965 it had gone up to $100,000,000, including the Government grants which had come into operation in that period and which accounted for about 75 per cent of the income. Therefore, there is a rise over a period of a mere 13 years from a total income of $11,000,000 to an income of $100,000,000.

One might have been forgiven for assuming that the demands of the universities were getting a little out of hand and that they were becoming almost insatiable in their requirements for financial assistance. However, this would have been a wrong conclusion to draw, because in the same period there were wage and salary increases, which the universities had to apply, and increases in materials, books and equipment. Although it appears that the actual income of the universities has gone up over the period by 10 times, the increase in real income, having regard to these changes, has been only about three or four times.

During the relevant period there has been an enormous increase in the number of students attending universities. For instance, in 1937 only 11,000 students were attending universities in Australia. The estimate for 1968 is that there will be 100,000 students attending universities. One of the reasons for this is, of course, the increase in population. There has been a great increase in the number of persons in the 17 to 22 age group who are seeking entrance to the universities; in fact, the percentage of people in that group has increased from 4 per cent to 8 per cent over the relevant period. In that period there has also been a tremendous increase in the demand by commerce, industry and Government departments for trained personnel, and these demands are constantly increasing. So long as this process continues, the universities' demands for extra finance will rise.

In the light of these circumstances and in the light of the fact that the universities have, at the instance of the Government, increased their fees by 15 per cent, it is interesting to note that the general purpose grant this year for the University of Adelaide is $7,330,000, which is a little lower than the 1966-67 figure of $7,390,000. I appreciate that these figures have to be adjusted, because about $550,000 was included in last year's figures in respect of the finances of the Flinders University which, in the earlier part of the 1966-67 financial year, was still under the administration of the University of Adelaide. Having regard to that fact, the increase proposed for this year is only about $500,000 in the present circumstances, and that is nothing for the Government to be proud of. What concerns me is that, having regard to the fact that there has been a 15 per cent increase in student fees, the Government has provided only $75,000 for assistance to students who are unable to meet their fees. This is the same amount which was provided last year and which was under-spent to the extent of $15,000. The 15 per cent increase in fees affects either the students themselves who have to pay their way or the parents of students who do not receive benefits from the Commonwealth Government.

The Commonwealth Government has provided scholarships for people who have been successful in winning them. In addition, the State Government has provided certain teachers college benefits and, together, both Governments have provided money for cadetships and studentships; but having taken all these facts into consideration and all forms of assistance, including assistance under the Colombo plan to oversea students, the total number of assisted students at the University of Adelaide for the current financial year is 5,296 out of a total of 8,298. So there are 3,002 students at the University of Adelaide who are entirely unassisted from any source except their own resources and the resources of their parents. That figure represents 37.5 per cent of the total student enrolment. In the light of that situation and the very great increase in student fees, I consider that there should have been increased provision for this assistance item.

Some consideration should be given by the Government to making more generous the terms under which students are given assistance. There is a means test on an adjusted income which qualifies a parent or a student for benefits, but these are not generous, despite what the Government might say. It is not sufficiently known in the student community and in the community at large that the Government provides this limited scheme of assistance for students at the universities and at the Institute of Technology. Much more publicity should be given to the fact that this assistance is available, even on a limited basis and with the present means test applied by the Government,

because there are many students and parents who are struggling along and who are not aware that some assistance can be made available to them. In view of the fact that the Government will benefit as a result of the increase in university fees, the demands on the Government will be less and the amounts provided by the Commonwealth Government will be increased automatically for the students who are receiving scholarships. I have no doubt that this is one of the main motives behind the Government's demand that the fees be increased.

I notice that last year $6,000 was provided for the reprinting of the South Australian Statutes. That amount has not been spent, and nothing has been put on the Estimates this year for it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Government has taken some action.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I should like the Chief Secretary to say what has been done in this matter. I hope that something can be done, as it is now 31 years since the Statutes were reprinted. This creates difficulties, as I know from personal experience and from comments that are made to me from time to time by any number of professional people, and it is getting a little over the odds.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will let you know what we are doing.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Perhaps we could follow an idea that seems to have been adopted in some other States, namely, arrange for a reprint and then follow with periodical reprints of certain sections of the Statutes. In other words, reprinting is not left for another 30 years but a portion is reprinted every five years, or perhaps during the life of each Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think the honourable member will be happy with what the Government proposes doing.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The method I have suggested seems to have been successful in other States because such States are never far behind in the consolidation of Statutes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In effect, a loose-leaf ledger system.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, but I think a bound volume would be of more assistance for Acts of Parliament.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In rising to discuss this measure, which comes before this Council each year, I cannot support it with any great enthusiasm. I have noted the manipulations of the Government as regards its finance over the last 2½ years and I regret to say that its work does not fill me with admiration. As the Hon. Mr. Potter said, the Government has used trust funds to finance its deficits; it did this in its first year of office and it now proposes to do so again, to some considerable extent. Again, as the Hon. Mr. Potter said, the Chief Secretary has stated that such action is legal and that he would not be a party to anything that was not legal and above board. I appreciate that the Chief Secretary is guided by high principles, but I seriously question whether the method employed by the Government in financing its various works is a prudent one.

Whether it be a small business, a large undertaking, or a Government, money borrowed from any source (whether from a bank, institution, or certain funds) has to be replaced. As far as I can see from the document produced, it does not appear that the Government has any plans to replace the money so borrowed, and this means that at some future time South Australians will have to be taxed even more in order that the money borrowed can be put back where it belongs.

In an endeavour to explain away those difficulties, which are largely of its own making, the Government has on occasion talked loudly and blamed the Playford Government for overcommitting the following Government. From time to time the present Government also blames the Commonwealth Government for not doing enough. I note in the Estimates of Receipts that last year the Commonwealth Government provided nearly $96,000,000, which is rather more than the original estimate of $94,000,000. During the coming year the Commonwealth Government is expected to provide $104,000,000 towards total estimated receipts, being an estimated increase of over $8,000,000 in one year, or better than an 8 per cent increase. Therefore, I do not think excuses blaming the Commonwealth Government, the Playford Government or the Legislative Council cut much ice.

The Government is now committed to an expenditure of over $180,000,000 on public works, and I quote from page 2 of the Auditor-General's Report:

The costs of practically all capital works except Highways construction are met from the Loan Fund. I estimate that at the present time, for Government Departments excluding Highways Department, the major works in progress, approved for commencement and others recommended by the Public Works Committee

total more than $180,000,000. This is equivalent to more than three years' expenditure at the present rate of availability of funds for these purposes.

I know that for the moment the Auditor-General was referring to Loan funds, and that those are his words and not mine. I also say that if a Government talks about a previous Government over-committing its successor then it appears that the present Government has over-committed itself to a very large degree. It will be over three years before many of these capital works can be carried out. Just for good measure, I have noted in another paper (to which I will refer later) further public works that will cost nearly $13,000,000, and they will have to be added to the list.

I do not wish to dwell on the financial situation, but I do want to say one or two other things which to my mind are important. First, one matter has been mentioned several times lately, and justifiably so; that is, water restrictions. I agree with the Chief Secretary that the Government has encountered a difficult year. I know that today water restrictions are beginning in the Warren water district, and from the reply received last week by my colleague the Hon. Mr. Hart I cannot assume that such restrictions will not occur soon in other country water districts, such as Barossa. The restrictions that are to commence today will, I believe, result in about 25 per cent less than normal usage in the Barossa Valley in particular, and such a restriction must affect production in these areas. While not being unappreciative of the Government's difficulties I am sorry to have to say that I think there could have been more full-scale pumping from the Murray carried out. Recent information suggests that in June this year there was not full-scale pumping, and that also applied to 11 days in July. Even if restrictions could not have been avoided, they might have been minimized had the Government taken earlier action to instigate full-scale pumping.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The figure was 47 per cent in June.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I thank the honourable member for that information.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is that when the honourable member said he did not believe there would be a drought?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If the Hon. Mr. Banfield knew anything about agriculture, he would know that in June that statement could be correct. In June we can still get a late season but, apparently, the honourable member does not realize that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I was talking not about agriculture but about your prophecy of its being a late season.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I said that at that stage it might only be a late season.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You said you believed that it was only a late season.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I did not say such a thing; I said it could be a late season. If the honourable member wants to quote me, I wish he would be sure of his quotation. I note that today water restrictions in the Warren area are to operate, by law. Presumably, if other areas are restricted, the same process will be followed; yet the city at present is only under a voluntary system. I wonder why. I cannot see why the Government should restrict country people by regulation and merely suggest that city people voluntarily reduce their water consumption.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What did your Government do in that regard?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The honourable gentleman may well know that the record of the Playford Government in respect of water supplies was unsurpassed in Australia, in the way in which it built up the supplies and increased the availability of water all over the State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There were still restrictions in the Warren area as opposed to the metropolitan area.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: When the honourable member has finished cackling—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am not cackling. The honourable member is slipping on the muddy bottom of the Warren reservoir.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If we eventually find the bottom of the Waren reservoir and see that it is muddy, it will be largely the fault of the honourable gentleman's Party. Before I leave the matter of the water restrictions, which are even today in force and may have to be widened, let me say a word or two about the use of effluent.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Who is using it?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is the point—nobody is using it at the moment. I am indebted to the Minister of Mines for making available to me a report prior to its general release. It is a detailed report to which much thought has been given. I need not stress that we are in an emergency: surely the Government realizes that. We cannot spend much time thinking whether this report can be implemented at some stage in the future. We are aware of the sumps that I think the Minister indicated might be provided

now. There is no time for a long-considered scheme to be worked out. If the Government can supply the take-off points for the use of effluent, private enterprise in the area will start to use it as soon as possible. I know there are difficulties but a positive approach is needed in that area. Another relevant matter that I have mentioned previously (and which has been dealt with recently both by question and in a second reading debate) is salinity in the Murray River. Only last week, accompanied by the Hon. Mr. Hart, I had an interview with Mr. Rex Andrew (the President of the Murray Citrus Growers' Association) and Mr. Harry King (the Secretary of the federal body) about salinity in the Upper Murray.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't bring politics into it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: This is not a political matter; it is urgent. I am given to understand by these gentlemen, who have been in that area all their lives and have lived and grown up with the citrus industry in particular, that the situation with which they are confronted is more urgent than ever before.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I agree with that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: This is partly because of the state of the water reserves, partly because of the increased use of overhead irrigation and largely because of pollution from other States, which is serious. As I understand it (I may be wrong but I think this is correct) the River Murray Commission controls the allocation of available water among the various States, but I do not believe the commission has any powers with regard to the indiscriminate recharging of the river with saline water and effluent which is going on in the Eastern States. This is a matter for urgent negotiation between the State Governments of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, and possibly the Commonwealth Government—although negotiations at a State level are most important and urgent. I was interested to hear the Minister of Labour and Industry earlier this afternoon referring to steps that were being or were proposed to be taken within the State, but there is a vital need at this moment for urgent negotiations about the recharging of the river, which at present is going on indiscriminately and which must really be controlled if we are to maintain reasonably pure water in the river.

While I agree that it may largely affect the Loan Account and the grant we may get from the Commonwealth, nevertheless I bring to the notice of the Government for its consideration the provision of a further college for the education of young agriculturists in this State. I have stated previously that, with the advancement of the present agricultural college to virtually a university diploma standard, we need a further agricultural college that would combine, after the Intermediate level, a vocational education with some of the normal secondary education we have. Dookie Agricultural College in Victoria, which is now being advanced to university or semi-university standard (certainly to tertiary standard, as is Roseworthy) used to follow the practice of continuing instruction in English and one or two other basic subjects together with agricultural science and animal husbandry, after the student has left the ordinary secondary school. At present there is a need for such a college (and probably more than one in time to come) much more than there is a need for high schools that happen to teach some agriculture on the side.

I have earlier mentioned two or three locations that may be used. My colleagues from Midland and myself have had strong representations from the district of Loxton in this regard. There is much to be said for the case that has been made out for this location, where it would be possible to establish a combined agricultural and horticultural college. It could make full use of the many fruit blocks around Loxton and other Upper Murray towns. The college could make use of any research farms in its vicinity, such as the Wanbi research farm. Such a college must be established, whether it is at Loxton, Turretfield, or elsewhere. The Government must look ahead and plan for such an institution, because it will have the attraction that much Commonwealth money should be available for it.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Would such a college be at secondary level?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It would be at semi-tertiary level—after the Intermediate Certificate stage. It would provide a combination of further Leaving Certificate subjects, such as English, physics and chemistry, and subjects with an agricultural bias. It would provide a contrast to the Roseworthy Agricultural College, which is now entirely a tertiary institution.

Turning to the parish pump for a minute, in the debate on the Appropriation Bill last year I said I was pleased to know that the Government had provided money for the reconstruction of the Gawler hospital, which was over 50 years old. I recalled that I went along to you, Sir, when you were Chief Secretary, with a deputation, and later with the

member for Gawler in another place to the present Chief Secretary. We were able to secure the necessary matching finance to reconstruct this hospital. I am very pleased that the reconstructed first stage will be opened next Saturday, and I am only sorry that the present Chief Secretary will not be opening it. If I had any say in the matter, he certainly would be doing so.

The previous Chief Secretary did many valuable things for country hospitals and I must say that the present Chief Secretary, to his credit, has done his best in the circumstances to bring about improvements to country hospitals. As he has said, we have much to be proud of in our country hospital services, and he accurately and fairly added that this reflected credit on both the present Government and the Playford Government. However, all honourable members will agree that much remains to be done; we have not yet reached Utopia, but good progress has been made.

The Chief Secretary misunderstood me when I recently asked a question regarding the southern Yorke Peninsula hospital; I said that much remained to be done, and he took it that I was trying to make political capital out of the position by making a generalization. I do say that, whilst good progress has been made, much remains to be done, compared with an ideal situation. However, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I appreciate the progress made in this field under the previous and present Chief Secretaries.

However, I must direct some more general criticisms at the Chief Secretary, not in his capacity as Minister in charge of hospitals but in his capacity as Minister representing the Treasurer. The Hon. Mr. Springett has asked some searching questions, and rightly so, regarding the provision of two large hospitals, only one of which will for some years at least be a teaching hospital. What is urgently needed is one very large teaching hospital and one medium-sized general hospital. In the *North-East Leader* it was reported that the Treasurer had announced that the first stage of the proposed new Modbury hospital was expected to be completed early in 1971. Later in the article the Treasurer is reported to have stated:

> This growth is expected to continue—

he was referring to the growth of the Tea Tree Gully area—

> in the future, reaching an ultimate population of some 104,000 persons. The area is centred around that served by the Tea Tree Gully council, and at present lacks any hospital facilities outside the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth.

True, that area does lack any hospital facilities outside the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth. However, I want to know whose fault this is. I say that it is the fault of the Government, and the fault of the Government alone. Prior to the Labor Government's coming to office, the Playford Government had purchased 10 acres of land at Tea Tree Gully from a Mr. Willison for $30,000. The Playford Government, in accordance with normal policy, paid $20,000 and the Tea Tree Gully District Council paid $10,000. The arrangement was to provide a hospital with an upper limit of 60 beds, which would have been operating by now. Enough land was also provided for a larger hospital, when necessary. It was envisaged that the original hospital would become the maternity block when the larger hospital was built.

The council eventually purchased this land for a recreation area and, in order to do this, it had to raise its contribution from $10,000 to $15,000. So, the Labor Government received a small refund from local government funds of $5,000. Any Liberal Government that follows the present Government will continue to provide hospital facilities for this area, but the Treasurer stated that the eventual population of the area would be about 104,000 and that the only hospital facility at present was the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth, which at present serves 80,000 people in the Salisbury, Munno Para and Elizabeth council areas. When I last heard the figures, this hospital had a daily average of about 86 patients. If that average has increased to 100 and the total number of beds is about 150, it means that the hospital is only two-thirds full, and therefore a 150-bed hospital could serve an area like Tea Tree Gully, with its expected population. Yet we have before us here a set-up that suggests a hospital of 450 beds and expenditure of nearly $13,000,000 when we already have on the Government list $180,000,000 approved for capital works.

I believe that the delay in providing this hospital is entirely the fault of the present Government. I consider that the original 10 acres of ground would have provided ample area for a hospital which would have been finally constructed and which would have been completely adequate for the final population of that particular area as it is planned for the future. Therefore, I say that while a future Liberal Government will certainly provide

hospital facilities in that area, the fact that there are no hospital facilities in the area at present and there will be none until 1971 is entirely the fault of the present Government.

I have read the Chief Secretary's statement and I have noted, for example, that for the Education Department there is an increase of over $4,000,000 (almost 10 per cent) above the actual payments of last year. The additional cost for special items such as major awards and the second instalment of the five-year programme of equal pay for female teachers, offset by a somewhat reduced requirement for free books for primary schoolchildren, is estimated at a net $1,115,000, leaving an increase of $3,207,000 to financc general expansion of the department's services. I have no particular quarrel with that item except that I believe that more of that $1,115,000 could well have been spent on additional facilities in the Education Department. I do not wish to delay the Council any further. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I intend to address myself only briefly to the Bill because I realize that it is a financial measure and that it is the wish of the Government that it pass through this Chamber as speedily as possible. However, I believe I should make one or two comments about it. With a debate of this nature, if one is in Opposition it is usual to express certain criticisms and if one happens to be a member of the Government it is usual to praise the Government for its past achievements and future intentions.

On the question of future intentions, I should like to expand on the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who referred to a report of the Auditor-General in which it was stated that major works in progress, approved for commencement, and recommended by the Public Works Committee totalled more than $180,000,000 and that this was equivalent to more than three years' expenditure at the present rate of availability of funds for these purposes. I think we should realize that the Auditor-General made this comment shortly after June 30. I have not checked on what further works the Public Works Committee has recommended since that date, but no doubt the increase would be fairly considerable, so the present Government would be committed for not $180,000,000 for public works but considerably more than that. If $180,000,000 was our commitment for three years hence as at June 30, I would expect that by the time the next election comes around, particularly if there is an acceleration of projects submitted to the committee for its endorsement, the amount could be well over $200,000,000 and well in excess of three years' future needs.

If that is the position, the present Government is completely misleading the general public when it continues to make statements that further projects will be entered into. If at the present time we are committed for three years hence and further projects are endorsed by the present Government, there will have to be a change in priorities. If the matters that have been submitted up to now are in their correct priority, how can any Government submit further plans and hope to be able to finance them within a given period?

It was all right for the present Government when it came to office to criticize the previous Government for leaving it a legacy of $27,000,000 in public works projects, but the next Government that comes to office after the next election (which I understand will be possibly in April) will be committed for about $200,000,000. Where is this money to come from? How can any future Government hope to progress when it has a legacy of public works costing over $200,000,000 left by an outgoing Government? I consider that for the present Government to continue to suggest that certain projects will be entered into is completely dishonest. This is completely impracticable, and I think the public should be told what the position is.

When one looks at some of the major items in the Estimates before us one finds that the present Government over-estimated its income by over $3,000,000 on these major items alone. Stamp duties receipts were down by $708,000. The reason given for this was a quietness in the economy. It appears that there is no great improvement in sight in the economy, so we can expect that stamp duties will again be reduced by over $700,000. Land tax receipts were down by $150,000. Surely the Government should be able to estimate what land tax will return. However, the reasons given were that there was late billing and outstanding accounts. Undoubtedly, if there were outstanding accounts this would be brought about to some extent by drought conditions, and as those conditions are still prevailing it is quite possible that the income from land tax in the coming year will still be about $150,000 below last year's estimate.

Railway earnings are down through freight shortage, and no doubt in this coming financial year they will be down considerably more than they were last year. In fact, I would not be

surprised if they were down by anything up to $2,000,000. This is brought about not necessarily through the fault of the Government but through the conditions we are facing at the present time. Also, harbour dues are down. Yet we find that the Government is making provision for increased expenditure. Certain social legislation has been introduced, and this will increase the cost of government. If this is so, how does the Government hope to meet its commitments? Provision for the Police Department was $278,000 less than expenditure. This position was brought about by award increases and was no doubt contributed to by the Government itself.

Provision for the Hospitals Department was $154,000 less than expenditure, and provision for the Education Department was $272,000 less than expenditure. There is a provision of $131,000 for fruit fly eradication. Admittedly, one cannot budget a known amount for this, but every year or so this cost has to be met and it is something for which any Government should be prepared. Also periodically the State experiences drought conditions, so that in any budgetary estimates provision must be made for a slowing down in the economy. Provision should be made for such things as droughts and expenses in connection with fruit fly and, when the Government introduces social legislation that will increase its costs of administration, this, too, should be taken into consideration.

Last year the administration costs of the Highways and Local Government Department increased by 20 per cent, which is a substantial increase. The administration costs of that department will increase in the coming year because of the introduction of certain legislation. The Highways Department has its problems. Since this Government has been in office there has been a refunding of certain moneys from the Highways Department to general revenue. The department's revenue has been used for other than departmental activities. The Auditor-General's Report mentions that certain lands had been purchased for road widening and for hospitals, but when it was found that the land in question was not necessary to be used for these purposes there should have been a correction in the position in relation to the department's finances. The Auditor-General's Report states:

As mentioned earlier, the land selected for the erection of the hospital was purchased and financed from Highways Department's funds. The intention was that the Highways would take over for freeway purposes the original site at Oaklands, but there are indications that the Oaklands land, after acquisition of part of it for river improvements, is unlikely to be required for that purpose. Purchases of land for hospitals should be made from moneys directly appropriated by Parliament for that purpose. The method adopted to obtain that portion of the land which was to be for hospital purposes has, in my opinion, involved the improper use of the Highways Department funds, and financial adjustment should be made to correct the position.

Other raids are being made on the Highways Department's funds.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That's the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes. That statement was made by the Auditor-General. It is not my statement. One can sympathize with the Minister of Local Government in having to find finance for these projects. On the other side of the ledger there are certain improvements in Government finance. For example, succession duties have increased by $573,000. The Government was fortunate in this regard in that the people with large estates happened to die during this period. I cannot blame the Government for that, although it may have contributed to one or two heart failures. It is interesting that fines have increased by $330,000, which is a substantial increase in 12 months. Does this indicate that under a Labor Government there is more lawlessness and that the people are not as law-abiding as they were under the Playford Administration, or does it indicate that the Government is using the law courts as a means of raising revenue? I think the Government is using this method as a means of boosting its revenue. If this is so, it is very regrettable. The Auditor-General's Report further states:

Amounts paid during 1966-67 to persons directly employed by the State Government departments as salaries, wages, etc., totalled $134,139,000, an increase of $12,554,000 compared with the previous year. Some of the increase was accounted for by an additional pay period (27 for the year) in most departments. . . .

I suppose it sometimes occurs that June 30 falls on a pay day, so that it could be possible that in one particular year there would be 27 pay periods and in the year either immediately preceding it or following it there would be only 25 pay periods. In the 1965-66 financial year there were only 25 pay periods, which meant that the Government in that year was virtually committed for more money in its General Revenue Account than was shown in the Budget. What actually happened (if my information is correct) is that Publice Service

employees received their cheques on that particular day a few hours later than they normally do, which meant they could not be cashed on that day but they were carried into the next day, which was in the next financial year.

So, the Government in 1965-66 endeavoured to make its Budget look a little better than it actually was, and misled the public because, in effect, it should have been over $1,000,000 more in deficit than it was as it had outstanding cheques that it met in the following year.

Hospitals are an interesting subject. The Government has given certain priority to hospitals. The Labor Party's policy speech states:

Labor's proposals provide for a general hospital at Tea Tree Gully of 500 beds and a teaching hospital for the south-western districts of 800 beds—this must be at or near the university area at Bedford Park—and to provide for sufficient doctors this teaching hospital must be erected without delay.

However, at the present time the Modbury Hospital is to take precedence over the Bedford Park project, yet the Labor Party in its policy speech had said that the latter was to be erected "without delay". Then, on December 21, 1966, the then Premier said:

The Government is prepared to go further into debt rather than increase hospital charges and university fees.

However, within a few months of that statement being made hospital fees were increased from $10.50 to $31.50 weekly. There again, it is shown that when in opposition it is possible to make a number of promises in an election speech without the necessity of carrying them out, but if the Party happens to be successful at the election, then, of course, it will be found that such promises are completely hollow and not able to be sustained. Because of that, it is found that the Government is increasing costs and charges all along the line and it must continue to do so because we are not facing a buoyant period.

Certain things are occurring in the Education Department into which I think there should be an investigation. Allegations have been made that payments to certain instructors have been unduly delayed. An instance was reported to me recently of a swimming instructor conducting classes in January but not receiving payment until the following May. I know it has been said on occasions that such people have not made out claims in sufficient time, or that the claims have not been in order, but that does not occur in all instances. Surely in such an instance something is wrong somewhere, and I cannot believe that people cannot be paid on the due date. Of course, the Minister of Education has a big department to administer and perhaps he cannot attend to all of these minor details, but I think some of these allegations should be more closely examined. At the present time the Minister is opening a number of schools; many more schools are being built, and it is to be expected that these also will be opened by the Minister. He is also opening a number of schools that were started during the term of office of the Playford Government, and of course that cannot be avoided. No doubt the Liberal Party, when it gets back into power next year—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Who are you kidding?

The Hon. L. R. HART: —will open a number of schools started by the Labor Government. An instance was recently drawn to my attention concerning a school that was finished nine years ago. That school is to be paid a visit by the Minister of Education soon. Of course, he will not go as far as to declare the school open but, by some means or other, a new shelter shed has been erected and he is going to open it.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That is nearly as good as the Keswick bridge.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is the shelter shed necessary or not?

The Hon. L. R. HART: If the Minister has to go along and open such sheds and other projects, then he has little to do.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is it in a doubtful district?

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is held by the Labor Party at the present time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Then it is a doubtful district now.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is one where the Labor Party may have some fears.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have no fears in any district, don't worry about that! What is more, we have some chips, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are likely—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Government has some fears in certain districts, and it will use any means to improve its position. However, Labor Ministers must do as they are told.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Who told you that funny story?

The Hon. L. R. HART: It has been indicated by a debate in Parliament. One reads certain reports where back-benchers have

stated that they are in a position to give the orders. For instance, a back-bencher may be President of the Trades and Labor Council, a strong body, and one that issues certain orders to the Labor Party. The Chief Secretary has said, "I never run away from Labor policy." He has often indicated that he stands by Labor Party policy, and it is also written in the little book that Labor Parliamentarians are subjected to control by their own governing bodies. Therefore, we find that the back-bencher is probably stronger than the Ministers, and that is the situation we have at the present time, that the Government is not ruling the country, but a group of what has been called "faceless men" is running it. There was a period when that group was referred to as the "36 faceless men", but the position has altered since the recent Australian Labor Party Conference in Adelaide and I understand that now there are 47 faceless men.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At least our conferences are open to the press, unlike those of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Perhaps some of these people are identifiable now, and they may not necessarily be faceless men; however, the point is that the left wing is still in control of the Labor Party. I think it has altered its representation, but it is still in control: that is what is worrying Mr. Whitlam. He did have a few ideas to put forward to the A.L.P. conference in Adelaide, but we found he was not successful. Mr. Whitlam is held up today as the saviour of the Labor Party, the man who is to lift the Labor Party from the doldrums.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What line of the Budget are you on?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am dealing with the Government at the present time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are playing Party politics, and you are not doing too well.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am getting a few interjections, anyway.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And you are not doing too well.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The fact is that the Government's voice at the present time is not the voice of the land. We are being controlled by people who do not sit in this Parliament. At the recent Adelaide conference Mr. Whitlam said that the Labor Party was now the most broadly based national conference in the land. I know, as the Hon. Mr. Banfield interjected just now, that we do not allow the press into our conferences, but for his edification I would say that the Liberal Party has been more broadly based—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is only because they have been sitting down for so long!

The Hon. L. R. HART: In fact, it goes further than the Labor Party because at the conference there are representatives of the Young Liberal Group, with full voting rights. It was interesting to hear Mr. Whitlam say on television that one of the things that disappointed him concerning the Labor Day March in Adelaide (and there were a number of disappointing aspects of that march) was the lack of the under-40's. Does that mean that the Labor Party no longer holds an attraction for people of that age? It indicates that the under-40 people have little interest in the Labor Party today because they are not given any say in it. It is not a matter of whether the press is let in to conferences or not; we know that the Labor Party allows the press in because it has had to.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think I have allowed a considerable amount of latitude. It would be better for the honourable member to address his remarks to the Appropriation Bill, the measure now before the Council.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes. I have been distracted from my remarks.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: All of your own making. You went away on the journey yourself.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I have had a lot of distraction—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, you have not. You went away on your own and you deliberately set out to do it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: However, I make this point clear, that many of the economic problems we are facing today and which will increase are not the fault of the Government alone: they are being forced on the Government by people who do not sit in either House of Parliament. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I propose, first of all, to remind honourable members of certain basic facts connected with the funds of the Highways Department. I do not intend to go into other subject matter, which has been dealt with adequately by previous speakers. It appears that the Government is determined to sidetrack or mislead (call it what you will) many people in this State (in fact, over 200,000) about Highways Fund works. I refer specifically to a statement

(which I presume was not incorrectly reported as it was stated to be official) by the Premier and Treasurer, Mr. Dunstan. Part of it is printed in the *South Australian Motor* (I am willing to table a copy of it, if necessary). In it, the Premier suggests that money provided by people to the Highways Department from motorists' funds and so forth was not adequate to obtain the Commonwealth grants for highways in the preceding five years, 1959 to 1964. This is only a half-truth. I am not saying it is entirely incorrect—do not get me wrong about this.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is a "mini-truth", is it not?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes; it is certainly short-skirted. I draw honourable members' attention to the report (which is brief) of the main components of Commonwealth expenditure, in the *Year Book of Australia*, 1966, No. 52. On page 770 there is a lengthy paragraph referring to grants for road construction. It refers to the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1964, which lasts for five years, on a principle of escalation each year. A total amount of $750,000,000 is available to the States over five years for the construction and maintenance of roads. The basic grants operate on a formula (of which honourable members may be aware) of motorists' registrations, populations and areas of States, etc., and we get about 10 to 11 per cent of the money every year. The basic figure of what each State gets is set out in the Act itself, but what is not generally known and where the public seems to be misled is that of this grand total of $750,000,000 the last $90,000,000 is made available to the States, on the same formula, only as a matching grant. The States are not obliged to match the first $660,000,000. Therefore, only $90,000,000 (or about 12 per cent) is subject to the matching grant, and not the whole total, as the members of the Royal Automobile Association are being led to believe.

Later, after some observations about the Morphett Street bridge (of which more anon) the Treasurer mentions that recently funds have been quite adequate for obtaining the 12 per cent matching grants. That does not tie up with his following paragraph, which suggests that, if the department found all the bridge costs, it might not qualify for the full 12 per cent matching grant. Either somebody has made a mistake in the statement prepared for the Treasurer or he was not aware of an obvious mistake when he made the statement. He went on to tell the 200,000 members of the R.A.A. that, after all, this Morphett Street bridge was clearly a roadwork. I wonder whether the members of the R.A.A. know that section 2 of the Highways Act specifically excludes (with one small exception, which is well-known, in respect of the park lands) the city of Adelaide from highways works. Are the members of the R.A.A. aware that Part IIIA of the Highways Act deals entirely with the structure that we know as the Birkenhead bridge? Was that paid for out of the motorists' funds? Of course not. It was paid for out of funds directly approved by Parliament for the purpose, and clearly set out in the Highways Act; but the public is not told these things.

The public is told, "The bridge is part of a road. All right; go ahead with it." I am in considerable doubt whether all the payments for the Hackney bridge could be charged to the Minister's department. I am not certain that the Adelaide City Council should not have contributed something to that by way of loan. Without doubt, what the public should know is that the repudiation of that Act meant that it was a transfer of a loan agreement with the Adelaide City Council, which was not concerned with the Highways Act; it was a transfer of that and, therefore, a filching of the motorists' registration fees and licence money—and the public has been told that no funds have been taken from that fund.

The Highways Department (I have mentioned this previously) submits a budget to the Minister every year. The Budget was balanced last year and there was no mention in it of any repayment whatsoever—to Consolidated Revenue Account, Loan Account, or wherever the money goes. Surely the Government is not so naive as to believe that that programme was not short-falled by at least $1,000,000 which was recalled to the Treasury; yet we are being told that no money is being taken from the motorists. A further statement in this magazine states:

Not all the excess—

this refers to section 31(a) of the Highways Act repayments—

was required to be repaid—

this is just to cheer the motorist up—

but the amounts repaid were $600,000, $640,000 and $1,000,000 in the 2¼ years so that "half the excess—

I want honourable members to mark this point—

was returned to Government funds".

Excess! What excess? What the Treasurer means—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How does the honourable member know what he means?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: What I imagine the Treasurer means is that the amount of money obtained from registration and licence fees was in excess of the amount needed to collect the maximum possible Commonwealth grant. There is no suggestion throughout the whole of Australia that funds in excess of the amount required are collected. Motor vehicle registration fees are decided by the State Governments, and apparently this Government at the moment—and I say "at the moment" advisedly—is satisfied that those fees are sufficient. However, the suggestion that they are excessive and that therefore we can repay what were obviously long-term loans for bridges and so on within a few years of their being borrowed is a little more than unreasonable.

Although I agree with the comments of the executive officers of the R.A.A. at the end of the statement, I deplore the fact that they did not object strongly to the recall of long-term money and to meeting the cost of the Morphett Street bridge during the same period. Here were two gross inflictions on the funds of the Minister of Roads, and the Minister knows it. It is no good his supporting the Treasurer. He has been inflicted with a two-headed attack. His department knows it and is not pleased about it.

The Government cannot laugh off the Auditor-General's statement that improper practices are being followed in connection with the Highways Fund. I have inquired regarding the money paid for the "Sturt triangle" opposite the university. As the Hon. Mr. Hart said, the Auditor-General himself states that these funds are being improperly used. What is being done about it? Nothing! I imagine the Treasurer says, "He is only the Auditor-General! Who cares a hoot? I am the Treasurer, and I say what is proper and what is improper." This money was paid a considerable time ago, and now the Highways Department is to be compensated with odd pieces of land here and there, and if that is incorrect I should like the Minister to say so.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I will.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Perhaps the Minister will say that he is to be paid for the land. In that case we will be delighted to hear it. It is obvious that these inroads into the fund greatly concern the man in the street. For years the people put up a fight to see that their registration fees were returned directly to the Highways Department.

The Auditor-General draws attention to the fact that $118,000 was paid to the Police Department in respect of drivers' licences. I suppose, strictly speaking, I cannot query this. It is certainly work in conjunction with the issue of licences, but this payment has not been made before and it shows the way things are going. This fund is a live fund: it is a "kitty" that has something in it; evidently the attitude is: "We must grab hold of it somehow, so we will add $118,000 to the Police Department for its charges." We all know perfectly well that officers of the Police Department perform this work whilst doing other work: they are on the payroll anyway. The public should be told about this.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Doesn't the honourable member think it right that other departments should pay the Police Department for its services?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The Minister will notice that I did not press the point. I merely said it had not been done before, and now the till is being tickled again.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member has used bad verbiage. The department is being properly charged.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The administrative costs increased by 15 per cent in the year before last, and this year they increased by 20 per cent. This point is made in the Auditor-General's Report. It is worrying and should be carefully watched.

I turn now to another charge that seems to be getting out of hand; again, it is a charge against the Highways Department. I refer to the charge for the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. An ex-Commissioner told me that originally it looked like costing £200,000; he hoped it would not cost so much, but he thought it might do so. To date, the study has cost $559,000. This is a long way over £200,000.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The honourable member should cut it in half.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It will be 50 per cent over the original estimate. The Minister should do a little arithmetic and he will find that what I am saying is correct. The cost will probably rise to $600,000, and if that is not an increase of 50 per cent, I do not know what is. This Government, with considered judgment, put the Minister of Roads in charge of the town planning legislation, and

I am glad that it is in his charge. However, this study deals with roads, planning, and green belts, and I point out that the Minister of Roads is loaded with the lot. Why? Because he has the live "kitty". Why should the Minister of Transport not be debited with some of this money? It may be said that the people should pay for town planning in the metropolitan area, but the Minister should see whether the people agree with that. Why shouldn't the Town Planning Department contribute? I turn now to the Financial Statement delivered by the Treasurer only a few weeks ago. He said:

> The reduced recovery from the Highways Fund of earlier contributions made from Revenue Account is the difference between the actual recovery—

I love that word "recovery"—

> of $1,000,000 made last year and $240,000 to be recovered this year. This year's recovery of $240,000 will complete the recoveries of $2,480,000 to Loan and Revenue Accounts as authorized by section 31a of the Highways Act.

What an apologia, if ever there was one. I suggest that all honourable members should ponder what is the ultimate aim of this Government. I suggest that that aim is to bring the payments out of Revenue Account on account of the Highways Department into line only with the Commonwealth Government's requirements for matching grants. I would add that the provision of eight major bridges and very considerable concrete work on freeway construction just around the city, without any Loan funds whatever being used, is just as unreasonable as the provision out of Revenue Account for the Chowilla dam or for water storages in this State. This Government might suggest that these come out of the Revenue Account instead of the Loan Account. That is how ridiculous it is. In a few years' time the Minister, if he is still around in Parliament, will realize that these long-term projects (about 50 years in the case of bridges) will have to be financed from Loan funds or there will be no departmental funds for the building of roads. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): Nothing that I have to say will alter the Budget of this State, but I want to make a few comments on the Bill before us. I believe that much that has been said regarding the way in which our present Government has depleted trust funds has now been proved and is now no longer denied. It is apparent that the trust funds have been depleted by about $8,250,000, and it is estimated that they will be depleted even further. The question I ask is: to what good use has that money been put? Where can we see anywhere in our economy any of the much vaunted stimulus that the Treasurer has indicated industry is about to receive? Nowhere is it evident that industry has received any stimulus or that it is likely to receive any.

Further, I doubt whether the Treasurer has fully taken into account the disastrous conditions throughout the rural areas of this State. Despite everything that has been said, we are primarily dependent on a rural economy, for we have very little to offer industry, even at the best of times. Geographically, South Australia has many draw-backs. We have no ports of great importance, no water of any significance (what supplies we have are becoming more and more depleted), and no cheap power. Therefore, it is obvious that for some time to come this State will depend very much for its economy on its rural productivity.

As I said, I doubt whether sufficient significance has been placed on the effect this very dry season will have on our economy. Further, very little has been done to help the farmers who are in such dire straits. We have seen recently a Bill which allots up to the handsome sum of $300,000, which could mean $300 for each of 1,000 farmers or $600 for each of 500 farmers. Those who are interested in primary production know very well just how far this sum would go. I say it is purely a gimmick and of no consequence except to the newspapers, which have carried various headlines stating that assistance is being given to the farmers.

In effect, the farmers are not being helped and neither is the State. I make that point because I consider that the deficit of $4,000,000 that is allowed for probably will be exceeded several times unless the Government can use some of its moneys in a manner that will in some way stimulate the growth of industry or perhaps help existing industries.

It has been indicated that an increase of 8 per cent is to be allowed the Mines Department, although I do not know how it is intended this money is to be spent. Also, geophysical surveys, which are already lagging far behind, are to be reduced by another $40,000. Without some type of investment, such as stimulus to our mining industry or to our fishing industry, I find it hard to see how the Government hopes to reduce in some way the amount of money that it has taken from trust funds or indeed to balance its Budget at all.

I can easily understand how any financier may take a gamble, with funds accumulated or held in trust, on some venture that he hopes will pay off or to meet some unforeseen circumstances, but the possible recovery of nearly $9,000,000 is not evident anywhere in our economy, nor have any means of repaying it been indicated. It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government will come to the aid of this State. I sincerely hope that it will in matters of water and drought relief, but it has clearly indicated that it will come to the aid of the States only when they have done their utmost to overcome their problems. It is obvious that the State has not done and does not intend to do all that it could do regarding drought relief.

It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government will pay some or all of the amount necessary to install a water main from Polda to Kimba but to date there has been no indication that this will happen. Unless the State can budget for some of these programmes, it is most unlikely that much assistance will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government. I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): The Treasurer is to be congratulated on his first Budget. The appropriation provided in this type of Bill has never been sufficient for any Government, and that applies now, but the Treasurer has done a better job than that done by Liberal Governments. The appropriation is being made to the best advantage of all concerned rather than to the few who received the benefits during the era of the Playford Government.

Receipts for 1967-68 will be $274,022,000 and expenditure will be $277,989,000, giving a modest deficit of $3,967,000. Of course, this deficit compares with the deficit of $4,984,000 budgeted for by Sir Thomas Playford for 1964-65, which was the last Budget he brought forward and which, no doubt, was the last Budget to be brought forward by a Liberal Government for many years to come.

I point out that these are estimates. We may be well in front by the end of the year. We do not know exactly what will happen any more than Sir Thomas Playford did in 1964 when he brought down his Budget. Much has been said about the lack of action of the Commonwealth Government in respect of State Governments' finances. When one hears some honourable members one would think it was only this Government that complained about the Commonwealth's attitude. However, in addition to the complaints of other State Goverments, we find that Sir Thomas Playford in his Financial Statement for 1964-65 said:

I feel bound to express the view that the Commonwealth has taken far too severe an approach in its financial policy towards the States.

Of course, we know what a modest man Sir Thomas Playford was, and he showed that modesty in his rebuke and also in the size of the deficit he budgeted for, which was $1,000,000 greater than the deficit budgeted for this year.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: He was not charging items to Loan Account, as this Government is doing.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Sir Thomas Playford also said in his Financial Statement that unless a substantially more favourable approach was made by the Commonwealth, the 1965-66 State Budget would be very difficult. His prophecy was correct: the Commonwealth's approach was not substantially more favourable, and therefore the 1965-66 State Budget was difficult, but I must also point out that it was well handled by the Government, and the Government has again handled this Budget in an efficient and businesslike manner in spite of the difficulties imposed on it by the Commonwealth's unfavourable policy towards the States.

It is also interesting to note that the budgeted deficit of the Playford Government in 1964-65 was arrived at after the inclusion of an estimated 300 per cent increase (from $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent to 5 per cent) on licence fees payable by insurance companies as a duty on net premiums (excluding life assurance), and after an increase of 100 per cent in the duty imposed on brokers' contract notes for share transfers, and after an increase of 100 per cent in the duty on mortgage documents, and after a new levy of 1 per cent on documents relating to new registrations and transfers of registrations of motor vehicles.

This year's budget does not increase taxation rates to any great extent. Under the present Government, taxation per capita in South Australia has remained at the lowest level in Australia, with the exception of Tasmania, which also has a Labor Government. South Australia also had the lowest increase of any State in taxation in 1965-66. This point contrasts with the misleading propaganda issued in the pamphlet *Voice of South Australia* distributed by the Liberal and Country League. Most of us know what "L.C.L." stands for, but the people outside who receive this pamphlet

say, "Here is more of the Liberals' contradictory lies". This is how they interpret the pamphlet.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Nothing has worried the honourable member more than this pamphlet.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The pamphlet states:

In 1963-64 (the last financial year under an L.C.L. Government) South Australia paid $29.23 per head in State taxes.

People already know this is a misleading document and I am prepared to advertise it accordingly. What happened to the year 1964-65? This document says that 1963-64 was the last year under an L.C.L. Government. We all know that the taxation rate for 1964-65 was set by the L.C.L. Government, and it is for that reason that the misleading pamphlet omitted to print the 1964-65 figure.

According to the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, taxation collections per capita for the year ended June 30, 1964, were $29.74, and for the year ended June 30, 1965, they were $35.53, an increase of $5.79. This was brought about by the Playford Government's administration. No wonder the pamphlet forgot about 1964-65.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Does the honourable member think the pamphlet did so deliberately?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I get that impression. There are other misleading things in this pamphlet that I shall point out later.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Another pamphlet will be issued next week.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And I have no doubt that it will contain as many lies as the others that have been issued. It consistently brings out lying propaganda.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Mr. President, I object to the honourable member's referring to a pamphlet as containing lying information. I do not believe he can back up his statement.

The PRESIDENT: Unless the remark applies to an individual, the Hon. Mr. Banfield is within Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. There is no question of this remark not being backed up: the people outside back it up, and they know that there is lying propaganda in this pamphlet. We know that there was an increase in taxation for the year 1965-66, which was the first full year under the Labor Administration. In that year the taxation collection per capita was $36.68, or an increase for that year of $1.15. This compares with an increase of $5.79 in the previous year under the Liberal Administration.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Weren't we always the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth up till the time of this Government?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, not by any means. Despite the trips made by the Leader of the Opposition to investigate the so-called buoyancy of the other States, the fact remains that under this Labor Administration the taxation increases have been the lowest in Australia, including Tasmania on this occasion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We are no longer the lowest taxed State.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Compared with South Australia's increase in taxation of $1.15, bringing the total tax per capita to $36.68, we find that the increased amounts for other States, four of which are shackled with a Liberal Administration, are as follows: New South Wales paid $50.86 a head, an increase on the previous year of $1.28; Victoria (the State we have heard so much about as being so buoyant) paid $52.96, an increase of $4.54; Queensland paid $41.35, an increase of $1.18; Western Australia paid $42.40, an increase of $5.64; and Tasmania paid $35.60, an increase of $3.06.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Were they for 1965-66?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. These figures were given before the introduction of this year's Budget, but we know that the South Australian Budget for this year does not increase taxation to any extent. We also know that some other States have announced increases in taxation and that in fact some have announced new types of taxation. There again I refer to Victoria, the State which has been held up to us by members opposite.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They are being honest in not running their State into debt forever.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Sir Henry Bolte has had plenty to say about deficits. He is not very happy with the Commonwealth Government, and the Victorian people are not very happy with the position under Sir Henry Bolte, either.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He is financing the State.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There would be a hue and cry in this State if we jumped from $36.68 to $52.96, and quite rightly so.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You have a little check on some of the land taxation in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let us have a check on the figures given by the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics; those officers don't lie.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you congratulating this Council on throwing out the Succession Duties Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, I am abusing it for throwing out that Bill, which was designed to give some relief from the taxation imposed by the Liberal Government on the small people. I am still abusing the Council for throwing out that Bill.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: If you had got your additional revenue from taxation instead of borrowing from trust funds, it would have been a different story.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And if the horse had not stopped he might have won the race. The position of South Australia compared with the other States is actually much better than is shown by the figures, because since these figures were released other States have increased their taxation.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: But the figures you quoted for South Australia are the previous Liberal Government's taxation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, they are not. In 1965-66 the Budget was brought down by the Labor Government. That Budget was for the 12 months ended June, 1966. The increase in that year was about $3 less than the increase imposed the year before by the Playford Government.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: But those figures did not take effect until 1965-66.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Then how did the Statistician have the figures for that year? The Statistician gave those figures, and they showed that there was an increase of $5 a head under the Playford Administration, compared with a little over $1 increase under the Labor Administration.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: That is the taxation collected, not the taxation imposed.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It was collected at a rate of $5 higher under the Playford Government. The Hon. Mr. Rowe, when speaking to this Bill, referred to this Council as a House of Review. Let us look at what happened in the 1964 Budget when the Playford Government was budgeting for a deficit of $5,000,000. This Council did not earn its money as a House of Review. We find that apart from the Hon. Mr. Rowe, who introduced the Bill, there were only two other speakers from the Government side in 1964, whereas this year practically every member opposite has spoken on the Bill.

I say that members did not speak to the Bill in 1964 when there was a budgeted deficit of nearly $1,000,000 more than there is under the present Government. Where were the speakers then, and what was the House of Review doing then? The deathly silence of the 15 Liberal members of this Chamber at that time could not have been very encouraging to the Playford Government. It was not encouraging to the people outside, because at the next election the Playford Government went out of office, despite the vicious gerrymander that existed and still exists today. The people of South Australia have been under a gerrymander for 35 years as a result of the attitude of members in this Council. The people will be told not only once but hundreds of times of the position regarding the gerrymander imposed by Liberal Governments.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: And preserved by the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Despite that gerrymander, we broke through, for the people had had the Liberal Administration. Concern has been expressed also by a number of honourable members about the necessity to impose limited water restrictions. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins this afternoon was at a loss to understand why legal restrictions were placed on people using water from the Warren district while restrictions existed on only a voluntary basis in the metropolitan area. The honourable member seemed to forget what happened under the Playford Government, when legal restrictions were imposed in the Warren area in January, 1957, again in November, 1957, and again in January, 1959. Legal restrictions were not imposed in the metropolitan area in these years, although legal restrictions were placed on those using Warren water. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins implied that there were no legal restrictions placed on the Warren area when the Playford Government was in office.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: There was no pipeline to the Warren then.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There was a pipeline to the Warren area in those years. Legal restrictions were also placed on the people in the northern areas in October, 1959, when no legal restrictions were placed on the people in the metropolitan area. Appeals were also being made at that time by the Minister of Works to avoid waste and to minimize the

use of water wherever possible. Neither this Government nor any other Government likes having to impose water restrictions. However, Governments cannot be blamed if we get no rain. We know that certain members have housemaids' knees through praying for rain, but those same members are now praying for drought because they expect this Government to be defeated if the drought continues. The Playford Government did very little in its last 10 years in office to make sure that it would not be necessary again to impose restrictions similar to those imposed in 1957. It was not until February, 1962, that the Public Works Committee had referred to it a scheme to augment the water supply by building the Kangaroo Creek dam. The committee issued its report in July, 1962, but nothing further was heard of the scheme until December, 1966, when the project was again referred to the committee. The committee brought down its report in June, 1967, and, in the meantime, while awaiting the report, a diversion channel that was neccessary for operational requirements was commenced in July, 1966. What happened in the intervening five years? Nothing was done by the Playford Government.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The honourable member does not pay much attention to his Public Works Committee work.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The fact remains that in 1962 a plan was put before the Public Works Committee for a certain project, and in 1966 that project was altered—

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: —to provide for a different type of wall. The project was altered, but nothing was done.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Because the engineers could not find a place to build the wall.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: But they were able to find a place in 1966 under this Government. Perhaps they were on long service leave for the other three years.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In 1957, South Australia knew the position regarding water restrictions: appeals were made by the Playford Government. The honourable member asks, "What about the Chowilla dam?", but why was the dam not built if the Liberal Government wanted it built?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Have you ever seen the Mount Bold reservoir?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course I have. I mentioned how long the Liberal Administration had been in office, and the honourable member points to the Mount Bold reservoir. Adequate provision for water was not made and nothing happened from 1957 until 1962, when plans were referred to the Public Works Committee. People outside are entitled to ask what happened. Have a look at the position under the present Government: the Government has decided not only to proceed with the Kangaroo Creek dam but it has also made plans to install additional pumps to bring additional water from the Murray River and to increase the capacity of the present pumps. Much more has been done by this Government in regard to water in the last two years than was done by the Playford Government in its last eight years.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What has it done? Plenty of talk.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Honourable members should interject one at a time. Honourable members have had an opportunity to ask these questions before. What did the Government do in 1964? It sat very quietly, and there was a $5,000,000 deficit. There were only two Liberal speakers in addition to the Minister who introduced the Bill. Members opposite knew a shortage of water was on the way.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: We got Chowilla on the way.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The fact remains that you were not prepared to talk on that Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: What Bills are you talking about?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member is asleep again. We are now dealing with the Appropriation Bill, which has been before the Council for some time, but apparently the honourable member has not seen it. The Hon. Mr. Hart appeared to be very worried because the Minister of Education had made it his business to visit as many schools as possible. He said that the Minister was wasting his time. Obviously he has the same idea as Ministers of the Playford Government had. They believed that administration was better carried out by remote control instead of by going around to see what the position was.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: That's rubbish. What about Sir Shirley Jeffries? He toured the whole State twice.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Hart implied that the Minister was wasting his time by visiting schools. Now we have heard what Sir Shirley Jeffries did, but what did Sir Baden Pattinson do in regard to touring the State?

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: I don't care.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Other members of the present Opposition did not care what Sir Baden Pattinson did, because they did not rebuke him, although he was due to be rebuked on many occasions.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: What nonsense!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This is true, and nobody can deny it.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What has this to do with opening bicycle sheds at schools?

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That seems to worry the Hon. Mr. Banfield.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It does not worry me, because I know what a good job the Minister of Education has been doing. It is most desirable for any Minister, not only the Minister of Education, to pay as many visits as possible to establishments under his jurisdiction.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Minister has been opening new schools.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In addition to opening new schools the Minister has gone around to see the position in regard to the areas under his control.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He has not been to see any of the crook ones.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No doubt there were many crook ones to visit, but they could have come about only as a result of the Playford Government's administration. This Government corrects the crook schools as quickly as possible. As a member of the Public Works Committee, the Hon. Mr. Story knows as well as I do that this Government has established new schools in place of old schools in many areas. The Minister of Education has made extensive visits throughout the State in his desire to have a clear understanding of the needs of the children of the State and the wishes of the parents and the school committees.

On most of his visits throughout the State the Minister has been accompanied by Mr. Walker, who is now the Director-General of Education. On these visits the Minister has met the headmasters, representatives of the parents' organizations and members of the staff, and he has addressed assemblies of students and, contrary to what the Hon. Mr. Hart thinks, the members of school committees, school councils and welfare clubs have expressed interest in the Government's policy regarding the equitable allocation of subsidies, the supply of free textbooks in primary schools, and the introduction of special rural schools. Have honourable members seen some of the canteens provided in the crook schools referred to by Mr. Story? Canteens did not exist under the Playford Government, but this Government provides canteen shells at no cost to the public. As a result of this Government's policy the schools are getting decent canteens compared with the ones that existed under the Playford Government.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: No cost to the public! Are you paying for it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: These visits give the Minister an opportunity to solve some of the problems on the spot and to provide a better understanding between the public and the department. As a result of this, there is a better understanding by the community in regard to education than existed under the Playford Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why is the Government spending less on schools this year than was spent previously?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader knows that this Government is spending more on schools and education (and a higher percentage) than did the Playford Government. Much has been said about the use by this Government of trust funds on a temporary basis. The Hon. Mr. Rowe referred to this; he was amazed that the Government should use trust funds. Other honourable members, too, have expressed surprise at trust funds being used. They were just as greatly surprised when it was brought to their notice that trust funds had been used by the Playford Government on two occasions.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: For a limited period and in small amounts.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No period was mentioned. The Playford Government nudged the funds and used them. In 1958 it was over $1,000,000; in 1959 it was more than double that. That Government nudged the funds. The Hon. Mr. Rowe, when asked a question whether trust funds had been used by the Playford Government, replied:

> I do not remember any occasion, whilst I was a member of the Cabinet, when the Playford Government borrowed money from the trust funds. The answer to the honourable member's second question, therefore, is that there was no necessity to introduce a Bill.

He was referring to his previous statement that, if he were a member of another place, he

would introduce a Bill to ensure that the Government received permission from the people for whom the money was being held in trust funds. He also said:

I should like to add that I do not approve of this method of finance.

Let us look at the position. It has previously been said and recognized by the people of this State that Sir Thomas Playford was a dictator. It has been denied by honourable members opposite. What do we find? The Government's legal adviser, the Attorney-General in the Cabinet at that time, states:

I do not remember any occasion whilst I was a member of the Cabinet when the Playford Government borrowed money from the trust funds.

Later, the Hon. Mr. Rowe sought leave to make a personal explanation. He said that he "did not remember any occasion, whilst I was a member of Cabinet," but he did "find there was a very limited borrowing on a temporary basis". What an admission by the Playford Government's legal adviser! If it was legal to use those trust funds, surely the Government's legal adviser—

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Mr. President, on a point of order, I never at any time said it was not legal to use trust funds. I ask for that statement to be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: What are the words objected to? Without the words in front of me, I cannot rule.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I assure the Council that I did not say that the Hon. Mr. Rowe said it was illegal or otherwise. I said that the Government's legal adviser was not, apparently, even consulted in regard to the use of trust funds. He had no knowledge of such funds being nudged by the Playford Government, and they were nudged not on one occasion but on two occasions. The Hon. Mr. Rowe, who was legal adviser to the then Government, said that he could not remember and he had no knowledge of it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And you have nudged those funds a lot more.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We get this question coming up in different ways. When we refer to the greater number of unemployed people in South Australia in 1961 compared with the position under the Labor Government, we find members opposite saying, "Let us work on percentages, not numbers". But here, on the question of trust funds being used by the Playford Government and being used now by the Labor Government, the principle is just the same whether it is $1,000,000 or $2,000,000.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Under the Playford Government it was a temporary loan, and it was repaid.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, but all these funds have to be repaid; it is on a temporary basis. The Hon. Mr. Rowe knows that as well as I do. The same thing applied in 1958 and 1959 when the then Attorney-General was lacking in his advice to the Government, because he knew nothing about it. Although there was a dictatorship under Sir Thomas Playford, at least he was the Leader and kingpin. That does not apply to the present Leader of the Opposition in another place. I have conducted schoolchildren through Parliament and many times I have asked them who the Leader of the Opposition is; many times I have received the reply, "Mr. Millhouse is the Leader of the Opposition in another place"; but there was no doubting the Leader under the Playford regime: he was the Leader, kingpin and everything else.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: At least he was Premier, and he had another Minister as Attorney-General.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He was never Premier. The office of Premier was not set up until the Labor Government came to power. The honourable member should know that because he was a member of the Cabinet in the Playford Government. He was nowhere near as vocal then as he is now but, according to *Hansard*, he was in the Ministry of the Playford Government—and he does not even know that the office of Premier did not exist in those days! No wonder that Administration was so bad. The present Government has brought adulthood to this State. Even when the last Bill for a referendum was before Parliament, Sir Thomas Playford still referred to the people who would vote as "children" because he said that it was "like putting poison in the hands of children", and those "children" to whom he referred were the people who would vote. Is it any wonder that this Government has brought this State to adulthood and has been widely acclaimed in all States and by the people of this State?

In a recent debate the Hon. Mr. DeGaris queried the statement that the people of this State did not favour a Labor Administration and he attempted to give some cock and bull story hatched by a member of the university. Why cannot the honourable member give figures taken from Senate elections where everybody on one roll votes as he pleases? Voting there is compulsory. What about the desires of the people? On two occasions since and

including 1940 the people of South Australia have voted for an Administration other than Labor. In 1940 (and these figures were taken from statistical returns relating to Senate elections; the percentage was not given in the 1964 returns) the Liberals received 50.26 per cent of the votes, but from then on they did not receive a majority until 1955 when they received 44.62 per cent of the votes. In 1943 Labor received 52.88 per cent and, in 1946, 51.55 per cent of the votes. From then on the percentages of the first preferences (which are given only to the man elected at the first count) are that in 1940 Labor received 46.65 per cent compared with the Liberal vote of 44.11 per cent.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: What did Labor get on November 9, 1966?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member knows very well that there was no Senate election in 1966. I am now referring to a Senate vote where everybody was on a common roll and there was no distinction. They voted on a State basis. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins awakens in his corner and asks, "What was the result in 1966?" I know what the result was in 1967 in Corio and Capricornia, but that has nothing to do with this. I shall refer to the votes for the man elected at the first count. In 1946 the Labor Party received 51.55 per cent of the votes cast. In 1949 the Labor Party received 46.65 per cent, compared with 44.11 per cent for the Liberal Party. In 1951 the Labor Party received 48.32 per cent and the Liberal Party 47.39 per cent; in 1953 the Labor Party received 51.74 per cent and the Liberal Party 44.50 per cent; in 1955 the Labor Party received 42.78 per cent and the Liberal Party 44.62 per cent.

I am showing how the people of this State voted in the Senate elections in a situation of compulsory voting and a common roll. On only two occasions did the Liberal Party receive a majority, yet we find that, because of the gerrymander in this State, Liberal Governments have been elected by a minority of the people and have clung to office in this way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Members of this Parliament are not elected as a result of the Senate voting.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But this is the only way to get an accurate idea of the distribution of votes between the two Parties in any State.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We know what sort of Government the people of South Australia want: they indicate this when they are given a fair dinkum vote, and the only such vote that can be recognized is the Senate vote. In 1958 the Labor Party again came into favour with 46.38 per cent and the Liberal Party received 43.11 per cent; in 1961 the Labor Party received 48.77 per cent and the Liberal Party 41.39 per cent; in 1964 the Labor Party received 50.05 per cent and the Liberal Party received 39.40 per cent.

I must point out that this last figure is somewhat misleading. It is not misleading in regard to the number of votes received by the Liberal candidate, but I point out it was freely rumoured that, because Nancy Buttfield did not stick up for her State in regard to railway standardization when every other South Australian Senator did so, her term as a Senator was to end. We find that she was No. 3 on the ticket for the Liberal Party because the Party knew that the No. 3 would not be elected. So, although the first man elected received 39.4 per cent, I want to be fair and say that Nancy Buttfield in her own right attracted more votes than second and third people on the ticket normally attract.

I am suggesting that, although we are told that Opposition members do not act on any instructions, the fact remains that if they do not do so their resignations will be accepted, as happened in the case of Senator Hannaford. Alternatively, such Senators will be placed lower on the list, where they have no chance of being returned. Nancy Buttfield has served the sentence imposed on her and she now appears as No. 2 for the L.C.L. for the next Senate election and she looks like being returned.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I am surprised the honourable member concedes that much.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I know the true position, but the honourable member would not know it. If the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was allotted second position on the Senate ballot paper, unfortunately he would have to be elected.

I promised the Hon. Mr. Story that I would refer to the gerrymander. Opposition members of this Council were not prepared to provide for a more even way of voting, either for the House of Assembly or for the Legislative Council. The Government attempted to introduce one roll for the two Houses, but the Opposition members of this Council threw out the measure. It is also interesting to note that, because of the gerrymander, the Playford Government was able to provide a Speaker, the Treasurer, the Minister of Works, the Miniser of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture, who between them represented 37,474

electors, compared with 39,091 electors represented by the member for Enfield in the House of Assembly. Opposition members claimed this was a true reflection of voting in South Australia and they then had the audacity to question my reasoning about the way people voted. I point out that the figures I quoted were obtained from the Commonwealth Statistical return and they related to a system in which each person has an equal right to vote.

This Government has continued to assist primary producers. This Council has recently been debating the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Bill. The Government has also continued low freight rates for primary producers; there are certain exemptions from land tax given to primary producers, who are also assisted with the cartage of fodder during the drought. So, this Government has not done a bad job.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did the honourable member say that the Government had not raised rail freights?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No; I said that the primary producer still enjoys lower freight rates for some of his goods, compared with other freight carried on rail. What do we get in return from these farmers who have been assisted by the Government—and we must remember that they are also assisted by the Commonwealth Government? Whilst this Bill was passing through this Council some farmers appeared on a television programme saying that they would do nothing to stop the sale of wheat to China even though they knew some of it would be sent to North Vietnam to assist the soldiers there to kill our sons.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: There is no proof that wheat is going to North Vietnam.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not say that any wheat was being sent to North Vietnam: what I said was that that was the answer given by these farmers who appeared on television. This is the thanks this Government and the Commonwealth Government get for the assistance given to the primary producers. Those farmers will do nothing to stop the sale of wheat to China or North Vietnam, so the soldiers in that country can continue to kill our sons. It makes one wonder whether these people deserve the assistance that everybody so readily gives them.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you believe the sale of wheat to China should be stopped?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not say that at all. I did not say what I believe. All I know is that we hear that it is necessary to trade with China, but we also hear farmers saying, "All right, let it go to China; it will sustain the forces fighting against our boys and if our boys come home maimed or not at all we cannot be worried about that."

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That is your interpretation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is not my interpretation at all: it is what those people said when they appeared on television.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: They were three people interviewed in a paddock.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No matter where they were, they were farmers. These are the same farmers who promised the agricultural workers that when they got a good year the workers would do all right, that they did not need anyone to adjudicate on a fair and reasonable wage because when the farmers got a good year the employees would be looked after. We are still getting letters from farm employees wanting to know why something cannot be done about getting an award for the agricutural worker. All we can say is, "Battle on, mate; if the farmers get a good year you will certainly benefit as a result." Those are the promises on which, we have been told in this Council, the agricultural workers are living.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The Australian Workers Union does not have anything to do with it at all!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Although the time is getting on there are a couple of other things I wish to mention. It has been said repeatedly that the Labor Party is not the only Party that looks after the workers of this State. I wish to point out a few things the Labor Government has done in looking after the workers of this State, things that were never put into operation by the Playford Government which claimed that it also looked after the workers.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It did give them a job.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member's Party will also give them a job on the land and pay them with promises. Anyone can get a job in those circumstances. I am prepared to give the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan a job gardening for me, and when my salary is doubled I will look after him, too. Let the honourable member try to live on that promise. He says that his Government gave people a job. It also gave trainee teachers a job, but it did not give them any increase in their allowance for 10 years. Was it any wonder that we could not attract a decent number of

trainee teachers to the teachers colleges? It was the Labor Party that increased the allowance. We have also introduced the principle of equal pay for teachers. This has already been implemented, and it will be in full operation before long. We have increased subsidies for schools, and we have encouraged the installation of swimming pools at schools. During the Playford regime there was a maximum subsidy of $1,000 on a swimming pool costing $7,000. This Labor Government has made a number of allocations of as much as $4,000 for swimming pools.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The $1,000 maximum under the Playford Government was the maximum amount payable in any one year.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This Labor Government has also introduced legislation to assist the unfortunate people who have been injured and who are waiting for their claims to come before the court. We all know that prior to the legislation passed by this Government it was many months before a person would receive any amount towards his upkeep while waiting to see what damages eventually would be awarded by the court. The position now is that an interim award can be made for those people. Also, when we came into office a person had to wait for up to two years before he could even get into court, once he knew what amount he was able to claim. That time lag has now been reduced to a little over two months. Of course, it is true that we appointed an extra judge to get on with the work. Incidentally, the judge appointed, Miss Roma Mitchell, was the first female judge to be appointed in the Southern Hemisphere.

I could go on to deal with the question of unemployment, because the Hon. Mr. Hill gave me plenty of scope to deal with that subject. We very much regret the unemployment that exists in this State. We do not deny that there is unemployment, any more than members opposite cannot deny that in 1961 under the Playford Government South Australia had 3 per cent of the unemployed persons in Australia. This figure has never been reached under the Labor Government. At that time the Playford Government had been in office for 25 years and it was not prepared to meet the unemployment position in this State. The number of unemployed under the Labor Government has never been within 4,000 of the maximum number of unemployed persons during the Playford regime. I believe that this Government has done the right thing, in spite of the difficulties and in spite of the vocal members opposite who apparently were struck dumb in 1964. It is most fortunate that they have now been able to raise their voices in support of this Bill. I join with other honourable members in supporting it.

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

MINING (PETROLEUM) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of unrelated amendments to the Stamp Duties Act. The first amendment I shall deal with relates to the records that must be made and the return that must be furnished by sharebrokers of all sales and purchases of marketable securities. The return is the document that constitutes the instrument on which stamp duty is levied. In the amendments to the Stamp Duties Act that were made by the Marketable Securities Transfer Act, 1967, duty is imposed on a return that sets out particulars relating to all sales and purchases which are made by a broker in a weekly period and which are shown in the record he is obliged by the Act to maintain.

Subsequent to the passing of the Marketable Securities Transfer Act, representations were made by the Stock Exchange of Adelaide that the submission of a return containing all this detail would involve a considerable amount of clerical effort in brokers' offices and a corresponding amount of clerical work in the Stamp Duties Office. It was suggested that, as the Commissioner of Stamps has the right to inspect the records that must be kept by brokers, the purposes of the Act would be equally well served if the return could be lodged in the form of a certificate by the broker that the stamp duty tendered was in accordance with the records, leaving the Commissioner to make such checks of returns against original records from time to time as he deems appropriate. Similar action has been taken in the other States in these uniform marketable securities transfers and associated stamp duty arrangements, and I gave an undertaking to the Stock Exchange that I would place amending legislation before Parliament as soon as possible to provide for the much simpler form of return.

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 (*a*), (*b*), (*e*) and (*f*) deal with this aspect. Clause 6 (*c*) inserts a new paragraph (*ab*) under the heading "Conveyance or Transfer" in the Second Schedule. It has been suggested to the Government that there could be a substantial amount of investable funds that could be channelled into house mortgage finance were it not for several inhibiting factors. One of these factors is the expense of setting up an organization for house mortgage lending without a continuing flow of funds and unless the lender can operate an extensive and continuing business. This difficulty could be met if lenders were prepared to lend money to an organization already in the business of house mortgage lending but, as the Act stands at present, the transfer or mortgage of mortgages by the existing house mortgage lender in order that the private lender may have full security is not generally acceptable because such a transfer is stampable at normal conveyance rates and such a mortgage is stampable at normal mortgage rates.

The proposal now made in this Bill is that such transfers of mortgages in respect of properties upon which a dwellinghouse is or is to be erected are to be stamped at a flat rate of $3. This is the same rate as is adopted in Victoria in respect of such transfers. The other States (except Western Australia, which imposes a concessional rate of 10c for each $200) continue to stamp these transfers at mortgage or at conveyance rates. Similarly, and with the same object, under the new paragraph (*c*) of the item entitled "Mortgage, Bond, Debenture" etc., as re-enacted by clause 6 (*d*), a mortgage of a mortgage of land on which a dwellinghouse is or is to be erected is to be stampable at a flat rate of $3. The other provisions of the item entitled "Mortgage, Bond, Debenture" etc., as re-enacted by clause 6 (*d*), are made to protect the revenue in respect of mortgage stamp duty. Duty is at present imposed by the Second Schedule of the Act on a mortgage "being the only or principal or primary security for the payment or repayment of money", and an exemption is given in respect of "every collateral or auxiliary or additional or substituted security, or security by way of further assurance for the above-mentioned purpose where the principal or primary security is duly stamped".

The South Australian Act follows the English Act closely in this matter. A decision of the House of Lords has recently come to the attention of the Government, wherein it was ruled that, where an agreement is made that involves the giving of security by mortgage to secure payment of moneys due under the agreement, the agreement itself is the principal security and the mortgage is therefore not "the only or principal or primary security for the payment or repayment of money". Accordingly, in such case, the mortgage is exempt from mortgage duty, as it is a "collateral or auxiliary or additional" security as set out in the exemption. This decision makes it possible, by suitable documentation, that such transactions could escape with merely flat rate duty on an agreement at 10c instead of *ad valorem* duty on the amount of money secured by mortgage at 50c for each $200. The British Parliament has acted to amend its stamp duty legislation in an attempt to ensure that the intentions of its legislation are not avoided, and the new item, as re-enacted by clause 6 (*d*), is similarly designed to ensure that the *ad valorem* duty is payable on the mortgage document.

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

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2445.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading, although I am not to be taken as supporting all its provisions, because I think all honourable members are aware of what my attitude on long service leave has been for some time. Indeed, this Council will remember that last year I sponsored a Bill that, from the point of view of format, was along much the same lines as the Bill which is now before us and which is now introduced by the Government. It can be seen from its general structure that the present Bill is similar to the one I introduced last session. We all know the fate of the measure I introduced; namely, that it was not acceptable to the Government in another place and that, after a conference between the two places, the Bill had to be laid aside because agreement could not be reached.

Now the Government has brought forward this measure. It proclaimed in its election policy that it intended introducing what was unique legislation in Australia relating to long service leave and that it would be, in fact, a pioneer in this field. I emphasize that, with regard to the main provisions of this Bill, namely, the provision for long service leave after 10 years' service with pro rata leave after five years' service (which is only a longer way

of saying long service leave after five years), the Bill is completely unacceptable to me. I now take the opportunity, because I am not the sponsor of the Bill and not in duty bound to explain its provisions as I was on another occasion, to examine a few of the aspects of the problem that I did not examine on the previous occasion. This Bill governs what is called long service—leave for long service—and I suggest that this means some reasonably lengthy period of service in order to qualify for the benefits provided.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How long do you suggest?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I suggest that the courts, particularly the Commonwealth Concilation and Arbitration Commission, have laid down certain criteria for long service leave and included what they consider to be the principles upon which such leave should be based.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Didn't the previous Government recommend seven years?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It recommended a different system which was not in step with the legislation in other States and which apparently did not appeal to industrial tribunals.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But it called that long service leave, didn't it?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It provided for leave after seven years' service. This Bill cuts that period back by a further two years.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Only in certain circumstances.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, but in pretty wide circumstances. In 1964, when the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission was dealing with applications for long service leave, it made the point (and I quote the remark that was made by their Honours Wright, Moore and Sweeney):

> The principal purpose of long service leave is to enable a worker to enjoy during his working life the reward of leave for long service to enable him to return to his work refreshed and re-invigorated.

That indicates, first, that the words "long service" are key words. The general rule in private industry throughout Australia and the universal rule as far as other legislative enactments are concerned is that 15 years' continuous service constitutes a qualification (or the initial qualification) for long service leave. That is an important point.

In the previous debate it was said that New South Wales was out of line, but I emphasize that New South Wales is not out of line as far as the qualifying period is concerned. Its legislation provides for long service leave only after a 15-year qualification period. I will deal with pro rata leave at a later stage.

It is interesting to trace the whole question of long service leave over the years, because if ever we have an example of a political football we have it in respect of this matter. The obtaining of long service leave has been a long time in coming to fruition in one way or another; it originated in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in about 1950, and since then the whole issue has been tossed between State Legislatures and Commonwealth and State industrial courts and commissions from time to time. It has become a political football, and it is interesting to note that the attitude of unions generally on this issue has changed considerably. Unions originally sought long service leave provisions by means of arbitration awards. The whole history of long service leave could be traced, if time permitted, but it does not permit it in a debate of this nature.

Over the years unions have consistently swung back and forth from getting benefits either through arbitration or through legislation. Employers generally throughout Australia (and I think particularly in South Australia) have always taken the attitude that long service leave should be dealt with by arbitration tribunals. The original matter started in the Commonwealth tribunal in 1950, and in 1951 the New South Wales Government bounced, as it were, the political football by introducing its Long Service Leave Bill. That legislation was followed by Victoria in 1953. It has been progressively introduced in all States (with the exception of South Australia), and most of the States have now adopted the 15-year qualifying provision. The only exception is South Australia, and I have already said in previous debates that I think the position here (and I do not retract what I said) concerning long service leave is chaotic. I think the Minister's speech when introducing the Bill indicates the position in this State.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Is there any move in any other State to bring it back to 10 years?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No, there is not; nor am I aware of any move before any industrial tribunal at present to bring it back to the 10 years' initial qualifying period.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is there pro rata leave in any award?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: There is pro rata leave in all awards and industrial agreements, except that, in New South Wales, pro rata leave is available after five years, under certain conditions. It is interesting to note that the conditions for pro rata leave after five years (provided for in clause 4 of this Bill) are far more generous and wider in their application than the provisions in the New South Wales legislation. That indicates clearly that this Government has embarked upon real pioneering legislation in every respect on this issue.

In the history of this matter, it is interesting to note the union tactics. We can look mainly at what they have done in the Commonwealth sphere, where many applications have been before the Commonwealth courts, and appeals have been made to the High Court on certain matters. In 1957 (I think it was) the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the national body representing the employers got together and proposed the introduction of a national code on long service; it was agreed upon. As it has turned out, it forms substantially the basis of agreement for long service in South Australia and Western Australia as far as court awards and industrial agreements are concerned.

When a national code was agreed to in principle (I emphasize that it was agreed to in principle back in 1957) the problem that arose afterwards was how it would actually be implemented. It was only then that the unions generally had some second thoughts about the matter and decided that probably they would be in a much better position to play off one set of benefits against another if they had their long service leave ideas implemented through State Parliaments and not through the adoption of a national code through the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. This turning away by the unions generally from agreement on a national code and going back to their respective State Legislatures to deal with the problem started a series of legal battles, because the employers moved for the implementation of a national code through the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. The whole thing proceeded for a long time without any real decision being reached. It is interesting to note that in 1959 the Arbitration Commission found that it did in fact have jurisdiction to make a longe service leave award but decided not to do so for the time being because of the "present circumstances" then existing—namely, that there was already in force substantial uniformity by means of legislation in the various States. However, in deciding, because of that, not to make a national award the court did say this:

> We emphasize the expression "present circumstances" because we realize the possibility of today's substantial uniformity being disrupted by the future State legislation in such respects that the public interest may render further proceedings by the commission necessary or desirable to ensure full justice to the general bodies of employers and employees subject to the award in industry.

I do not want to use that quotation for the purposes for which it was used then by the commission, but it contains food for thought, in that it recognized the fact that a substantial interruption of the then existing uniformity amongst State Legislatures might in fact give ground for the Commonwealth tribunal to step in and make some award. The Bill before us will, in fact, be a substantial disruption of the existing long service leave provisions made in the other States. Obviously, the Government of South Australia is looking far beyond the borders of this State in seeking to implement its pioneering legislation and is endeavouring here to set the pace for the rest of the Commonwealth.

I now return to pro rata leave. This Bill provides for pro rata leave after five years of adult service on terms far more generous than those in New South Wales. The Arbitration Commission, when dealing with the provision of an award in 1964 in the Metal Trades Award, which has become the standard award for long service leave, actually considered what the New South Wales Legislature had done in connection with the five years' pro rata leave. It did not have to worry about the qualifying period because that was 15 years, which the commission provided. This is what the Arbitration Commission said about the New South Wales amendment for pro rata leave after five years:

> We regard this as too short a period to qualify for anything we are prepared to call long service leave. In our view, such a provision in our awards would tend to alter the true nature of the leave and unfairly affect the continuing interest of the employee in rendering long service, which is the return the employer could reasonably be entitled to expect in return for the benefit conferred upon the employee by the provision of long service leave.

That is a considered statement by the highest industrial tribunal in the land, and I think it is something that cannot be lightly tossed aside without proper consideration by every honourable member. I do not think I need say much more about the history of this matter. We all know what has happened in South Australia. We had a Bill dealing with long service leave, which this measure repeals, which was not greatly used. I think the Minister estimated that it applied to only 20 per cent or 25 per cent of the work force. It is true that at any time there is a section of the work force that cannot benefit because it is unorganized or because it is unable to be covered by an award. It has long been known that shop assistants are not very keen about a 15-year qualification period; they are a marked exception to the general run of union thinking in this regard.

This idea of having a standard form of long service leave agreement was dealt with by the employers' chambers in this State; just prior to the introduction of my Bill last session they approached the State Industrial Commission for an award that would be more or less in the terms of previous agreements they had made with employee organizations concerning long service leave. This process of the State Industrial Commission in making an award for long service leave was held up because of the introduction of my Bill and because this Parliament would have taken care of the matter, had that Bill been passed. However, when it was not passed, the employer organizations went back to the commission and obtained an award which was published in the *Government Gazette* of June 8, 1967. It is an award of an industrial tribunal set up by this Government; the tribunal considered all the effects of the award and it awarded long service leave on the basis of 15 years' service, with pro rata leave in fairly generous terms after 10 years. This measure is designed to tear up that award, because it provides that there is to be no award less generous than this Bill.

Because the commission carefully considered this question and because this Bill provides benefits far in excess of those provided in any other State, we ought to consider seriously its important provisions, particularly those dealing with qualifying periods. I am preparing amendments, most of which will relate to the period of qualification. I have carefully considered the Bill and I shall propose alterations to bring it into line with the award recently made by the State Industrial Commission.

In clause 3 the Government has made some attempt to deal with the vexed problem that we were discussing at length on an earlier occasion; this problem relates to whether a person who is remunerated partly or wholly by commission should be eligible for long service leave. This matter has been dealt with in the way I expected it might be dealt with. The Bill now provides that a "worker" means a person employed under a contract of service and includes a person so employed who is remunerated wholly or partly by commission. I think this matter is now limited to a person employed under a contract of service, and it will to a large extent get over the difficulty concerning payment by commission.

There is a contract of service and an employer-employee relationship. It deals with work to be done. The problem I was worried about last time was that many people get overriding conditions not related to actual work done. Indeed, I still think that this provision should be extended and that it should state that a "worker" means a person employed under a contract of service, whether remunerated partly or wholly by commission for work actually performed by him.

I realize that some people enjoy very high remuneration in respect of this work, for which they are paid by commission, but I do not think we can have a provision that will cut out people who are remunerated by commission, because this would be quite unfair. The ordinary rate of pay is provided for in the definition of "ordinary rate of pay" in this respect. In the Committee stage I shall deal with this further and quote from the New South Wales provisions, which handle this matter in a different way.

I have always agreed that some proper long service leave legislation is necessary in this State to benefit the small section of the work force that is unorganized and does not enjoy benefits now made available to other people through agreements between employer-employee organizations and through awards of the State Industrial Commission. I support the second reading.

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

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: LACEPEDE

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

That the travelling stock reserve adjacent to sections 423, 523, 522 and 520, hundred of

Lacepede, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on March 14, 1967, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1966, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): This reserve, comprising about 180 acres, was dedicated in 1901 as a reserve for the travelling of stock. With modern methods of transport, the need for this reserve has largely disappeared. In addition, occupation of the area would help control noxious weeds and vermin. The district council and the Stockowners' Association of South Australia have both recommended the resumption of the reserve, and the Pastoral Board concurs. In view of these circumstances, I ask honourable members to support the resolution.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support this resolution. I think we all appreciate that with modern means of transport the need for many of these stock reserves has disappeared. I know this reserve very well, and one sees right around it land being developed and put to extremely good use. I cannot see any reason why this reserve should not also be developed in line with the country surrounding it. Probably the Government intends to lease this area to some person, and I believe that this is the correct thing to do with the reserve. I support the resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2445.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): The Bill itself contains no contentious matter. It is before us merely to correct the mistake made in a similar Bill when it was before this Council last year. That Bill was a Statutes Amendment Bill and, like all similar Bills, it dealt with more than one subject.

I can recall that when the present Government was in Opposition it was at times very critical of that type of Bill. Of course, a Statutes Amendment Bill that deals with more than one subject poses some problems because it is often difficult to find a reference to it. Therefore, it is unfortunate that we have this particular Bill before us at the present time. It may not have been necessary for this Bill to be introduced had the matter been dealt with in a different way last year.

The matter that the present Bill sets out to correct is the rating of areas under the Sewerage Act. Under the Waterworks Act, a water district is defined and then the land within that area is rated. The area usually extends for at least half a mile from a water main. This presents no great problems, because in many instances it is possible for a landholder to get a connection to the water main. However, at present some landholders in defined water districts, even though they are close to a water main, are not able to get a service unless their properties abut a main.

Even though a district may be defined under the Sewerage Act and a person's property in that district may be abutting a water main, that person may still not be able to get a service. This could be so for several reasons. One of the main reasons would be that the sewer was on an incline and because of a back pressure it was not possible to connect that person to the main. This is the problem that was recognized when the Bill was passed last year. In that Bill clause 8, which dealt with the amendment to the Waterworks Act, and clause 17, which dealt with the amendment to the Sewerage Act, were worded identically, and it was realized later that it was necessary to have a variation in the wording. This Bill sets out to rectify that matter. However, I point out that if a Bill is submitted to this Council in a singular form these mistakes can often be detected.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This wasn't something new: this sort of thing had been done for a long time.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I realize that. Even this very short Bill was not without defect, because I notice that in another place it was necessary to amend it. Although I do not criticize the Bill, I deplore the fact that it has been necessary to introduce a rectifying Bill. This is not the only Bill we have had before us to rectify mistakes that have been made previously.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It won't be the last, either.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I agree with the Chief Secretary on that, because this sort of thing is the result of rushed legislation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And it will go on.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Whenever Parliament is in the dying hours of a session we get an upsurge of legislation that cannot be dealt with effectively.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That is because some people talk too much.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is this sudden upsurge of legislation that causes many of the

drafting mistakes in Bills. If Parliament were given sufficient time to study the legislation that came before it, perhaps these mistakes would not occur. However, as I have said, I do not wish to deal with this Bill at any great length. I see nothing wrong with it, so I am prepared to support the second reading.

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

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.40 *to* 7.45 *p.m.*]

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2450.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): The original Act to approve and ratify an indenture relating to the establishment of an oil refinery in this State was assented to on October 23, 1958, and amended in 1965. The 1965 Bill was introduced to remove an anomaly regarding wharfage charges made for the transportation of products from the refinery. It was originally planned that outward wharfage should not be charged on petroleum products shipped from the company's marine installation at Port Stanvac to ports in South Australia. Wharfage was to be charged at inward ports only on the products carried in tankers from Port Stanvac to Port Adelaide, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, etc. It so happened that the exposed site at Port Stanvac caused tankers carrying products to other ports in South Australia to be unable to load regularly all year round. Sometimes vessels could not get in close enough to the shore. On 90 occasions in the first year of the refinery's operations ships could not get in close enough to the shore to take on their loads.

In consequence, a pipeline was built from Port Stanvac to Port Adelaide and oil was pumped through the pipeline and into tankers at Birkenhead. As a result of a contract with the Electricity Trust at Osborne it was found necessary that there should be double tanker transfers on these occasions: Port Stanvac to Birkenhead by pipeline, thence into a tanker, thus incurring wharfage charges, and then unloading at Osborne, thus incurring further wharfage charges. In other words, there were double wharfage charges, and this was contrary to the intention of the original Act. In 1965 the Act was amended as follows:

Notwithstanding anything contained in the indenture in the Schedule to this Act petroleum products produced at the refinery and transported by pipeline to Port Adelaide and therefrom shipped and subsequently unloaded at any wharf in South Australia under the control of the board, will not be chargeable with outward wharfage at Port Adelaide but will be chargeable with inward wharfage at the rate fixed by subclause (2) of clause 11 of the Schedule to this Act.

Another anomaly has now arisen: furnace oil cannot be taken by pipeline to Port Adelaide but must be taken by road or some other means.

Furnace oil can be transmitted through a pipeline but it has the effect of fouling the pipeline for carrying other substances such as gasoline, kerosene and diesel oils. Since furnace oil cannot be transmitted through the pipeline there are three alternatives: by sea (much of it is still carried by sea), by road (when the sea route is unusable because of the weather) or by rail. At the moment road, instead of rail, is being used for convenience. It is estimated that for as long as the present pipeline remains in operation no product other than furnace oil will create any problem. This Bill makes possible the use of either road or rail as an alternative method of transport, but it does not limit the transport of furnace oil to road alone or to rail alone. Depending on the weather, furnace oil is still carried by sea tanker. This amendment will not cause any sufferring or heartburn in any quarter. The refinery is an important asset to South Australia's economy and the amendment only does to the original Act in spirit what was intended by the 1965 amendment. I support the Bill.

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

BUILDERS LICENSING BILL

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2446.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): This Bill amends three sections of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-67. Clause 3 amends section 5, clause 4 amends section 44 and clause 5 amends section 59. The first of those three changes simply includes the definition of a strata title, or a home unit coming

within a strata title system, within the definition of "allotment", a necessary change, with which I entirely agree.

The main changes, however, are to sections 44 and 59. Honourable members may recall section 44 of the principal Act, because it was one of the provisions about which there was much discussion some time ago in this Chamber. Section 44 reads as follows:

(1) A person shall not—

(*a*) sell, grant, transfer, convey or mortgage any land other than an allotment or an undivided share of an allotment to any person;

(*b*) enter into any contract of sale or agreement for sale or purchase of any land other than an allotment or an undivided share of an allotment; or

(*c*) lease or grant a licence to use or occupy any land other than an allotment or an undivided share of an allotment for a term exceeding five years or as a term of the lease or licence or by way of option to renew the term of the lease or licence without the approval in writing of the Director.

Penalty—Four hundred dollars.

Then there are several subsections, one of which is deleted and replaced by this Bill. The section generally within Part VI of the principal Act that deals with the control of land subdivision has the marginal note "Land not to be sold, etc., except in allotments".

This Bill can be broken up under three headings. The first deals with the problem that was encountered previously by pairs of maisonettes, apartments or units (call them what you like)—but residential buildings commonly known as pairs; in other words, they comprised two separate occupancies. These pairs were excluded from the terms of the principal Act. The home unit provisions of the Act, in other words, dealt only with buildings with three or more occupancies.

In the Bill dealing with strata titles that we passed recently (honourable members will recall that it was an amendment to the Real Property Act) these pairs could be divided into the strata title system of ownership; so there was some conflict, in that one Act prohibited the division of an allotment where there was a pair of occupancies on it and the strata title legislation permitted that same building that was built as a pair to be divided into separate occupancies.

Therefore, the first change effected by this Bill is that it brings about this uniformity, and now under the amended Act it will be possible, in certain circumstances, to divide an allotment into these two separate forms of ownership. The second change effected is that under this Bill buildings constructed before January 1, 1940, cannot be subdivided into units. Again, honourable members will recall that, when we were debating the Planning and Development Bill, the pairs to which I have referred came under criticism (and, I think, justifiable criticism in many examples cited) in that they were old buildings built well before 1940 and had been sold in some forms of ownership, and some of those transactions were questioned by responsible people who received complaints about the transactions.

The recent strata titles legislation provided that buildings constructed before January 1, 1940, could not be divided up into the strata title system. So, here again, uniformity is being brought about and January 1, 1940, is being taken as the date covering the original Act and this amending Bill.

The third and most important change being effected by the Bill is that it will mean that all forms of home unit construction in the future or after the commencement of the strata title legislation will have to be owned under the strata title system. That will be the effect of this Bill. Section 44 is amended in such a way by clause 4 that it will be possible for people to own land under the previous company system but after the date of the proclamation of the strata title legislation everything will need the permission or approval in writing of the Director. I have no doubt that the Director will give that permission only if the strata title system is to be followed.

We heard during the debate on the strata titles legislation and also during the Minister's second reading explanation of this legislation that the Director considers that the erection of small groups of home units on a block of land is a means by which the promoters get around the subdivision or resubdivision of the allotment. The Minister stated:

> This is designed to prevent promoters of land subdivision from virtually subdividing their land by converting it into home units without a properly approved plan of subdivision or plan of resubdivision or strata plan.

I believe we should retain the company system of ownership of home units as well as the new strata titles system, for which legislation has already been passed by this Council. A builder or developer should be free to erect home units and to choose whether he wants to place them under the strata titles system of ownership or whether he wants to continue with the company system.

During the debate on the strata titles legislation two important points were made: first, the strata titles system will be fairly expensive for the builder and, of course, he will pass such costs on to the purchaser of the home units; secondly, the company system provides control as to who buys into a unit block. Under the strata titles system there is no control; a person has a clear title to a strata title unit and can sell it to whom he wishes. In home-unit blocks people live fairly close together, and it is a safety valve to owners to know who will be living alongside them.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: A person in a private home has no control as to who will be his neighbour.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: But when a person builds a private house he is not as close to his neighbour as a unit owner is. I plead the case of the relatively small builder to be able to continue to build small blocks of units and to retain the company system of ownership if he so wishes. Under this Bill that right will be removed. Clause 4 states:

Section 44 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by striking out subsection (4) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:—

(4) Subsection (1) of this section shall not apply to any land that constitutes a building or portion of a building designed, held and dealt with as a unit for separate occupation within a building unit scheme laid out in an allotment and comprising two or more of such units where—

(*a*) the predominant rights to the exclusive use and occupation of each of those units are, under or by virtue of a lease, underlease or tenancy or other agreement or the ownership of shares in a company, vested in a person who is or in persons who are, in consequence or in pursuance of such lease, underlease, agreement or ownership of shares, either in possession of the units or entitled to the rents and profits thereof;

and

(*b*) the plans and specifications for that building unit scheme have been approved, by the council within whose area the allotment is situated, under the provisions of the Building Act, 1923-1965, and the regulations made thereunder, not earlier than the first day of January, 1940, and not later than the day of the commencement of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Act, 1967.;

and

(*b*) by inserting after the word "extent" in subsection (5) thereof the passage "being a portion of an allotment of land separately owned, where the remaining portion of the allotment so owned is also over twenty acres in extent."

This provides an exemption from the need for the Director's approval to subdivide land as units; this exclusion applies only from 1940 until the date of operation of the strata titles legislation. After this date the exclusion does not apply at all.

Section 44 (1) states that one cannot convey an interest in units and one cannot grant any lease for a term exceeding five years. We know that the company system of ownership of units involves long-term leases from the company to the occupier. One cannot do this without the written approval of the Director.

I referred earlier to the small builder who in the past has built three home units on a small block of land in the suburbs and has provided a service for the buying public. Many elderly people, particularly widows, pensioners and retired people, leave their existing houses and purchase such units. They want to buy as cheaply as possible. Many of these builders have turned to this form of construction simply to keep their building operations going in these difficult times.

Previously they built speculative houses but experienced difficulty in selling. They sensed there was a demand from these elderly people who wanted small units and they turned their activities toward this field. They have endeavoured to keep their costs down because of the market in which they are operating. They are controlled by the local council, by the Building Act, and by every other regulation under which builders operate.

We must also consider the customer they have been wanting to please; for this type of customer cost is an important factor. I do not know of any such people who have complained of the company form of ownership. A few of these people have borrowed a little money. This does not apply to a great many of them, because most of them sell their existing house and put that capital into their home unit. I agree that if any of them want to borrow a little money they will probably borrow that amount at a low rate of interest if a strata title exists. Of course, they can still borrow, under the present system, and some of them are borrowing these small amounts.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Doesn't that bring Aldersgate and Sunset Lodge and all these people under State Government control?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Where it is a church organization—

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Some are not church organizations.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Any charitable or church organization that develops land into units of this kind probably would become involved. However, these units would have to be of separate occupation, and I doubt whether many of these places are. Many of them have common dining-rooms.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Many of them do not have common dining-rooms, and they are separate units completely.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Elderly Citizens Homes is one organization that comes to mind as being an organization that has such units.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: And these are all brought under control, are they?

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is the Minister's job to answer that question.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is an interesting point, because the occupier of such a unit as this is a donor-occupier; the ownership of the title remains in the institution's name, for it provides one-third and the Commonwealth Government provides the other two-thirds of the value of the unit. The occupier never owns the unit, nor has he any financial interest in it.

Some builders are operating in this small way with home units and they want to go on building in that way: they do not want to become involved with the problems, the complexities, the delays and the expense involved with the strata titles system. They do not criticize that system: they say (and I agree with this view) that this strata titles legislation which this Government introduced is suitable principally for future large developments, such as multi-storey apartments and commercial buildings of a fairly large kind within the city of Adelaide. That is the kind of development to which the strata titles legislation is most suitable. The small builders still want to go on building these small blocks of units; they simply want to carry on with this company system of ownership. I submit that the buyers, because they will be buying more cheaply, also want to continue with that system.

Again I say that the developer who puts three units of that kind on one residential block in the suburbs is not just trying to get around any problem of applying for subdivision of the land, having his application to subdivide refused and then scoring at the expense of the Director by putting units on it. I can understand how in theory that outlook might exist, but I submit that in practice it does not apply. The person who builds flats for letting purposes is not trying to get around any regulations concerning subdivision and resubdivision of the land.

I cannot understand the attitude of the Minister when he makes the point that a builder of this kind is virtually subdividing his land by putting units on it and that he would not have been permitted (so the reasoning goes), if he had applied, to subdivide it. We are sweeping the net back through the waters and we are going to catch up all these builders and all these little people who do not want to pay too much for their home units. This Bill says that they must all be under the strata titles system. It seems to be a terrible crime to divide an allotment in this manner.

This Bill is preventing the division of an allotment. If we pass it in its present form and these small builders are faced with this issue of having to put three units under the strata titles system, they will not continue with that kind of construction, and this will go against the general activity in the building industry. Any measure that tends to do that in today's world is a dangerous measure. We should be doing everything possible to encourage building.

I cannot pass over the obvious point that the Director has power to charge this capital tax of up to $100 in the metropolitan area and up to $40 in the country areas for each unit in any strata plan. It means that if we pass this Bill in its present form the whole programme becomes an income-producer for the fund which, we were told, is to be used for the purchase or development of reserves. How ridiculous this position gets when elderly people and pensioners do not want playing fields put up around them.

This kind of reserve purchase and development would properly apply in the outer suburbs, where we do not find units in any number at all. Incidentally, the money is not being used for that purpose at present. It is one of the trust funds, and it is one of the 33 such funds being used by the Government. The Government is paying 4 per cent to the fund itself. I say that there is no need at all for builders to be stopped in their operations of building home units and carrying on under the company form of ownership. It is a case

of freedom of choice between these two methods of ownership, and I do not know why the two of them cannot be used at the choice of the developer.

I should like some explanations from the Minister concerning the Bill and some of the definitions it contains, especially the definition of a building-unit scheme, which is not defined. I should like to know how closely it comes to buildings such as shopping blocks, commercial buildings, and flats, particularly shops and shopping centres generally. If this Bill is passed in its present form, section 44 of the principal Act will be amended and, as I said earlier, the exclusion of the need for the consent of the Director will not apply to any buildings after the proclamation of the strata titles legislation. One might say that this will apply to any buildings in the future. This means that if somebody wanted to build a block of shops, he would not be able to lease a shop for a term exceeding five years without the consent of the Director. This is for buildings to be erected.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think this would cover a three-year right of renewal?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That point is covered in the Bill before us. It does not matter whether the period of time extends over one lease, being the original lease, or the lease and the right to renew. What it means is that a lease for three years with a right to renew for another three years must have the consent of the Director.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why has that been put in the Bill?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I was just going to ask that myself. What has this to do with the Director? Let us consider any shop built after 1940. Section 44 says that the lease cannot be entered into without the approval in writing of the Director. If, in the Bill before us a shopping block is deemed to be a building unit scheme, it would appear that a lease cannot be entered into without the consent in writing of the Director, but I do not think the word "unit" in this context is actually defined in the strata titles legislation. It is referred to as a unit for which a strata title is to be issued. In terms of normal definition I do not think a shopping block could be termed a building unit scheme.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What will the approval of the Director cost?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We do not know what it will cost or the reasons on which he may base his approval or refusal.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: There must be some fee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is a fee attached to the application, although I think it would be reasonable for a fee to be charged because the Director's staff would have to process the application. In other words, every shopping lease that extends over five years or for which the original lease and extension exceeds five years will have to have the consent of the Director. This will entail much work and will involve many public servants being employed to process the applications. What is the need for this? The Director has no doubt approved the zoning of the locality for shopping purposes. That is where his responsibility lies.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: He can come back for a second cut and raise more revenue.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. He and the local council control zoning, but once the shopping block is there, why should he have the right to approve or refuse a lease of that time. The position becomes even more unfortunate regarding the newer shopping centres where the developer has to arrange his leases or his principal leases before he goes to his finance body to secure his loan to build the centre. He goes to his financier, who says, "Have you got your head tenant?" He says, "Yes, I have a big chain store and it has agreed to lease the main part of the centre for 20 or 30 years." The financing body says, "That is no good to us because it must be approved by the Director." At that stage, it is only a form of agreement, so the financing body does not know whether the Director will approve of any lease longer than five years and it does not lend the money.

This has already happened at Marden, although conferences have been held to straighten out the problem, but no-one wants to give up any power on the issue. As a result the building has not started, and the building trade generally speaking does not have this activity in this centre. To the best of my knowledge the shopping centre at Marden has not started, although it may have.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Perhaps the Minister has some information for us?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I shall give it in due course.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Perhaps the Minister will see the point and agree that there is no need for the consent of the Director being required for shop leases. Regarding office buildings, there again I should like to know, if

an office block similar to the A.M.P. building opposite Parliament House were contemplated for the city of Adelaide, would this be deemed a building unit scheme? That is a very important matter. If it were built after the proclamation of the Strata Titles Act, which I imagine will happen in a few weeks' time, as I read section 44 every lease exceeding five years in a building of that kind would have to be approved by the Director. I do not see any need for this.

If we consider a building constructed between 1940 and the date of the proclamation of the strata titles legislation, it will turn on whether or not that building is deemed to be a building unit scheme. If it is a building unit scheme, it would seem to me that a lease could be granted for a long term, although I have grave doubts whether that could be defined as a building unit scheme. Again, the permission of the Director is necessary for a lease of that kind.

Regarding flat development, people who build flats today are providing a service to future tenants and to the metropolitan area generally. We need moderately small blocks of flats. These developers do not want to become involved in questions of whether or not they have to obtain consent to lease. They acknowledge that the Director has the responsibility to zone the areas in which the flats are built. From that point on, surely his responsibility should cease and the owner should be able to treat with a tenant. If a person wants to lease a flat for three years with a right to renew for another three years, it should have nothing to do with the Director.

I intend to move an amendment that will delete the words "and not later than the day of the commencement of the Real Property Act Amendment (Strata Titles) Act 1967" in subclause 4 (*d*). Also, the same words should be deleted on page 4 of the Bill. The effect of this will be that any home unit scheme (if such schemes come within that definition, as I am sure they do) built at any time in the future will be able to be owned and sold under the company system if that is what the vendor wants.

If we take the position of a small residential unit block at this time with that change being proposed in the Bill, we can see how section 44 (1), which states that a person shall not, in effect, sell units under the company system without the consent of the Director, will be overruled by the new subsection (4), and the builder will be able to do that. From the point of view of the building trade in this State and the purchasers of home units, that will be a far better arrangement than the proposed idea of spreading the net so far that any form of division of an allotment will be prohibited. Whichever way one looks at it, it seems unreasonable for this Bill to include that intention.

There was a need to straighten out the little problem of two or three units as a minimum, because the two pieces of legislation were in conflict. I admit, too, that there was reference to the principle I am discussing here when the strata title legislation was introduced. At that time the Minister indicated that this question would be examined. It has been, and we see the result. It is most unfortunate.

The consequences of it will be that, in the immediate future at least, all home unit construction will cease. I do not say that lightly; I have discussed the strata title legislation with people at a meeting attended by those who both build and sell home units.

It is fair to say that the general consensus of opinion at that meeting was that very few strata title blocks would be commenced in the foreseeable future because of the complexities of that legislation and the delays and cost involved. At that time this Bill was not available but the response at that meeting was enough to convince me that it felt that the strata title legislation was suitable for large blocks of home units, none of which we have so far built in the metropolitan area.

The meeting agreed that at least we had it on our Statute Book and, when the time came for the kind of apartment building suitable to strata title ownership, then, the legislation being there, that form of ownership could take place. But here, in one sweep in this Bill, we bring everyone into the position where, if people want to go on with their building of home units, they will have to knuckle down, go through these complexities, suffer the delays and pay the extra cost. I have grave doubts that the building industry will do that.

We do not know, of course, the reasons that the Town Planner will use as a basis for approval in these instances. As I said in the debate on the strata title legislation, it is in effect over-government. A builder is seeking permission from the council on the one hand, as traditionally he has done, and, on the other hand, he is seeking the approval of the Director, and what the Director is using as his standards or reasons we do not know. That is coming by regulations, but it cannot be much more than that which is dealt with by local

government, which administers the Building Act. So there are these two avenues of consent needed, and that is over-government.

That is another reason why there is no need for it. There is every possibility that in the near future builders will be registered, and that is another assurance of standards of construction. So, on this argument, I wonder why we have to go to the Director of Planning for permission in regard to these home units. I propose to move an amendment to delete the lines I have mentioned. If that is done, at least the building industry in this sector will continue and purchasers will have a choice of buying units under one system or the other. I support the second reading.

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

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (LEASES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2450.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill and commend the Government for the consideration it has given to this matter. We all appreciate the introduction of this legislation. It is not hasty but has been well thought out for some time by this Government and the Playford Government. It is primarily designed, as the second reading explanation indicates, to allow development in two counties in the South-East—Buckingham and Chandos. This legislation has been specifically designed to enable land in this area to be allotted and developed. This country has always been regarded as problem country. For many years it has been referred to as "tiger" country; indeed the Minister of Lands referred to it in this way not long ago.

Development is already taking place on the fringes of this area, and this development indicates that the country needs careful management, but with such management and with good control it can be brought into production without any great dangers. However, such development must not be carried out hastily; caution and control must be the keynotes. I commend the Minister of Lands for taking his time in considering the whole problem before introducing legislation. It would have been very easy for a young, enthusiastic and new Minister of Lands to decide suddenly to enter upon legislation for the development of this land but, to his credit, he took his time and wise counsel prevailed.

This matter has been discussed for some time; in 1962 it was referred to the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, which brought down a report on August 26, 1963, after taking evidence from many people, including public servants and interested people in and near the area. Also, departmental officers investigated the matter for a long time. The recommendations of the committee are worth repeating in connection with this matter; they were:

(1) That a limited development of the area be undertaken.
(2) That development be encouraged inwards from the fringe areas.
(3) That roads be surveyed before the allocation of land, and development follow the routes of the surveyed roads.

I think we all appreciate the wisdom of this last recommendation. In all these areas it is necessary for amenities to be provided before any large-scale development can take place. The next recommendation was :

(4) Under no circumstances should the minimum area of each unit holding—whatever is decided upon—be reduced either on initial allocation or by way of subdivision upon change of ownership, until such time as changing techniques of development suggest that the matter needs reviewing.

Those who know this country will agree that this is an extremely wise recommendation. The next recommendations were:

(5) That the Soil Conservator, with the assistance of the Land Board, control the use of allotted land, and the Land Board control the tenure. Applicants for allotment should be required to follow proved techniques of development and utilization of land.
(6) That the present fauna and flora reserve areas be retained; the requirements for additional areas and further reserves (whether for fauna and flora, wild life or research) be favourably considered before any allocation is made for development.

These recommendations were made after a thorough examination by the committee. Those who have seen this country will understand why it is necessary to use caution in developing it. The country to which I am referring is between Pinnaroo and Bordertown.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is no small man's place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree. The country carries mallee, broom bush, heath and yacca. I believe it has a rainfall of between 14in. and 17in. a year; however, I believe this year's rainfall has been about 5in. If one can visualize this country without any top cover in a year like this, one can envisage what could occur there. The

danger, of course, lies in the sand ridges that occur throughout the area. They are boomerang-shaped, and are known as barchans. The sand ridges slope gradually from the western side to a ridge, and rapidly fall away on the eastern side. The two points of the boomerang face eastward and the bow of the boomerang faces westward.

These ridges are covered with mallee scrub. People who know the area very well have told me that they have seen the tops of these ridges gradually moving after a fire. In other words, the scrub growth does not have to be removed. The top ridges move even with gentle breezes. If these ridges are in any way denuded and if we have another drought, one can imagine what will happen. One gentleman I knew very well likened the structures in the area to the structures in the Sahara Desert. I cannot say whether there is such a likeness but if the lip of a ridge starts to move there is no way of arresting it. If the development is not controlled, undoubtedly there will be some difficulty in the future development of the area.

I emphasize that this is not an area for what I may term L-plate farmers. Most people on the land realize that there are many such people about. I emphasize, too, that it is not country for a farmer with limited capital. With areas such as this we must encourage people with very large amounts of capital and those who, in the event of there being any difficulty in the season, can completely close their area down for perhaps a year or two to allow the country to regenerate. Also, I believe that it is not country for farmers without a know-how of that particular area.

The area is principally deep sand, although in some places there are clay subsoils reasonably close to the surface. Over most of the area the clay subsoil is at a depth of 60ft. or more, although in some flats there is evidence of clay very close to the surface and in places it is actually on the surface. Therefore, we can say that the development of this area must be handled with great caution.

I believe that that caution is reflected in the legislation before us. The principal change the Bill makes to the present Act is that it introduces a new type of lease. Clause 11 introduces a new Part VIa into the Crown Lands Act. Under this Part, a new perpetual lease, known as a special development lease, will be issued. These leases will have special conditions written into them, and I emphasize that this is necessary for the future control of this area.

Also in the change that is made to the principal Act the limitation on the unimproved value of leasehold land a person may hold is removed. I believe this indicates that the concept of this legislation is to encourage the development of the area by the people who understand the area and who have a strong capital backing.

I am sure that the Government is fully aware of the three "nots" that I have specified. I repeat that it is not country for learner farmers, for farmers with small capital, or for farmers who lack the know-how and understanding of the district. I support the Bill, and I emphasize again that it is a Bill that comes before us not in haste, because it has been duly considered.

I should like the Minister in charge of the Bill to have a look at one or two matters and possibly, when closing the debate, answer my queries on them. Several minor amendments are involved. Clause 7 provides:

Section 44 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (1) thereof the passage "this Act:" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "this Act or as the Governor thinks fit and shall also contain such other provisions as the Governor thinks fit, together with a right of re-entry:".

Although I think I know what the word "re-entry" means, I should like the Minister to tell me exactly what the legal interpretation of the word would be. I assume it means that the Crown can resume the lease.

There is one other matter which I can take up with the Parliamentary Draftsman but which the Minister himself may like to answer. Clause 7 strikes out the words "this Act" and then inserts the same words again. This seems rather strange. However, there may be some drafting reason for it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The words are in the wrong place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Although I would bow to the superior knowledge of the Minister in this matter, I would not have thought that was so. I suppose there must be some reason why it is done that way.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I emphasize that a great deal of care is required in the development of this area. Although it has a rainfall of between 14in. and 17in., the land is of such a type that unless there is a strong measure of control in its development and in the tenure of the land there could be difficulty in its future development. I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's suggested amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL, RED SCALE CONTROL AND SAN JOSE SCALE CONTROL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2447.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): This Bill is very necessary, because it overcomes many of the difficulties that have been encountered in the working of the practical control methods of oriental fruit moth, red scale and San Jose scale.

There is no reason to hold up the passage of the Bill, except that habitually when these matters come before this Council for discussion the whole matter of control of such pests must be considered. There is no doubt whatever that oriental peach moth remains an important pest in South Australia only because of the inadequate measures that have been taken to control it in the last few years. There is no possible excuse for this pest having become a dangerous one in South Australia.

These are strong words, but the whole approach to the control of insect pests must be examined. I must protest at the indecent haste with which the Government is asking the Council to consider these matters in the present context. These pests, which look like interesting names on the Notice Paper, are very vital matters when considering the production of fruit in South Australia, as they are costing the State many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The approach to this matter is altogether wrong, as the Bill is merely a patchwork to make the present measures work reasonably. The defects of the committee system to control oriental peach moth, red scale and san jose scale have been mentioned. We should have the opportunity while the Bill is before the Council to consider the matter as a whole. There is no doubt that present measures are inadequate.

Oriental peach moth has been a serious problem in other States for many years. It appeared in South Australia only recently, in comparison with the number of years it had been present in Victoria and New South Wales. It was kept out of South Australia for many years. Now the community is being forced to take the cost involved in control as a day-to-day cost in the production of peaches and nectarines. This could have been utterly unnecessary. If attention had been given to this pest only a few years ago oriental peach moth would not be a problem in this State today.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We were not here a few years ago.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I do not think the present Government is to blame for this, and I am not saying that it is. This is a matter that is completely and utterly above the day-to-day hurly-burly of this Council and of another place. We should have a chance to see what is being done in relation to the control of these pests.

As the Bill stands it is completely unobjectionable. It is a reflection of the difficulties people are facing in trying to make work the inadequate approach that has been made in this matter in the past. If the Government would only accept this and give honourable members a chance to delay the Bill until we can see what is going on, we could make a step forward, but to ask the Council to pass the Bill without any consideration other than the words in the Bill is completely wrong.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Who is asking you to do that?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: We have had considerable pressure tonight.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This matter has been before honourable members since last Thursday. What is the matter with you?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think that is the biggest joke of all time.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We are all laughing.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Let us join in the laughter against the Minister, because I am afraid that, once again, he does not understand what I am talking about.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Nobody else does, either.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am very glad of that, because mine is a voice crying in the wilderness against the sins which have been going on for some considerable time. Red scale on the Adelaide Plains is a pest we do not have to worry about. However, when it comes to the Murray River, it is a costly pest. There is something wrong. Something is going wrong also with control measures being used against San Jose scale.

When an orchardist finds San Jose scale on his fruit trees on the Murray River, it is a costly and devastating experience for him. Indeed,

he comes close to bankruptcy before he can put an end to it. When a Bill of this nature is introduced, the whole matter of the control measures that the Government is using as normal practice should be examined; but we are not here being given the chance to examine them.

The Bill was introduced in this Chamber on Thursday last. A deep study of these things is needed. If the Minister can between Thursday last and today find out what has been happening over the last four or five years in pest control in relation to these serious pests that we are now considering, and can set himself up as an expert he must be a most able academician.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I thought you were the expert.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill. It merely puts into operation the inadequate measures that this Government is backing. If the Government is not willing to give us the opportunity to consider why the measures operating today are not successful and is not prepared to give us a chance to correct them, it must take the blame squarely on its own shoulders.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This matter in the form of regulations has been on the Notice Paper in Parliament House for six months. What are you talking about? The honourable member has had plenty of time to look at it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The regulations dangling in front of the Council for the last six months were completely unsuited to the purpose. These matters, instead of being introduced as regulations, now appear in the form of a comprehensive Bill putting much responsibility on individual people. Over the last few years there has been a complete change of approach and attitude to responsibility in these agricultural disasters.

Oriental fruit moth is an agricultural disaster for people growing peaches. On the Murray River oriental fruit moth is at present costing South Australian peach growers many thousands of dollars. The responsibility for controlling it within their area is now left in the hands of a committee of growers who are answerable, and even regulated, in their work.

A grower has to register his block for growing peaches and has to do on that block what the Agriculture Department wants; but the men who have to carry out the work and ensure that it is done are not officers of the department but the growers themselves. That is wrong. They are untrained but take responsibility even to prosecution of fellow growers. Until recently the Government had borne this responsibility on its own shoulders; it has been the Government's responsibility to look after new pests adequately with public funds.

Why has that changed; why has this new method gradually crept in? This is not a responsibility of the present Government; it is a change that has crept in. This burden being imposed on the growers today is completely beyond what they as individuals should have to sustain. This is another factor that should be considered seriously. The Government wants to get this Bill through with indecent haste. There is no time in which to consider it adequately.

When I raised this matter earlier and said we needed time to look at it, I was told that the Government would deal with it tonight. There is no purpose in going around in circles any further. We have not had time to consider oriental fruit moth, red scale and San Jose scale in detail yet these are three of the greatest problems facing the fruit industry today. San Jose scale is the reason why our fruit exports are limited through quarantine measures. Red scale severely limits the marketing of oranges.

Oriental fruit moth is one of the most disastrous pests ever to face peach-growers in South Australia. Here is a measure vitally concerned with the control of those three pests, yet the Government wants to force the Bill through without adequate consideration being given to these measures, a consideration that could take a long time before satisfactory conclusions could be reached.

We lack much technical information on these things; in fact, none has been put before us. We can eradicate fruit fly in South Australia and these comparatively simple pests can be eradicated if the fruitgrowing industry is given a chance. The Government is not giving the industry this chance.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.23 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 11, at 2.15 p.m.