LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Representations have been made to my colleagues representing the Midland District, to me and also to Mr. Ferguson, the member for Yorke Peninsula in the House of Assembly, regarding the local government accounting regulations that were gazetted on September 28, 1967. The correspondence I have received points out that in some respects the requirements of these regulations are a little too lengthy and complicated for the smaller councils. I think the best way to explain the representations is to read the letter I have received from the Clerk of the District Council of Clinton. The letter, dated October 7, 1967, states:

I have been directed to advise that my council at its meeting held on Monday, October 2, unanimously opposed the local government accounting regulations gazetted on September 28, 1967. To investigate the matter further a small committee was appointed to act on the council's behalf. The committee is of the undoubted opinion that these regulations will compel all councils irrespective of size to conform to a system of accounting and methods of keeping records, which are quite unnecessary and far too cumbersome for a number of councils. Our council is always endeavouring to keep administrative costs to a minimum, thereby ensuring that the maximum amount of ratepayers' money is directed to its proper function, namely, the maintenance and construction of roads, etc.

We therefore ask for a motion of disallowance to any regulations making it compulsory for councils to carry out the provisions contained in the amended section 691, paragraphs (*a*), (*a*1) and (*a*2) of the Local Government Act, 1934-1966. This amendment of the principal Act referred to was assented to on November 24, 1966. Should, however, the aforementioned request be unacceptable may we further suggest that councils with an annual value assessment under $500,000 or its equivalent under land value be exempted. In conclusion, may we appeal to you to earnestly consider this matter, which has such vital importance in restraining overhead expenses and, also, the preservation of local government autonomy.

Yours faithfully
C. E. Zwar,
District Clerk

I do not propose at this stage to move that the regulations be disallowed. However, will the Minister have a look at these regulations with a view to ascertaining whether it would be possible to write into them a clause giving the Minister power to grant exemptions from compliance with such portions of the regulations as it is thought may be too difficult, complicated and unnecessary for some of the smaller councils?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member was good enough to draw my attention to this correspondence. The whole trouble is that there has been an alteration to the bookkeeping methods. The draft regulations were submitted to the councils, and there was much discussion between them and the Local Government Accounting Committee. Unfortunately, some of the district clerks (and I am assuming that the clerk named by the honourable member is one such clerk) are not conversant with double entry bookkeeping; they have been using single entry bookkeeping. I know that this was so in the case of one council, not the council named by the honourable member. I have offered to allow my officers to visit the council and to explain all these matters thoroughly to the district clerk, for I consider that the problem arises not so much because of the expense involved but because of a lack of understanding. The expense involved to a small council in giving effect to the regulations would be negligible. However, as the honourable member has asked that I have a look at these regulations for the purposes outlined by him, I shall be only too pleased to comply with his request.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister said that the cost involved to a small council would be negligible. I know of an instance of a council with an assessment value of $520,000, and the cost quoted for installing the accounting machine in that council was about $2,700. I would not regard that as being a negligible amount.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Can the Minister of Local Government confirm that the local government accounting regulations will not come into force until a period of six months has elapsed since their tabling in this Council?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There is a clause in the regulations stipulating that they shall not come into operation for a period of six months after tabling.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Minister stated that the cost would be negligible (and I am not necessarily contesting that statement), but some small councils are concerned that they will, in the first instance, have to invest in equipment and stationery to the value of about $2,700, as mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Hart. They are also concerned because some district clerks consider that the new accounting regulations may mean not only a capital outlay but also the employment of an extra office girl. This is a serious problem to the very small councils that are managing on a restricted budget. When the Minister is having another look at the regulations, will he investigate the minimum cost to councils as a result of this matter?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes.

UNDERGROUND WATER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In reply to a question asked in the Commonwealth Parliament by the member for Grey, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry gave the following reply:

The Commonwealth has recognized the problem of unsuccessful bores in the arid and semi-arid areas and has provided direct assistance to landholders in the Northern Territory, where the Commonwealth has a responsibility for all agricultural and pastoral matters. It has also provided financial assistance to the States, including South Australia, to assist them in determining the nature and extent of underground water resources. These funds are used for investigational work, including the sinking of exploratory bores, and are not available to individual landholders to recompense them for unproductive bores. Such assistance would be entirely a matter for consideration by the State Governments.

Can the Minister say in what areas exploratory bores are being sunk at present, and also whether the State considers that perhaps some subsidy could be given to private landholders who are investigating underground water resources in arid and semi-arid country?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will obtain from the department particulars regarding the areas in which exploratory bores are being sunk. I know of several such bores. For instance, an investigation is being undertaken at the moment regarding underground supplies at Keith in the South-East, and quite recently another investigation has been taking place. There is an agreement between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government in relation to this search for underground waters under which the Commonwealth subsidizes this State. Regarding whether or not private landholders will be subsidized in relation to the sinking of bores, I can say that the Mines Department would not be in a position to offer subsidies. This question would have to be referred to Cabinet and determined not by me as the Minister of Mines but by Cabinet.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I wish to clarify my question. Subsidies are not sought for bores that are successful: the fact that water is found is considered recompense for anyone. A subsidy for an unsuccessful bore would perhaps enable a landholder to sink another bore, as often several holes have to be bored before supplies are found.

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In view of the world-wide studies regarding the fluoridation of water supplies, will the Minister of Health explain the attitude of the Government to this question?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; I cannot state the Government's position in this matter, which has been discussed off and on. Various Ministers have personal views on whether fluoride should or should not be added to the water, but the Government has not yet come to a definite decision on this.

GILES POINT

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I wish to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My question relates to the Public Works Committee report on the Giles Point bulk handling facilities, tabled in this Chamber on June 28, 1967. The committee's recommendations dealt with the collecting of tolls or levies to be paid to the Treasury under the scheme. Mr. Sainsbury (Director of the Marine and Harbors Department) desired to give authority to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to collect levies from farmers to be paid to the Treasury; but, before that can be done, the two relevant Acts concerned with the Australian Barley Board and the Australian Wheat Board will have to be amended. I notice that the second reading of the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill is on our Notice Paper for today. As time is running out this session, I am wondering whether this matter is receiving attention, because I understand that the facilities at Giles Point cannot be used legally unless

the two Acts are appropriately amended. Will the Chief Secretary take up this matter with the Government to see whether these two Acts will be amended this session?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know just what stage the proceedings have reached but the matter of collecting fees at Giles Point has been discussed by Cabinet. I will endeavour to have a reply ready, if not tomorrow by Tuesday next.

SHEARING CLASSES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to a question I asked last month about adult education classes for shearers?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I apologize to the honourable member that he has had to wait so long for an answer, but this matter concerns three different Ministers. I have had to get reports from the Department of Labour and Industry, the Agriculture Department and the Education Department. Following the honourable member's inquiry, I took up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Education. It will be appreciated, I am sure, that shearing is essentially seasonal, and that employment in this occupation therefore fluctuates considerably throughout the year, causing temporary shortages of shearers during the shearing season. The Director of Agriculture reports that it takes two or three years of regular shearing to produce competent shearers. The Australian Wool Board, which has been examining the question of properly conducted shearing schools, has concentrated on providing training for experienced shearers in improved techniques, and for several years the Agriculture Department has conducted coaching courses in Tally-hi shearing and shed management. The department discontinued these activities, however, when the board recently took over all coaching courses throughout Australia.

I am advised that a National Shearing Advisory Committee was appointed a couple of years ago with subcommittees in each State to study the needs of the industry and make recommendations to the Australian Wool Board on training requirements. This inquiry is still in progress. It would be impracticable for the Adult Education Service of the Education Department to establish shearing classes, due to the difficulty of providing the necessary facilities (including the sheep required) and the high cost involved.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have complained in this Chamber for some two months that I have not been able to obtain a reply to a question I have persistently asked with regard to a deputation I introduced to the Premier about a week before he went to the Premiers' Conference. The deputation made certain suggestions with regard to salinity in the Murray River, and also the Chowilla dam. This deputation, which was organized by the Murray Citrus Growers' Association of South Australia, asked the Premier to take up four points with the Minister for National Development or the Prime Minister and his fellow Premiers. The deputation, apparently tired of waiting, went to Canberra only a few days ago and was granted an audience with the Minister for National Development. It was reported to me that the deputation, which was led by Mr. Andrew, of Waikerie, the Federal President of the Citrus Growers Association, had a good hearing. The four points mentioned, which were listed in the *Advertiser* a few days ago, were made in an attempt to convince both the Commonwealth and this State Government that they were necessary to reduce salinity. I am informed that the Commonwealth Minister has made a statement and that the deputation when in Canberra also had interviews with members of the River Murray Commission. I am wondering why I have not been able to get any replies when it has been possible for that deputation to go to Canberra and be given a reply, which I believe came from the Commonwealth Minister and which satisfied the deputation.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will take this matter up with the Premier and see whether I can get a reply for the honourable member.

ROAD FUNDS

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: An article appearing in this morning's press deals with the annual report of the Highways and Local Government Department, and portion of that article is as follows:

Until more money is made available, the road needs of the State will not be met,

the Highways and Local Government warns in its annual report to Parliament. The original programme for the 1966-67 financial year, based on assessed needs, was reduced by $3,000,000 because of the lack of funds.

In view of the improvements in the Loan Account, will the Minister ask the Treasurer to defer the repayment of Loan moneys, advanced under section 31a of the Highways Act, until the Highways Fund is able to meet its road needs?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Certainly not, because that money was paid back to the Treasury some time ago.

CITRUS ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture and refers to the annual report of the Citrus Organization Committee, which I believe may be overdue. Will the Minister ascertain whether this report will be tabled in Parliament before the end of the present session and, if it will not, how soon it will be made available to the public?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall be pleased to convey the question to my colleague and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to extend the life of the Barley Marketing Act for a further five seasons. This Bill has been prepared after consultation with the Victorian Government, which has already taken steps to introduce a Bill for the extension of the Victorian Barley Marketing Act for a further three years. The proposal to extend the South Australian Act for a further five years should be welcomed by all sections of the industry in South Australia.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I do not think it is necessary for me to follow the usual procedure of asking that the debate be adjourned after hearing the Minister's explanation of a Bill. This Bill extends the operation of the Barley Board for a further five years. The growers have considerable reason to be satisfied with the board's operations, in spite of some criticism about arrangements made in connection with the classification of barley, receivals, and the moisture content at which barley may be received. As time goes on these problems are gradually being resolved, I think, to the satisfaction of most growers.

Honourable members will remember that a short time ago the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, which set up South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, was amended to provide that this co-operative should have the exclusive right to store barley in bulk. From two viewpoints I believe the co-operative is doing all it can do: first, in providing adequate accommodation for bulk barley in the various receival points; and, secondly, in raising, as far as can safely be done, the moisture content at which the barley can be received.

At present the co-operative has exclusive power to handle barley in bulk in this State, and I have no doubt that it will be able to operate amicably with the Barley Board, thereby giving maximum satisfaction to the growers. It is regrettable that due to seasonal conditions there will not be the congestion that has occurred in previous years at silos. I suppose that, if the farmers had the choice, they would prefer the congestion that results from too much barley to the present situation. I have reminded them of this when they have complained to me about inadequate facilities. I congratulate the board on its work. In existing circumstances this is the most satisfactory way in which barley can be marketed, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I, too, support the Bill. Orderly marketing is the order of the day in most circumstances. It depends entirely on the personalities involved as to how these matters work. In some instances they have worked to the growers' great benefit, and I believe that the marketing of barley is one such instance. It was on Yorke Peninsula that this Bill and, indeed, the whole barley marketing set-up, had its genesis. It is a pleasure to get up and honestly say that one is pleased to be able to support the extension of the Act for a further five years.

I know that this legislation has the backing not only of the barley growers on Yorke Peninsula but, now that they have become

used to it, also of the barley growers in the Murray Mallee, where there is still much barley grown. Even with the adverse seasonal conditions, certain areas of the Murray Mallee will still produce quite useful yields of barley this year. Earlier today I raised by way of a question the point that a further amendment may be necessary to enable the project at Giles Point not to be impeded any further, because it is essential for the Yorke Peninsula farmers that the facilities be established as soon as possible. The second report of the Public Works Committee on this project contained a better scheme than the first report contained; the second scheme will be a little less costly and the facilities infinitely better. The sooner we have this installation on Yorke Peninsula the better it will be for the producers and, I believe, for the whole economy of the State. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I endorse the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Rowe and the Hon. Mr. Story. By and large the Barley Board has been very successful and efficient. Of course, there have been times when complaints have been made, but as my colleagues have said, we would rather be in a position where it is possible to have some complaints than in the position we are facing today, because in some cases there will be a total harvest failure. I endorse my colleagues' comments regarding the value of orderly marketing and of the Barley Board. I also endorse the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Story regarding the need for the Giles Point facilities, and I am very pleased to see that they are likely to go ahead. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Second reading debate adjourned on October 10. Page 2511.)

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 2512.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): This is a Bill that I can support. It has three principal objects. The first of these relates to the stamp duty payable in respect of sales and purchases of marketable securities. At present the Act provides that a return must be prepared and submitted to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties setting out the details of all sales and purchases made by a broker in a weekly period.

Representations have been made by the Stock Exchange to, I presume, the Attorney-General that this involves a great deal of clerical work and that the matter could be covered more simply by a sharebroker's preparing a certificate that would set out all the details of the securities transferred in any one week. The suggestion is that it is on that certificate that duty will be assessed and paid. It is pointed out that the Commissioner has the right to go ino a sharebroker's office at any time, inspect the relevant documents, and consequently make an audit (I suppose one could say) in respect of the transactions to make sure that the certificate is correct. It seems to me that this is just something that is in line with modern business practice, and I cannot see any objection to the amendment. In these days when business is so complicated and when we are trying to reduce expenses as much as we can, it seems to me that this is a desirable amendment, and I support it.

The second amendment relates to the stamp duty payable in respect of the transfer of a mortgage where the money is loaned in respect of land on which a house is built or is to be built. Apparently it has been suggested to the Government that a considerable amount of money would be invested in this type of finance if it could be done more cheaply and if there were not factors inhibiting this kind of investment. One of these factors that prevents this flow of funds is that where a mortgage is transferred it bears stamp duty at *ad valorem* rates, which I think vary from $1.25 per cent to $1.50 per cent.

The proposal in this Bill is that in the case of transfers of mortgages in respect of properties on which a dwellinghouse is or is to be erected, the transfer, instead of bearing *ad valorem* rate of duty, will simply bear a flat rate of $3. I think this will reduce the cost and simplify the matter, and if it does have the desired effect of drawing more money into this kind of investment it will be a good thing for everybody concerned. Therefore, I support the amendment.

The third and last thing the Bill seeks to do is to protect the revenue in respect of stamp duty on mortgages. This amendment is brought about because of a decision of the House of Lords that has been brought to the notice of the Government. It relates to the

question of the primary security and also a collateral security relating to the securement of funds. Although I have not read the actual report of the decision of the House of Lords, as I understand it the House of Lords has held that it regards the agreement relating to the lending of money as the primary security, and in those circumstances the mortgage itself could be regarded as a collateral security and therefore under our Act not attract *ad valorem* duty; and in those circumstances the revenue would lose a certain amount of money.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Government takes notice of the House of Review in England; it sees the benefit of it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Where is there a House of Review here?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I thought for a moment we had got back to the question of water supplies, because members opposite seemed so interested. However, we are on another topic relating to the protection of Government revenue, and apparently this has equal interest for them. Although I do not normally rejoice in the Government's seeking more revenue, I think in this case it is taking action purely to get over a legal difficulty that has cropped up, and I cannot see that I can raise any objection to it. I support the Bill.

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

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 2526.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading of this Bill. I begin by going back to the passing of the first Oriental Fruit Moth Control Bill in this Chamber in 1962. In 1960 I introduced a deputation to the then Minister of Agriculture after fruit moth had first been discovered in South Australia in early 1959. That deputation asked for financial assistance to endeavour to eradicate the pest while it was still in only 10 to 15 acres of orchard at Renmark. The matter was delayed for some time by departmental officers and we were told there was no hope of immediate action, only procrastination, and we would have to be prepared to leave the matter with the department. That we were not prepared to do. By persistence, we managed to get $24,000 from the then Minister of Agriculture to undertake an eradication scheme within the contained area. Unfortunately, no powers existed to enforce a complete coverage of the pest or for compelling people to spray in the river areas.

It was about this time that a group of fruitgrowers visited the Murrumbidgee irrigation area. They seemed obsessed with inflicting pain upon themselves by getting themselves put under pest control boards. This was the "in" thing for that year: everybody wanted a pest control board of some description. I led the original deputation on these boards—not with any great heart in it myself, but I gave the Minister the opportunity to meet those people, who put themselves under various boards. Legislation was framed for the control of oriental fruit moth and red scale, and later San Jose scale. If my memory serves me aright, it was about the time that we were framing the San Jose scale legislation that the first of the oriental fruit moth pest control boards was being disbanded by the first group of people to set up such a board. They had lost interest in it in a very short time, mainly because the levies imposed under the statutory powers did not suit certain growers, and they petitioned to remove themselves from that control.

In other areas the matter was embraced with some enthusiasm, and even now certain areas still operate under a pest control board. It was the "done" thing at one stage that, when a new disease broke out, the Government provided the money to try to eradicate it. In the very early days of South Australia and in the Upper Murray areas, some attempt was made to eradicate the codling moth, but there was never sufficient power in the arms of the inspectors to do that successfully. The board did give power but it shifted the responsibility from where I believe it still lies—with the Agriculture Department. The Minister of Agriculture and the Director of Agriculture have shifted the powers to a committee, and the burden of prosecution falls upon that committee. In country areas some people like to wield power but, by and large, people are rather reluctant to take the responsibility of inflicting penalties upon their neighbours. However, in the interests of trying to do something about eradication and containment, committees were appointed and filled, and the chairman of such a committee had the unsavoury job of having to be the person to lodge a prosecution.

It has always been my contention that we could have done a tremendous amount towards getting red scale under control in the Upper Murray many years ago if the department had been prepared to undertake complete prosecutions, but it was always reluctant and adopted the attitude (a very good one, in some cases)—"It is better to encourage people and get their co-operation than to hit them with a big stick." This works splendidly for about 90 per cent of the people but there are always the recalcitrant 10 per cent who will not conform, which makes it necessary to have some statutory powers to bring those people into line. I still maintain, however, that, had the powers vested in the Minister and his officers been completely exercised, we would not have had half the problems we have now with each of these three pests with which we are dealing today.

In 1964 we had to amend the Act because it was not watertight. I raised the matter in 1962, when the measure was before us, as can be seen in *Hansard,* but I did not think the thing was worth the paper it was written on. In 1964 we had to amend the Act. In 1967 certain regulations were brought down, under this consolidated Act, which, as I pointed out to the Agriculture Department, were not, in my opinion, legal. They were withdrawn, and new regulations have been drafted.

What the Chief Secretary said last night about the regulations being on the table of this Chamber for six months is quite true; the only problem is that they were not able to be enforced; so this Act has been amended and no doubt the regulations will be redrafted and put before Parliament again shortly. At the moment we are suspended like Mahomet's coffin somewhere between heaven and earth, and there are no actual powers for the committees to function until such time as we get our house in order.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp made some interesting points last night when speaking to this measure, and I agree wholeheartedly with some of them. I agree that as a State we have taken the easy and cheap way out in allowing these boards to be set up and to be responsible entirely for financing their own affairs. The fruitgrower has made a vast contribution over the years in order to keep an export industry going. As one well knows, the regulations in Japan, Germany, Scandinavia and various other places prohibit the importation of fruit infected with certain diseases, one of which is mentioned in this Bill. This affected a small area at Mypolonga. The Government brought down regulations, which came before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and some remedial action was taken by the Government: trees were removed and people were compensated. The matter seemed to stop there, but it is now the responsibility of the industry to finance this activity and by good will to come under the provisions of this Act.

If an area will not proclaim itself, nothing is done. I was most critical of the 1964 Bill, which dealt with the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, 1962-64, the Red Scale Control Act, 1962-64, and the San Jose Scale Control Act, 1962-64. Parliament took the lazy man's way out and put them all together. This is not a good policy, because as I have said before it is a very clumsy way of doing it. Last night I had to search for some time in the index to find where I had made a speech on oriental fruit moth, because my speech was made on a Statutes Amendment Bill. I predicted when I made the speech in 1964 that this would happen. I have been here a few years and I have a new pair of glasses and can see these things, but the unfortunate fruitgrower in the Upper Murray area who wants to get a copy of these Acts is battling somewhat. I have never liked this policy. The Minister of Local Government was also critical of grouping several Bills in one measure. I hope that this will not be done in the future.

By and large, the amendments have to be made to the legislation. There is no alternative at this stage, because if the Bill is not passed we will have nothing. I have voiced my opinion with regard to responsibility. First, the Bill alters the method of voting. This is a very interesting matter, and I raised that in 1964, too. In 1962 we did not do anything about the use of the funny word "keeper", although the matter was raised. In 1964, it was necessary to define "keeper". In the original set-up, the owner and keeper were both able and eligible to vote for appointments to the committee or for its disbanding, but under this Bill only one will be able to vote: the man who gets there first and gets himself enrolled or the man to whom the actual enrolment form is sent.

This is hardly the democratic way we hear so much about in other quarters from the Government. In other words, either the owner or the keeper will be deprived of a vote as a result of the amendment. The Bill also clarifies (and I do not disagree with this) the

position of a person with three properties: if he is enrolled for one property he has one vote, whereas previously he could be on the roll three times and get three votes.

One of the other main points is that the responsibility is removed from the chairman of the committee and placed on the whole committee. It was almost untenable for some chairmen of committees in some areas who had to prosecute and do some other unpleasant things. I am not over-thrilled with this by any means. I think it is duck-shoving a simple responsibility into a regional area. In a matter such as this, surely a small group of people should not be called on to supply the whole of the wherewithal for the common good of the remainder. It does not happen in other matters. If a slice of a person's land is taken under compulsory acquisition, the whole of the community pays for it because it is done under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act. I could instance various other cases where things done for the common good are paid for by the whole community. This matter has certainly gone past the eradication stage in many instances.

Having got out of hand, it becomes the responsibility of the individual to protect himself and to be protected from his neighbour who will not conform and carry out the various planned schedules circulated by the department from time to time in these matters. In the last couple of years we have had very good weather conditions for reducing red scale in the Upper Murray areas. Many of these problems have got out of hand because of the use of early sprays, particularly D.D.T. Those sprays were advocated early in the piece, before people knew very much about them. This is one of the great dangers when scientists do not carry out the first fundamental of a scientist: that is, to prove before he practises and gives people advice. Many of these sprays and insecticides that were allowed to come on to the market and to be used generally were subsequently proved to be detrimental to people's health. D.D.T. is a glaring example. Many predators and parasites were killed, but it did not kill all of them: there are still some two-legged ones about. However, it killed many parasites that were useful in keeping in check, or at least containing, many of these scales, such as san jose scale and red scale. In recent times weather conditions have been such that the red scale population has decreased and, provided the more vicious types of spray are not used to a great extent, I believe that the natural parasites will keep in subjection many of our existing scale problems.

Good work has been done at the insectory at Mildura and much good work is going on at Loxton. If it is possible to induce the parasites and predators to do their jobs properly and nature is not thrown too much out of balance we can save this State millions of dollars. When I say "millions of dollars" I mean just that, because a full-scale spraying programme on an orchard of normal size would cost almost enough to cripple the individual grower.

For san jose scale alone, five sprays a year are necessary, and for codling moth and oriental peach moth five to seven sprays a year are required. All sprays have to be applied separately, and that is extremely expensive. Not only are the sprays expensive but also the capital cost of equipment is heavy. I am interested in the work being done by the Agriculture Department with aerial spraying at Waikerie in an attempt to catch the oriental fruit moth while it is on the wing rather than attacking it in the egg stage as we attempted to do at Renmark in the early stages.

I commend the Bill to honourable members; we have to continue with this legislation because we have gone this far, but I offer some good advice to primary producers, particularly those in my own electorate: that is, that they do not get too enthusiastic about inflicting pain upon themselves because the Government will do that without any help from them.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Poll for constitution of Red Scale Committee."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Paragraph (*a*) strikes out section 6 (3) and inserts new subsections (3a) and (3b). Should it not insert new subsections (3) and (3a)?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I would like to see the three Acts repealed. I ask the Government to again look at the whole matter of pest control and consider adopting a fresh approach.

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

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "(3*a*)" and insert "(3)"; and to strike out "(3*b*)" and insert "(3*a*)".

The amendment is to correct the drafting error pointed out by the Hon. Mr. Story.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It will be necessary to reconsider clause 4, as that clause and clause 20 contain the same drafting errors.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Poll for constitution of San Jose Committee."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

In subclause (*a*) to strike out "(3*a*)" and insert "(3)"; and to strike out "(3*b*)" and insert "(3*a*)".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (21 to 25) and title passed.

Clause 4—"Poll for constitution of Oriental Fruit Moth Committee"—reconsidered.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

In subclause (*a*) to strike out "(3*a*)" and insert "(3)"; and to strike out "(3*b*)" and insert "(3*a*)".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

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

That the Committee's report be adopted.

However, I point out, Sir, that there were certain amendments in Committee.

The PRESIDENT: They were only formal amendments.

Motion carried.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (LEASES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 2524.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris gave a very detailed explanation of its purpose yesterday, and I do not intend to reiterate what he said. I support the principle in the Bill, which gives effect to a plan for developing land in the counties of Buckingham and Chandos. This land has never been fully used, and this present action is a move to settle more families and to bring the area into production.

I agree with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that the conditions contained in the Bill regarding the development of this land are cautious in that they are ensuring that the land is not abused. I do fear that the Government, in its desire to protect this country, may find that some of the conditions contained in the Bill are rather restrictive in encouraging people to take up and develop these tracts. However, those restrictions are something that will be the problem of the proposed lessees, who will have to work out for themselves whether they consider that there is sufficient security of tenure for them in the proposed lease to encourage them to invest what could be quite a large sum of money in developing this class of country.

We still have some competition from the other States, particularly Western Australia, in the propositions that encourage people with some capital to move into a developmental project. I mention that point because I believe that the Government may find it has to re-examine the proposition. It seems to me that under the proposed amendment a lessee will have rather a slender tenure in respect of his investment.

Although this amendment is meant to apply particularly to land development in the counties of Buckingham and Chandos in the South-East, as I interpret the meaning of "Crown lands" in the Act I believe that it could be made to apply also to other areas in the State where leases expire and land reverts to the Crown. As this amendment reads, I believe that, on the re-examination of these leases and on the recommendations of the board, further conditions could be written into any new lease. In fact, I believe that in some circumstances special development lease conditions could be imposed on some of this land that reverts to the Crown.

However, I believe that the Bill generally is a forward move and that it is intended to be constructive. I do not intend to go through it in detail, as it has been explained fully by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. As I have said, I consider that perhaps in some instances there is barely sufficient security for the lessee, because many of the sections of the original Act referred to in this amendment exclude those provisions in the Act that give security of tenure to a lessee.

Regarding clause 7, which amends section 44 of the principal Act, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the striking out of the words "this Act" and then reinstating them with further words to follow. I wonder whether this particular amendment is necessary at all, because it refers to the freeholding of perpetual lease land and the writing in of extra provisions as the Governor thinks fit. I am not sure that this is a good thing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It probably won't be used for quite a while yet.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: If the Government does not intend to freehold perpetual leasehold country, then section 44 would not

be invoked at all. This would enable extra provisions to be written into the schedule that delineates the form of contract where leasehold land is freeholded. I am very wary of writing too many provisions into a document of this kind, because I believe that any unnecessary interference with the tenure of a landholder tends to discourage development. I maintain that the matter should be watched to see that the conditions laid down do not unduly discourage a person from investing in this land and developing it to its full potential. It may be necessary in the future to see that a lessee is given more security in his lease. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on this Bill. I assure the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan that the purpose of the Bill is to see that this area is developed and not just taken over by some individuals and left undeveloped. I agree with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that this would not be country for a beginner or a person with limited means. I have been through the area several times, and quite frankly at this stage I would not like to be investing money in trying to develop it; I would think twice about making that move, even if I had the necessary money.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris pointed out that this land could become a considerable hazard if it were left undeveloped. The honourable member queried the use of the words "together with a right of re-entry", and he asked for an explanation of this point. What he thought about it was quite close to the mark. In fact, the Bill merely repeats the phrase used in the principal Act. This right of re-entry is very seldom used, although such action can be taken when it is considered that a lessee is not developing land. Section 35 of the principal Act is as follows:

A perpetual lease shall vest the land leased in the lessee in perpetuity, and shall contain the provisions for rent and the reservations, covenants, and conditions set forth in the Third Schedule, subject to such modifications thereof or additions thereto as are required for giving effect to the provisions of 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, and shall be read and construed as if any reservations, covenants, and conditions in the form in the Third Schedule had been expressed in the extended form in the Fourth Schedule, and the lessee and all persons entitled to any benefit of the lease shall be bound thereby.

I refer to the Twelfth Schedule in the Bill, and section 66E of the principal Act. The provisions of the Fourth Schedule of the principal Act, under the heading "Condition of forfeiture", apply: authority is given for re-entry. However, I am informed that this right has not been used because where the rents are not paid in accordance with the lease the landowner receives a written notification suggesting to him that his best method is to sell and be done with it; and in that way he gets full recovery from the land. That is why the right of re-entry is inserted in this schedule. I hope that explanation clarifies the point.

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

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 2515.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): Some years ago representatives of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission made a statement about long service leave in these terms:

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 reinvigorated.

About the same time the same commission rejected pro rata leave after five years as not being long service leave in the sense in which that term should be used. The State Industrial Commission, which was set up by the Labor Government, has also awarded provisions for long service leave similar to those spelt out in the Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr. Potter in this Council and in harmony with the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission's long service leave provisions. When the State Industrial Commission made the provision for long service leave, it said that South Australia could afford to and should make provision for conditions that equated with those conditions applicable to the rest of Australia. This Government says that the State can afford more—that is, that industry can afford more. The Government claims it is doing all right but, when it makes this claim, it does not take into consideration what will be the additional cost for long service leave if it is given for a different period of time from that operating in the rest of Australia.

One of the problems in the Bill is that part of the Government's dogma is that no sinking

fund or provident fund can be allowed by industry to offset the cost of long service leave. If industry were to set aside money out of profits to offset the impact of paying out money for long service leave in any one year, that would not be appreciated by the unions and the Government because it would be claimed that such moneys coming out of the profits in any one year were bonuses rightly due to the employee. Bearing in mind the average weekly wage, if we take a hypothetical wage of $40 a week and the employee receives 13 weeks' pay for his long service leave entitlement, that means he receives $520. Under the present provisions of the State Industrial Commission's findings, that would mean that a worker would get $520 at the end of 15 years' service with his employer. However, under the provisions of this Bill, he would get $520 at the end of 10 years' service.

In effect, this is increasing costs to industry by one-third. Also, these costs (plus the four weeks' annual leave, plus other increased State taxes) must result in an increased price tag on any product manufactured by industry in this State and exported to markets in the Eastern States. It is claimed by the Government that the New South Wales legislation has some of the provisions contained in this Bill, but New South Wales industry, because that State has such a large population, generates its own markets, and that industry does not have the transport problem that troubles South Australian industry. On the other hand, South Australia has 10 per cent of the Commonwealth's population trying to obtain markets in places where 90 per cent of the Commonwealth's population lives. This means that every increase in costs in South Australia makes it doubly hard to meet competition in the Eastern States.

Some businesses that manufacture in South Australia and sell in Melbourne and Sydney have estimated that three or four years ago there was a profit margin of 6 per cent with which they could play: they could reduce their costs of goods landed in, say, Sydney, in order to get a market, but today they estimate this margin to be less than 2 per cent. The Government says in one breath that it believes in arbitration by the Commonwealth Industrial Commission or by the State Industrial Commission, which spell out fair and reasonable terms for long service leave, but it rejects their advice by the provisions of this Bill and tries to impose its own will on industry. I cannot see any merit in debating the Bill on any point other than the one I have raised. I support the second reading, but only in order to consider in Committee some amendments that are on file.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): During the debate on the Budget I raised the point that it made no provision whatever for the strain of an adverse season. There was no direct line in the Budget to provide assistance to those who are in difficulty as a result of the drought conditions this year. Moreover, as one looks through the lines of the Budget one finds that the estimates for income in this financial year were based on a normal season. One could look at line after line in the Budget and see that the Government had estimated for an increase in income from certain departments. To quote one from memory, the Government estimates that the Railways Department will have an increase in income of $300,000. When one remembers that last year we had the second best grain harvest for 10 years, one can see that there will be some difficulty in achieving the estimated income the Government expects to get this financial year.

There has been no budgetary line of direct assistance to those who need help as a result of the adverse season, and, as the Budget will be under strain because of the adverse season, I wondered whether the Government intended to proceed with its defined course of introducing at this stage legislation that could only place further strain on the Budget. I wish to make this point clear: in many ways I have a good deal of sympathy for the Government for the position in which it finds itself with the strain on the State's finances as a result of the effects of this season, but I emphasize again that I have no sympathy with the Government for its financial policies that have already contributed to a difficult budgetary position, nor have I any sympathy for the Government when, in this context, it is still prepared to pursue legislation that will in no way assist the State to face the present situation.

Over the last two years the Government, or its spokesmen, have been critical of the Council's attitude in relation to certain legislation. I have no hesitation in saying that in many ways the Government owes some of the support it has maintained to the attitude of this Council. In other words, the Council has protected the Government from its own folly in many cases. If the Council had not taken a realistic and practical attitude to some of the legislation that had been introduced,

then the reputation of the Government would have been at an even lower ebb.

For example, the question was raised in debate yesterday of the Succession Duties Bill, which appeared in the first year of the Government's term. Some people still believe, mainly due to the propaganda of certain Government spokesmen, that the first Succession Duties Bill that was placed before the Council would have removed the burden of succession duties from the less weathly and would have placed it firmly on the very wealthy in the State. I shall not go quite as far as using the phrase used yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, but there was a good deal of propaganda that attempted to mislead the people of the State as to the effects of that Bill. If the public of South Australia was misled, it was in relation to the first Succession Duties Bill that came before the Council.

The only way the public could have known that it was being misled would have been by the Council passing the Bill and letting those people understand the effects of the legislation that the Government had placed before Parliament. In other words, the Council in many ways has assisted the image of the Government by preventing legislation of this type from appearing on the Statute Book. Lately, the Premier has laid emphasis on the fact that South Australia must have a cost advantage over the other States of the Commonwealth if it is to preserve its trading position. I can recall honourable members saying that they were pleased to see that at last the Premier was making some statements that gave a little hope for the future of the State's industries. Several times recently the Premier has stated that a cost advantage is necessary, not only to assist existing industries in the State but also to enable the State to attract further industries.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It needs to be a substantial cost advantage, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It needs to be at least some cost advantage and it is possible that it needs to be a substantial cost advantage. South Australia's industrial development has deteriorated in the last two or three years, and in an effort to stimulate industrial expansion in the State the Government has established (rightly, I think) an Industries Development Branch, with the object of collating and giving information to industries that might wish to establish in South Australia. What earthly use is all this if conditions are created that will place this State at a cost disadvantage in relation to other States? I put the following two points: (1) the adverse season affecting this State and consequent budgetary difficulties; and (2) the Premier's statement that this State needs to have a cost advantage over other States. Can any member of this Council see the logic of introducing long service leave provisions in South Australia in excess of provisions applying in other States? This seems to me to be a most illogical way of facing the problems of this State.

I do not intend to deal at length with all matters contained in the Bill because I believe that the Hon. Mr. Potter, both in his speech in this debate and in the contribution he made when explaining a Bill during the last session, clearly set out the matters involved. The two principal issues involved are, first, the qualifying period for long service leave and, secondly, the pro rata entitlement period. If one compares the two principal issues as they apply in the various States, one can see why I have raised the point about a cost advantage being necessary in South Australia. Three focal points exist when considering long service leave legislation in the other States. They are, first, at a five-year period; secondly, at a 10-year period; and thirdly, at a 15-year period. It will be found that no other State has a qualifying period under 15 years: in every other State the qualifying period for long service leave is after 15 years' service.

In all other States, with the exception of New South Wales, a pro rata entitlement period of 10 years is provided, but in New South Wales that period is five years. However, certain other qualifications are stipulated in the New South Wales legislation concerning pro rata entitlement. Comparing the provisions in the Bill with those of New South Wales (the only State that provides entitlement after five years), the following position emerges:

	Entitlements	
	South Australia proposed	New South Wales actual
At the end of the fifth year	6.5 weeks	4.3 weeks
At the end of the sixth year	7.8 weeks	5.2 weeks
At the end of the seventh year	9.1 weeks	6.1 weeks

At the 10-year mark, under Commonwealth awards, long service leave entitlement begins, and that is where pro rata entitlements also begin. Under Commonwealth awards the entitlement is 6.8 weeks at the end of 10 years' service; under this Bill the entitlement will be 13 weeks, while in all other States the entitlement is 8.6 weeks.

From there I move to the qualifying period for long service leave as applying in all other States. Under Commonwealth awards, the long service leave entitlement is 13 weeks and under this Bill such entitlement would be 22 weeks.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that after 15 years?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. In South Australia, after 15 years there would be an entitlement of 22 weeks, while in New South Wales it is 12 weeks. It can be seen exactly how far in advance the provisions of this Bill will make this State over those of any other State, including the only other State (New South Wales) that has a pro rata entitlement period of five years. However, I have pointed out that other qualifications apply in New South Wales that must be taken into consideration when dealing with the pro rata entitlement period. At the 15-year mark the entitlement in this Bill is almost double the entitlement in any other Act in any other State. I do not know whether the Minister disagrees with my contention.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I am wondering how you make it almost double.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Under the Bill, after 15 years' service in South Australia there will be an entitlement to 22 weeks' long service leave. Commonwealth awards provide for 13 weeks, New South Wales 12 weeks and other States 13 weeks, so my figure is not far out. The Bill provides 70 per cent or 80 per cent more leave than in other places.

I made two points earlier, and I do not wish to repeat them, but there can be no doubt that the long service leave provisions of this Bill would, in my mind, be a penalty upon local industry. I do not believe this is the right time to place this extra burden upon the cost structure of this State, particularly when one compares the long service leave provisions already in existence in other States with those provided by the Bill.

Like the Hon. Mr. Geddes, I am prepared to support the second reading. However, as the Hon. Mr. Potter pointed out in his second reading speech on a private member's Bill introduced last session, we should bring into line with people working under Commonwealth awards the 20 per cent of people in this State who are working under State awards. There is an anomaly that should be corrected, and I believe some alteration in the long service leave legislation in this State is necessary.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What effect will there be on heavy industry, if this affects only 20 per cent?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Not being an expert in this field, I cannot answer the question. However, I have listened to those who are far more expert in this field than I am, and I believe this applies to those under State awards.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It applies to everybody, whether under awards or not.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It applies to those who are not covered by Commonwealth awards.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This will give a certain section of our work force an advantage over other sections under awards.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We have a section now that has an advantage over other sections. For many years public servants have had 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but the main point is that this Bill creates a structure in advance of that of any other State. This stage of South Australia's development is not the correct time for this move to be made.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The same old cry.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have already quoted the Premier; he emphasized that South Australia must have a cost advantage over the other States. Because of much of the legislation previously introduced by the Government this cost advantage has been lost, and this is one of the reasons for the downturn in South Australia's industrial activity. This Bill will add to the burden. To enable honourable members to compare entitlements for long service leave between various States, I ask that I have leave to have a table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS
(Entitlement in weeks)

Period of service (years)	C/wlth awards	Proposed State Act	Other States	N.S.W. State Act
1	—	—	—	—
2	—	—	—	—
3	—	—	—	—
4	—	—	—	—
*5	—	6.5	—	4.3
6	—	7.8	—	5.2
7	—	9.1	—	6.1

LONG SERVICE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS—*continued*

(Entitlement in weeks)

Period of service (years)	C/wlth awards	Proposed State Act	Other States	N.S.W. State Act
8 . . .	—	10.4	—	7.0
9 . . .	—	11.7	—	7.8
*10 . . .	8.6	13	8.6	8.6
11 . . .	9.5	14.8	9.5	9.5
12 . . .	10.4	16.6	10.4	10.4
13 . . .	11.2	18.4	11.2	11.2
14 . . .	12.1	20.2	12.1	12.1
*15 . . .	13	22.0	13	12

*These years are "focal" in the particular Acts and/or awards.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I support the second reading, but in the Committee stage I shall consider the amendments foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Potter, which I believe are along lines similar to those in the Bill he introduced last session.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 12, at 2.15 p.m.