

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

HIGHWAYS EQUIPMENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand the Minister of Roads and Transport now has a reply to a question I asked on September 17 about the possibility of hiring Highways Department equipment to do small jobs on pastoral leases.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is not the policy of the Highways Department to hire plant to or carry out work for private individuals or companies. The department owns only sufficient plant adequately to carry out full-time programmes of construction and essential maintenance. The uncertain nature of private work in both quantity and timing means that such jobs are difficult to co-ordinate with normal operations.

It is also considered that there would be criticism from private companies whose business it is to hire earthmoving units to the public if the department entered the field. There are various companies that have similar units available to those operated by the department. It is appreciated that the cost of transport to the pastoral areas would be high but this might be reduced if a number of pastoralists could organize their requirements to be carried out concurrently.

DOCTORS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Chief Secretary say how many doctors trained at the University of Adelaide in the last five years have gone into general practice or into a specialist type of practice both inside and outside the metropolitan area?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am sure the honourable member realizes that I cannot give the figures immediately. I shall, however, obtain them and bring back a report.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have taken great interest in the progress of gauge standardization in South Australia, particularly in

what is happening in regard to the standardization of the section between Broken Hill and Cockburn. A newspaper report a few days ago stated that the agreement between the various Governments was ready for signing and that it was likely it would be signed today or in the very near future. I am interested, too, in the negotiations, in which I earlier participated, with the Silverton Tramway Company Limited. I know the company's attitude to what is proposed and I know that it disagrees with the amount that is proposed by *ex gratia* payment to the company. Can the Minister say whether, in fact, the agreement has been signed, and has he any further information regarding the important negotiations that were taking place between the company and representatives of the various Governments in regard to an *ex gratia* payment?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When the honourable member raised the question of the signing of the agreement a few days ago, I said that we were awaiting the agreement from New South Wales and that we hoped to receive it, signed by the New South Wales Premier. Further, I said we intended to sign it as soon as we received it and forward it to the Prime Minister for his signature. We have received the agreement and this morning the Premier signed it, so it will be now forwarded to Canberra. We have started the procedures necessary for drafting a Bill to ratify the agreement in this Parliament in anticipation of the Prime Minister's signing it.

The agreement states that the three Governments will mutually agree upon an *ex gratia* payment to the Silverton Tramway Company. On another occasion I said in this Council that the Commonwealth Government had made an offer on behalf of the three Governments to pay the company \$1,250,000 as an *ex gratia* payment, but the size of the payment has not been approved by the company. Further, I point out that the settlement of this issue of an *ex gratia* payment (and I think from memory that I did mention the word "compensation" earlier, but, if I did, I intended to say "*ex gratia* payment") is not in any way delaying the construction of the line, which will be proceeded with irrespective of our settling with the company the issue of an *ex gratia* payment.

CAR ACCIDENTS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding records of cars involved in accidents?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Deputy Commissioner of Police reports:

The year of model and make of every vehicle involved in a road traffic accident is included in all accident reports for statistical and other use as required. In general, however, the length of time prior to an accident that a vehicle was last serviced has not been considered relevant to be included in each accident report as a special item. Too many variables are involved. The standard would obviously vary from individual service station to service station, or garage, or other point concerned. Who actually performed the service on a particular occasion would also be an influencing factor, as would the actual requirements of the individual owner, driver or person in charge at the time.

The condition of a vehicle from a road-worthiness and safety point of view, however, can be relevant in connection with the offence of dangerous driving, and in all fatal and serious accidents a very thorough examination is made of all vehicles concerned in an accident. The attached vehicle information sheet gives some indication of the extent of examination in such cases.

That sheet is available for the honourable member to inspect. The report continues:

In some instances the form is not large enough, and even more comprehensive reports are submitted. In all accidents investigated by traffic division members, which additionally has a specialized accident investigation squad which makes an appreciation of all metropolitan and near-country fatal and serious accidents, the vehicle check includes enquiries to ascertain the date of the last service of the vehicle if there is any suggestion that the accident was caused as the result of brake failure.

Separate from the foregoing, whenever members of the police force attend the scene of accidents, vehicles are checked as part of normal routine duty, with the check varying in intensity depending on the type of accident.

All patrol members and stations are additionally issued with books of defect notices with a view to policing the provisions of section 160 of the Road Traffic Act as required, and inspections of motor vehicles are not confined to those instances or to those vehicles which are concerned in accidents. Some indication of the extent to which this provision is utilized can be gained when it is realised that during the year ending December 31, 1967, 14,987 defect notices were issued by members throughout the State.

A number of items relevant to the condition of vehicles, namely steering, brakes, tyres, and wipers, are additionally included in the statistical data required to be completed by members on the back of each accident report, and from this and the other statistical information supplied, each report is examined and classified for accident statistic purposes. Among other things, responsibility from a driver and road user aspect is assessed, as is a classification of accidents and casualties according to apparent error, both human or vehicle.

I have copies of the road traffic accident report form, to which the honourable member can have access if he so desires. Other police forms used by the police traffic division accident investigation squad in relation to requests for vehicle examination and brake test reports are included with the reply, and they can be made available to the honourable member also.

HAMBIDGE RESERVE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: My question concerns the Hambidge Reserve which, in reply to a question in another place, the Minister of Lands said was still being considered and for which the alienation of portions of the reserve requires a resolution to be passed by both Houses. Can the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Lands, say how far negotiations in this matter have proceeded?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will ascertain that information from my colleague and report to the honourable member.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: For some time negotiations have been proceeding with regard to the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, which is due to be considered for renewal for a further period of five years. As this affects the return wheatgrowers will receive from their wheat, can the Minister of Agriculture give the Council any further information on how far the negotiations have progressed?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is correct that lengthy negotiations have been entered into by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, the State Ministers, and the Wheat-growers Federation. A number of meetings between these people have been held. I think one of my first duties on coming into the office of Minister was to attend Canberra in connection with this matter. The position at present is that most States have agreed that the Commonwealth Government's proposition should be accepted. Although some sections of the wheat industry could still be at variance with the decision, I believe that the Commonwealth Government reviewed the position on four occasions and met many of the complaints of people in the industry. The salient points on which the Commonwealth has moved ground in favour of the industry are that whereas under the previous arrangement the guaranteed price for export applied to only 150,000,000 bushels this has now been

increased to 200,000,000 bushels. On the other hand, the Commonwealth has decided (this, too, in negotiation) that the system previously operating with regard to cost of production should be on an actual basis instead of on a notional basis with regard to interest and freight and land values. This has probably deprived the wheatgrowers of a good many million dollars over the next five years, but in my opinion the old system would have been completely unworkable, for it could have cost the Australian taxpayer an additional \$200,000,000 over the five years of the guaranteed price.

I believe other sectors of primary industry are probably in a worse position than is the wheat industry at the present time, and those sectors might need assistance. I sent a telegram to the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Anthony) on Monday informing him that this State was in favour of the proposal and that the Government would introduce a Bill to ratify the agreement as soon as suitable complementary legislation was drafted.

GREENHILL ROAD

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Although there has been a good deal of talk about erecting a guard fence on Greenhill Road, there is yet no sign of it. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when this work will commence?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I commend the honourable member for showing a great interest in this question of the necessity for a guard rail on the upper reaches of Greenhill Road. The honourable member has mentioned the matter a number of times and he is echoing the concern and fears of people who travel along that road. I am happy to inform him, first, that the work is to be completed by private enterprise; secondly, the specifications for the work have been completed by the Highways and Local Government Department; and thirdly, it is hoped that tenders will be called on or before October 1 this year.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Last week I asked a question regarding flammable material used in the manufacture of clothing. Has the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to this question?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister of Labour and Industry reports:

The matter of the use of flammable material in clothing was discussed at the conference of State Ministers of Labour last July. All Ministers are firmly convinced that uniform legislation is essential to provide effective safe-

guards regarding flammability of material, but that no legislative action can be taken until a proved and reliable Australian standard for testing the flammability of fabrics has been established. The Standards Association has appointed a special committee to recommend such a standard and this committee is currently dealing with the matter. As soon as a reliable Australian standard has been established the preparation of uniform legislation will be considered by the Ministers.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I direct the following questions to the Minister representing the Minister of Works:

1. What is the position with regard to the possible use of effluent water from the Bolivar sewage treatment works?

2. Can this water be reserved as far as possible to augment the supplies available for industry already established in the area?

3. I understand that a particular party has purchased a considerable acreage of land in the area and is dividing it into small parcels and selling these on the understanding that effluent water will be available to them. Is this so?

4. If it is so, what effect will this have on the possibility of effluent water being made available to already established primary producers in the area?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I could give the honourable member replies to several of his queries, but I think it would be better if I obtained for him a detailed account from the Minister responsible for this matter, and I shall do that.

NORTHERN ROADS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: A letter I have received from the Secretary of the Stock-owners Association at Copley states:

It was suggested that the interests of the State would be better served if the proposed bitumen road from Hawker to Blinman was given a lesser priority than a bitumen road from Hawker to Parachilna, as tourism to Blinman would still be served, while a large contribution to the betterment of the main North Road would be made at the same time.

That is the general feeling of many people in that area, especially the inhabitants of Leigh Creek and surrounding areas. I agree with the text of this letter, which is that tourism would be harmed in no way whatsoever if this were done because the Parachilna Gorge is one of the entries to Blinman

that tourists seldom miss in any event. Can the Minister say what consideration would be given to this proposition?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will check with the department whether the question of priority between these two northern roads, one on either side of the main range, in effect, is as the letter states. If that priority has been established, I will obtain the reasons why the department has assessed this priority.

However, I point out that whilst Blinman might well be served by tourists if they travel up the main road to Leigh Creek from Hawker and go through the Parachilna Gorge to Blinman, that does not mean that the great number of tourists who visit Wilpena Pound would be served by the road being completed first on the western side of the range. However, I will obtain a detailed report on the whole matter.

MALLEE FOWL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: It has become increasingly obvious that quite a large number of mallee fowl have survived the clearing on the eastern side of the Coorong and have taken refuge in a small area of scrub just south of Salt Creek. They are now commonly seen on the roadside by people travelling through this area, and in no way are they safeguarded. I believe some of this land is still to be cleared and it would be a great pity if this were allowed to occur and these birds were not protected. Would it be possible for the Minister to get his wild life officers to examine the position and, if possible, preserve the environment in which these few survivors of a very rare breed of bird are now existing?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am interested in the honourable member's question because mallee fowl is, of course, a rare bird today. I shall certainly make inquiries to see whether land is available in the area for such a purpose and, if it is Crown land, what we can do about resuming it and, if it is private land, what we can do about it. I shall be most interested in having a report brought down to see whether we can preserve the natural habitat of these birds which at present, as the honourable member says, are surviving near Salt Creek.

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I move:

That this Council considers that, before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action.

It is not my intent in this motion to debate whether or not fluoride should be added to the water supply of South Australia; it is not my intent to debate under what authority the Government introduced this proposal, but it is my intent to question the right of the Government to introduce a controversial social measure such as this by a simple press announcement without first giving Parliament some right of debate and questioning as to the merits and demerits of fluoride in water supplies. The definition of "responsible government" in the *Encyclopaedia of Parliament* is:

Responsible government is used to denote a system of government which is responsive to public opinion. In this sense it can be used to distinguish between a democratic form of government, which recognizes an obligation to consult public opinion, and a totalitarian regime, in which the rights of the individual are subordinated to the monolithic State.

Under responsible government, the Executive is responsible, as we all know, for its acts of government to the Legislature and must frame its policy of government so as to keep the support and confidence of the majority vote of the legislators who, in turn, represent and are answerable to the electors. The problem that faces all people who are attached to the democratic way of life is to find a way to curb the power of the Executive and prevent it from usurping the entire function of government. This is the principal reason why I am moving this motion today, for the Executive exists as long as it has the confidence of Parliament, but this confidence is not a bottomless pit.

Do we really want to see government by the people, for the people and to hell with the people? First, I feel that the need for a preventive to help combat tooth decay is something that could well be introduced, but whether fluoride should be introduced to the water supply or some other medium used I do not know. I think there should be something to help fight this problem of tooth decay. It is regrettable that we still see many children who, on leaving school, are considered by their parents to need the removal of all their teeth so as to prevent any further expense in having their teeth filled and other dental treatment. This is wrong. With the shortage of dentists and our shocking record of tooth decay, we

definitely need some preventive measure, but the question is: should it be in our water supply or should it be by some other means? Why should the Government be ashamed to ask Parliament to consider this measure? If a private member can introduce a Bill into Parliament or move a motion, as I am doing today, we know well that the Government or Parliament has similar rights. It has been a tradition of this Council to try to protect, watch over and guard the rights of the minority. It is customary—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Those are the truest words you have ever used.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is customary for this Council to exercise its right of criticism of the Executive. It is, therefore, necessary that this Council remind the Executive that Parliament and its members represent the people and that Parliament should be allowed the right to debate this social issue on behalf of those it represents; and this is the motion I now formally move.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I formally second the motion and reserve the right to speak at some later stage of the debate.

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

ADELAIDE CITY BY-LAW: METERED ZONES AND SPACES

Order of the Day No. 1: The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE to move:

That By-law No. 68 of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide in respect of metered zones and metered spaces for vehicles, made on December 18, 1967, and laid on the table of this Council on June 25, 1968, be disallowed.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): In view of the action taken on a similar motion in another place, I move that this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

ADELAIDE CITY BY-LAW: VEHICLE STANDS

Order of the Day No. 2: The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE to move:

That By-laws Nos. 50, 60, 61, 69, and 72 of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide in respect of stands for vehicles in parklands, made on December 18, 1967, and laid on the table of this Council on June 25, 1968, be disallowed.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): In view of the action taken on a similar motion in another place, I move that this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Read a third time and passed.

ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY
(ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK
TERMINUS) BILL

Read a third time and passed.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Read a third time and passed.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1292.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the Bill. I mention first a matter which gives me considerable pleasure, namely, the provision made for the building of the women's rehabilitation centre. It is now eight years since I first brought to the notice of this Council the necessity for a new gaol for women. At that time, honourable members had visited Cadell a short time before and had seen the splendid work being done there to rehabilitate male prisoners. In complete contrast had been my visit, made subsequent to the Cadell inspection, to the women's prison at the Adelaide Gaol: a more antiquated building or more primitive conditions would have been hard to imagine. It was almost as if one had stepped back into the eighteenth or nineteenth century.

The Government of that time, in 1960, gave serious consideration to this state of affairs, and in 1961 plans were drawn for a new building, but they did not reach the Public Works Committee until 1963. In the following year it was announced that the whole project was to be delayed, but certain improvements were carried out. A dormitory with modern toilet facilities was built, which helped the situation, but it was only a palliative arrangement. I hoped that from this improvement there would be further rapid developments, but under the Labor Administration there has been a three-year hiatus, although I know that the then Chief Secretary was sympathetic to the plight of these unfortunate women.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Nothing had been done when we took office. We got on with the job and got it for you.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The women are not in it. It is therefore gratifying indeed to know that our new Liberal and Country League Government is treating the problem as one of urgency, and I congratulate the Chief Secretary on his decision to get the new building started, thus giving women prisoners a chance to be rehabilitated under modern conditions, where the well-trained staff will be able to help them so much more easily back into normal life.

While speaking along these lines, I turn to consideration of the gaol and surrounding areas, about which various propositions have been made. We have had constant advice about planning for the future and about Adelaide's new look, possibly as a city of greatly increased population. We have the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan to take care of certain problems, but always we should be conscious of the need for more, rather than less, in the way of new spaces, informal recreation areas and so on. Any proposition that the gaol area should be used for a teachers college or for any other Government project I believe should be deprecated. Apart from the earlier use of space set aside by Colonel Light, we have more recently seen much of the park land space being used for Government department purposes rather than for the benefit of the people, largely because, being State-owned, it was cheaply available and near the heart of the city—the very thing we should avoid.

I am thinking not only of buildings but of the extensive playing areas which are demanded and which, when received, become permanently alienated from the general public use. Examples of such areas are the large area taken over for the Adelaide Boys High School, an extensive area around the police barracks, and the area used by the Postmaster-General's Department for employee recreation on West Terrace. And now we have the suggestion that this gaol area should be set aside for some other Government purpose. The warning should be sounded that institutions never require space merely for a building: they require playing fields and car park space, which is lost forever to the public.

I am aware that years ago it was a joke to say that only cows used the park lands and that the people did not appreciate them. Since the fine work of beautification by the Adelaide City Council, particularly in the

eastern and southern park lands, people have flocked to enjoy outdoor living every weekend, on public holidays and during late afternoons in summer. At last our people are enjoying Colonel Light's heritage. It is our duty to see that they are able to continue to do so. I am pleased to see that \$150,000 has been set aside for national reserves when land becomes available, but I hope that a more determined and forceful policy will be adopted from now on.

South Australia has been notably short of reservations either in tourist areas or in areas of natural bush land. Areas that "become available" tend, I am afraid, to be areas which are found wanting for all other purposes or which have been overstocked to a point where all the native flora has been eaten out. One would wish that extensive areas suitable for outdoor recreation, for camping or simply for preserving natural beauty and grandeur could be acquired as rapidly as possible before it was too late.

Turning now to the provision for hospitals, I want to speak on a very serious matter. I hope that the situation has not arisen, as suggested by the Hon. Mr. Shard and the Hon. Mr. Banfield, that there is any doubt about the establishment of a medical school at Flinders University in association with a teaching hospital in the southern districts.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can take it for granted that there is a lot of doubt.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: It was at the request of the State Government that the Council of the Flinders University made a submission to the Australian Universities Commission for the establishment of a medical school at Flinders University. The Australian Universities Commission has considered the proposal but has not yet indicated to the council whether it will approve or disapprove. It is expected that the decision will probably be made at the end of this year. If, however, there is any doubt now as to the acceptance of this submission, then I suggest that the Government should make the strongest representations to the Commonwealth Government on this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Hear, hear!

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The financing of university education has become a partnership between the State and Commonwealth Governments, the State, of course, still being constitutionally responsible for the actual educational establishment of a university. The voice of the State in this matter must therefore be well advised and strong; indeed, it

should be loud and clear. We have in South Australia a serious shortage of medical practitioners. At the moment we have a quota system for the admission of new students to the medical faculty at the University of Adelaide. It would be extremely unintelligent of us all if we allowed this situation to become aggravated. Accordingly, I urge the Government to look at this whole matter very seriously and, as I have said before, to make the strongest possible representations to the Commonwealth Government. I hope the Government will then turn its attention to the building of a teaching hospital in association with the Flinders University medical school.

I point out two outstanding facts: first, the southern districts of the metropolitan area are not well served with hospital facilities and, secondly, there is a considerable difference in the basic establishment between a general purpose hospital and a teaching hospital associated with a university. It is to be hoped that, when a hospital is planned for the southern districts, it will be planned with its dual role constantly underlined. The establishment of a medical school at Flinders and of a teaching hospital in close proximity to it are matters of great urgency for the future welfare of the people of this State.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): Like other members of my Party, I support the Bill, but with no great enthusiasm. Despite a change in the leadership of the Liberal and Country League in this Parliament we are to see a return to the old uninspiring order of the days before the Labor Party fought its way to office against the most inequitable election system existent in modern times. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Hart, who spoke the other day about the electoral measure introduced in another place, let me say that, had it not been for the actions of the Labor Party in that place in forcing the Premier to introduce the measure, we and the electors of this State would still have been in doubt about the contents of the Bill, because the Premier consistently said outside of Parliament that he did not intend to introduce an electoral reform Bill until after the money Bills had been dealt with. As the Public Purposes Loan Bill, which we are discussing now and the Budget introduced in another place have not yet been finished, we would not yet have seen that Bill. However, because the Party in another place embarrassed the Premier to such an extent that he had to introduce the Bill, it has now been introduced in another place.

The Hon. Mr. Hart said it was our fault that it had not been dealt with before now. However, the Government, not the Opposition, controls the Notice Paper. Therefore, if the Government wanted to deal with the electoral reform Bill, it could have given it a higher priority on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What made you think it wanted to deal with it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I said, "If it wanted to": I did not say it wanted to. As my colleagues have asked, where are the provisions in the Bill now before us designed (as the Premier said) to get South Australia moving? Where are the provisions designed to put the building industry on a sound foundation? Where are the provisions immediately to get on with the Chowilla dam scheme? All these things and more were promised by the Premier in his many, varied, conflicting, and confusing statements during his election campaign. Even the Hon. Mr. Hart had to admit the other day, as a result of an interjection I made, that the promises the Premier had made regarding amendments to Acts affecting the building industry had not eventuated. He said that they would be brought down in good time, but when is that?

The Hon. C. R. Story: How long have we been here?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Too long!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Long enough! What sort of criticism did we get in our first six months in office? All sorts of criticism were made of us, and we were told that we were not doing things quickly enough.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We have heard it said that there was a hiatus for three years, and subsequently we were told we did too much—that we brought too much work to the place. Members opposite should not say that we should not criticize their Government after its being in office for six months, because they criticized us in this way.

The Hon. C. R. Story: If the Opposition in another place got on with the work, we might be able to do something.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Who is in charge there? Look at *Hansard* over the last three years and see how many words were spoken by other people in Opposition then, and see who was trying to delay matters. The Labor Party was criticized in another place recently because its members were not talking on Bills, but they did not speak merely so they could get to the electoral reform Bill.

We were told that the Government would get the State moving, but we have not seen much activity yet.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, we have. The State has been going backwards.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you seen the building figures?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The electors were told prior to the election (in regard to moneys obtained from the Commonwealth Government) by the *Advertiser's* leader writers that if we had here a Government of similar political affiliations to the one in Canberra, we would get a better go from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We got it all right. We got it where the chicken got the axe.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was alleged that like would help like in this regard. I wonder whether the same leader writers would say the same thing if the Labor Party came to power in Canberra. I wonder whether they would turn around and say that a Labor Government should be in office here because the Commonwealth Labor Party would give the State a better go. I say it is not likely. From what the D.L.P. has said recently, a Labor Commonwealth Government is not impossible at the moment. The Labor Party does not need the help of the D.L.P. to get it there either, but, if the Liberal Party does not have the support of the D.L.P., it will not be able to form a Government.

What happened after the Liberal Party went into office here and the Premier went to Canberra? He threatened that if he did not get what he wanted he would emulate his colleague in Victoria regarding taxation. Well, he did not get what he wanted from Canberra, and he has at least carried out one of his promises by increasing taxation similar to the taxation imposed in Victoria in the recent Budget. He said if he did not get a fair go that he would bring in all the taxes that Victoria has. That is what happened as a result of people being told that if they elected an L.C.L. Government they would get all the Loan money they wanted from the Commonwealth. In assessing the economy of South Australia in the past, the practice has been to look at the building industry and the vehicle industry, and when we look now at these industries and see a fall in sales of motor cars or any slump in the building industry we realize that the economy is not as good as it could be. There is a lack of confidence within the State, and I am not surprised at this, in view of the present inactivity.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: For the first time for a very long while there has now been an improvement in building activity.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There was a very minor improvement last month in the building industry, after its being, at last June, at its lowest ebb for many years, according to the statistics.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Last month was the first time there had been any change for three years.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is not so: it is the first time in the last six months there has been a change, but the Chief Secretary must not forget that this slight change occurred before the effects of the Commonwealth Budget and of the State Budget were felt. This recent improvement in building activity is only a minor and temporary one, in my view.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the effect of the lifting of price control on bricks and other things?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have no doubt that the Chief Secretary would be concerned by the fact that the builders labourers have just received some increase in wages. I think they are entitled to that increase; good luck to them. In view of the attitude we have heard expressed here before when people have received increases, members opposite must be concerned about that. The present Government has lifted price control on materials that affect the cost of building, and any increase in building costs could result in fewer houses being built.

Last weekend when watching and listening to news on television I heard that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles had reported that last month there was a considerable fall in the sale of motor vehicles in South Australia. Let us hope this is not the position in other States. Once we lose sales of motor vehicles, more particularly on the Eastern States' markets than in our own market (although our own market is important, too), this is the beginning of a slide in the South Australian economy, as we all know.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I think the figures included secondhand vehicles.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I admit that the last report from the Department of Labour and National Service disclosed a slight decrease in unemployment here.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is still the highest in Australia.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is so. I believe that this slight improvement is seasonal. I am concerned not with the small temporary increase in building activity but with the long-term effect on employment in the State. This Loan programme before us does nothing to inspire confidence or bring about an upsurge in the general economy of the State.

This Government is doing nothing to increase activity in the building industry or the sale of motor vehicles, and the Commonwealth Government has done less to improve conditions in the Eastern States, which are our main markets. I realize that the State Government can do nothing to help our markets in the Eastern States, but this Government's colleagues in the Commonwealth sphere are doing nothing to help us.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are all tarred with the one brush.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Last week the Hon. Mr. Hart endeavoured to compare the attitude of his Party when in Government with that of the Labor Party. I will quote his words, because they are very interesting. He said:

The Liberal and Country Party has always placed emphasis on development, for we believe it is essential that we develop our natural resources. On the other hand, the Labor Party, in its socialistic fashion, has been more concerned with social legislation . . . in fact, the Revenue Account has been so overloaded with social legislation . . .

He did not refer to the effects of the drought on the revenue of the Railways Department or the expenditure needed for continuous pumping of water to the metropolitan reservoirs by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. He implied that social and industrial legislation was about the only thing that had an impact on the Revenue Account. He then went on to say (I think with his tongue in his cheek):

The Revenue Account, as I have already stated, has been affected by social and industrial legislation, which legislation is, I agree, desirable (nobody denies that) but we can expand social and industrial legislation only according to our means. It is fairly evident that we have expanded beyond our means in this connection in recent years.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have been saying that for 50 years.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Let me correct the Hon. Mr. Hart. The Labor Party also places great emphasis on the development of natural resources, but the difference between the two Parties is that we believe in develop-

ment for all and not for just a few. The Snowy Mountains scheme, which in the formative stages was boycotted by members of the honourable member's Party in the Commonwealth sphere, is a monument to Labor's interest in the development of Australia's natural resources for the benefit of all.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It did not take the Liberals long to claim credit for it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am pleased to see that the Hon. Mr. Hart gives the Labor Party credit for all the great social reforms that have taken place in this country. I am proud of the Labor Government's record during its recent term of office in this State in regard to social and industrial legislation, which it was able to introduce despite the consistent opposition of the honourable member I am speaking of and those of his Party who think along the same lines. After all, the Hon. Mr. Hart is acting consistently and in line with what we have come to expect of the Liberal and Country Party administration. One would have thought that a change of leadership might have seen a change of attitude in this regard.

It has always been the habit of L.C.L. members to say that perhaps they could agree to certain social and industrial reform but that the present was not the appropriate time. When there is unemployment they always say there is no money, and when there is no great amount of unemployment the reason they give for not doing things is always that there is no manpower, and that reform at that time would cause inflation. This is the magic formula that has always applied. From experience we have found that there never is an appropriate time for these people.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins and the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan both referred to the provisions for the Railways Department's capital works programme, and they were both looking for some improvement in services. I, too, am interested in this matter of railway finance. No doubt the Minister will inform the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan that in regard to mechanical signals at railway crossings the Highways Department provides the funds and the Railways Department carries out the work. In view of the amount of signalling work that I know is being carried out and the limited number of workmen skilled in that work, I shall be interested to see what progress is made in this financial year in making crossings safer.

In regard to modernization of rolling stock and services, I had much pressure brought to bear on me during my term of office and I am, therefore, pleased that provisions are made

in the Estimates for the continuation of the modernization of rolling stock, commenced in the preceding financial year. I want here to pay a tribute to the work of the staff employed at Islington on this rolling stock, because it is of a very high standard. Anybody who has travelled on the Pirie line or on the Overland and has recently used the improved rolling stock will agree with me that it is comfortable and modern.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did you see that they are taking contracts away from the Islington workshops? I do not know why.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No; I have not seen that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The honourable member should not believe all that he reads.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is not far off the truth.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is going to private enterprise instead of Government works.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Further evidence of the efficiency of the work force there is the amount of work being done at Islington on the gauge standardization scheme. This work has been won on the open market against competition from people in other States, which indicates the efficiency of the work force at Islington. One further improvement made during the Labor Administration was in regard to the rail maintenance staff's sleeping vans which, prior to the introduction of these new improved vans, were most uncomfortable with no proper facilities for the care of the workmen carrying out maintenance on the railway lines in the various outposts of South Australia. Much improved sleeping quarters were made available at that time. I hope this policy will be continued and that further improvements will be made for the care of the work force on the railways.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is there any provision for a dining car on the Overland?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have not heard of any; there is nothing on the Estimates for that. One thing that is missing that should have been included and in respect of which during my term as Minister of Transport detailed plans were prepared is the supply of two new improved air-conditioned coaches for the Adelaide to Mount Gambier line. These plans I have seen. There is no provision in the present Loan programme for them. I hope the Minister will keep his eye on this. There is a great need for this rolling stock. Perhaps he will include them when it is possible. While on the subject of railway

finance, I should like to refer briefly to the need for greatly increased finance, either through the Loan programme or in some other way, if any progress is to be made with the M.A.T.S. Report. This depends, of course, on whether the report is ever implemented.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I know it has always been the practice for railway funds, when we build new lines, railways, stations or rolling stock, to come from Loan funds. However, I noticed in the *Advertiser* of September 2 that the Minister of Roads and Transport, in reply to several letters to the editor, which criticized the report and spoke about the dictatorial attitude of the Government—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: In the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In "Letters to the Editor"; they were not in the editorial.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They were edited letters to the editorial.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They came from people not within the *Advertiser* building on this occasion, as some others did prior to the last election.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not within the building, but workers within the building; they were good efforts.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The article states:

The M.A.T.S. Report was prepared on the basis that it had to be realistic and capable of achievement with a maximum of public acceptance.

I do not know where that will come from. The article continues:

Mr. Michelmore had questioned the allocation of public funds between various sections of the community, but could he point to any mention in the report that money would be diverted from other sectors for this work? The plain answer was that the financing of the M.A.T.S. proposals would be by the participating agencies within the framework of their financial structure as it would normally extend over the next 20 years. Any increase in allocation would be provided by the users of such facilities, such as through motor registration fees.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The insurance premium fee has already been increased by \$2.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: A glance at page 193 of the M.A.T.S. report will show those interested that the estimated cost of the recommended railway improvements is \$79,050,000. The King William Street subway, for which the Minister is reported as having already been seeking funds, will alone cost \$32,800,000. By a complicated formula of their own, the M.A.T.S. people have assessed

that, if the amount of funds allotted on the Loan Estimates follows the same pattern as it has in recent years and the same proportion of these funds is used by the department on improvement and new work on the suburban railway system over the next 18 years, the amount available will be \$11,000,000 and the difference between the \$11,000,000 and the \$79,050,000 is \$68,050,000. In line with the Minister's published statement in the *Advertiser* that I have just quoted, the users of the railway system will be expected to supply the \$68,050,000 difference. Do not tell me that the Minister hopes to save this amount by cutting out services. Even the most optimistic of his dreams could not supply him with this figure. Therefore, in the words of the Minister, the users of the facilities, both freight and passenger, will provide the amount. This means, I assume, that freights and fares will be increased. If, after all, the Minister finds he cannot get the funds from the users of the facilities (and I am sure he will not be able to in the case of the railways), he will have to ask Cabinet to approve the implementation of the suggestions of the M.A.T.S. consultants as to possible sources.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You are speaking as a former Minister?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. The suggestions in the report are those that were adopted in the United States of America in similar circumstances. The suggestions include a proposal for a tax on cigarettes, additional taxes on motor vehicles, a tax on monthly and other periodical accounts of public utilities (I assume "public utilities" means organizations such as the Electricity Trust and the Engineering and Water Supply Department). These proposals are referred to on pages 193 and 194 of the report. Because I can recall the hullabaloo that developed when, a year or two ago, I suggested a modest contribution from road users competing with the railways, I can inform the Minister that he is not likely to get much support for imposts on road users and others such as those suggested in the report, which imposts are to provide the funds he wants. The consultants, in discussing additional funds for the scheme generally, suggest on pages 191 and 192 other measures for raising these funds. Such measures include a substantial increase in motor vehicle registration fees and in driver's licence fees, the removal of certain exemptions in regard to some categories of goods to bring them under the provisions of the Road Maintenance (Contribution)

Act and the lowering of the exemption on the capacity of a vehicle from eight tons to four tons. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude was at one time quite hostile towards me for suggesting such things, but I suggest the Minister has the job in front of him to raise the additional funds for this scheme.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: If it seems so terrible to you, why didn't you stop the M.A.T.S. Report? You had it before you for three years.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister is interjecting that we should have stopped the report.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No; I said, "If it seems so terrible to you, you should have stopped the report".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We never had the report.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In November of last year—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Last November! You had it before that.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: —the people preparing the M.A.T.S. Report gave a sketchy description of what the report would eventually contain, but they had not come to a final decision. They spoke to us: we were not given anything in written form. Subsequently, they made their report.

I am fairly sure that during this session we asked in this Council when the report would be available. Eventually we got it and it was issued to the public as soon as it was printed. The Government did not study it and did not consider where the necessary finance would come from. Look at the damage that has been done!

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What do you suggest should have been done?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They told you what was in it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I point out that repeated interjections by honourable members are out of order. The honourable Mr. Kneebone.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I wish to inform the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill that I believe that the Under Treasurer (who has the best financial brain in South Australia, if not in the whole of Australia) should have been called in and I believe that the matter should have been discussed with him and other experts. Such people should have been consulted concerning the source of the enormous

funds needed to do the job. The Government should have considered whether this could be achieved.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: If the reply was "Yes" or "No", what would you have done?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: If the reply was "Yes", we would have had to make up our minds whether we supported it in principle.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What if the reply was "No"?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Then the report could have been issued with the qualification that we did not agree with every provision in it. In fact, however, the report was issued, no-one said whether he supported it, and, consequently, untold damage was done. The Minister has been associated with valuing properties, and he must have known the effect that this would have on people in regard to the sale of properties.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We do not believe in hiding things from the people.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I reluctantly support the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the Bill with considerable enthusiasm. I can understand the attitude of Opposition members, who support it with a lack of enthusiasm, because it is always very difficult to speak on a Bill that is very hard to criticize. In this Bill I see a Loan policy that represents an increase of 16 per cent, compared with the previous year, in the amount to be spent on Loan works in this State. This is exactly what we want and it is what we expect from a Liberal and Country League Government. To understand the difficulties that faced this Government in trying to frame a Loan programme, one must first realize the tragedy that has occurred with regard to this State's finances over the last three years. The truth is that they have been run down very considerably and steps have had to be taken to try to get things back on an even keel.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Was this because of industrial and social legislation?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Not necessarily, but because the then Government failed to realize that ultimately if a Government spends money it must get it from somewhere.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Did the drought have any effect?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, but a prudent Government should take such a possibility into account. One of the wisest men I ever met in political life was Sir Walter Duncan.

He had great ability to assess the effect of any legislation and, when he was leaving political life, he said that one of the things he had learnt was that the political promises of today are the taxation of tomorrow, and this is precisely the situation in which we find ourselves. Over the last three years so many promises were made with so little regard for this State's cost structure that we reached the stage where additional taxation had to be imposed to put the situation in order. At June 30 this year there was a deficit in the Revenue Account of this State of \$8,356,000, which had been built up by the A.L.P. Government over a period of three years. In addition, in 1966-67 the A.L.P. debited to Loan Account the sum of \$6,902,000 which was normally debited to the Revenue Account, and during 1967-68 there was a revenue deficit of \$2,860,000, but that was achieved only after \$5,015,000 of expenditure normally charged to Revenue Account was charged to the Loan Account.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How much is going to the Revenue Account now?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: We will deal with that later. I am trying to put the record straight in regard to the mess that the present Government took over. After allowing for a revenue deficit of \$8,365,000 for the three years and the transfer from Loan Account to Revenue Account, the total deficit in the Revenue Account over the three years was \$21,505,000. Therefore, on a revenue basis the Labor Government spent \$21,505,000 more than it earned, which left a legacy to be inherited by this Government.

This meant that the new Government had immediately to tackle new situations to see what it could do to put the finances of this State on an even keel again, but it was not only the financial situation that got into difficulties. We had also run into difficulties in that not only were we not able to make progress in attracting new industries here, but we were losing industries from this State and, of course, this has become a great anxiety to every economic sector of the community. Then, too, the housing industry had fallen into complete decay. The Housing Trust completed 2,375 houses during 1967-68, which was 853 fewer than the figure for 1966-67 and, indeed, the lowest number that the trust had built since 1949-50. Therefore, under three years of Labor Administration the construction of houses by the Labor Party had fallen to the 1949-50 level, 16 or 17 years earlier. That meant that the Government had

to do something to correct the situation, and it realized that it was not possible immediately to do so or immediately to transfer back to Revenue Account the sums that had been debited to the Loan Account, but it sought a middle course and did what I believe was the best that could be done in the circumstances.

The A.L.P. Budget for the year ended June 30, 1968, provided for a nominal deficit of \$4,000, but that was after a payment from the Loan Fund of \$5,220,000 less than was budgeted for by allocations from the Loan Fund, with the result that there was a surplus of \$5,668,000 in the Loan Account. When members of the Labor Party talk about trying to get the economy going, we find that in its last year of office, while it appropriated \$23,650,000 to be spent on public buildings, that Government spent only \$19,741,514, so it under-spent \$3,908,486 on Government buildings. If that additional sum had been spent it would have helped the economy greatly.

The total appropriation over the same period for non-government hospital buildings was \$3,000,000, but during its last year the Government spent only \$2,523,032, so it under-spent \$476,968 in that area. Not only was a large sum of money transferred from Loan Account to the Revenue Account during the Labor Government's term of office, but during the year ended June 30, 1968, that Government under-spent about \$5,900,000. Therefore, it must be quite clear to everyone that what happened under the Labor Party Administration in its last year of office was a deflationary process, when it transferred Loan moneys to the Revenue Account. In addition, that Government under-spent \$5,000,000 worth of Loan moneys. That was not calculated to boost the economy, and, when it came into power, the new Government realized this and has consequently come down with a Loan programme 16 per cent higher than the previous year, which is a remarkable achievement. There is a surplus of \$5,658,000 in the Loan Account—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Including money unspent last year.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, but the new Government properly said that it would not spend that sum on Loan works but that it would use it to meet the accumulated revenue deficit that occurred under the Labor Administration.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I thought they criticized that sort of thing when in Opposition.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not talking about that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It would not pay you to. You are not on safe ground. That is why.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The first concern of any Treasurer ought to be to see that he meets his day-to-day commitments and that he can pay wages as they become due. However, the Labor Party got to the situation where it could not do that without transferring Loan funds to the Revenue Account. We must see, too, that as much Loan money as possible is used for developmental purposes, because in that way we can provide for developmental works. The total funds available this year are \$97,340,000, out of which the sum of \$19,500,000 is to be appropriated for housing, leaving a balance of \$77,840,000. There will be recoveries during the year from previous Loan funds of \$12,300,000, which means that a total of \$90,140,000 Loan moneys will be available this year.

The Government proposes to appropriate \$400,000 of that sum towards liquidating previous revenue deficits, but even after doing so the sum of \$89,740,000 still represents an increase of 16 per cent (or \$12,400,000) over the \$77,338,000 spent last year. Any Government that comes into office and can immediately devise a Loan works programme providing for additional expenditure of \$12,400,000 in one year is on the right road to building up a recovery. Of course, this will not happen overnight, and it will take some time for the effect of this Loan programme to be felt and for the initial injection of money into the economy to take effect. However, the important point is that we are on the right road.

In addition to those figures, the sum of \$18,030,000 is provided for semi-government loans, of which sum \$10,000,000 is provided for the Electricity Trust. I thoroughly approve of that. In addition, the sum of \$4,250,000 is to go to the Housing Trust which, to me, makes sense.

I deal now with one or two individual matters. Under the heading of the Harbors Board, the sum of \$650,000 is provided for bulk loading facilities at Giles Point. As I said yesterday, the total cost of these facilities is estimated to be \$2,264,000. Last year the expenditure on the project was \$423,000, and \$650,000 is provided on the Estimates this year. This means that by June 30, 1969, \$1,073,000 will have been spent on the project, the total cost of which is \$2,264,000. Therefore, work on the project will be about half

completed at that time. I sincerely hope that this work will be pushed ahead because it is of importance to the people in that area.

While dealing with Giles Point, I wish to refer to the extreme difficulty we had during the last three years in getting this project moving at all. Today we hear some criticism of the existing Government, but if one goes back three years and thinks of the criticism that existed shortly after the then Government came to power, one finds that the criticism is a mere trickle today compared with the avalanche of criticism at that time.

The Hon. Mr. Hart has been anxious to do something about the police station at Snowtown. I know that the previous Chief Secretary was interested in this matter as well. I am pleased to see that \$36,000 has been placed on the Estimates this year. I hope that that police station will be built.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It would have been built if my Party had gone back this year.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I also asked a question with regard to a schoolhouse and classroom at Kulpara. There are some things which get to the stage where they become matters of urgency. I was interested in a comment made by the Hon. Mr. Kemp with regard to large schools. He expressed the opinion that we were probably not doing the wisest thing by making the schools as large as we are at present, and that we would be doing better for our children if we had them in smaller schools.

I had the privilege of attending a college at which there was a relatively small enrolment, and the headmaster of that college made it one of his responsibilities to take every student in the school for at least one subject in addition to religious instruction, so that when the parents of any student in that school came to interview the headmaster to discuss the progress of their child the headmaster could speak with the parents from his own personal knowledge and observation of that child and not from reports he received from other masters. I believe this is a very desirable thing, and I would be all in favour of reducing the number of children in each school to a lower figure than the present one. I think this would mean that there would be more opportunity for collaboration between the parents and the child and more opportunity to find and to develop the latent abilities that every child possesses.

As I understand education, the problem is not to see that the children who have the best talents and abilities get to the top: the prob-

lem is to see that the average child with average ability is taught in such a way that he can develop to the fullest of his capacity. I think what we need in a democracy is to see that everybody is doing a job which represents the maximum he can do according to his abilities, and I believe this would be obtained better by our having relatively smaller schools.

I approve the Government policy of subsidizing on a two for one basis non-government hospitals and various institutional buildings, and I am pleased to see in the Loan programme that in connection with the project at Calvary Hospital, which is to cost \$881,000, an amount of \$300,000 is provided this year, and that in connection with the Helping Hand Centre at North Adelaide, where there is being built a 100-bed infirmary at a total cost of \$384,000, there is to be provided this year \$100,000.

I remember over the years the introduction of school buses and the implementation of the system of area schools and consolidated schools and the closing down of many small schools. I approve of this policy. When I first went to school I attended a small country school where there were only, I think, 14 children, and the opportunities for competition and for expanding one's knowledge and so on were not very great. Therefore, notwithstanding the problems involved, I think these consolidated schools, which bring more children together, are desirable.

I notice there is provision for the expenditure of \$320,000 for the operation of school buses. There is a total fleet now of 647 buses, 368 of which are operated by private contractors and 275 by the Government. The private buses ran 3,900,000 miles during the year and carried 14,000 children, and the departmental buses travelled 3,200,000 miles and carried 12,000 children. It seems to me that that is a pretty good record when one realizes that this has been done almost without any accident of any consequence, and I commend the drivers of these buses for the way they operate and for the contribution they make to the State's education.

By interjection earlier the Hon. Mr. Kneebone asked whether in making criticism of the administration of the Labor Government over the last three years I had taken into consideration the effects of the drought on costs of water and railway services. I have noticed that the cost of pumping water in 1965-66 was \$2,186,000; in 1966-67 it was \$1,866,000; and in 1967-68 it was \$2,789,000, an increase of \$920,000 over the previous year.

This is a rather large impost in the Budget, and this means that everything possible must be done with regard to the development of our water storages to reduce this cost. I quite realize that probably the building of the Chowilla dam will not alter the situation regarding costs of pumping water to the metropolitan area, but I hope that we shall push on with the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, which I think is scheduled to hold when full 6,000,000,000 gallons, which was about the capacity of Mount Bold before it was enlarged. This will save a certain amount of pumping.

I am one of those people who believes that we must push on with Chowilla by any means available to us. I think it is true to say that the Playford Administration had got this thing off the ground. We had spent a certain amount of money, I think about \$6,000,000, on preliminary work. I think one of the tragedies of our history is that this work was not continued during the last three years. I do not want to enter into a political argument on this, but I think it behoves all of us in this State who are interested in this matter to pull together and try to get this thing going again. My own view would be that even if Commonwealth assistance is not forthcoming it is something we should try to tackle with our own financial resources. This may seem a very optimistic statement to make in relation to our State Budget.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is more feasible than the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, anyhow.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not criticize the Government for releasing the M.A.T.S. Report, for it merely released it and said, "This is something for you to look at and in due course we shall decide what we shall do about it." Therefore, I cannot see that there can be any ground for criticism of the Government's action in that regard. On the other hand, in general terms I think the total expenditure of the M.A.T.S. recommendations, as estimated by the reporters, is \$570,000,000. That is an estimate, and if I could buy the M.A.T.S. plan for that amount of money and sell it for what it will actually cost I am sure I would make a reasonable profit.

Assuming that the figure is \$570,000,000, and that this is to be spread not over 18 years as mentioned in the report but over 20 years, it means an expenditure of \$28,000,000 a year. Quite candidly, after I have allowed for the increase in revenue from motor taxation and so on I cannot see where we can write into our State Budget such an amount

over the next 18 years. If we can, I think then we also have to decide whether the M.A.T.S. plan is where the money should be spent. If \$28,000,000 was available tomorrow, I would sooner spend it on Chowilla than on the M.A.T.S. plan.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I would go along with that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This State is not spending anything on Chowilla.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Those problems have to be solved. I know there are technical and non-technical problems, but we must get more water to this State and we must be united on this matter and go ahead with it. My own view, after studying the problem, is that Chowilla is the answer; I do not think the other sites provide the real answer to the problem.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will need much more technical advice before it can be confirmed.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That may be so and perhaps I am not as fully informed on that as I should be.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is the problem; that is why it was stopped.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: On the present information I have, I think it should go ahead. The only other thing I want to mention before I sit down is the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States. This tends to become something of a political football. It was a problem with which the Playford Government battled through the whole of its term of office. We did, I think, succeed in getting the percentage of money available to us increased from 10 per cent (which was in line with our population percentage) to about 13 per cent. Under the taxation reimbursement formula we certainly have had some large increases in the amount we have collected over many years. I do not wish to weary the Council, but I should like to give the last two figures available. The suggested figure for 1968-69 is \$111,100,000, an increase of \$8,362,000 over 1967-68; but I do not think that is an adequate reimbursement or that the Commonwealth Government yet understands the problems facing the State and the limited area of taxation available to it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: By how much has the Commonwealth increased its returns?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think *pro rata* it has increased them considerably. One set of figures interested me. In forming its Revenue Budget this year the present State

Government had to provide for additional revenue equalling \$3,800,000 to balance the Budget. It is interesting to note that payroll tax paid by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government amounted to \$3,231,000, so that, if we had had a remission of the payroll tax that the State Government was paying to the Commonwealth Government, it would have gone a long way towards bridging the gap between our proposed income and our proposed expenditure. If, on top of that, the Commonwealth Government would pay rates on Commonwealth property in South Australia, that would further help the position. I believe that, whoever the owner of a property may be, in a city, in a township or in the country, he should pay rates to the local council; and I believe that that principle should apply in the case of the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you advocate that the State Government does that in respect of local government in this State?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, because it would meet much of the criticism that arises when the State Government buys a property.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But local government would not know what to do with the money.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not think that many people in this State appreciate the difficulties now facing primary producers. In some areas they have suffered three years of serious drought and in some areas in this year the returns will not be as good as some people estimate, because I know of areas where crops have not been sown because the weather has been too wet. On top of that, there has been a depreciation in farmers' returns. It was indicated, I think, by a responsible person the other day that a reduction of 20c a bushel for barley was likely in the coming year. I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question today about the position obtaining under the new wheat agreement, the net result of which is that there will be a lower return on wheat for the farmers. Everybody knows what has happened to the lamb market, and the wool market is not as buoyant as it might be.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: And the price of beef has gone down.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If it does not rain soon, we will not get as much wheat as we should.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: All these things have had a remarkable effect, and the result is that in country areas the liquid cash posi-

tion is difficult, many people finding it hard to meet their commitments pending receipt of income from the next harvest. The people in these areas are naturally feeling a little upset at the increased costs, charges and taxation confronting them. Whilst they are in this position and their income is decreasing, they are at the same time facing the position wherein awards of the Arbitration Court and other bodies are increasing wages and salaries, in some instances to a considerable degree. I am one of those people who believe that the maximum rate payable for a job should be paid, but I am worried about the impact of these increases on our primary industries, and particularly on the smaller people in those industries, because the truth still is that, notwithstanding that we have basically moved away from being essentially a primary-producing community to the position where we have a large volume of secondary industry, nevertheless for the economic health of this country we still must earn our export income, which will not be earned from minerals only, great as is the contribution from that source. We shall have to rely for many years to come on export income from our primary industries. I hope that whatever Government is in power will not overlook this fact, because there is considerable apprehension in the country about where the farmers are going.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You do not sound so enthusiastic now as you were when you started your speech. You have brought a black cloud over us now.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think perhaps the Leader is a little disappointed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, no. I merely say you are not as enthusiastic now as you were when you started.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Leader has driven from me the last point I was going to make. I do not intend to say any more at this stage, except that I believe it is a very good series of Loan Estimates. The increase of 16 per cent in the amount to be spent on development works is laudable.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is that a plum in your mouth or is it a tongue?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: We have a very good set of Loan figures before us. Ultimately, the State will get going again and we shall find that the Government will be appreciated for its efforts in getting it going again. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I had not intended to intervene this afternoon, but one or two things cropped up that I should like to mention briefly. First, this afternoon there has been severe criticism from the Labor Party of what is known as the M.A.T.S. Report. We have heard Labor Party members saying that everything the Government has done is wrong and saying what the Government should not have done. I venture to say that, if the Government had not released the report, there would have been a scream to high heaven from the Labor Party, asking why the Government had not released it. The Government would have been accused of not taking the public into its confidence.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We did not say the Government should not have released it. We said it should have released the report only after mature consideration.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The mature consideration that the honourable member mentions would have taken a considerable time, and in the meantime he and his colleagues would have been screaming as to why the report had not been tabled and why the Government was withholding it from the public. Yesterday in another place there was a performance by a certain duo act, Messrs. Dunstan and Hudson. There was much whining, wailing, whinging, moaning and gnashing of teeth about this naughty Legislative Council having knocked back one or two of the Labor Government's more iniquitous revenue measures. These two gentlemen were apparently totally oblivious of the fact that last week they did exactly the same thing themselves, when they had before them the question of Adelaide City Council revenue from parking meters. They had no compunction about telling the council its own business and what it should do about its parking meter revenue. They had the power to vote against any increased revenue for the Adelaide City Council, and they voted against it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They, and some Liberal members.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This was a recommendation of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I know, but surely we do not blindly follow that committee. I should like to ask the honourable member why he did not proceed with motions on the same matter in this Council. I think I could give the reply: that this is an experienced House of Review and it would

have seen that the Adelaide City Council got fair play in connection with its measures and received a proper hearing, quite independently of whether or not a particular committee had made up its mind on the matter. We would have individually examined the matter and come to our conclusions. I have always stood for the fact that when authority is delegated, as this Parliament delegated it to local government in general and the Adelaide City Council in particular, before we sit on it and tell it what to do about its own affairs we should have very sound and good reasons for overriding it. I do not think, in this case, that such reasons existed.

I know that such overruling is popular with the public. The public, including myself and other honourable members, does not like paying increased taxes and impositions, and it is consequently very easy to say that the Adelaide City Council, when looking for additional revenue, is doing the wrong thing. It is easy to do a little cheer-chasing in that relationship. I say (and I have preached this many times here) that we should not interfere with other authorities that are exercising their powers unless we have very good reasons for doing so. This was my charter and my creed in this Council during the last Parliament, when the Labor Government was in power. Members of the Labor Party will not deny that I supported most of their legislation, much of which was against my own political principles: I interfered only when I thought it was right and proper to do so, when I thought the Labor Government was going beyond its charter and going too far.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you deny another member the same right?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: No, not at all.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is what you are doing in relation to the parking regulations.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If you do exercise that right, you should not criticize other people for doing the same thing, and that is what Messrs. Dunstan and Hudson were doing in another place.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member is—

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am referring to a newspaper report. I bow to any ruling you may make, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is not allowed to reflect on another place.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I withdraw the words "another place" and will refer to the newspaper report stating that these two

gentlemen used certain words. I hope this brings me within the correct rule, Mr. President.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Surely you don't believe all you read in the *Advertiser*!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: We really are living in a topsy turvy world today. I thought Sir Mellis Napier really hit the nail on the head last week when he made a speech saying that young people, students, and so on were protesting and trying to tear down whatever exists, but that they did not have the faintest idea what they wanted to put in its place. Everything one reads on this matter points to the truth of this remark.

A letter in the *Advertiser* from two students (I assume they were students) protested against what Sir Mellis had said. They were extremely and unnecessarily rude to that very distinguished gentleman. They protested vigorously against what he had said and all they succeeded in doing was to prove that he was right. They said that the order of things they had found handed down by his and our generation was not right, but neither of them had the faintest suggestion to make as to what ought to be put in its place.

If the students continue to protest we ought to see that they tell us what ought to be done instead. We ought to see that their protests are constructive, not purely destructive, as most of them, if not all, are at present. The general protests about the order of things in the world today suggest apparently that nothing done in the past was any good, but we hardly ever hear any suggestion on what should be done.

I said earlier that we were living in a topsy turvy world, and I should like to give some international examples. In this afternoon's newspaper and, indeed, in the "stop press" of that very estimable paper that the Hon. Mr. Banfield referred to just now—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I referred to the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Precisely. It was announced that the Marylebone Cricket Club's tour of South Africa was off, for reasons we all know about. When we are imposing sanctions in Rhodesia on our own kith and kin whilst at the same time we are watching the Nigerians kill the Biafrans, apparently without any form of protest of any sort, South Africa has been ruled out of the Olympic Games. Russia, which did a deplorable thing (far worse than anything that has been done in South Africa), is still in the Olympic Games.

If anything can be more topsy turvy than that, I do not know it. It is up to people like us to do what we can to see that things are kept on a level keel here.

We are in a position of some sort of authority and we should try to make progress whilst using the best of the experience of all generations; the young people of today can build only on what was done for them by previous generations. If civilization had not reached this present stage they would still be cave-dwellers, yet all the time students are protesting that everything past generations have done is wrong and they are telling us about all the marvellous things they are going to do, yet they have not the faintest idea what they are going to do.

I support the Bill and congratulate the Hon. Mr. Rowe on the very good exposition he gave of these Estimates. He obviously went fully into the matter, and I agree with practically everything he said. I hope that we will be able to regain the financial ground that has been lost over the last few years and, as long as things are properly sifted and considered, I see no reason why we should not do so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If the season finishes well.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I agree. Like the Leader, I hope that the season will finish well; it appears that it will. Undoubtedly last year's drought had a serious effect on the State's finances. It had a direct effect on the cost of pumping water and an indirect effect in loss of revenue and income.

In private business, if one strikes financial difficulties and has not enough money coming in to cover expenses, one does not start asking the shareholders for further capital or reducing dividends, but tries to examine the costs. Immediately one gets into difficulty one does not say, "Where are we going to raise more money?" or, to make a Government analogy, one does not say, "What other taxes can we impose?" One examines one's costs and sees whether more efficiency can be obtained and try to save expenditure without damaging the business. By that, I mean that one should not start putting off employees. That is the last thing a private business or a Government wants to do. The only way to get out of such a situation is to ensure that there is greater efficiency in the business, that the cost structure is kept right, and that one does not waste money on things which do not count or which are unproductive. I am not recommending

that only to this Government; indeed, I recommended it to the last Government, and I recommend it to all Governments in Australia. They should, before increasing taxes, be far more analytical over their expenditures. On that note I cease, indicating that I propose to support the measure.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1298.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill subject to receiving some satisfactory answers to one or two questions I will raise. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kneebone for his contribution yesterday. He obviously did much research into the diseases that affect stock, and his contribution was, I am sure, of interest to all members. The matter of diseases, and particularly exotic diseases, that exist in other countries is of importance to all of us who have the interest of Australia at heart, whether or not they be on the land.

As the Hon. Mr. Kneebone said, we live in an age of swift travel, and in some cases people arriving here live only hours away in countries in which some of these more dangerous and highly infectious diseases exist. This places a great responsibility on our quarantine measures and, in turn, on the provisions made in legislation such as this to control the spread of disease and its establishment in this State. It is of interest to recall that we have lived for a much longer period in an era when transport was not so rapid and when visitors to this country (and I refer to our migrating birds) could be potential carriers of disease. Indeed, it is an accepted fact that some birds can be carriers of disease that affect stock.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They say that even the wind can be a carrier.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, in some instances, but when one considers that Australia is a continent surrounded by water, the main risk is from animals, birds and people from other countries. We have a large range of migrating birds and, although I am no authority on this matter, apparently most of these birds are not the carrion type.

Very few, if any, stockowners would be aware of the wide and stringent obligations on them to comply with the provisions of the Act. The duties of a stockowner who sus-

pects that he has a diseased animal are strictly laid down. I am sure that few stockowners are aware of these obligations. Indeed, on most properties, particularly sheep properties, a number of animals die each year, and the average owner accepts this as part of the normal losses of running a property. It is probably not until an outbreak reaches serious proportions that he would suspect something more than a normal loss each year, because stock can contract many diseases that would not come within the ambit of this Bill. I could name a number that could be caused by, say, nutritional disorders where an animal is found to be sick and beyond treatment, and I refer particularly to urinary calculi. This can cause quite substantial losses in a flock of sheep, yet it is not an infectious disease. I consider that the average person on the land is not only uninformed regarding his full obligations under this Act but is also probably not very well aware of the symptoms of many of these diseases. I think that perhaps the Agriculture Department could also add to the effectiveness of this Act by giving more publicity to the symptoms stockowners should look for amongst sick animals in their flocks.

The Bill itself contains some alterations to the existing Act. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone spoke about rabies, a disease which fortunately we do not have in Australia at the present time but which, if it became established here in such a large country, much of it uninhabited, could be quite dangerous. Of course, this applies to a number of these diseases, because not only is much of Australia uninhabited but also many domestic animals over a number of years have escaped from their owners and have established in the more remote areas in wild forms. I refer to buffalo, cattle which are wandering through the scrub in the North and are very difficult to muster. Even closer to home we have the domestic cat which has gone wild and can be seen on country roads.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Also wild pigs.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, and goats, donkeys and camels. The category of animals brought within this legislation has been widened. This is desirable, because many of these animals can be carriers of diseases and some of them, which are subject to disease themselves and even infectious diseases, have not been included in the Act. Clause 4 (b) inserts in section 8 of the principal Act the following paragraph:

For prescribing the sprays, dips, vaccines, and therapeutic substances by which stock shall or shall not be treated.

In his second reading explanation the Minister specifically referred to dieldrin. Dieldrin was used for quite some years as a sheep dip against sheep parasites, and it was a very effective dip. It was also effective against the blowfly, but in time the fly built up an immunity to it. It was found later that dieldrin had a residual effect and that it could be traced in meat slaughtered for human consumption.

I hope that the Minister in his reply can answer a query I have on this matter. I understand that dieldrin is still the best preparation to eradicate parasites in sheep. I refer to sheep with a fairly long fleece. Normally, dipping takes place very soon after shearing, but it can happen that a flock can become infected from straying sheep quite late in their wool-growing period when they may have three-quarters of a year's growth of wool, and this presents a problem when spraying with a number of preparations, whereas dieldrin, which has an affinity to the wool fibre, will travel down the fibre. To the best of my knowledge, it is still the best and most efficient insecticide for treating parasites on sheep.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you putting in a plug for it?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: No, I am merely asking whether this will be available under certain conditions. I understand that after a certain period of time this residual effect on meat will disappear. I would like the Minister to tell me whether dieldrin will be available under certain conditions such as I have described, and whether permission can be given for its use provided the animals are not slaughtered for human consumption for a certain period afterwards.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think it is only certain preparations of dieldrin that normally would be used for white ant control that have caused some concern.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I would like an explanation of this, because I think this situation arises from the fact that, because dieldrin has been frowned on for some time, stock agents do not normally stock it as a dip, and this could have led to the use of some of these other preparations that are readily available for white ant treatment. I understand it is the dieldrin in those preparations that is the problem. I would be interested to know whether any further work has been done to establish whether after a period of time dieldrin no longer has a residual effect on meat. Proposed new section 28b states:

A person shall not, without the consent in writing of the Minister, establish or use a laboratory or other premises for the purpose of testing or examining any stock in order to diagnose a disease by which it might be infected.

What is a "laboratory" for the purpose of this Act? There is no definition of it in the Act or in the Bill. I have checked through the *Oxford* and other dictionaries in the Parliamentary Library, including one or two judicial ones which I thought might have given a full definition of this particular word. In nearly all cases they refer to a building or place used for separate experimental work. That, of course, means veterinary, medical or industrial research; it covers a wide field. However, for the purpose of this Act, I believe there should be some definition, unless some other answer can be given, because this could apply to any shed where a veterinary surgeon perhaps does his normal work. Many properties have a room set aside for a stock of veterinary medicines where certain work of that type is performed. In his second reading explanation, in reference to the control of laboratories, the Minister said:

These laboratories present three main dangers to the stock industry. First, it is likely that diagnosticians employed by a drug manufacturing firm would recommend a preparation marketed by the firm whether or not it was the best treatment available. Secondly, the proper diagnosis of disease demands the availability of a number of scientists from different disciplines such as histopathologists, bacteriologists, virologists and biochemists.

There is a wide range of experts. The Minister continued:

A private laboratory with a small staff could fail to make proper diagnoses of serious diseases. Thirdly, the use of such laboratories could lead to the suppression of any publicity that could give competitors of the firm an advantage.

The Bill also provides for preventing stock from being sent out of the State without the permission of the chief inspector. I think we are on very thin ice in this clause. For a start, the drug manufacturing firms provide an important service. They use their own laboratories; they establish experimental stations in the field and we very much depend on this type of work to provide the very things we need to control diseases and parasites. If a drug manufacturing firm has a laboratory and a person uses it, I can see nothing wrong in that firm recommending the use of its own products, which are generally examined closely by the Central Board of Health in the various States. There is a very

strict control on the manufacture and sale of drugs. The second reading explanation states, as I have said:

the proper diagnosis of disease demands the availability of a number of scientists from different disciplines

If we are going to restrict the number of laboratories that are to be built and the number of people who can use them (because the prohibition applies also to people who may use them), how shall we cover the wide range of diagnoses required throughout the stock industry? Much of this is done on the property itself by a visiting veterinary surgeon. In many cases it is done by a stock inspector. It is often done by the owner of the property himself, who may have some knowledge of the simple diseases. If we are to restrict too much the number of avenues by which diagnoses can be made, will the Agriculture Department through its own facilities be able to handle them? There is also the point that people sometimes take specimens to another State for diagnosis—say, for worm control in sheep. There are many aspects of this restriction on laboratories and the people who may work in them to be considered. However, I ask the Minister to look, first of all, at the question, what is a laboratory for the purposes of this Act?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The clause states "or other premises"; it is very wide.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Unless the *ejusdem generis* rule applies.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Well, I—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest the honourable member continues making his speech.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I suggest that the words "of a similar kind" be added.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I turn now to clause 11, where new section 16 (4) states:

The chief inspector may recover from the owner of stock that has been treated or destroyed under this section, the costs of that treatment or destruction, as a debt due to him, in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Section 26 of the Act states:

No compensation whatever shall be payable to, or recoverable by, any person for or in respect of the forfeiture, killing, or destruction of any stock, fodder, or fittings, forfeited, killed, or destroyed under the authority of this Act or the regulations: Provided that full compensation shall be paid to the owner for all stock destroyed under the provisions of section 13, which are found to be free from infectious or contagious disease.

Section 13 refers to stock that may be killed by an inspector or a veterinary surgeon if he suspects such stock to be diseased. There is no provision for compensation other than for certain categories of cattle under the Cattle Compensation Act. In addition to that, the owner of the diseased stock is liable for any costs that may be incurred in the destruction of these animals; he has to pay the costs of anyone employed by the inspector. This is one aspect of the whole Act that could be looked at closely, because the whole purpose of the Act is to prevent the spread of infection to other stock throughout the country. If any person is unfortunate enough to have his stock infected from some source, he is liable for the whole cost of destroying them, plus the loss incurred in such destruction of his stock in order to protect the owners of other animals from financial loss. I think that some consideration should be given to spreading this cost. Finally, I wish to refer to clause 23, which inserts new section 45a. It deals with the onus of proof, and provides:

The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 45 thereof:

45a. In any proceedings for an offence against this Act, an allegation in the complaint—

(a) that the defendant was the owner of the stock referred to in the complaint at the time or for the period of time specified therein;

(b) that the stock was within the area referred to in the complaint at the time or for the period of time specified therein;

and

(c) that the stock was not dipped or treated in accordance with the provision of this Act, or lawful directions, referred to in the complaint, shall be deemed to be proved in the absence of proof to the contrary.

This means that the onus of proof is on a defendant to show that he has carried out these requirements. Section 35 of the principal Act is repealed and re-enacted with the addition of the words "or treated", which, of course, also refer to many other parts of the Bill and the principal Act in relation to treatment of diseased animals. The onus originally applied only to dipping sheep. I question how it would be possible for a defendant to prove that he had given certain treatment to stock. With dipping, it is not so difficult, because dipping sheep is a procedure for which helpers are necessary, so it would be comparatively easy to call witnesses.

With the treatment of stock, however, an individual could probably prove he bought the

medicine or vaccine required, but in many cases it would be almost impossible to prove that he had carried out the treatment specified. I question whether the onus of proof should be on the defendant in this situation. This could be unduly harsh.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We are dealing with a fairly critical situation with foot and mouth disease and rabies, though.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, but the provision says "In any proceedings for an offence against this Act", and the Act covers many matters besides this one. I believe the department has used much common sense and discretion in administering this legislation. I

said earlier that most stockowners are unaware of the Act's very wide provisions. If the department had not administered it with common sense, most stockowners would certainly know much more about it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They might lose that common sense now, under new direction.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I doubt that. I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 26, at 2.15 p.m.