

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 10, 1968

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

BRIDGE AT MURRAY BRIDGE

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I understand the Minister of Roads and Transport has a reply to a question I asked him on October 3 about the progress being made in investigations into a new bridge across the river at Murray Bridge.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The present position with regard to maintenance works and proposals at Murray Bridge is as follows:

- (a) The defective bolts in the old bridge have been completely replaced.
- (b) It is not possible to remedy the crystallization of the material of the old bridge, but the structure is now adequate to carry normal highway loads (Road Traffic Act loading).
- (c) Investigations into a suitable site for a new bridge, in conjunction with a by-pass to the town of Murray Bridge, have been prolonged on account of the very deep layer of material, upon which it would be impossible to found a major structure, which covers most of the river valley area in the vicinity. However, borings have now been completed along several possible lines, and an investigation is proceeding to determine the most suitable bridge site, from considerations of economics and of service to road users.

"WORLD FOOD APPEAL"

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my urgent question to him about an organization calling itself "World Food Appeal"?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Last week the honourable member asked me a question about this organization, which was canvassing

by telephone for funds in the Adelaide Hills area. An officer of the Police Department's fraud squad reports:

1. I have to report making inquiries into the *bona fides* of the World Food Appeal organization, which has been contacting persons in this State by telephone calls soliciting subscriptions.

2. This so-called "appeal" is a straightout confidence trick. It has used the name "World Food Appeal" on some occasions and the name "World Famine Prevention Society" on others. Neither of these organizations is registered in New South Wales or South Australia as a legitimate charity.

3. Depending on the person ringing up, it uses the names Kelly, Lenton and Cunningham; subscriptions can be sent to either Box 495 or Box 405, Post Office, Darlinghurst, Sydney. Inquiries by the Sydney police have revealed that the two box numbers are in the name of a W. F. Petty, Flat 4, Waratah Street, Kings Cross. The occupants do not know Petty and cannot assist with his whereabouts.

4. None of the persons mentioned is recorded in criminal records in New South Wales or this State. The Postmaster General's Department investigators and the local suburban police stations have been altered to these persons' activities.

5. These offenders are difficult to locate as they appear to move from one telephone to another. The police have received no complaints for the last five days, which suggests that the persons responsible have not received the response they anticipated.

6. Should any further information come to hand, the appropriate action will be taken.

I am very grateful for the honourable member's question, and I should appreciate it if the press would publicize this matter, because there seems to be a rise in this type of activity in South Australia. A bogus charity appeal is being used to put a confidence trick over certain sections of the South Australian community. I am grateful that I have had the opportunity of answering the honourable member's question about this appeal based, as it is, on the name of charity.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As one who has the greatest admiration possible for the charitable attitude of the people of South Australia towards all appeals, whether they be for hospitals, Telethon or anything else, I was pleased to hear the Chief Secretary's reply. Having had many dealings with charitable appeals, whether they be 100 per cent genuine or doubtful, over the last three years, I feel that the Chief Secretary's request for publicity may not be satisfied. Will he therefore ensure that all television and radio stations and the press are given a copy of the question and his reply, with a specific request to publicize the matter as much as possible, because I would hate to think that the people of South Australia,

who openly and generously give to such appeals, would be taken in by such a bogus body as that mentioned by the Chief Secretary?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, I undertake to do that.

LAURA BRIDGE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the cost of the bridge immediately south of Laura?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Originally it was proposed to reconstruct the bridge south of Laura by placing a new reinforced concrete deck on the existing substructure. As this was considered to be a relatively minor job, a small departmental day labour gang was assigned to the work.

After construction had commenced, however, and the old deck had been removed, it was seen that the condition of the existing piers was such that a completely new bridge should be designed. This being the case, the opportunity was also taken to increase the waterway by an additional span, and to raise the deck level by several feet so as to provide a more satisfactory structure than that which previously existed.

Although work commenced in September, 1966, the further investigations required did not permit completion until July of this year. The cost of the complete structure, including approaches and departmental overheads, was \$93,509.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: In view of the formation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Revision Committee, comprising, as announced in the press, a group of experts, which has been formed for the purpose of examining and reporting on the M.A.T.S. proposals, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ensure that this group has access to basic information from the M.A.T.S. organization?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The six months period allowed for public review of the M.A.T.S. plan has been allowed specifically for the type of activity contemplated by this group. The formation of a group of experts to examine the proposals on a sound professional basis is welcomed. The findings of such groups are expected to be of appreciable value in the future consideration of the M.A.T.S. proposals.

Much information has been collected during the course of the transportation study and this can be made available to appropriately constituted groups and organizations to assist in their work. Such groups may be assured of the maximum co-operation and assistance of officers of the M.A.T.S. organization.

NORTHERN ROADS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I was extremely disappointed with the reply the Minister gave me regarding priorities for the sealing of the road to Wilpena Pound as against the road to Parachilna. He said that the construction of a sealed road from Hawker to Wilpena (a distance of 33 miles) was estimated to cost about \$1,000,000. However, I know from personal experience that 90 per cent of all tourists that go to Wilpena Pound eventually go to the old mines at Blinman and return on the other side of the ranges via Parachilna. I point out, too, that there are 1,000 permanent residents in Leigh Creek, who, if they wish to come south, have to travel on that road. Although I have no desire to see the Wilpena Pound suffer any setback as the result of my question, I ask the Minister to examine my original question again because I was not asking about constructing a road between Wilpena and Hawker via Parachilna and Blinman (a distance of about 113 miles), the cost of which was estimated to be about \$4,500,000. I was asking about a road that would go only to Parachilna, a road that would serve both Wilpena Pound and those people resident in the area, not just a road to please tourists.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is quite understandable that when priorities are considered for roads in the Far North the question of the benefit of the road to local residents and to pastoral interests is considered in the same manner as is the tourist industry. The tourist industry, of course, is growing all the time in its importance to the State, and it cannot be omitted from consideration when priorities of this kind are being determined. This is particularly so in the case of Wilpena Pound, in which we have a considerable investment, and I am sure that the whole question of determining priorities was given full and proper consideration when the decision was made to seal the road from Hawker to Wilpena Pound.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was considered when we made the decision to seal the road from Quorn to Hawker.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As members know, there is considerable work being done south of Hawker. This, of course, does not mean that the road on the western side of the range between Hawker and Parachilna will simply be allowed to deteriorate in its condition. Indeed, a considerable amount of money is being spent, as the honourable member knows, on the main road to the north generally, although much of this at the present time is north of Leigh Creek in the Lyndhurst and Farina area where the swamps are being by-passed with a new road. At the present time I cannot comment further, but I assure the honourable member that when priorities of this kind are being considered in the future (as, indeed, when they have been determined in the past) full and due consideration will be given to the interests of local and permanent residents and also the pastoral interests in the areas under consideration.

WHEAT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have on previous occasions asked questions of the Minister of Agriculture with regard to advances on wheat relating both to advances on previous seasons' wheat and to the possible advances on the coming 1968-69 season. For some years the first advance on new season's wheat has been \$1.10 a bushel. Has the Minister any information for the Council on either of these aspects?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: When I replied to the honourable member last week I said that I hoped we would know in a couple of days the amount the Wheat Board would be able to pay out by way of final return on the 1966-67 crop. Unfortunately, a disagreement has occurred between the Wheat Board and the Commonwealth Government over the \$400,000 that the board claims for devaluation compensation. A total of about \$8,000,000 is involved altogether. At present the Commonwealth Government and the Wheat Board are negotiating on this matter, and until the issue is settled we will not get any payment to the producers. I sent a telegram yesterday to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) urging him to use his good offices to have the disagreement settled at the earliest possible moment, and also strongly urging him to see that the first payment on the 1968-69 crop will be no less than \$1.10 a bushel. Naturally, I have not yet received any reply to that telegram.

APPOINTMENT OF GOVERNOR

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Can the Chief Secretary tell this Council when an appointment of a successor to Sir Edrick Bastyan as Governor of the State will be made?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As all honourable members will appreciate, it is not in the hands of this Government or anyone else to make an announcement; that is the prerogative of Her Majesty the Queen. However, I hope an announcement will be made in due course.

FIRES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 18 regarding fire precaution notices?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The question concerned the possibility of erecting signs giving better publicity to possible bushfire danger in areas outside council areas. I assure the honourable member that I am deeply conscious of the potential bushfire hazard facing this State following the particularly good season, and every possible effort will be made to publicize that danger. Wellknown calico warning signs have usually been fairly widely distributed in the past through local post offices, police stations, and places of that kind. These signs are available from the Minister of Agriculture Department.

If the honourable member cares to furnish me with the names of people who he thinks would be interested in using these calico signs for roadside display and on station properties then I am sure the department would be pleased to see that these are made available, provided the people concerned undertake to collect the signs. The calico signs are most useful, and but for Standing Orders I would be happy to display one of them. However, any honourable member may inspect the sign I have with me if he so desires. I undertake to give every assistance I can in this regard.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I shall be happy to furnish a list of names of people who I know will place these notices in a prominent place.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

**BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1744.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1):
If I thought for a moment that I would achieve any purpose by moving for a reduction in one of the lines of the Budget, I would certainly do so but I know perfectly well that I would achieve nothing by doing that; it would be useless to move such a motion, but that is how I feel when I look at the Budget and examine its ramifications. The present Government on many occasions has charged the previous Labor Government with improperly using State funds, in that it debited to Loan Account expenditure that had customarily been debited to Revenue Account.

The present Government admits that a considerable volume of the expenditure transferred during the time of the Labor Government to Loan Account has normally been charged to Loan Account in other States. We have often heard it said in debates both here and in another place that South Australia should follow the other States in respect of certain things done there but, when it comes to this matter it appears that this Government thinks it is correct for other States to do it but it is not correct for South Australia to do it. Those items that were transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account were transferred to where they rightly belonged, but the Labor Government was criticized considerably for doing it. The Treasurer has commented on that, and I will quote briefly what he said:

Moreover, the diversion of current Loan funds to cover any further current revenue deficit is indefensible, whether the diversion is for formal funding of a revenue deficit or merely to hold surplus funds on one account as a general offset to a deficit on the other. I have already made it clear in the Government Loan works proposals that such a diversion will not be entertained under present circumstances.

Let us examine that statement. The present Government has not only perpetuated the actions of the Labor Government in debiting the Loan Account with the expenditures referred to but has also extended them, including the appropriation of about \$6,000,000 surplus in Loan funds to be held as an offset to the deficit in the Revenue Account. This cannot be denied—it is a fact. The Treasurer

says this cannot be tolerated, that such an action is "indefensible". It has often been stated by the present Government, and undoubtedly will continue to be stated, that the Labor Government completely ran down the State's finances, thus forcing the present Government to take the action it has. Here again, the Treasurer contradicts this statement when he outlines the action of the Commonwealth Government in relation to taxation reimbursements to this State. Although this was referred to by the Hon. Mr. Shard I, too, desire to mention it. Again, I quote what the Treasurer stated in his explanation to Parliament. He said:

Members will be aware that in June last the Premiers of all States put to the Prime Minister submissions and proposals for a revision of Commonwealth-State financial relations to divert to the States a greater and more equitable share of the Australian resources for public finance. These submissions were not successful, as the Commonwealth took the stand that a revision must await the conclusion of the present grants arrangements in June, 1970. The South Australian Premier at that time, and subsequently, submitted that from a variety of causes the South Australian reasonable requirements had latterly been less adequate dealt with than had those of other States. He indicated he was prepared, if necessary, to have the Commonwealth Grants Commission arbitrate on the matter pending the 1970 re-assessments. We now understand that the Commonwealth does not feel able to make an immediate increase in the financial assistance to this State or to any other State upon either general or particular grounds, but that it has not closed the door upon reconsideration of South Australia's position should developments during the course of the two years to June 30, 1970, make such reconsideration appropriate.

The Government considers that the stand of the Commonwealth towards the States generally and towards South Australia in particular has been most unreasonable and inconsiderate. A mass of information and submissions has been placed before the Commonwealth indicating the relative gross inadequacy of the sources of State finance both in volume and in growth potential to meet the ever expanding State responsibilities. This inadequacy is highlighted even more by the extent, flexibility, and growth potential of the Commonwealth's own resources, which are such that the Commonwealth is able to finance its works and functions at standards which are much higher, and increasing at a much more rapid rate, than is possible with State standards. The special problems of the State of South Australia and the retrogression in financial assistance relative to provisions for other States were impressed upon the Commonwealth.

The retrogression in Commonwealth assistance to South Australia, particularly in relation to assistance to Western Australia and Queensland, in both general purpose and

special purpose financial arrangements, has been very great indeed. We do not for one moment suggest that such assistance should not have been given to those States, but simple equity and real need demand comparable treatment for this State. The Government has no intention of relinquishing or even abating its efforts to secure a more reasonable financial arrangement with the Commonwealth for current purposes, for future purposes, and for some contribution toward those recent deficits which in part can be attributed to inadequate earlier arrangements made by the Commonwealth.

This is the kernel of the whole matter. We must have regard to the accusations made against the Commonwealth Government, not to the accusations made against the Labor Government. The Commonwealth's attitude has been the same for a considerable number of years not only toward this State but also toward other States. At the same time, the Commonwealth Government is wasting millions of dollars on purchases like that of the F111 aircraft. In such a situation the State Government has no chance of getting more consideration from the Commonwealth Government.

The present State Government is fortunate in that it is not faced with the same kind of difficulty that faced the Labor Government. During the previous Government's term of office drought conditions resulted in less revenue and in the need for continuous pumping from the Murray River at considerable expense. In contrast, the present Government is faced with a probable record season, and I hope that such a season eventuates. The present season opened well, but then deteriorated. However, following a dry period, we have recently had further good rains. A good general rain in mid-October is usually sufficient to keep crops going and to finish them off. If we receive such rain, there should be a good harvest, which I know all honourable members are hoping for. Because of the present good season the present Government is faced with a far better situation than that which faced the previous Government.

I do not agree that the taxation increases in this Budget will be shared equally by all members of the community. The first additional taxation with which I want to deal is the tax of 1c in \$10 on turnover. This type of tax is operating in Victoria, therefore the present Government believes that it should operate here. As I said earlier, in some instances it is all right and in other instances it is all wrong. It is expected that in a full year this tax will raise \$4,800,000. It has

been stated that this tax cannot be passed on and that it will be borne by those on whom it is levied, but I cannot for one moment agree with this statement. As the Hon. Mr. Shard has said, this type of tax is not borne by commercial undertakings. Although the tax is only 1c in each \$10, I fear that what will be passed on will be 1c in about every dollar.

The stamp duty of \$2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance is an imposition on the motoring public, because a person cannot register his vehicle if he does not have a third party insurance certificate. Every vehicle, whether operated by a private individual or by a commercial undertaking, will be involved. Whom does this stamp duty hit? It is not a great imposition on a commercial undertaking, because a carrying company or a business that uses vehicles can pass on the \$2, and more. However, the ordinary taxpayer cannot recover the \$2. The Government intends to use this imposition on the motoring public to relieve it of its own responsibilities in connection with the Budget.

I do not have much objection to gift duty, because I notice that the minimum gift subject to duty is one of \$4,000. Someone would have to give me the \$4,000 before I could make a gift of this amount to anyone else. There are, however, people in this State who could afford to make such a gift. If a father wishes to give his son or daughter \$4,000 to assist in the purchase of a house, he must pay gift duty.

I turn now to the extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time payment, leasing and like transactions. Who uses time payment and finance companies? The ordinary working man uses them. The finance companies are the ordinary working man's bank. He cannot pay cash for the necessities of life that he wants to purchase, so he uses the time payment system and, consequently, he will be hit again.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Some of the necessities of life to which you have referred did not exist in your young days.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That may be so. They did not exist in the honourable member's young days, either, but they are necessities today.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I would not call them necessities, though.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We did not have refrigerators when I was a child, but they are necessities in our climatic conditions. If a person wishes to buy a washing machine or refrigerator he has to utilize the finance

companies and, if he does so, the Government says, "You will have to pay a tax for using a hire-purchase agreement." The Hon. Mr. Shard mentioned liquor licences. The extra taxation involved will not be paid by the hotels: it will be paid by the people who patronize hotels when they are returning home from work at night.

Under this year's Budget, 45 per cent of the profits of the State Bank are to be paid to the Treasury. The Hon. Mr. Shard commented about public hospitals, but I do not wish to reiterate what he has said. The Budget also contains a considerable number of hidden charges, such as increased water rates. It has been pointed out that the Labor Government increased water rates, but that was done to meet the additional costs of pumping.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The rates were increased the year before. It was this year we did all the pumping.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In 1967 we pumped continuously from the River Murray so that restrictions would not have to be imposed and, because of the complete co-operation of the people, restrictions were avoided. Now the people will pay increased water rates, as well as other hidden charges contained in the Budget. If one registers the birth of a child now one must pay an increased registration fee. The Government does not tell the people that it is doing these things. I refer now to roads. In his explanation the Chief Secretary indicated that there would be an increase of \$450,000 in motor registration fees and a total of \$13,300,000 was anticipated. However, I fail to see how one can anticipate an increase in registration fees simply in the light of increased taxation on motorists.

When the Government recently announced that it was releasing certain items from price control, it said it would keep a wary eye on prices and, if there was a tendency for prices to increase, it would consider bringing those articles back under price control. Only two days after this announcement was made the Government announced that the prices of certain articles would be increased. Of course, the result of such action was known perfectly well. Although an extra \$2 tax will be imposed on motorists, I think it is beating the gun to anticipate an extra \$450,000 in motor registration fees, as the Chief Secretary did in his second reading explanation. Many people will find that they cannot afford a motor car, and others will have to sell the cars they already have.

I note also the comment of the Chief Secretary that \$7,466,000 is to be transferred to the Highways Fund, which is \$279,000 less than the amount so transferred last year. This means that that department will have less money with which to function. In the *Advertiser* of October 3 the Minister of Roads and Transport is reported as having said that it was planned to spend about \$124,000,000 on rural roads over the next five years. However, on checking I found that most of the planning on these projects was done before the Minister came into office and, in some instances, construction work was already in hand. Therefore, one must consider that the sum of \$124,000,000 includes the continuation of work that was in hand before that time.

The Minister said that this expenditure represented 62 per cent of the total funds available to the Highways Department over the next five years. That leaves only 38 per cent of the funds available for the metropolitan area and for other purposes. Before the debate is finished the Minister might inform me about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report and the statements made regarding the expenditure in relation to that report, and also about the amount of Highways funds that will be available to undertake that work. If the M.A.T.S. Report is adopted by the Government, does this mean that no work will be done on the report for at least the next five years? I submit that this is the probable meaning.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: They are doing the Crafers Freeway now.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That has been in operation for some time and was budgeted for, and it is included in the \$124,000,000 mentioned by the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How many times was that in the newspaper?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No more than five. The Labor Government has been accused from time to time of not doing anything for the country people. However, I draw the attention of honourable members to what the Labor Government did in relation to roads during the three years it was in office and I was the Minister. I am rather proud of that record. It is interesting to compare the amount spent on roadworks in South Australia during that time compared with the preceding three years under a Liberal Government. The amount spent between 1962 and 1965 was about \$76,000,000, whereas from 1965 to June

30, 1968, during the term of office of the Labor Government, it was estimated that the amount expended would total \$100,000,000.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A good effort.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is what you estimated you would spend. What did you spend?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This amount was spent on the maintenance and expansion of the road system in South Australia and it is an increase of about 33½ per cent over the preceding period. The effect of that, particularly in the country (and this is the kernel of the matter), is that whereas to the end of the financial year 1964-65 rural roads consisted of a total length of about 3,450 miles, the Labor Government expanded the road system in rural areas by a further 1,143 miles of new sealed roads, taking the total to about 4,600 miles. I emphasize that these new roads are all sealed and that their construction has lowered transport costs and improved commercial and everyday communications. The current planning was for this road system to be increased by a further 1,100 miles during the next three years.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Who started the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In 1964-65 in the metropolitan area four miles of new sealed road were constructed and, in the rural areas, 294 miles. In 1965-66, the first year of the Labor Government, there were 25 miles of new road in the metropolitan area and 329 miles in rural areas. In 1966-67, there were 19 miles in the metropolitan area and 260 miles of two-lane sealed roads in rural areas. The anticipation (I use that word because the figures given were estimated to June 30 last, and the Labor Government went out of office in April) for 1967-68 was a total of 30 miles in the metropolitan area and 260 miles in rural areas. I emphasize again that these were all new roads in the rural areas. Over these years 1964-65 to 1967-68 there were 78 miles of new roads in the metropolitan area and 1,143 miles in the rural areas, making a grand total of 1,221 miles of new road constructed within the State's roads framework.

Therefore, when honourable members accuse the Labor Party of doing nothing for the country people I suggest that they have a look at the programme accomplished by the Labor Government in the three years it was in office.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: How many of these roads were planned before the Labor Government took office?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There could have been some; I do not deny that.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I would say practically all of them.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What about the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I frankly admit that the Eyre Highway was started before the Labor Government took office, but it was continued under the Labor Government.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: No-one is suggesting that it was not continued.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I did everything possible to persuade the Commonwealth Government to make funds available so that we could complete the Eyre Highway to the border, because it is definitely uneconomic for us to do it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That doesn't apply to the South Road, and that was stopped.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That comes under what we know as the Noarlunga Freeway in the M.A.T.S. Report.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You fixed the Hackham crossing.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Regarding the Noarlunga Freeway planning, we find considerable advocacy at present because of what that is going to do to residents throughout the Goodwood area. That could be an advantage to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill because he might use it. However, I will not. In any event, it will not be any good to me because I will not be able to afford to go there in the future.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What about the Crafers Freeway that you opened three years ago? That is what I am interested in.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not know what Sir Norman Jude is driving at, so I put the question back to him: what about it? Is his objection that I went up there at the time it was officially opened? No doubt Sir Norman Jude knows what he is talking about and is trying to bait me. I could say the same thing to him regarding the construction of the Broken Hill Road from Peterborough to the border, which will be officially opened shortly by the present Minister of Roads and Transport. I do not see that there is anything wrong with that. In fact, I congratulate the Minister on being in the position to do that, and I only wish I were in that position now.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: What do you say about the completion date of 1968 for that road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Labor Government's plan was that this highway would be completed in 1968. The first statement I made about it was that it was expected to be completed in December of this year, but because of the progress that was made we found that it could be completed much earlier than December. The Labor Government pushed on with that road as quickly as possible while it was in office. Because this road was started during the regime of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude it could have been an excuse for me or for the Labor Government to take a parochial attitude and say, in effect, "The previous Government did this; we will stop it." By way of contrast, what has been done in some instances by the present Government could well be more closely examined, but I will not go into it too far.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It has never been suggested that the Labor Government stopped that project.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There are some things that were stopped immediately the present Government came into power. They were started by the previous Government, and I will go further into that if honourable members so desire. However, I believe I have taken up enough of this Council's time on this question. I have made my protest against the attitude of the present Government, and if an election were held tomorrow I know perfectly well what the result would be. I have no alternative but to support the second reading.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): Before the Hon. Mr. Bevan commenced speaking he said there would not be many matters left for me to speak on in this Bill because of his contribution towards it. I heartily agree with him, because he certainly covered many subjects.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He refuted all the rubbish that has been talked about the Labor Government not supporting country areas.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In Parliamentary Paper No. 18 when introducing the Bill and explaining the current Budget, the Treasurer said:

... if the community is to have the expanded and improved services that only Governments can provide, then it will continue to be necessary for taxation and other revenue-raising measures to be brought into effect from time to time. There is no escape from the simple principle that if the community

continues to make new and increased demands upon the Government, then the Government must make increased demands for financial contributions from the community.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When the Labor Government did that your Party said it was wrong.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That statement by the Treasurer is basically an economic fact that cannot be denied. If a service is wanted, it must be provided if there is sufficient reason for it, regardless of the political colour of the Government. However, that is not the point I am trying to make.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member has tried to make a lot of political colour out of actions of the Labor Government during the last three years on matters he said should not have been done.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: My point is that we must acknowledge the need for taxation increases to provide the necessary finance, regardless of the fact that we do not like such increases. One thing that State Premiers have been doing for some time, as the Hon. Mr. Bevan pointed out, is to continually ask the Commonwealth Government to provide additional finance for the States. Taking this a little further, do we want the Commonwealth Government to give us more money or do we want that Government to give us (not only this State, but Australia as a whole) a different concept of stability in the whole price structure of the community?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We want that Government to give us a more equitable part of the taxation pool it is collecting.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I do not deny that at all.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When we suggested that when in Government, and asked for it, we were told by members opposite that we were wrong and that we should not do it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I quote from a book entitled *Price Stability, Growth and Balance—Australia's Economic Objectives*, which states:

The Chifley Labor Government formally adopted the full employment objective in 1945 in a White Paper whose opening sentence left no room for doubt: 'Full employment is a fundamental aim of the Commonwealth Government. The government believes that the people of Australia will demand and are entitled to expect full employment, and that for this purpose it will be able to count on the co-operation of servicemen's associations, trade unions, employers' associations and other groups'. At the same time the White Paper made clear the government's desire for price

stability and balance-of-payments equilibrium and its determination to see, as far as possible, that full employment was achieved without sacrificing either.

The Menzies Government in 1959 and the present Commonwealth Treasurer have expressed views similar to those, that is, the need for full employment, which we do not deny, but there is also the more important matter of wage stability and of price stability.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: In 1948 Menzies said there should be a pool of 10 per cent of unemployed people.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: We have moved a little further from those days; it is now 1968 and we are still aiming for full employment, but there must be contributing factors to make this possible. There are indisputable signs of increased inflationary trends in the economy of Australia that influence the economy of this State. Once people accept inflation as a normal pattern they take steps to protect themselves against the inflationary spiral. It is something similar to a dog chasing its tail.

It is regrettable to see that the trade unions, when making claims for basic wage adjustments, make claims in excess of what is actually needed at the time. I do not criticize the unions for doing this, because they have to apply for an excessive figure, in my considered opinion, so that in 12 months when their next basic wage claim comes up for arbitration there will have been sufficient money available to wage-earners to enable them to meet the cost rises that took place in that intervening 12 months.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Not when the case comes up again, but before it is adjudicated.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There must be a bargaining point and an ambit to be covered by the claim. I am not criticizing the unions for this; I am making the point that it is a case of dog chasing dog. Wages go up, prices go up, commodities get dearer. Where do we end up? Our export potential becomes smaller because of the price structure.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: There is a difference between dog chasing dog and a dog chasing its tail.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It depends on whether the dog has two tails.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But in the process there has been an increasing standard of living in all sections of the community.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There must be an increase in the standard of living. We

must have an expanding economy that will rub off on the community. If we do not have these things, our education system will break down or become less potent. Our hospital schemes would not be quite as ambitious as they are today. The excellent argument we had on roads a few moments ago could not have been possible if the economy did not grow. The Premier of Victoria and our Premier have said that we must get more money from the Commonwealth authorities in order to exist, otherwise taxes must be increased or we have to get the money from another source.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But they did not agree with that idea 18 months ago. They, and members of this Council said, "What are you whining about? Why go to the Commonwealth Government? Why not do something yourselves?"

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is what I am saying today.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No. You are saying something stronger.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Many people say, "Let us have more money from the Commonwealth Government." If we do, I maintain that the State, in turn, is maintaining this inflationary spiral without a better wage and commodity stability. Therefore, I venture to say that what we need in Australia is a control of profits, income and expenditure so that a balanced economy can be achieved because, if the Commonwealth Government keeps giving us money and wages keep rising, the job will not get done. It only helps to put a little more water into the pool: it does not achieve what we really want.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What do you think of price control?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I do not think much of it in relation to what I am talking about, which is price stability. With price control we have a fixture but, with price stability, we must have a rise and fall in prices. When the demand for commodities is great the price can be one figure and when the demand is not so great it can be another.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If you believe in arbitration for the employer, why not for the employee?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If we can achieve financial stability, we do not have violent rises in prices for commodities, and wages rising to cope with them. If the Commonwealth authorities do not make some attempt in this matter, the process will be endless: we shall just go on having wage increases every year

and the price of butter, building costs and costs incurred in making roads and providing schools and hospitals will increase, too. Although it can be said that the Commonwealth authorities are like blotting paper, absorbing taxes all the way along the line, it is not real stability or good Government; it is not good economically.

I want to leave that theme and turn to the problem of financing country hospitals in this State. I preface these remarks by referring to the problem of the general practitioner, who is doing such a wonderful job in the country areas, and of the future, when he wishes to leave his practice and a replacement has to be found. Much money is being spent on country and subsidized hospitals, but how many of them will be operating efficiently with a doctor in 10 years' time? Will a replacement be available for the general practitioner when he leaves the hospital? I know these questions are hard to answer. With the advance in medicine, which is all the time becoming more technical, it is becoming increasingly difficult for a doctor to practise as a one-man organization with his own surgery. Already in the cities we observe a grouping together of three, four or more doctors in a partnership. Some of them are specialists in their own field. Therefore, with such a grouping together of doctors, a patient can be moved from one doctor to another and in that way the best appreciation of his health can be obtained.

However, in the country it is becoming increasingly difficult for the general practitioner to keep abreast of the medical information, which is continually altering as the years go by. Is it wise for the Government to continue spending considerable sums of money on hospitals which, in possibly five or 10 years' time, will not be operating as hospitals as they are today if the doctors cannot be replaced? Will it not be far better for the Government to examine this problem and declare openly what its plans are in this respect so that the doctors, who contribute so much to the efficient working of country hospitals, will know it is likely that hospital A in a few years' time will be operating as it is today, whereas hospital B will be operating in an entirely different manner in five or six years' time? Just as the M.A.T.S. Report has been produced in an endeavour to acquaint the public with future metropolitan transport requirements, so I think that something similar, although not so elaborate or costly, could be

prepared for the future of our hospitals, so that they will know where they stand and we can plan ahead, and doctors can be encouraged to go to central bases in the country and establish practices there.

At this point, I do not wish to criticize the various methods that the Government has announced for increasing taxation. Taxation will have to be increased and, when the Bills are introduced, that is the time for criticism or comment.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do I understand you are suggesting base hospitals?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes—area hospitals, or base hospitals, if you wish, as is the case with area schools. The area school has become a wonderful asset to the country. It is not linked directly with the major towns; these area schools are scattered throughout the country and provide the sort of education that was denied country children a few years ago. If hospitals could be organized on similar lines, it would benefit the general community and the medical community as well, and would have much to commend it. I support the second reading.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I support this Bill, but with some reservations with which I must deal in some detail. The proposed tax upon turnover, slight though it is, will, if applied without consideration, kill the co-operatives that serve our agricultural industries in fruit, dairying, fish and vegetable-growing.

In all these industries times are difficult. In fact, the only way a small producer has been able to survive is by forming co-operatives to handle the sale of his fruit and by purchasing in bulk the many and costly requirements of his trade. In doing so, he has made himself peculiarly vulnerable to this tax if he uses his co-operative either to sell his produce or to buy his needs.

The plight of a fruitgrower illustrates my point. A grower preparing his own fruit, taking it to market and selling it to a retailer will pay tax once. If he takes his fruit to a co-operative and if the co-operative places the fruit, as it always must, in the hands of a merchant, commission agent or market man for distribution to retailers, the tax will be extracted three times: between the grower and the co-operative, between the co-operative and the agent, and between the agent and the retailer.

Regarding the purchasing side, all co-operatives have set up a joint co-operative venture

in Murray River Wholesale Co-operative Limited to carry out all buying. Requirements of spray chemicals will be taxed as follows: between the chemical firm and Murray River Wholesale; between Murray River Wholesale and the co-operative; and between the co-operative and the grower. Again, the tax is extracted three times, but the grower who purchases direct from the chemical company will pay it only once.

Thanks to the competition between chemical companies, there is already considerable pressure on growers to purchase direct. I do not think the Government sufficiently understands that these co-operatives, which have grown up in accordance with the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, are not separate businesses, agents or merchants: they are part of the business of fruitgrowing.

Instead of building their own packing sheds and cold stores, these fruitgrowers have spent their money co-operatively to form a neighbourhood packing shed to which the fruit is carted, instead of a farm shed. There is no other difference. This is, in fact, recognized in commercial law. Under State law this fruit retains its identity as belonging to the grower until it is sold to the retailer.

Even when the fruit is sent overseas, it is identified by the grower's number on every package. Any loss or cost through deterioration or damage that arises before the fruit is sold to a retailer in Britain, Hamburg or Sweden is the grower's loss or cost. Final proof of this position at law lies in the insurance settlement for the fruit impounded in the Suez Canal. In the settlement, a substantial margin has been held back to pay for the unloading and disposal of the rotten fruit, which the grower must pay for—if the ships ever emerge from the canal.

Consequently, I am sure that, legally, transactions between growers and fully registered co-operatives and between the co-operatives themselves are exempt from taxation. This is recognized by the Commonwealth Government, under whose taxation laws registered co-operatives are exempt from taxation. In the days when State Governments levied taxation this exemption was extended to co-operatives by the South Australian Government. Why this change now? If there is any fault in this analysis it will, as I said at the outset, kill the co-operatives that growers are finding it hard to sustain, because of the upsurge of costs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill): Is the honourable member reading his speech?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: No; I merely have extended notes. The second point to which I want to draw attention is the gross injustice that is being done in the levying of drainage rates by the South-Eastern Drainage Board. This was the subject of a meeting convened early this week at Greenways which was addressed by the Minister of Lands and the Chairman of the board. I congratulate these gentlemen on the clarity of the exposition they gave of the law and I also congratulate them on explaining the expenditures that have given rise to the increase in rates.

I also congratulate the settlers on the restraint with which they have advanced the hopeless position that faces them. I know it deeply impressed the Minister and I know the depth of sincerity that is behind his promise to examine this matter and see just what can be done. After all, as landlord to many of the men on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, he is well aware that many of these men have not got the money to pay the increased rates.

He is also well aware of the difficulties of the small man in Zone 5 at the end of the worst drought of all. If the South-Eastern Drainage Act lays it down that these rates must be paid, the Act should be changed. In the details of the expenditures it was made clear that the whole of these rates would be devoted to structures and road bridges, which must be maintained. As they depreciate, provision must be made for their eventual replacement.

This is quite unjust: in every part of the State except the South-East means of carrying away surplus water are a charge on the roads and on the public who use them. To ask the farmers to pay because of the depreciation and maintenance of bridges over the drainage system in the South-East is sectional legislation, which would not stand up in law if it was examined without any bias.

We do not have to go far in the South-East to find land that is charged a betterment rate but which has, in fact, been grossly depreciated in value by drainage. The actual betterment, if any, is reaped by land remote from the drain and in respect of which rates are not charged at all. A re-examination of this whole question of South-Eastern drainage is long overdue.

In many areas the drains have fulfilled their purpose and will never run again. Many of the laterals I have examined this year have not run at all, or have carried a negligible

stream. Consequently, they should now be filled in. All they can do now is to waste water that should be stored.

In this, the wettest winter we are likely to experience, water could be stored in the soil above the water table. The South-East is not high-rainfall country. Now, underground water supplies are being used wherever farmers have the capital to do so, and water supplies are being used for crops and pumped much more rapidly than the rainfall can replenish those supplies.

There is no mysterious underground source of water in the South-East: it is all derived from the rain that falls on the land. Whenever the water table has fallen sufficiently to provide enough space for the storage of the surplus winter rain, it is urgent that drains be closed and that only those drains be retained where the water table reaches the surface for long enough to impede the use of the land.

During my frequent visits to the South-East in this near-record wet winter, I have not seen any large area where the land is submerged to this extent. Many millions of gallons of water have, on the other hand, run to waste at sea, but they should have been conserved at their source. This is urgent: it is not a matter for consideration in the future. There is no need for a long wait for the appointment of hydrologists, etc.

We should alter the constitution of the South-Eastern Drainage Board now and appoint to it some of the highly-qualified practical men who are competent to make a start, at least, upon the now important task of controlling water and of its conservation and proper use. For goodness sake let us get something started instead of seeing precious water being run out to sea.

On the subject of underground water, I was deeply concerned indeed to hear the reply given by the Minister of Works to the question of the Hon. Mr. Rowe regarding the sale of Bolivar water. I must add my voice to the rising tide of protest that must come from fellow members of the horticultural industry who have had the misfortune to have established themselves on the dwindling water beds of the northern Adelaide Plains.

I do not care how much it costs; every drop of effluent water and run-off water must be conserved to preserve the industry which has established itself in this area. To divert any water at all for other purposes cannot be considered by any responsible Government.

The only thought that has entered costing so far has been the line of the cheapest means available to the department of disposing of an unwanted waste.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you disagree that the use of such effluent water could have an adverse effect on the health of the community that uses the crop grown with it?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: This is ridiculous. Certain types of vegetables will grow if this water is used, without any risk at all to health. In some cases it may be necessary for growers to change the type of crops they grow so that full use can be made of this water.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about root vegetables?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: A large number of potatoes are grown in the Virginia area, and many types of vegetable can be grown without any risk at all.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Are you talking about the situation as it is at present?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes, I am.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That does not tally with the experts' reports.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I feel that we probably listen to the experts too much.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't you realize that you are listening to the expert now?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I will claim that. This is level country, and the cost of channelling water along the areas that are now in desperate straits for water is negligible when compared with the loss that will ensue if these gardens are allowed to perish because of the lack of an adequate water supply. I give fair warning that we will raise a furore through our associations if water that could be used to save these gardens, even though they must stick to crops suitable to the water quality and purity, is not taken advantage of.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you threatening the Government?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Yes. I implore the Government to get busy and take action, because this is a problem of today, not of tomorrow. Some big water users have the resources to re-establish themselves elsewhere. Therefore, the first move should be to get these people out and re-establish them, and to distribute this effluent water to the gardens that it can serve.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Don't you think it would be a good idea to have a re-appraisal of the use of water on the plains?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I do not want to comment too widely on that, because it is the subject of a resolution in another place. However, many people are in an almost hopeless position until they can be given an alternative water supply.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Didn't they know the position before they went out there and established themselves?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I do not think so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I beg to differ about that. When I was—

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am not concerned about the problem in the past. This problem will seriously affect many people in the future. Meanwhile, the Minister of Mines should get his hydrologists to examine the possibilities of recharging the supplies in winter by soakage from the surface, not only from Bolivar but from the run-off from Elizabeth and Para Hills, which water is at present being wasted.

This area is only one that needs urgent attention of this nature. Also, big trouble is impending in the Langhorne Creek and Milang area. There is also big trouble ahead for the South-East and particularly for the paper mills, if the subject of underground water is not immediately made a major preoccupation. I know that a committee is being promoted in another place, but this subject is not one for a committee that will give it sober consideration over a long time: it is one that needs urgent action now. I cannot worry about possible technical faults that may, in the opinion of the experts, impede progress. For goodness sake, let us get on with the job.

The next matter to which I refer is what I can only call the rape of the Adelaide Hills. We have only a tiny strip of high rainfall country in South Australia. The road distance between Outer Harbour and Murray Bridge is only 70 miles and, as the crow flies, is less than 50 miles. The rainfall at Outer Harbour is less than 14in. a year; in the Adelaide Plains it is about 21in.; in the foothills it is 24in.; from the top of Mount Lofty a very narrow strip receives 45in. each year; Mount Barker gets just under 30in.; and then the rainfall drops away range by range to less than 10in. at Taillem Bend.

The devastation that has been wrought in the past 10 years in this terribly small good rainfall area is staggering when reviewed in total. In the name of progress, thousands of acres of what should be our most highly prized recreational areas have been bared by

road building, subdivision and farming—land that should never have been touched by anyone. Roadways that should be closely guarded by-ways have been cleared fence to fence. Streams which should be devoted to carrying pure water into Adelaide's water supply have gathered effluent, mud from road construction, clearing, and fouled pasture land.

Urgent protest to highways authorities, to local government and to the Town Planner by representatives of these districts have got nowhere. The rape of this land is snowballing, and it is now almost too late for anything to be done.

On behalf of the Mount Lofty Ranges Protection Association, I appeal to the Government to act immediately to arrest this grisly ruin that is being made of our best land which is close at hand where it can be enjoyed. This very responsible body has approached this problem with the needs of all sections of the community in mind, but with the ideal in front of it that we must preserve the beauty of the Adelaide Hills and the development of the area and its residential population. It has prepared an overall plan and a report, a copy of which has been presented to the Government. This report calls for the appointment of a responsible authority, with power to co-ordinate needs and of meeting them, as well as saving as much land as possible from destruction. Again, I appeal for early action. We should not let this report lie in baskets, which is what will happen if there is any objection to it. This is a national need, and surely no-one will object to the motive of preserving the beauty of our hills, except perhaps those who have an axe to grind because of some motive that is not in the public interest.

Finally, I raise the matter of the profitability of farming in the high rainfall districts of this State and the areas still badly drought-affected from Sedan, Palmer and eastwards. The city people who have had rainfall in abundance may think that the disaster of the drought is over, but this is not so. I invite any member who thinks in that way to come with me into the Murray Plains and the Murray Mallee to see the land that it has not yet been possible to recover from drift sand, and into the land that had too little rain too late. These farmers are still in serious trouble, and have no sign of recovery yet.

I would like also to take whoever comes with me down to Greenways and back through the Adelaide Hills to talk to the men who have entered into heavy commitments to keep

stock only to find, after they have preserved their flocks and herds, that the price of wool, fat lambs and now beef have fallen so that there is little possibility of their recovering their financial position in the foreseeable future. Men like those at Greenways who had to tell the Minister of Lands what he already knew did not have the money to pay increased rates. Even the big sheepowner is this year realizing investments made years ago to enable him to make ends meet. The small man is rapidly approaching the stage when he will have to leave the land, with all the unhappiness attached to bankruptcy and the losses involved to the community when this happens on any large scale. For goodness sake, we must not let that occur again.

This is not a matter of theory: it is a bitter personal individual need that the whole subject of the profitability of farming in these areas (I refer chiefly to high rainfall districts) be looked at as a whole. In order to survive, these men must have alternative cash crops. World-wide search should be in progress for crops which can be grown in these areas, and trials should be in hand to pilot their practical use. The alternatives are to intensify their production in this land or to combine holdings into what is likely to be an economic unit in the unceasingly difficult years ahead.

Admittedly, small seeds production has brought prosperity to some farmers in these areas. However, this is a comparatively minor development, and there is no indefinite market in this line. There is no reason at all why grain crops cannot be taken if suitable varieties are found, and my opinion is that with regular cropping some of the difficult and costly problems that face these areas, such as weed control, pasture grub, and non-wetting sands, to name but three, will disappear with more intense land use and regular cropping.

However, the problem is far too great for individual farmers to solve, particularly at present when to stay on their farms many farmers are eating into capital reserves. This problem must be given to the Agriculture Department and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization to study in depth as well as to find immediate palliatives. It now concerns a very large sector of the agricultural industries in the Southern District and must be tackled on a State-wide scale, for fundamental changes in agricultural practice are involved.

I lay the problem in the capacious lap of the Minister of Agriculture as yet one more problem with which to burden him. It is

one that must be tackled presently. The Agriculture Department has served this State well through its history by thinking ahead and foreseeing these problems and being well on the way with solutions to them when they arise. We must break the policy which has led the egg and citrus industries and the Virginia vegetable growers into disaster through letting foreseeable trouble come before doing anything about it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Are you in favour of regulating the amount of production?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I do not think it is possible for any statutory body to regulate production without profound disturbance to the industry. Very high costs are involved.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What could any department do to correct the trouble that you foresee?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: If we upset the natural laws of supply and demand in any industry we raise forces with which it is far beyond the capability of a small industry to compete.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You said you would put it in my lap. I want your thoughts on it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The thing I want to put in the Minister's lap is that bringing in legislation to control the number of sheep carried or the amount of pasture devoted to sheep cannot in any way help this position of unprofitability in the high rainfall lands. In the case to which I refer we are bound completely by the fact that our markets are the wool and the fat lamb markets, which are overseas, and the people concerned must find alternative crops which allow them on comparatively limited acreages to be able to pursue an alternative occupation when pressure becomes too high on any particular line of produce. After all, this is what the wheat farmer does: if wheat prices go down, he goes in for barley, and if prices are favourable for stock he increases his stock. The men to whom I referred earlier run into trouble because they have no alternative lines of any profitability at all. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1739.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the Bill. In doing my homework I was surprised to find that at least

two unsuccessful attempts were made previously to legislate for the registration of veterinary surgeons in this State, and that it was not until 1935 that an Act provided for such registration. The two previous attempts (in 1919 and 1927) were both made in this Council, and although in each case the Bill passed this Council it was defeated in another place.

Some of the speeches made in this Council were interesting. I am surprised that the Bill passed through this Chamber, in view of the attitude of some honourable members regarding registration, not only of veterinary surgeons but of dentists and other people. Apparently at that time there was a feeling against registration of any nature. The people who most ardently sought the registration of veterinary surgeons were the members of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the academically qualified veterinary surgeons themselves, the former because of the cruelty practised on poor dumb animals and the latter because they were endeavouring to raise their own status and to protect their livelihood from the activities of totally unqualified competitors. During the debate in 1935 that resulted in the principal Act being placed on the Statute Book, the Hon. Malcolm McIntosh (as he then was) said:

Many instances have been noted from time to time of the cruelty practised by unqualified persons in the treatment of stock.

He quoted from the annual report of the Government Veterinary Lecturer made some years prior to then, and said:

The annual report of the Government Veterinary Lecturer made some years ago made reference to cases of gross cruelty due to the ignorance of quacks, such as the roasting of a cow's udder for mammitis; the packing of a horse's foot with sulphuric acid, resulting in the sloughing of the hoof in acute agony; rubbing sulphuric acid into a horse's sides for pneumonia, so that the animal, shrieking with pain, had to be shot.

It was surprising to me that this could happen in a community like South Australia in 1935, but the honourable member evidently had evidence that it was occurring. It was apparent then that there was a great need for something to be done to stop such happenings from recurring. It was hoped at that time that the passing of the Act would prevent such undesirable practices from continuing. It was maintained that, given a choice between qualified practitioners and mere "quacks", the owners of stock would prefer the former. I think that, in the main, that is what occurred as a result of the Act being

passed, where people were given a choice. The choice over the years appears to have been somewhat limited because of the shortage of academically qualified veterinary surgeons prepared to act in the more remote areas of the State.

This position has arisen because over the years, and at the present time, there is no chair of veterinary science in the South Australian universities. The cost of establishing such a chair may be great, but the time must be fast approaching when this State will have to make a greater effort to ensure that an adequate number of veterinary surgeons is being trained to meet our needs. The 1935 Act provided by section 17 (2) that any person who did not hold the requisite academic qualifications could still register as a veterinary surgeon provided he had for seven years prior to the commencement of the Act attended and treated animals for disease or injury in Australia as a sole means of his livelihood. However, applications had to be made within six months of the commencement of the Act.

Section 18 (1) of the Act provided for the registration of veterinary practitioners or other people without academic qualifications, such as a veterinary officer of five years' standing of a veterinary lodge subsidized by the Government, and inspectors of stock holding such a position at the commencement of the Act. Those people also had to apply within six months of the commencement of the Act. Although a few people were still practising in 1952 who had sought and received registration either as veterinary surgeons under section 17 (2) or as veterinary practitioners under section 18 (1), I think that the passage of time has eliminated them by now.

An amendment was passed in 1938 that gave power to the Veterinary Surgeons Board constituted under the Act to issue a permit to a person who was able to satisfy the board that he was competent to treat animals for diseases and injuries. Every such permit authorized the holder to practise for reward the treatment of animals for disease and injury. The permit was limited to the part of the State specified in the permit. The purpose of this permit was to provide a veterinary service in areas where qualified veterinary surgeons were not available.

In 1952, as we have been told by the Minister, a move was made to amend the principal Act to enable the Veterinary Surgeons Board to register in South Australia competent veterinary surgeons who had graduated outside the Commonwealth. That amendment limited

registration to those who applied within three years of the passing of the amending Act. The position now is that, to be registered as a veterinary surgeon, a person must comply with section 17 (1) of the principal Act and have academic qualifications.

The penal sections of the Act do not prohibit an unregistered person from treating animals, but section 29 and following sections make it an offence for an unregistered person to hold himself out as being registered or as being a veterinary surgeon or veterinary practitioner. When one considers that most of the amendments I have mentioned were made to the principal Act over the years in order to provide for additional qualified veterinary surgeons (and in other cases for certain unqualified persons) so as to meet the great need existing for such people in some areas, one wonders why a chair of veterinary science has not been established in our universities. I believe one of the causes of the shortage in certain remote country areas is the more lucrative field open in the metropolitan area for academically qualified veterinary surgeons in the treatment of race horses, polo ponies, stud dogs, greyhounds, and other animals. In addition, the Agriculture Department needs qualified veterinary surgeons to examine cattle before they are killed at a meatworks. These are lucrative fields for veterinary surgeons. As a result of this, it has been necessary to allow certain people without academic qualifications to practice in certain remote areas of the State. However, I am sure those people have given good service in some areas. All of this makes me wonder why, if such a demand exists for veterinary officers, something has not been done about training them in this State instead of relying on other countries to provide them or other States to train them.

I support the principle of the Bill, because it is a move to provide some relief of the situation. This must be necessary, or the Bill would not have been introduced in order to provide sufficient veterinary surgeons to look after injured and diseased animals in this State.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris (Minister of Health):

That this Bill be now read a second time, which the Hon. A. J. Shard had moved to amend by striking out all words after "be" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the

words "withdrawn and that the matter of measures to protect the public from any harm which may be caused by the teaching or practice of scientology be referred to a Select Committee of the House", and which amendment the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan had moved to amend by striking out the words "withdrawn and that the matter of measures to protect the public from any harm which may be caused by the teaching or practice of scientology be".

(Continued from October 9. Page 1748.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave of the Council to withdraw my amendment to the motion.

The PRESIDENT: Before asking leave of the Council, I point out that the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan has an amendment which is dependent upon the amendment the Hon. Mr. Shard desires to withdraw. It will be necessary first for the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan to withdraw his amendment.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Shard.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Before the question is put to the Council, may I ask whether it will be competent, before the closure of this debate, for a motion to be moved, consequent upon this Bill being read a second time, that it be referred to a Select Committee?

The PRESIDENT: I understand that is contemplated.

Leave granted; amendments withdrawn.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. S. C. Bevan, C. M. Hill, C. D. Rowe, A. J. Shard and V. G. Springett; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Tuesday, November 19, 1968; and the committee to have power to invite any specially qualified persons whom it may select to attend any of its meetings in an advisory capacity.

ABORIGINAL CHILDREN

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. H. K. Kemp:

(For wording of motion, see page 1733.)

(Continued from October 9. Page 1734.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): In rising to support this motion, I should like to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kemp on moving it. It is a slight deviation from the general Aboriginal problem with which we are faced today, in that it refers specifically to what I prefer to call "native children".

I noted that, within a few hours of the honourable member's drawing the attention of this Council to the desirability of the motion, honourable members received a newsletter setting out the actual work being done by the Aboriginal Education Foundation of South Australia. I have perused that newsletter and find nothing in it with which I can disagree. In fact, I am glad to say it lends additional support to what the Hon. Mr. Kemp is suggesting is necessary today.

The Aboriginal Education Foundation is, apparently, moving along with quiet subtlety in certain directions with regard to Aboriginal children, but I do not think that in this case subtlety is enough. What we need is a considerable amount of publicity, for publicity will bring home this problem to many more thousands of people than those in immediate contact with the problem today. The problem should be understood by all our people, particularly those in the metropolitan area who do not have the opportunity, of course, of observing it at first hand.

I was interested to read in the press a day or two ago of the intention of the Lutheran Mission, associated with Yalata, to endeavour to obtain a licence to supply liquor to Aborigines of that reserve. I have always been a supporter of that attitude. I have believed from the outset in granting full rights to our natives, and that it was highly desirable that they be given every opportunity to learn to tolerate the problems of alcohol within their own community to begin with before they moved out and took their chance, so to speak, in the tougher world of the people who have learnt their lesson (at least, I hope the majority have) outside. I hope that experiment proves successful. I am certain that if handled properly it will. I could have said, "This is not a matter for the Lutheran Mission; it is a matter for the Government", but I am not so sure, and that is why I am not saying it. It may be better in the hands of these people who are continually in contact with the Aborigines rather than being subjected to strange appointees with little or no knowledge of the social job ahead of them beyond merely running a canteen. Therefore, I hope this will prove of benefit to our native population. It is definitely a move in the right direction.

I need not speak at length on this matter, but I should like to refer to one or two cases that I personally have encountered in this matter in other States. In the far north-

west, I went on a station where there were some 80 natives—not all full-blooded, of course; in fact, the majority, I should imagine, were not full-blooded. They were living close to the homestead. Work was provided for them and their share of the week's killings for food was 2½ bullocks; they were a happy community. Most of the able-bodied women had minor menial tasks connected with the station, in return for which they were well fed, receiving ample rations. My point is that they were happy. Some of the not so competent men had what one may term part-time jobs. A few of them who were able-bodied and able stockmen were working on the station for wages in excess of the ordinary pastoral wage, because they were good men. An employee or, should I say, an agent of a large union turned up at this station and informed the owner that she would have to pay all these men the full award rates if they were to remain there. Of course, the reply was obvious: she said, "I will pay all the able men the full rates, but I cannot afford to pay full award rates to some dozens of other people and keep and feed them at the same time. It is up to you: the ball is in your court."

I think that when the new award provision comes into force these employees will have to go. When I was there, it was like a wailing wall: they were very unhappy. I would be the first to object if I thought these people were being victimized or used as slave labour, but I know better in this case. So, let us consider where these women and children will go in the next few months. They will go to the coastal towns and will be a general drag on the community. The women and children will wait in these towns until the able-bodied men have their holidays or go walkabout, when they will go to the coastal towns with their cheques.

The Aboriginal is one of the most democratic fellows in the world. When he gets a cheque he cashes it. He does his best to enjoy his share of it, and he makes a general hand-out to all his friends. Consequently, most of his money soon disappears: he becomes a good friend of the tribe, but unfortunately most of the money is spent on the new outlet of alcohol. Consequently little or nothing is left for some of the young pregnant women and their small children, who either become a charge on the community or starve.

I should like to relate another incident to honourable members. I arrived one evening at an hotel in a coastal town at about 7 o'clock.

There were four of us: we left our womenfolk in the car because disturbances had been occurring. The hotelkeeper suggested that we enter the hotel through a side door because he was having trouble with the Aborigines. He said, "The police station is not on the telephone, so I shall have to go and get the policeman, because there will be trouble." There did not seem to be any serious reason for trouble, apart from the fact that some people had had too much liquor.

There was only one constable in the town and he could not be on duty in the hotel all the time. In the meantime, the front bar remained absolutely full of Aboriginal men and women drinking much liquor. I was told that, on the day before, not one of the Aborigines had had a cent, but two men had arrived with large shearing cheques. I was told that neither of them now had any money left.

We then tried to get a meal, and we went to a cafe about 200 yards from the hotel. Having ordered the meal, I was confronted with a country helping of food. I said, "I cannot possibly eat all this. Take the plates away and let me have half of this quantity of food." The attractive waitress said, "You need not worry: it will not be wasted." I said, "I notice many children around." Honourable members can guess the rest of the story. We left plenty of food, and by the time we had left the cafe all the children had disappeared to eat our left-overs. Yet, when I got back to the hotel the bar was chock-full. The publican himself told me he was thinking of giving up the hotel because his wife was sick of it. I have related these incidents to illustrate two practical effects of what is going on.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They occurred in Western Australia.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes, but you do not want the position to become worse here?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Thank you, Mr. Acting President; I stand corrected. I have said enough to indicate that something should be done about the honourable member's motion. I support it.

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

FLUORIDATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. A. Geddes:

(For wording of motion, see page 1361.)

(Continued from October 9. Page 1738.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): As representatives of various electoral districts in the State, we have a responsibility to give expression to the views and feelings that we know are those held by our electors. In doing this we remember that we are representatives, not delegates. In other words, we are not sent here with a book of instructions: we are sent here to act as we think best in our people's interests. Rarely can we say that we speak for everyone, although there are occasions when many of our electors make their feelings known to us quite clearly.

On the question of fluoridation many people have made their feelings known to all of us, some rationally, some passionately, and some by warning of future consequences. We respect the views of all these people, except those who say, "Listen to us and ignore everyone else, or else." This motion deplores the fact that it has been announced, without prior Parliamentary approval and consultation, that fluoride will be added to the water supply. Surely it is this Council's prerogative and duty to act as a watchdog for minority views as well as for majority views. In this case very many people have expressed concern at the Government's action on fluoridation and, as the Hon. Mr. Whyte said yesterday, he could assure the Premier (as we all could) that this is not a vote of no confidence in the Premier or his Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You speak for yourself.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I am.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The majority of people have no confidence in him, have they?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Most thinking people have.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It must be a small percentage of thinking people. The people of this State did not make him Premier at all.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Not only Gallup polls, but what one hears around the State, confirm that most people are in favour of the introduction of fluoridation—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have not found that in my district.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: —but some people have an uneasy feeling about the method by which it was introduced. In Parliament we all have a responsibility to give expression to those views. We must admit that when the announcement to introduce fluoride was made it was emphasized that every member would have a right to speak and, if he so wished, to oppose the measure or to move for its rejection.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We were also threatened twice if we did not do the right thing.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: It is the method and not the aim that is under criticism. Most of us commend the introduction of fluoride. At the risk of taking up a few minutes of honourable members' time I re-emphasize the extreme value of fluoride. One might also say that it plays a vital part in our well-being. It is good not just for dental health. It has a place in the general health of the individual. It is a vital trace element, and those who are concerned with primary production are well aware of the value of trace elements. Indeed, people on the land who find trace elements missing from the soil do not say that the Lord made the land without those elements and leave it at that: they add them and make their land more valuable and useful. This vital trace element is found naturally in water in many parts of the world. It is also found in certain food-stuffs. We must remember, too, that it is also a normal constituent of the human body. Its presence or its diminution cannot affect directly the existence of life, but it does alter the degree of good or bad health. I use the words "presence or diminution" because its absence is impossible to obtain. This is because it is present even in the air. Some people emphasize that it is a poison, but so are many of the chemicals found in the human body if they are ingested to excess.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is this cumulative?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I will mention that in a moment. We think of it being valuable to teeth, but it is also valuable to the general bone structure. The body is full of interacting chemicals, one of which is fluoride. It is readily absorbed, but when taken in reasonable amounts (and this is the answer to the Hon. Mr. Kneebone) the body retains what it needs and excretes the excess. This applies not only to fluoride but to many other chemicals in the human body.

We emphasize its value in the care and protection of teeth. As honourable members are aware, Australia has one of the worst dental records in the world. I learned this when I first came to Australia some years ago. I was talking to a girl of 13 years of age, who told me that she had a full set of dentures, both upper and lower, at that age. I had never seen this before in my life and I was indeed staggered. I then asked everyone under 14 years with whom I came in contact whether his teeth were his own. However, this was in Victoria, not in South Australia. Honourable members would be surprised to find that in many parts of the world people of 50 and 60 years, and even beyond that, are keeping their teeth.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Surely that is an indication that the body has enough fluoride. Why do we want more?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Those people are in areas where there is enough fluoride. As most people are aware, the value of fluoride is emphasized for the part it plays in the prevention of dental caries. I agree (and all medical and dental people would agree) that the diet and the type of food ingested have an important part to play in dental health.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Isn't that the main point at issue in this matter?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: No: even given a perfectly balanced diet taken in the correct proportion, there will be a much higher dental caries rate than in areas where ample flourine is available. People have also questioned the use of tablets and have asked whether these would not be better because people could control the consumption of fluoride themselves. However, honourable members should be aware of the difficulty day after day or year after year of trying to get children to swallow a tablet and to keep up a regular pattern. Secondly, the people who provide tablets to their children are by and large families that are responsible in their outlook and responsible in their care of their children but, unfortunately, these are not the children in the greatest need.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about putting it in toothpaste?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In exactly the same way toothpaste is not the best answer because not all people use it. Indeed, often the people in the greatest need do not use it. It has also been suggested that it should be added to sugar. However, sugar is in sweets,

and to put fluoride in sugar is like sending for the fire brigade to put out a fire and then calling on an oil company to put more petrol on the blaze.

Other people have said that there is a tremendous allergic risk associated with the use of fluoride, but that is not so. If this were the case no medicine at all would be used, because a form of allergy to every accepted medical substance is known. By and large, the proponents of the use of fluoride state their facts precisely and carefully. The opponents in the main (although not all of them) tend to play on emotional facets and many of their arguments are open to challenge. The World Health Organization reported in 1958 that there were no confirmed cases of allergy in population groups who were drinking water that had been treated with fluoride. The introduction of fluoride to our water supplies is a public health measure and is not mass medication.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is it supported by all doctors?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I will come to that in a moment. It is not a means of introducing medication and additives, but simply the replacement of essential elements. I regard the crux of this matter to be not the right or the wisdom of introducing the measure in the way it has been introduced, but that the Government should have taken bold and deliberate steps in the interests of and for the good of the people. There is cumulative evidence which proves beyond any reasonable doubt that it is for the good of the people. This evidence comes from our own dental association, the Australian Medical Association, the British Medical Association, the American body, and the United Nations World Health Organization, to cite just a few.

I accept that not 100 per cent of the members of any profession can be found to support this or any other facet of research. When one realizes that in Britain there is still a Flat Earth Society, one cannot see how complete unanimity can be expected on this point.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The medical boys learn at the same type of university.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Can you tell me why some States of America, after intensive and expert examination, have discontinued fluoride?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: This has happened because of the violent pressure of cranks. In fact, most of the States, after careful research, have gone back to fluoride. The investigations of all these organizations and

bodies must count for more than a little, and they must indicate a considerable degree of safety of the measure envisaged and the overall benefit to a large proportion of the community. This Government must be given credit for taking this move and so, in part at least, must the previous Liberal Government, although it did not implement measures to give the benefit to the people. Having ascertained the value of this measure, the Government has actually introduced it.

I respect those people in the community who do not hold the view that fluoride is valuable, and most of those, although not all, will respect my view and the views of other people equally sincerely held that this measure is of value to South Australia. Because I believe that the value of the step proposed is more important fundamentally to the good of the people than the way in which it was introduced, I will move an amendment to the motion of the Hon. Mr. Geddes. I move:

After "that" second occurring to strike out all words and insert "while the procedure adopted by the Government in introducing fluoride to the water supplies without reference to Parliament may be open to criticism, nevertheless the Government is to be commended for its wise decision to safeguard the dental health of the community by so adding fluoride".

I appreciate the intention of the motion of the Hon. Mr. Geddes, but more I give credit to the Government for facing up to the need and taking steps to meet it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP seconded the motion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: (Central No. 1): I listened with interest to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Springett regarding fluoride, and I suppose he could be classed as one of the experts.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If you disagree with him you are a crank.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. However, other experts have a different point of view, and I am getting more and more confused every day regarding this matter. I heard the Hon. Mr. Kemp say this afternoon that we take too much notice of experts, and that is another point of view. I support the motion of the Hon. Mr. Geddes, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Whyte, because I disagree with the way the Government has gone about this matter. A proposal of this sort, on which there are such widely divergent views, should

have been brought down to this Council so that we could be given an opportunity to debate it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Or to another place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You still have an opportunity to debate it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Hon. Mr. Whyte, when speaking yesterday, said that he hastened to point out that the motion moved here was not a vote of no confidence in the Premier. I differ from the honourable member in that regard. I have no confidence in the Premier, and I am speaking on this occasion because I want to say that I have no confidence in him, particularly because of the way in which he has introduced this matter.

Evidently the Premier became petulant when he found that some of his own supporters were prepared to doubt whether the Government had gone about this thing in the right way. The Premier is attempting willy nilly to add fluoride to our water supplies whether or not the people desire fluoride. Following opposition from his own people, he even threatened to withdraw the plan.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is a habit he learned from his old master.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That comes about as a result of dictatorship.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: One Liberal and Country League member in another place was so naive regarding the effects of Liberal and Country League policy and the voice of the individual in that Party that he said he was opposed to the introduction of fluoride. He expressed that view definitely at one stage, but it is interesting to note that following the Premier's outcry about what was happening in this Council that honourable member very smartly changed his view and is now prepared to support the Premier.

Following the Premier's outcry that if this motion is carried it will be a vote of no confidence in him, it will be very interesting to see what happens to the motion. We have heard the oft-repeated statements by people in this Council that they have no contact with people in another place, and we shall now see whether actions substantiate the words that have been spoken here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I don't quite see what you are getting at.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Many people here have said that the actions of the Premier in another place have no effect on them in this Council; that they have no contact with the Premier; that they have the right in this Council to express their own view because there

is no control over them; and that they are not bound by any Party politics or anything of that nature. Therefore, it will be interesting to see, in view of the Premier's remark, whether this motion gets carried. It will also be interesting to see the actions of the Premier if the motion is carried. We saw what happened to a member in another place, who had to change his views, and I am sure that there will be enough support for the Premier in this Council to ensure that the Premier does not have to face up to this being a vote of no confidence in him.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You are having a bit each way; whichever way we vote we are going to be wrong!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not propose to argue the benefits or otherwise of fluoride, except to say that I personally am opposed to adding fluoride and forcing people to take something they do not wish to take. This will not affect me, for I drink only rainwater anyway. However, I am against mass medication of this type.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You use ordinary water in your cooking.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We use rainwater in the cooking because we have the tank connected to the kitchen. About three years ago, many brave words were said in this Council about mandates. Some people believed the Labor Government had a mandate for several things because those matters had been included in our policy speech.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you ever have a mandate to increase water rates?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Did the Chief Secretary's Party have a mandate to do it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Answer my question first.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We had a mandate for many things but the Liberal and Country League does not have a mandate for anything. As the majority of the people voted for the Labor Government, we had a mandate. However, the L.C.L. had only 43 per cent of the people vote for it, and a majority voted against it. About three years ago a learned discourse took place in this Council about whether we had a mandate for certain things. However, in a devious way, the position was reached where it appeared that we did not have a mandate for anything, because it was said that a person who voted for our policy in one respect did not necessarily vote for it in another respect.

We were told that, if we brought a matter into this place and the L.C.L. was sure we had a mandate for it, we would probably get the L.C.L.'s support. However, nothing was said about what would happen to us if we did something (even if we had a mandate for it) without first bringing it before Parliament. I am sure that, had we done that, the mass media which support the L.C.L. would have screamed to high heaven.

If we had done something, by an administrative act, for which we did not have a mandate members can imagine what the mass media would have done to us. However, in this case the Government, which has no mandate for anything at all, is proposing

this course without bringing the matter to Parliament and putting it before the representatives of the people so that they can criticize it if they wish to. I believe that the amendment introduced here was possibly instigated by the people who incited a member of another place to amend a motion there to save the Government from some criticism. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 15, at 2.15 p.m.